



Effective Citizen Participation in Vulnerable Urban Renewal Areas A Comparative Analysis of the ‘National Program for Liveability and Safety’ Initiatives in the Netherlands

Master Thesis

29.06.2025

Erasmus University Rotterdam

MSc Urban Governance of Inclusive Sustainable Cities

Student: Melina Albani, 728416

First Assessor and Supervisor: Dr. Sofia Pagliarin

Second Assessor: Dr. Ingmar van Meerkerk

Word count: 11,993

Pages: 34

Abstract

Urban inequalities increasingly threaten social cohesion, particularly in vulnerable areas undergoing renewal. In response to rising disparities and deteriorating community trust, the Dutch government launched the ‘National Programme for Liveability and Safety’ (NPLV) in 2022. This is a long-term, integrated, decentralized intervention to mitigate pressures in the country’s twenty most vulnerable neighbourhoods undergoing urban renewal. Central to its governance approach lies citizen participation. Progress reports from two NPLV initiatives particularly structurally impacted, Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest, highlight implementation barriers of citizen participation. A framework for evaluating effectiveness of citizen participation structures in vulnerable urban renewal area contexts and directing them in overcoming barriers is undertheorized. This research addresses this gap by exploring the question, “What factors contribute to effective citizen participation within the urban focus areas of the NPLV?” and searching for hampering and facilitating factors. Conducting a qualitative, comparative case study of Amsterdam Nieuw-West’s Wijkallianties and Den Haag Zuidwest’s Partnernraad participation structures, this research proposes a comprehensive indicator framework for effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas. It extends a framework informed by key citizen participation theorists Arnstein (1969), Ianniello et al. (2019), and others through insights from nine semi-structured interviews with NPLV programme managers, participation structure leaders, and citizens. Findings reveal effective participation hinges on communication between participation structure leaders, members, the wider community, and public officials. Transparent, continuous communication of intentions and structure builds trust and facilitates committed leadership, a balanced group dynamic, a coherent process design, and meaningful citizen influence. The framework enables mutual learning and is applied to generate recommendations for both cases.

Key Words: Amsterdam Nieuw-West, Citizen Participation, Den Haag Zuidwest, NPLV, Urban Renewal, Vulnerable Areas

Acknowledgments

The successful completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the guidance of my supervisors and lecturers, the participation of my research respondents, and the support of my friends and family.

First of all, I would like to express my profound thanks to Dr. Sofia Pagliarin for her thoughtful mentorship, support, and critical insights throughout the research and writing process over the last six months. Her constructive feedback and reminders strengthened this thesis and improved the way I think and write. Additionally, I thank all professors and lecturers who have taught me in the Urban Governance Master at Erasmus University Rotterdam over the last year. Their genuine passion for research motivates and continues to inspire me to take intentional steps toward building a career that is equally fulfilling.

Second of all, I extend my sincere thanks to Tim van Lieshout, without whom this thesis would not have been possible. I deeply value his trust in me to research and advise on a challenging topic faced by the Partnerraad. His constant availability to answer questions, provide feedback on my ideas, and willingness to give me access to his network, greatly facilitating my participant recruitment, have shaped this thesis. On that note, I want to thank every participant of this research. Without them, none of this would have been possible. Additionally, I am thankful for Ingmar van Meerkerk for introducing me to the Thesis Lab Den Haag Zuidwest, the programme under which affiliation this research has been conducted. Thank you to the Thesis Lab for providing the valuable opportunity to work on a research project with real societal relevance. Getting to work on this project not only enriched my knowledge, but also confirmed to me the scale and issues I am passionate about pursuing.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes out to my family and friends. None of my achievements would have been possible without their immeasurable support over the last four years. Thank you to my family for their encouragement, patience, and understanding. And thank you to all my friends who have made the last six months, and indeed the last four years, well-manageable with their support, humour, and perspective. Thank you to my Urban Governance classmates and friends for every memorable moment. And a big thank you to Rebecca, Nadia, Anna, Mihail, and Stacy. I am endlessly grateful for their support and friendship throughout this journey.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Acknowledgments	1
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Citizen Participation	1
1.3 Research Purpose and Question.....	2
1.4 Research Relevance	2
1.5 Structure.....	3
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework	4
2.1 Role of Citizen Participation in Equality and Social Cohesion	4
2.2 Effective Citizen Participation: Hampering and Facilitating Factors	4
2.2.1 Contextual Factors.....	4
2.2.2 Organizational and Managerial Factors.....	5
2.3 Synthesis and Adaptation.....	7
2.4 Conceptual Model.....	7
Chapter 3: Methodology	9
3.1 Research Design	9
3.2 Case Selection.....	9
3.2.1 Case Selection Criteria	9
3.2.2 Case Context.....	10
3.3 Operationalization	11
3.4 Data Collection and Participant Recruitment	12
3.4.1 Semi-Structured Interviews.....	12
3.4.2 Contingency Plan	12
3.4.3 Participant Recruitment.....	13
3.5 Data Analysis.....	13
3.6 Limitations.....	14
3.6.1 Validity and Reliability	14
3.6.2 Privacy and Security.....	14
3.6.3 Positionality.....	14
Chapter 4: Results and Discussion	15
4.1 Indicator Framework for Effective Citizen Participation in NPLV Initiative Context	15
4.1.1 Contextual Factors	15
4.1.2 Organizational and Managerial Factors	18
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations	22
5.1 Conclusions	22
5.1.1 Confirmed Expectations	22

5.1.2 Practical Conclusions.....	22
5.1.3 Academic Conclusions.....	23
5.2 Recommendations	23
5.2.1 Practical Recommendations	23
5.2.2 Academic Recommendations	24
Reference List.....	25
Appendixes	28
Appendix A: Interview Topic List	28
Appendix B: Code Book.....	29
Appendix C: Privacy Checklist and Consent Form.....	37
Appendix D: Final Indicator Framework	44
Appendix E: Application of Indicator Framework	46

List of Table and Figures

Figure 1:Conceptual Model.....	11
Table 1: Case Context	15
Table 2:Operationalization and Preliminary Indicator Framework.....	17
Table 3:Participant and Interview Data	19
Table 4:Recommendations	34

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

“The future of inequality largely depends on what happens in cities” (UN DESA, 2020, p.109). This is what the UN’s World Social Report 2020 concluded in its analysis of global inequality trends.

Today, the majority of the global population resides in urban areas. This number is predicted to grow from 4.4 billion to 6.7 billion by 2050 and is the effect of cities’ decades-long chronicle as the heart of economic and social opportunity. Given projected uncontrolled urban growth, the emphasis on cities as engines of development must be reframed to account for their growing socio-spatial inequality and declining social cohesion (CBS, 2024). To avoid the detrimental effects of urban growth, planning for and managing urbanization is more critical than ever (UN DESA, 2020).

Though one of the wealthiest countries, the Netherlands also faces inequalities related to income and wealth. The number of working poor in the Netherlands is growing steadily (Van den Bossche, 2019) and discrimination experiences, relative poverty, community disconnection, and dissatisfaction with social life are increasing (CBS, 2024). Low-income youth residing in the largest Dutch cities, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Haag, and Utrecht, have lower income and education prospects than those from socioeconomically similar backgrounds in rural areas (Kansenkaart, 2025). Research on processes underlying neighbourhood socioeconomic change reveals each city centre is undergoing structural urban renewal upgrades leading to spatial segregation that increases social inequality (Modai-Snir & van Ham, 2020). Urban inequality undermines social cohesion by weakening residents’ participation, trust, and integration, threatening equal opportunities and inclusiveness (CBS, 2024).

Amsterdam and Den Haag deal with the most significant effect of growing inequalities on neighbourhood structure and social cohesion (Modai-Snir & van Ham, 2020). Low-income communities cluster geographically and these areas become increasingly vulnerable as injustices of housing, education, security, and more accumulate.

Vulnerable areas in Dutch cities, defined by accumulating inequalities, experienced particularly worsening social cohesion in the 2010s due to a policy vacuum of insufficient investment and fragmented governance (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, 2022). A common trend across Europe in earlier decades, the Dutch government was not the first to respond to deteriorating social cohesion. The United Kingdom’s (UK) 1998 ‘New Deal for Communities’ (Lawless et al., 2009), Germany’s 1999 ‘Soziale Stadt’ (Walther & Güntner, 2007), and France’s 2014 ‘Politique de la Ville’ urban policy (URBACT, n.d.) target deprived areas. They aim to improve liveability through long-term, integrated, area-based, and decentralized governance for urban renewal.

Guided by these, the Dutch government launched the ‘National Programme for Liveability and Safety’ (NPLV) in 2022, a long-term collaboration with local municipalities to mitigate pressures faced in vulnerable neighbourhoods undergoing urban renewal (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, 2022). The programme objective is to improve the prospects of residents over the next 15 to 20 years. It invests in renewal of the 20 most vulnerable Dutch urban areas based on low liveability scores. This is projected to bring transformational changes to the quality of life and safety of 1.2 million residents.

Distinct from past Dutch centrally- and nationally-imposed neighbourhood improvement approaches but mirroring the other European decentralized policies, the 19 NPLV member-municipalities determine their individual implementation strategies.

1.2 Citizen Participation

A core feature of many NPLV member-municipalities and European urban renewal policies is a participatory decision-making structure centering citizen involvement. The emphasis on participatory governance has normative roots as participation promotes democratic legitimacy and equity (URBACT, n.d.), practical reasons as it enhances quality of outcomes (Lawless et al., 2009), and strategic motives as it builds trust, social cohesion, and governance capacity (Walther & Güntner, 2007). According to key theorist Arnstein (1969), effective participation is defined as the power redistribution between government and citizens that realizes expected normative, practical, and strategic benefits.

Urban renewal threatens social cohesion as structural changes can increase inequalities (Nationaal Programma Zuidwest, 2023). Particularly sensitive are vulnerable citizens facing stronger systematic and structural barriers and weaker starting conditions, such as lower institutional trust or fewer resources (Nachmany & Hananel, 2023; Vanleene et al., 2017). Involving citizens in official decision-making is justified to reach NPLV programme objectives for bettering social cohesion (Brock et al., 2023). Considering vulnerable residents' unique realities, effective citizen participation requires tailored support, safeguards, and empowerment mechanisms for equitable access to genuine influence on official decision-making (Richards & Dalbey, 2006). Participation contexts are deeply influenced by political and socio-cultural locally contingent factors, therefore highly complex (Ghose, 2005) and context-specific. Citizen participation, thus, cannot be standardized despite focus areas facing similar socio-cultural realities. What, however, unites Europe-wide approaches is that participation frameworks are government-initiated, embracing a top-down and reactive character.

Research stresses that participation structures must be formalized to be effective (Ianniello et al., 2019). Structures in British, German, and French urban renewal policy approaches are institutionally embedded in national laws (Lawless et al., 2009; URBACT, n.d.; Walther & Güther, 2007). Nevertheless, assessment reports reflect on insufficient resident autonomy (Batty et al., 2010), restricted citizen influence to consultation (Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung, 2017), and weak implementation of participation goals (Commission des Affaires Économique, n.d.). Two NPLV initiatives involve formalized participation structures; Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest (Samen Nieuw West, 2025; Gemeente Den Haag, 2022b), programmes from the Dutch cities dealing with the largest structural and social impact caused by inequalities (Modai-Snir & van Ham, 2020). NPLV progress reports, similarly to European ones, highlight insufficient continuity of communication and capacity as hampering effective participation (Nationaal Programma Zuidwest, 2024; Nationaal Programma Samen Nieuw-West, 2024). Thus, though participation is formalized, it may still require structural strengthening and guidance in development.

1.3 Research Purpose and Question

Despite the growing emphasis on citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas, a dedicated framework to evaluate effectiveness of participation structures in these contexts remains undertheorized. This research aims to uncover opportunities for European participation initiatives in vulnerable urban renewal contexts to improve structure effectiveness by developing a comprehensive, context-specific evaluation framework. It studies the Dutch NPLV programme through a qualitative comparative analysis of two structurally impacted areas. Findings from interviews with four Amsterdam Nieuw-West and five Den Haag Zuidwest stakeholders expect to confirm theory-derived hampering and facilitative factors for effective citizen participation and reveal indicators specific to the vulnerable urban renewal area context. Varying combinations of factors characterizing participation structures and relevance of factors to increase structure effectiveness are anticipated.

To serve the research purpose, the following research question and guiding sub-questions are posed:

“What factors contribute to effective citizen participation within the urban focus areas of the National Programme for Liveability and Safety (NPLV)?”

- 1) “What factors facilitate effective citizen participation within NPLV urban areas?”
- 2) “What barriers hamper effective citizen participation within NPLV urban areas?”
- 3) “What combinations of facilitating and hampering factors characterize the participation structures in Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest?”

1.4 Research Relevance

Academically, the research contributes to the European-wide debate on effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas. Previous researchers have developed frameworks with clear indicators for effective citizen participation, such as Ianniello et al.'s (2019) hampering and facilitating factors. However, these were designed for a general or undefined context, while a dedicated framework for effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas remains undertheorized. Participation frameworks explicitly tailored to these contexts are scarce. Therefore, this research adapts

Ianniello et al.'s (2019) model. It synthesizes its generalized theoretical insights with similar conceptualizations and the few frameworks specific to urban renewal and vulnerability. Refining the resulting framework with empirical findings from NPLV context, it addresses this academic gap by validating and extending existing theory. The constructed indicator framework constitutes an innovative and relevant, yet contextually specific, academic contribution to existing citizen participation literature.

Socially, the research addresses growing socio-spatial inequality, declining social cohesion, and its particular impact on vulnerable residents in European urban renewal areas, such as in Amsterdam and Den Haag. By reframing lessons learned from initiatives into critical success factors for improving cohesion and equality in this context, the framework assists in facilitating effective participation in vulnerable urban renewal contexts. Recommendations developed through application of the context-specific framework, these account for the fact vulnerable residents require targeted facilitative measures (Nachmany & Hananel, 2023). Recommendations promote greater democratic legitimacy (URBACT, n.d.), sustainability (Lawless et al., 2009), and governance capacity (Walther & Güntner, 2007). The framework incorporates diverse theory- and practice-informed factors, respecting participation standardization limits (Richards & Dalbey, 2006) by allowing for generalizability across participation structure contexts falling within vulnerable urban renewal areas.

1.5 Structure

The following Chapter 2 explores the central research question through literature and conceptualizes theories on citizen participation into a theoretical framework. Chapter 3 operationalizes theoretical findings into a preliminary indicator framework for effective citizen participation and justifies methodological choices. Chapter 4 discusses interview findings, finalizing the theory-informed indicator framework with success factors and barriers to participation in NPLV-context. Finally, Chapter 5 applies the framework to evaluate participation structures in Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest and concludes with policy recommendations and research reflections.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Role of Citizen Participation in Equality and Social Cohesion

Research underscores the relation between growing income inequality and lowering levels of social cohesion (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). Inequality weakens residents' participation, trust and community integration, and threatens equal opportunities and societal inclusiveness. Income-equal societies show higher levels of trust within community and towards institutions, and more physical safety. Goodlad and Meegan (2005) highlight democratic governance as the solution to degrading social cohesion. Participatory processes with citizens promote economic growth and mitigate social conflict. Enhancing trust in institutions furthers competitiveness and economic development, thus, presents a positive cycle fostering social cohesion through citizen participation.

Political and socio-cultural factors deeply influence citizen participation approaches (Ghose, 2005). Therefore, participation structures cannot be standardized but must be tailored to specific case context regarding decision-making barriers, development goals, and residents' experiences (Richards & Dalbey, 2006). An indicator framework that shows the effect of varied combinations of hampering and facilitating factors on effective citizen participation is valuable.

2.2 Effective Citizen Participation: Hampering and Facilitating Factors

Before synthesizing literature exploring factors vital for effective citizen participation and to establish what constitutes effectiveness in this context, one must draw upon the theory foundational to citizen participation. Arnstein's (1969) citizen participation ladder conceptualizes meaningful participation as the top three rungs, the ones below representing tokenistic or non-participatory, thus ineffective levels. Effective citizen participation encapsulates a power redistribution between the government and citizens, lending citizens true decision-making power. The rung *partnership* represents citizens entering negotiations and discussions with decision-makers. *Delegated power* involves citizens with dominant decision-making power and in negotiation with professionals. The highest rung, *citizen control*, presents participants having full governing power and authorities solely involved for financial and administrative purposes.

Considering the NPLV citizen participation structure's top-down governance, this framework exclusively involves theories or theory elements exploring government-initiated participation.

Building on Arnstein's typology and a critical review of participation literature, Ianniello et al. (2019) identify hampering and facilitating factors for effective citizen participation in a general context. Other scholars adopt similar approaches, though with varied factor presentations. Considered are Adamson (2010), Ansell and Gash (2008), Blijleven and van Hulst (2020), Bryson (2013), and Kim (2014). As one of the only participation frameworks for urban renewal context, Bingsheng et al. (2018) are integrated, as is Vanleene et al. (2017) for their vulnerable area focus. As these models lack empirical backing, synthesizing general and specific insights lays the foundation for a robust, context-specific framework and enables subsequent empirical testing of relevant indicators.

2.2.1 Contextual Factors

Information Symmetry

The first set of Ianniello et al.'s (2019) generalized contextual barriers address information asymmetries between government and citizens, an aspect no other framework incorporates but Ansell and Gash's (2008). If governments lack understanding of citizens' interests, they risk resident involvement in highly complex or technical issues unsuitable for their knowledge, skill, or interest levels. Participation structure objectives are misaligned with citizens' goals, instead motivated by expectations unrealistic to be met according to citizens' competencies. Ansell and Gash's (2008) framework for effective collaborative governance urges participation to be communicated as a valued process with final decision-making power to citizens to overcome asymmetries, incentivizing them to participate. Bingsheng et al. (2018) identify how symmetries are facilitated in their discussion of critical success factors specific to urban renewal areas. Investing in adequate, transparent, and diverse information-

providing processes and a long-term participation structure and regularly responding to participant inquiries are needed.

Initial Mutual Trust

An aspect Ianniello et al. (2019) and various other frameworks also do not address, but Ansell and Gash's (2008) framework discloses, is the impact of a problematic and contested participation history and culture for initial citizen trust in the government and incentivizing participation to citizens. Kim's (2014) comprehensive framework based on a global literature review of success factors addresses this in his cultural dimension. He recognizes effective past cooperation conditions, an established state-citizen partnership, and post-modernist societal values emphasizing democratic values as facilitating factors.

Transformational Leadership

Ianniello et al. (2019) address bureaucratic structures and regulatory systems restrictive to effective participation, particularly influencing public officials' attitudes. Public officials are unwilling to give up hierarchical authority and share power, instead engaging citizens in a symbolic manner, and have no interest in facilitating citizens' final decision-making influence, which hampers structure effectiveness. Blijleven and van Hulst (2022) draw upon the diverting sentiments among officials who recognize the importance of considering citizens' needs but are internally tied to bureaucratic norms. Led by values of neutrality and accountability, a departmental silo governance structure, an efficiency-focus, expert knowledge-orientation, and scarce resources, organizations aiming to enable participation are frequently unequipped to do so. Transformational leadership, mandated institutional support, stakeholder's capacity, and facilitators are needed to ensure inclusivity and trust by stimulating leader commitment to participatory governance (Ianniello et al., 2019). Transformational leadership means leaders must work beyond personal expectations and facilitate citizens' needs above bureaucratic norms. Institutional structures must make it feasible for resources, rules, and efforts to be directed at realizing citizens' expectations (Blijleven & van Hulst, 2022). To develop citizens' capacity, governance structures must be responsive, flexible, and open to local knowledge (Adamson, 2010). Kim's (2014) political dimension stresses a decentralized government structure, and Blijleven and van Hulst (2022) add an integrated cross-departmental and -sectoral approach for effective participation. Kim's (2014) individual dimension underscores public officials' commitments by highlighting the need for their skills, abilities, and knowledge to develop a shared understanding and establish mutual trust. Adamson (2010) articulates that this should be fostered through deliberate staff training. Bingsheng et al.'s (2018) structure for urban renewal context and Vanleene et al.'s (2017) focus on vulnerable neighbourhoods do not address leadership.

2.2.2 Organizational and Managerial Factors

Balanced and Representative Group Dynamic

Organizationally and managerially, group dynamics impact participation structure effectiveness. Out of the frameworks, Blijleven and van Hulst (2020), Adamson (2010), and Bryson (2013) do not address this barrier. According to Ianniello et al. (2019) and the other frameworks, in the case of absent criteria for participant selection, participation processes are not guaranteed to involve a diverse participant group. This introduces a selection bias and participant involvement via unsuitable communication strategies, a barrier to effective collaboration. Authors suggest explicit requirements for diverse, fair, and representative involvement. Instances where innovative ideas are sought need a diverse participation group, where deadlock circumstances are addressed require a specific group with solution-finding interest, and where public support is desired demand a representative group. Bingsheng et al.'s (2018) framework for urban renewal areas adds the allocation of clear roles to participants. Without clear selection requirements for diversity and role allocation, inappropriate group dynamics that obstruct participation structure effectiveness are prone to occur. Enhancing the chance of well-organized and uniform groups of "usual suspects" dominating participation processes and overshadowing minority groups can exacerbate inequalities. Effective group dynamic management involves the availability of multiple participation techniques and involvement of professional facilitators. Kim (2014) and Ansell and Gash (2008) stress strong facilitative leadership to ensure consensus, mediation, communication, and citizen coordination. Vanleene et al.'s (2017) and Bingsheng

et al.'s (2018) context-specific frameworks also highlight professionals who facilitate citizens understanding and involvement opportunities and, through frequent interactions with residents, enhance sense of empowerment. Van Meerkerk and Edelenbos (2014) designate these responsibilities to 'boundary spanners' with connective capacities to link citizens' environments with decision-makers and build trust. Considering boundary spanners' informing role and, therewith, ability to foster information symmetry, their influence goes beyond facilitating organization of participation but is also powerful in establishing the right context for effective participation.

Organized Process Design

Ianniello et al. (2019) warn of cases where definitions and benefits of participation structures are not agreed on and clear to participation stakeholders prior to the engagement processes. These enhance the possibility of participants developing different intentions, unrealistic goals, or critical opinions during participation processes. Possibly triggering structure rearrangements may hamper timely decision-making, consensus, and citizen support and trust, highlighting the barrier of inappropriate and inattentive participation management. Coinciding with suggestions for previous barriers, a long-term, transparent, inclusive, and institutionalized design that is context-sensitive is advised. Considering institutionalization facilitates citizen's influence which is this the final indicator of this conceptualization, institutionalization is transferred to the proceeding section (see Citizens Influence). Regarding context-specificity, Bryson et al. (2013) intend to create steps for practitioners to support the importance of an adapted participation design to context, problem, and purpose. Bingsheng et al. (2018) address collectively recognizing the participation rationale, issues, planning approach, and participants. Mutual agreement on participation context must be reached between participation initiators and citizens (Ianniello et al., 2019). Clear collaboration rules, transparent communication of risks, and multiple engagement techniques are suggested to which Bingsheng et al. (2018) add flexibility and conflict management.

Though Blijleven and van Hulst (2020), Adamson (2010), and Vaneleene et al. (2017) don't address process design, the conditions intertwine with Ansell and Gash's (2008) and Kim's (2014) frameworks emphasizing participatory inclusiveness, clear ground rules, and process transparency. These factors enable structure effectiveness by making citizen participation institutionally feasible and fostering facilitative public officials attitudes. Factors clarity and agreement are tied to communication, therewith enable overcoming information asymmetries and enhancing citizens' capacity development (Adamson, 2010). Like the cross-indicator link to the need for communication, almost every facilitative indicator fosters trust. Showing how factors influencing effective citizen participation are deeply interconnected, with improvements in one area having cascading effects on others, this underscores the complexity of managing citizen participation and the need for integrated participation structure design.

Citizens Influence

A final element vital for citizen participation effectiveness not addressed in Ianniello et al.'s (2019) analysis, nor by most other frameworks, concerns the use of evaluation measures ensuring citizens' final decision-making influence.

The institutionalization of participation structures also strongly affects citizens' influence, thus is moved to this indicator for effective participation. Embedding inclusive engagement into institutional processes, thereby strengthening democratic governance, enhances policymaking legitimacy, transparency, and accessibility (Ianniello et al., 2019). Citizens' input reaches higher governmental levels and can be translated into practice.

Regarding evaluation structures ensuring citizen influence, Kim's (2014) managerial dimension and Bryson et al.'s (2013) redesign phase address their application to restructure and improve participation processes consistently. Bingsheng et al.'s (2018) urban renewal-specific framework supports the importance of participation outcome evaluation, timely feedback, public participation output adoption, and appreciation of public's devotion. The absence of evaluation measures is, thus, a barrier to effective participation as it prevents the anchoring of citizens' contributions into decision-making processes and ensures citizen input influences change.

2.3 Synthesis and Adaptation

Synthesizing general theories of effective citizen participation with the few frameworks specific to urban renewal and vulnerable areas reveals overlapping and diverging indicators. Notably, contextual factors are largely absent in context-specific models, underscoring the need for a comprehensive framework. The resulting theoretical model is a contribution in itself by integrating existing fragmented approaches into a robust, context-specific theoretical framework. This forms the foundation for developing an empirically-validated framework of factors essential for effective participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas.

Considering the goal of adapting the framework to the NPLV, theory-derived indicators that represent conditions the case context directly meets are omitted at this stage. As the NPLV operates within the democratic society of the Netherlands, the contextual indicator of post-modernist societal values is excluded. The organizational indicator of a decentralized, cross-departmental, and cross-sectoral governance structure was omitted, as the NPLV adopts this.

2.4 Conceptual Model

A simplification of the theoretical framework is provided in Figure 1 (page 8). Effective participation is conceptualized as the outcome of facilitating contextual, organizational, and managerial factors alongside the absence or overcoming of corresponding barriers. If facilitating factors prevail and are not hindered by barriers, participation structures achieve effective power redistribution. Reaching Arnstein's (1969) highest levels, citizens are meaningfully involved, and participation structures directly contribute to social cohesion.

Findings from NPLV initiatives are expected to confirm the theories from the conceptual framework. Specifically, expectations are:

- 1) Participation-related contextual, organizational, and managerial barriers hamper effective power redistribution and this must be addressed through facilitatory structures.
- 2) Primary research with NPLV participation structure stakeholders reveals indicators specific to citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal area contexts.
- 3) Varying combinations of factors characterize participation structures and varying relevance of factors are needed to increase structure effectiveness.



Figure 1: Conceptual Model

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study analysing stakeholders' social experience with participation structures called for a qualitative research design (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). The research adopted a constructivist worldview, assuming stakeholders form individual meanings through interaction with participation structures. Considering diverse experiences, the research captures the complexity of citizen participation (Ghose, 2005). Aiming to explain success and failure of participation structures within the NPLV, it embraces high contextuality. Literature suggests qualitative research effectively accounts for highly complex and contextual cases (Creswell & Creswell, 2022).

An in-depth comparison of participation structures in the NPLV programmes Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest was undertaken. Accordingly, the research followed a comparative, multi-case study approach (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). It empirically investigated effective participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas through NPLV context, analysing multiple approaches against theory and one another. This revealed patterns, impact of contextual, organizational, and managerial differences (do Amaral, 2022), and how NPLV initiatives could learn from each other's successes and failures.

The compared cases overlap in bureaucratic and socio-political contexts, social cohesion objectives, and participation structure formalisation (see 3.2.1 Case Selection Criteria). They differ in programme implementation, development stage, and the primary variable of interest: participation structure effectiveness. With differing outcomes but shared explanatory conditions, this qualified as a most-similar case study (Seawright and Gerring, 2008). Holding certain contextual variables constant, the study isolated factors explaining differences in participation outcomes and effectiveness (Quinn, 2009).

3.2 Case Selection

3.2.1 Case Selection Criteria

To narrow the analysis scope and allow for in-depth exploration, a purposive sampling strategy (Seawright and Gerring, 2008) was applied to select the NPLV programmes for comparison. Case selection criteria were: 1) NPLV programme initiative, 2) highest Dutch inequality levels, and 3) a formalized participation structure.

In the strategic selection (Seawright & Gerring, 2008) of cases, a citizen participation initiative's link to the NPLV was the first criterion as this is the established context of the study. This yielded all twenty NPLV initiatives as potential cases for analysis.

The studies' aim of exploring effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas and producing impactful suggestions further guided case selection. Given that urban areas contain the Dutch neighbourhoods most affected by reduced social cohesion and urgently needing urbanization management, the focus turned to those with critical increases in inequality (Modai-Snir & van Ham, 2020). This led to shortlisting the five NPLV initiatives from the four largest Dutch cities: Amsterdam Nieuw-West, Amsterdam Zuidoost, Rotterdam Zuid, Den Haag Zuidwest, and Utrecht-Overvecht.

Comparative research requiring a common basis to ensure feasible comparison (do Amaral, 2022), NPLV initiative participation structure characteristics directed the final selection. Research highlights the importance of a formalized participation structure for effectively redistributing power and ensuring accountability, transparency, and accessibility (Ianniello et al., 2019). Initiatives with informal participation structures were excluded. Applying this criterion led to the final case selection: Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest.

3.2.2 Case Context

Table 1 provides a comparative overview of the two cases according to the selection criteria. Framing their suitability for answering the research question underscores this is a convenience sample (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). By selecting the cases for analysis most impacted by deteriorating social cohesion and with formalized participation, research results have significant societal relevance and impact.

	Amsterdam Nieuw-West	Den Haag Zuidwest
<i>Criteria 1:</i> an NPLV-programme initiative	• Initiative ‘Samen Nieuw-West’ • Domain ‘Inclusion, Ownership, and Democracy’: development by, for, with, and from residents • Goals: improved resident representation and engagement, real decision-making power of residents • Action lines: enhanced resident ownership through equal involvement, inclusive practices, neighbourhood alliances • (Samen Nieuw-West, 2024)	• “At the bottom of the ladder of broad prosperity” • Domain ‘Social Cohesion and Participation’ • Goals: clear participation structure and developed participation skills; increased resident satisfaction, voter turnout, increased number of citizen-led initiatives • Action lines: strengthening trust in government, of social ties, of space for resident initiatives • (Gemeente Den Haag, 2022a; Nationaal Programma Zuidwest, 2023)
<i>Criteria 2:</i> high inequality and low social cohesion levels	• Increasing discrimination, exclusion, loneliness, distrust in governmental institutions, low civic participation • Decreasing perceptions of safety, public space, housing quality, accessibility • Strong internal support within cultural groups leading to social separation and hindering emancipation • Planned urban renewal may further strain fragile social cohesion • (Samen Nieuw-West, 2022)	• Problematic debts, welfare dependence, health, education, crime, societal participation, control over own lives • Planned urban renewal may further strain fragile social cohesion • (Nationaal Programma Zuidwest, 2023)
<i>Criteria 3:</i> formalized participation structure	• Neighbourhood alliances ‘Wijkallianties’: comprised of residents, professionals, local organizations, government actors; key resident selected for local knowledge and network to lead alliance formation and citizen design sessions (citizens part of structure formation and design) (Samen Nieuw-West, 2024) • Formalization through formal but flexible covenant including vision, values	• Independent advisory body of citizens ‘The Partnerraad’: comprised of 16 core members, a 60-person support base, and a three-member daily board; members with strong ties to Zuidwest, local networks, topic knowledge, and availability; municipality-provided secretary as established part; provide solicited and unsolicited advice on urban renewal to the Alliance Council and Den Haag’s Municipal Council (Gemeente Den Haag, 2022a;

	(collaboration, trust, adaptive learning), commitments signed by municipality of Amsterdam (Samen Nieuw-West, 2024) Progress report 2024 highlights barriers: dilemma of need for urgent results but slow pace of systematic change with citizens, complexity, coordination, continuity of communication, decision-making influence (National Programma Nieuw-West, 2024)	Nationaal Programma Zuidwest, 2023 - Formalization in municipal regulation and with structural working budget and designed to embody values (inclusivity, transparency, righteousness, equality, bindingness, ambition, and pioneer) (Gemeente Den Haag, 2022b; Partnerraad, 2024) - Progress report 2023 highlights barriers: struggles with continuity and capacity after chair's resignation, low output of formal advice, leadership gap, need for stronger support (National Programma Zuidwest, 2024)
--	---	--

Table 1: Case Context

3.3 Operationalization

To prepare for empirical research, key concepts linked to effective citizen participation were operationalized into an indicator framework following the conceptual framework discussed and presented in Chapter 2. By abstracting facilitating and hampering factors, this is the initial step to answering the first two sub-questions.

Table 2 presents this operationalization or preliminary indicator framework. To explore every indicator, primary data was collected through interviews.

	Concept	Indicator	Values	Authors
Contextual Factors	Information Symmetry / Asymmetry	Degree of alignment between participation structure characteristics (tasks, topics, communication) and citizens abilities and interests	Strong/Moderate/Weak Alignment	(Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bingsheng et al., 2018; Ianniello et al., 2019)
	Initial Mutual Trust / Distrust	Existence and quality of past state-citizen partnerships	High/Medium/Low Quality	(Ansell & Gash, 2008; Kim, 2014)
	Transformational / Non-transformational Leadership	Degree of public officials' commitment through bureaucratic flexibility (adaptation and responsiveness)	High/Medium/Low Flexibility	(Adamson, 2010; Blijleven & Van Hulst, 2022; Ianniello et al., 2019; Kim, 2014)
Organizational & Managerial Factors	Representative and Balanced / Dominating and	Transparency and clarity of criteria for representative participant selection	High/Medium/Low Clarity	(Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bingsheng et al., 2018;

	Unbalanced Group Dynamic	Use of multiple and diverse participation techniques	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use	<i>Ianniello et al., 2019; Kim, 2014; Meerkerk & Edelenbos, 2014; Vanleene et al., 2016)</i>
		Use of professional facilitators/boundary spanners	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use	
	Organized / Disorganized Participation Process Design	Clarity and mutual agreement on participation context (purpose, goals, expectations)	High/Medium/Low Clarity and Agreement	<i>(Adamson, 2010; Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bingsheng et al., 2018; Bryson et al., 2013; Ianniello et al., 2019; Kim, 2014)</i>
		Clarity on the distinct roles of stakeholders	High/Medium/Low Clarity	
	Citizens final / no final influence	Institutionalization of participation process	Full/Partial/No Institutionalization	<i>(Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bingsheng et al., 2018; Bryson et al., 2013; Ianniello et al., 2019; Kim, 2014)</i>
		Degree of use of evaluation structures for project redesign	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use	
		Degree of use of evaluation structures for participation structure redesign	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use	

Table 2: Operationalization and Preliminary Indicator Framework

3.4 Data Collection and Participant Recruitment

3.4.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Nine semi-structured interviews were conducted to uncover nuanced perspectives (Knott et al., 2022) of NPLV participation structures and advance the preliminary indicator framework. These consisted of open questions guided by a flexible topic list (Appendix A) aligned with the operationalization (Table 2). Questions were adapted to the participants' communication and knowledge levels and their responses, providing in-depth insights (Knott et al., 2022). The depth and language used varied specifically between interviews with participation programme initiators, leaders, and citizens. Moreover, questions were "probed" or reformulated based on missed opportunities in previous interviews. This adaptive approach ensured each concept was addressed and rich data was collected while avoiding use of unsuitable technical jargon and guaranteeing participants remained informed and comfortable.

3.4.2 Contingency Plan

A contingency plan was developed to ensure timely delivery and achievement of research aims and to respond to the primary concern of recruiting less than ten respondents from the small population of NPLV participation structure stakeholders. Offering an alternative data collection method, the plan proposed a document analysis of NPLV progress reports. A limited discussion of participation barriers in the documents highlighted the relevance and contribution of this research. This encouraged the researcher to persistently pursue several participant recruitment routes. Efforts resulted in nine lengthy, in-depth interviews with knowledgeable citizens and experts, yielding valuable data and the

contingency plan not necessary. This counters methodological debates arguing for a minimum number of interviews for credible research. High-quality interviews provide rich, nuanced insights that reveal underlying contextual factors that numbers alone cannot achieve. While results may be highly-specific, a varied and experienced participant group can ensure the relevance and validity high numbers of interviews are said to do.

3.4.3 Participant Recruitment

Nine participants were purposefully selected using a multi-layered ‘snowballing’ sampling tactic (Goodman, 1961). The participant prerequisite was involvement with the participation structure of Amsterdam Nieuw-West or Den Haag Zuidwest. Through the research’s affiliation with the LDE Den Haag Zuidwest Thesis Lab, a contact at the NPLV Zuidwest acted as a gatekeeper facilitating access to the network. This led to interviews with programme managers M1 and M2, programme secretary S1, and participation structure leaders L1 and L2. For Nieuw-West, the researcher initiated contact via LinkedIn, leading to a conversation with citizen C1, who referred C2. For Zuidwest, M2 and S1 referred citizens C3 and C4. The final participant group included four respondents from Nieuw-West (M1, L1, C1, C2) and five from Zuidwest (M2, L2, S1, C3, C4), offering diverse and representative, thereby credible, insights into participation structure challenges and opportunities (Tracy, 2010).

Table 3 provides an overview of participant and interview data. Interview conduct differed by case according to interviewee preferences and availability.

Participant	Role	NPLV Focus Area	Interview Location and Date	Interview Length
M1	Programme Manager	Amsterdam Nieuw-West	Online, 10.04.2025	41:00
M2	Programme Manager	Den Haag Zuidwest	Online, 08.05.2025	33:00
L1	Participation Leader	Nieuw-West	Online, 08.04.2025	40:00
L2	Participation Leader	Zuidwest	Zuidwest, 06.05.2025	50:00
S1	Programme Secretary	Zuidwest	Online, 14.05.2025	48:00
C1	Citizen	Nieuw-West	Online, 16.05.2025	57:00
C2	Citizen	Nieuw-West	Online, 21.05.2025	30:00
C3	Citizen	Zuidwest	Zuidwest, 06.05.2025 & Online, 13.05.2025	50:00 & 33:00
C4	Citizen	Zuidwest	Online, 14.05.2025	35:00

Table 3: Participant and Interview Data

3.5 Data Analysis

To support data analysis, interviews were recorded and transcribed with participant consent. Transcripts were coded in Atlas.ti to interpret findings in light of the research question (Elliot, 2018). Coding followed a deductive approach based on theory-informed categories from the indicator framework (Table 1) acting as the coding scheme (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). However, the design first allowed for inductive coding to adapt the framework to NPLV context. Coding began with open codes that reflect emerging themes, proceeded with axial codes showing relationships between themes and framework indicators, and was finalized with selective codes that formed core categories with

explanatory value for a response to the research question (Williams & Moser, 2019). Final codes were, thus, predetermined and emergent. Appendix B shows the resulting codes in form of a codebook.

3.6 Limitations

3.6.1 Validity and Reliability

As a qualitative comparative case study, the research design safeguarded strong internal validity or the ability to draw intended conclusions (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). The purposive selection of cases best suited to comprehend the research problem enabled causal claims about the empirical reality. However, this introduced potential bias toward cases aligning with researcher expectations rather than ensuring reliability. This links to the weak reliability of the context-specific research, limiting replicability and consistency of findings across future research, findings depend on contingent interactions (Knott et al., 2022). To mitigate bias and enhance reliability, case selection criteria were established (Elliot, 2018) and a code book was kept (Appendix B). These track choices made, increasing transparency, accountability, and replicability (Elliot, 2018).

External validity, or the generalizability of results (Creswell & Creswell, 2022), was also limited due to the small number of cases and interpretive data analysis. Some transferability was achieved through analytical generalization, the framing of findings as relevant to any initiative of similar vulnerable urban renewal context as the NPLVs.

3.6.2 Privacy and Security

To minimize harm, participants were informed of the study's context, data use, storage, privacy measures, and their right to withdraw (Knott et al., 2022). Prior to interviews, these points and plans to audio record were communicated in an informed consent form and according to a privacy checklist (Appendix C). For data security, recordings and transcripts were stored in a private, password-protected, and automatically backed-up drive. Participant anonymity was maintained by not recording names and the only personal processed data point being role within the NPLV, essential for sampling and research credibility.

3.6.3 Positionality

As a non-resident of the urban focus areas and a highly-educated international student in the Netherlands, my outsider position as the researcher of this study allowed for critical distance. This also required awareness of the potential bias as a public administration student inclined to view participatory structures positively and from a government perspective. To counter this, I remained open to facilitating and hampering factors to citizen participation, allowing participants to challenge theoretical and academic assumptions. The adaptive interview approach to participants' characteristics ensured participant accessibility and comfort and addressed the educational gap between researcher and citizen respondents.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

4.1 Indicator Framework for Effective Citizen Participation in NPLV Initiative Context

Insights from four interviews with Wijkallianties stakeholders and five interviews with Partnerraad stakeholders provide a deeper understanding of what facilitates or hinders effective participation in these contexts, thereby responding to the first two sub-questions. Findings expand on challenges mentioned in progress reports, and as **indicators** for effective participation in vulnerable urban renewal context inform an adaptation of the theory-informed framework (Table 2).

4.1.1 Contextual Factors

Information Symmetry

Beyond the theory-identified facilitative aspect of alignment between participation structure characteristics and citizen abilities and interests, results underscore alignment between citizens' awareness and government objectives and participation constraints.

Interviews reveal that citizens' understanding of neighborhood development plans is key to effective participation. A Zuidwest resident notes: "What fuels the citizens over here is that they are not seeing where the millions are going" (C3). Lacking transparency on government investment scope and actions fosters distrust about whether changes serve citizens' interests, discouraging willingness to participate in neighborhood renewal. Introducing complexity, participation professionals highlight the limits to transparency, namely privacy and legal constraints. M2 states that "sometimes people are asking a lot of questions because of distrust and wanting to know private information" and that "it cannot be transparent in the way people expect us to be transparent". While citizens entering participation processes commonly expect to get full disclosure on neighborhood affairs, a degree of integrity must be kept. Fostering trust for meaningful engagement through information symmetry requires balancing openness and upholding ethical standards through transparent and consistent communication.

Interviews also confirm the importance of matching participation characteristics with citizen capacities. Respondents emphasize participation accessibility and the problem that "when it comes to language and educational barriers, there is often a level of political knowledge needed" (C2). L1 highlights the complexity between engaging short-term thinking citizens in topics with a long-term outlook, while C1 notes that "people talk differently, they plan their time differently". Respondents also preface citizens have clear ideas of what requires work in the neighborhood that would serve them. To facilitate effectiveness, participation methods must, thus, attend to citizens' communication styles, interests, and concerns. As L1 emphasizes: "You have to know what's bothering them, what's keeping them going, to activate them" (L1).

To achieve this alignment, results suggest external communication that makes participation visible and understandable. A Zuidwest citizen expresses that "the problem is that the Partnerraad is not known by many people" (C3) and "before I joined, [...] I didn't know about their existence" (C4). In Nieuw-West, residents notes that "people in the national programme bubble know about Wijkallianties. But there are also a lot of people that we don't reach" (C1). Transparent communication with the local community about participation opportunities and their goals are essential facilitative factors. This way, "people can interact and start believing in the purpose of the Partnerraad" (S1) or of Wijkallianties. Communication on the programme's and participation structure's independence from the Dutch government is particularly crucial: "When the goal is very clear, people will know this has nothing to do with a political agenda" (C4). Citizens distrust the national government, so clearly framing the NPLV's position as "an extended arm penetrating the community to make sure they also have insight" (L1) is vital for citizens to see this as an asset and show willingness to participate.

Public officials' understanding of the standing of NPLV participation structures is also critical. Wijkallianties leader states members must "understand where we're working to. That we are not there to take over, we're there to help, extend, assist, and support." (L1). With a transparent external communication strategy directed at informing on the participation structures' workings, citizens and public officials will develop trust and show support for collaboration.

Research findings highlight the importance of internal communication for effective external communication. An internal strategy aligns participation structure objectives with internal stakeholders' understanding on effective external communication. C4 warns that without clear goals "we are going to do a lot and, in the end, not going to reach anything". An established participation structure strategy with goals, vision, mission, and values that set the line of work and expectations among participation structure members is vital. Members' awareness of this strategy is also essential, results showing strategic clarity is often missing. At the time of S1's interview who agrees that "everything starts with strategy", "it was only last week a common drive for everyone to look up documents", such as the strategic plan, was created. The disconnect between Partnerraad members' understandings of strategic goals is underscored by interviewed citizens unsure of the existence of this: "If they got something, I haven't received them. I hope that they got something" (C4). Importantly, the citizen's recent entry into the participation structure may explain their lack of insight into strategy rather than this being absent. In Nieuw-West, residents express confusion regarding structure purpose and approach: "I was not sure what it was then and [...] I'm not quite sure what it is still" (C2), this citizen, however, only having been part of the participation structure for a short time, and "[Programme managers] are still vague about what it really is to me." (C1). As concluded by C4, "if we're going to communicate more and reach the community, we all have to say the same thing", members' equal understanding and communication of participation structure purpose, values, and goals is of utmost importance for it to be visible and succeed through increased citizen and public official's trust.

Contrasting Vanleene et al.'s (2017) framework for vulnerable areas, primary research highlights information symmetry as crucial for facilitating effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas. Specifically, the **alignment between participation structure characteristics and scope with vulnerable citizens' abilities, interests, and expectations through clear external and internal communication** is relevant in this context.

Initial Mutual Trust

Also different from existing frameworks for vulnerable and urban renewal contexts, findings support the relevance of **successful past citizen-state collaborations**. Respondents highlight the influence of governance history on their trust and willingness to participate. Specific barriers pointed to are past failure of government-led urban development and neglect of citizen input. A Partnerraad member compares Zuidwest's renewal efforts to a past failed intervention that continuously shapes local distrust and resistance to participation, warning "if you don't get the neighbourhood quality up to average, then this will be the next Schilderswijk of the Hague. [...] people already don't have trust in the city government" (C3). Similarly, respondents suggest governmental institutions to have consistently undervalued citizen input: "A lot of citizens are disappointed because if they ask for something or want to do something, they are told there is no money or the municipality doesn't want to do it" (M1) or "the neighbourhood is like, we don't know if we can trust them because they don't listen to us" (C4). This perceived pattern of dismissal hampers support for new government-led participation plans that claim to be inclusive.

Respondents also emphasize societal divisions and frictions as a barrier to trust and participation. Both focus areas are described as fragmented with rooted divisions between groups, contributing to reduced social cohesion that undermines willingness to collaborate. C1 captures this situation as one of "closed bubbles": residents are "pointed inside with their face, angry at other bubbles because they perceive them as threats" (C1), which leads them to be "unwillingly cooperative to change". Tensions are rooted in intersecting issues of race, class, neighbourhood changes, and generational differences: "It has to do with politics, [...] with race, [...] with old and new." (L1). As residents with migration backgrounds, structural exclusion is embedded in national political developments, amplifying local distrust. C2 from Nieuw-West explains that residents "do not trust the government at all [...] especially now with PVV being the biggest" (C2), citing the party's discriminatory rhetoric as exacerbating marginalization and distrust in responsiveness of democratic institutions. Citizens' sentiments of feeling safe, respected, and included influence their trust and engagement. As one respondent reflects, "it takes more than a conversation to fix it" (L1). Thus, **social cohesion** should be recognized as a contextual indicator shaping the foundation for citizen participation in NPLV areas.

Transformational Leadership

Similarly, research results counter existing context-specific frameworks as they back the facilitative role of transformational leadership for effective participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas. Given the NPLV's independence from government structures, transformational leadership is required from public officials and participation structure leaders.

Transformational leadership by public officials must move beyond rhetorical support and be demonstrated through sufficient investment and concrete action. A citizen-member of the Partnerraad remarks: "The problem is that the stadsdeel [district] is not getting enough money to improve the system [...] in The Hague, but also in Amsterdam" (C3). A Wijkallianties-affiliated respondent explains governmental institutions "have signed that they want this, but if you go to see what they have to do, that's another level." and directing at them to "practice what you preach". Government officials often sign agreements or express ambition to support citizen participation, but this does not translate into practice through sufficient investment or responsiveness. C1 notes: "The mayor and CEOs have ambition to change, but the ambition to change is not change itself". Announcing their support for participation is insufficient if officials resist the long-term efforts, flexibility, and patience required to engage vulnerable communities meaningfully. The gap between declared and practiced support erodes citizens' trust in the state. This contributes **public officials' commitment through financial investment and concrete action in accordance with claimed support** as an indicator for transformational leadership.

The rigid and hierarchical governance structure is perceived as the key barrier to public officials' transformational leadership, backing the factor of bureaucratic flexibility. One citizen says, "you've got all these types of layers, and on each layer, the person there is like, well I am the big boss. If I will not agree with you, you cannot go to the next layer" (C4). Citizens perceiving gatekeeping and lack of responsiveness within bureaucratic structures hamper trust by limiting access to decision-makers and turning participation into personal relationships. Further stakeholders emphasize restrictive system perspectives held by citizens and public officials. As one explains, "the municipality has a system [...] also the corporates [...], and a lot of citizens don't match with that [...] it has a lot of not good things for citizens" (M2). Citizens' perceptions of the governance system as hierarchical and exclusive, particularly due to the lack of past meaningful impact of their input, leads to resignation and disengagement: "People with lower economic backgrounds feel like they are powerless [...] so they just decide to [...] make the best for themselves within the system" (C2). Public officials' restrictive perspectives that "people do not match their system" (M1) is what makes them "walk against the wall thinking it's not possible" (M2) and establishes this barrier. They hold "this stigma that says that people with lower economic background, because they don't know the language, they don't know the system, therefore, their voices are not as valuable" (C2). This highlights that the existence of public officials in a rule-bound system impedes meaningful responsiveness and adaptation to effectively engage citizens, as well as deteriorates citizen's trust.

According to the Wijkallianties leader "it's an obligation of the professionals to make or to think about how we can connect to the flow of the citizens" (L1) and the programme manager "we have to confirm to them and not them to us" (M1). It is the participation initiators' role to adapt to their way of thinking and working. Leaders must also respond to dynamics of the participation and neighbourhood environment as "you never have a solid group of people" (C1) and "the vision changes every time" (M2). Professionals should adapt their leadership, therewith "stay allies or instruments to society" (C1). A citizen from Nieuw-West expresses pride for their approach of shifting from a traditional top-down to citizen-oriented decision-making: "Now we don't speak about or for civilians without civilians [...]. Civilians are there from the start" (C1). What led to this shift is the "group of people working together now really believing in it, really willing to learn and put their egos aside" (C1), highlighting the necessity for participation structure leaders' commitment. **Bureaucratic flexibility** is, thus, not only required **from public officials**, but also **from participation structure leaders**.

Transformational leadership by participation structure leaders is facilitated by incentive-free leadership. Leaders and managers are “doing this voluntarily” (L2). Reinforcing equality between roles and centring the work around shared goals, they affirm their commitment and reduce citizen scepticism about underlying motives. Additionally, effective participation requires leadership by professional and relational individuals. Regarding professionalism, a former Wijkallianties member states that a leader would have been beneficial in meetings to “ease in the balance [of conflicting interests]” (C2). Important according to a citizen tasked to manage Wijkallianties is to be “neutral, so I cannot think or have an opinion about stuff that happens” (C1). Wijkallianties structure leader also stresses being “a neutral party there for everyone. [...] not here to take over” (L1) and to only “facilitate and make sure it works”. Interviews underscore that professional leaders need to remain sensitive to local contextuality: “There can never be a formula” (C1). Participation strongly depends on community- and culture-related factors and local citizens shall remain steerers of decisions. C1 urges professionals to shed rigid methodologies “You cannot be the professional that does everything one way because we have always done it that way [...]. Everything you learnt is not relevant right now”. In terms of relational leadership, stakeholders highlight the importance of leaders with affiliation to neighbourhood realities. Respondents are critical of distant decision-makers: “50% [of officials] are not living in The Hague. 40% are living on the sand. 10% maybe living on the mud” (C3), implying a detachment of decision-makers to Zuidwest and misaligned sense for what suits the context. In contrast, relational leaders can avoid a “lack of solutions which citizens think is the right solution” (L1) by better recognizing local priorities such as citizens’ short-term concerns that overshadow long-term planning. The indicator **participation structure leader’s commitment through incentive-free, professional, and relational leadership** emerges.

4.1.2 Organizational and Managerial Factors

Representative and Balanced Group Dynamic

Interviews confirm the importance of a representative participant group, in line with Bingsheng et al.’s (2018) urban-renewal-focussed and Vanleene et al.’s (2017) vulnerable-area-focussed indicators. In Nieuw-West, C1 notes that “concepts like equality and inclusiveness [...] drive the process” and C2 emphasizes the need for diversity to represent the area’s community and facilitate meaningful engagement. Stakeholders across both initiatives recognize the complexity of achieving genuine representation. Without management of this aspect, participation risks being limited to “key players [that] [...] don’t represent everyone” (L1). This then restricting “insight into the community” (C3) and knowing “everything that’s going on” (L2) underscores a diverse group captures the full scope of community needs, challenges, and opportunities. Particularly important is representing those typically “not heard or [that] do not participate [...]” (L2) as “they have ideas. They know what is going on in their neighbourhood” (M1). In NPLV context, “most people who would benefit [from neighbourhood renewal] are not represented” (C2), referring to residents in lower socio-economic positions. Their participation facilitating a representative group would spark broader engagement as C1 hopes “that this acts like a forest fire or an oil spill. That we engage more and more people and people start believing more and more” (C1). A representative participant group fosters wider community support and trust in the participation structure, thus strengthening the process by mobilizing and empowering citizens.

Contrary to theory, findings challenge the requirement of clear criteria to ensure representation and, instead, emphasizes an open participant selection process. Both initiatives demonstrate that flexible, evolving recruitment processes, grounded in openness and trust in citizens’ judgment, can foster inclusivity and diversity. C1, involved in forming a Wijkallianties, advises “to start somewhere [...] just a few participants who could reach out to other people”. Through self-reflection, people assess their own fit: “perhaps this position is not for me, but I can help here and there” (C1).

Intentional outreach also plays a role. C2 remembers “one of the people who worked there connected me for the alliance” and C4 explains, “they just randomly sent it to all kind of organisations like we are looking for members and everyone could sign up”. Underscoring the value of intentional outreach and self-initiation for participant recruitment, S1 explains: “We asked a number of very active citizens in Southwest to apply to be a member of the Partnerraad [...]. Two of them took initiative themselves”.

These insights highlight the NPLV’s shift from top-down selection based on criteria toward a group formation process whose purpose is intentionally communicated outwards but participation remains open to anyone. Therefore, **intentional but open participant selection** is needed.

Stakeholders also extend the importance of employing multiple and diverse participation techniques. Nieuw-West actors explain their metaphorical “suitcase” of methods, emphasizing that “if you only do one then you only reach one type of citizen” (M1). Different tools are employed according to citizen needs and abilities. Wijkallianties, for instance, use “‘public evidence’ [as] this gives us enough space to get each [problem] on the table, but also to use whatever intervention is already being used within the neighbourhood and the public also forces us to be equal around the table” (L1). This argues for facilitatory and open methods, giving citizens space for problem-identification, solution-formulation, and participation structure design. S1 underscores the urgency for multiple and diverse participation opportunities, recalling that at the “last [Partnerraad] meeting [...] of those 13 [members], 6 weren’t at the meeting” and that on the weekly letters they “always ask input for [...] and barely get one”. Respondents address the need for participation accessibility, especially in vulnerable areas with low social cohesion where “you can’t expect someone working 24/7 just to make rent to participate three times a month” (L1). They question, “how do you get people who are struggling in daily life [...] into a position that they can actually help you give advice on things that matter?” (S1).

Addressing this, both initiatives employ varied participation methods, both online and physical. Partnerraad members explain recent actions of extending their “weekly letters [...] to all members where it gives an overview of things that are happening, important dates, and also if you have questions to do or respond to” (S1) to “an offer to make a website” (S1). This website is also to reach the wider community with updated insight on the Partnerraad’s advisory progress, keeping the public up-to-date. Wijkallianties-stakeholders explain physical presence remains crucial. M1 explains “what you have to do with a lot of people with migration background not talking the language well and not understanding the system [...] you have to go to the neighbourhood to talk with them”. The use of “Buurtkamers” (C3) or neighbourhood chambers in Zuidwest and containers as hubs in Nieuw-West demonstrate the need for accessible, localized spaces to build trust and share information.

A key barrier remains lack of awareness. C4 brainstorms “maybe it is better for the Partnerraad to visit some organizations within Southwest just to tell them about their existence [...] we’re here and you can call us or mail us or send us a letter if you need this or this”. Engagement methods should promote the existence of the participation structure itself, tying in with external communication. Thus, the **use of multiple, diverse, open, and promotional low-barrier participation techniques** is crucial.

The indicator of facilitatory professionals aligns with Wijkallianties and Partnerraad, both employing trusted intermediaries to gain insight into community dynamics and collect information, thereby engaging citizens less likely to participate proactively. Partnerraad members describe “the importance of community builders, [...] people who are in the roots of the community” (M2) and “have different entrances for different groups”. Wijkallianties actors explain “Wijkverbinders [...] to connect with people [...]. To active them and to make them participate. [...] to get their opinions and ideas through Wijkverbinders” (L1). These actors function as connectors between residents and participation structures, gathered input “coming together in the back so that they can do something with it” (L1). Partnerraad stakeholders acknowledge that “there is a lot to build” (M2), and a clearer established link between Partnerraad and community builders would be valuable for mutual benefit. According to another citizen’s judgements “they had to do it five years ago” (C3), the early involvement of boundary spanners to gain insight and spread participation structure messages is critical. Additionally, the role of these intermediaries is strictly facilitatory: “when all is sorted and the regular organisations have adopted that way of working, that’s when we will start taking our hands off. We want the stakeholders that have always been there to adopt this” (L1). This task shall be assigned to trusted and well-connected individuals: “finding the right ones is absolutely key” (S1). Wijkverbinders are described to have to be “people who are well known in our neighbourhood, people who are already trusted” (C1) and, similarly, a community builder’s “job is [...] to be personal, [to] build something” and that, hence, “one of the most important tasks is [...] gaining trust and building on that [...], [being] very committed and communicative” (S1). One citizen notes diversity matters: “it helps that two of them are multicultural” (S1), representation enhancing legitimacy and trust. This indicator is extended to **early and facilitatory use of trustworthy boundary spanners linked to participation structures**.

Organized Participation Process Design

Findings support that agreement and clarity on participation context are critical enablers for effective participation, an indicator addressed by Bingsheng et al. (2018) and others. Regarding agreement, numerous Nieuw-West stakeholders highlight the value of early and continuous citizen involvement. A citizen tasked with managing Wijkallianties design explains, “what they really want to achieve is that everybody aboard the process will learn together what the Wijkalliantie has to become” (C1). This emphasizes a co-creation approach, where professionals and residents shape the participation structure. “The opinion of regular citizens [should be considered] within every step” (L1), to together “think about how do you engage people? How do you educate them? Coach them?” (C2). Ongoing collaboration builds a shared vision and sense of ownership, aligns expectations across stakeholders, and ensures mutual agreement while preventing information asymmetry. Findings suggest that early and consistent engagement alone is insufficient. A Wijkalliantie citizen describes this “sounds like chaos and makes citizens feel like the government is chaotic, which would bring more distrust” (C2). The absence of a clear structure hampers citizens’ trust. While inclusive processes are beneficial for mutual agreement, they must be balanced with organization for clarity. Partnerraad-affiliated S1 explains their clear and layered participation model to provide transparency and coherence: “it’s layered in four phases: desk research, interviews with experts, making up our mind analysis, testing that analysis with citizens, and then finalising the advice”. Such structure communicates when and how participant’s input is sought, offering clear timelines that help them navigate the process and enforce a sense of legitimacy and efficiency. **Clarity and agreement on participation context through early, inclusive engagement of citizens and a structured process design** is vital for success.

Additionally, research findings support clearly defined roles as essential. In NPLV context, the clear equal positioning of all actors is particularly crucial. Rather than rigid task division and traditional hierarchies, the emphasis lies on equal legitimacy and influence of citizens and participation initiators. A citizen from Den Haag Zuidwest explains “everything is equal [...] if you have any certain point, you can discuss it with any member” (C3), similarly to the Amsterdam Nieuw-West participation structure leader announcing, “we are all equal and we have the same saying within any issue” (L1). Reinforced by the role of leaders as facilitators rather than directors, the equal positioning of members empowers vulnerable citizens to engage openly by fostering transparency, dialogue, and a shared sense of ownership over decisions. Findings, thus, suggest that effective participation in the NPLV depends less on clearly demarcated roles and more on communicating their **equal positioning**.

Citizens Influence

Finally, stakeholders confirm institutionalization as necessary for citizens to exert final influence in official decision-making processes. This is illustrated by a member of the Partnerraad, who compared the council to the informal neighbourhood group of “Buurtmoeders [...] [who are] asking for help [...] then its closed doors. [They are told] you’re not an official organization, so we cannot help you” (C4). Absence of institutionalization hampers capacity of informal groups and sidelines certain community voices. Hence, the Partnerraad’s formal structure grants it influence within the decision-making system: “We can translate advice higher up to the mayor and the councillor” (C3) and “We really deliver advice that needs to be considered by the government. They cannot walk around it” (M2). It being “more or less built in stone’ (S1) in official regulations provides the structure with legitimacy by enabling it to influence neighbourhood renewal project designs. In Nieuw-West, a former citizen member explains their connection to higher government levels occurring by “every two weeks, all those Wijkallianties would gather with all these political people and the mayor, and they would propose their ideas” (C2). They criticise the open nature of the structure as raising concerns about depth of citizen’s influence: “You’re looking at 100 people maybe in one room, with the mayor and other stakeholders. The question remains, how much voice or how strong is the power and influence of one group”. Findings underscore that institutionalization, direct connection, and independent positioning ensure access and credibility, however, the design and scale of participation structures settings and focus on meaningful, efficient interaction also affect influence critically. This brings about the facilitative factor of **focused interaction formats**.

Results from Zuidwest highlight the importance of independence from government: “The Partnerraad is independent, has nothing to do with the City Council. We advise the major and the alderman if they ask us. But we can also give them advice if they don’t ask”. The dual role of providing solicited and unsolicited advice strengthens the Partnerraad’s role as a proactive autonomous actor, fostering credibility and citizens’ trust. S1 emphasizes independence for financial sustainability and autonomy. “I had to fight to make sure the budget of the Partnerraad wasn’t part of the national programme, but part of the standing organization” they explain, adding “I didn’t want that because the national programme will only have money until the end of 2026, maybe 2027”. This strategic separation reflects the Partnerraad as a stable governance structure, functioning long-term beyond the lifespan of the national programme. Nieuw-West’s programme manager highlights the tension between institutionalization and financial autonomy: “The Gemeente is a partner who gives the most money [...] have the most power [...]. We want to be independent [...] that’s the difficulty” (M1). While institutionalization provides formal legitimacy and is aimed for, full autonomy is complex if funding comes from dominant actors.

Nieuw-West stakeholders argue against the rigidity common with institutionalization, one citizen critically reflecting on the need for flexibility within formal structures: “I can imagine it can also change along the road. [...] More like a lifeline. [...] Things will change” (C1). This adds a critical layer to institutionalization, emphasizing not only embedding participation structures and aiming for structural and financial independence but ensuring structures remain adaptable, responsive, and open to renewal. Importantly, Zuidwest’s traditional approach to institutionalization versus Nieuw-West’s flexible adaptation of it is a case of competing narratives for effectiveness. Considering both, **institutionalization, independence, and adaptability** matter. Institutionalization facilitates a direct connection to governmental decision-makers who are structurally held accountable for responding to citizen-formulated advice, which ensures citizen impact on project redesign. Thus, institutionalization functions for the same purpose as the theory-identified evaluation structures. Along with these not addressed by stakeholders, evaluation structures for project redesign are removed from the NPLV-adapted indicator framework.

The final indicator concerning evaluation mechanisms for participation structure redesign is also not reflected as theory suggests. In Zuidwest, the Partnerraad plans a formal evaluation process: “The general director [...] will work together with me and the daily board to make up a number of indicators on which we will evaluate [...]. And this is laid out in the regulations of the Partnerraad” (S1). Including space for citizen input, it involves them in participation redesign. Nieuw-West, taking a more informal and continuous approach, explains their early involvement of citizens in the design of the actual participation structure as the mechanism that enables citizen-led participation structure redesign: “it’s up to citizens how they want to reach [goals]” (L1). Initiatives reveal varying approaches to evaluating participation structures with citizens and redesigning these accordingly. Findings suggesting alternatives to evaluation structures, this factor addressed by various frameworks such as Bingsheng et al.’s (2018) is adjusted to **deliberate actions for use of citizen input in participation structure redesign**.

An overview of the final indicator framework for effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas is provided in Appendix D. The presence of these factors in participation structures facilitates while their absence hampers effective citizen participation.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Researching “What factors contribute to effective citizen participation within the urban focus areas of the NPLV?” this comparative case study reveals facilitating and hampering factors for effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas. The constructed indicator framework, informed by nine interviews reflecting on Amsterdam Nieuw-West’s Wijkallianties and Den Haag Zuidwest’s Partnerraad (Appendix D), integrates, validates, and extends literature into one robust framework for citizen participation in vulnerable urban renewal context. Practical recommendations for enhanced participation effectiveness and social cohesion carry high social relevance.

5.1 Conclusions

5.1.1 Confirmed Expectations

Confirming theory-informed expectations from Chapter 2, results reveal contextual, organizational, and managerial barriers hampering power redistribution and back the need for facilitatory structures. The framework in Appendix D highlights these factors. By differing from the theory-informed framework from Chapter 2, findings confirm the relevance of context-specific indicators for participation in vulnerable urban renewal areas and account for vulnerable residents requiring targeted facilitative measures (Nachmany & Hananel, 2023). The framework guides vulnerable citizens in overcoming systematic and structural barriers possibly exacerbating through urban renewal (Vanleene et al., 2017), and facilitates democratic equity (URBACT, n.d.), high-quality outcomes (Lawless et al., 2009), and trust, social cohesion, and governance capacity (Walther & Güntner, 2007).

Moreover, findings prove varying factor combinations across NPLV cases, as shown in the application of the developed framework in Appendix E. Evaluations reveal context-specific barriers and facilitators, responding to the third sub-question. Justifications stem from Chapter 4’s analysis and stakeholder-informed framework adaptations.

Both Wijkallianties and the Partnerraad face contextual barriers. Absence of clear external and internal communication hampers alignment among citizens and structure members, affecting understanding of purpose, independence, and outreach. Past failure of government-led renewal and ignored citizen input, as well as weakening social cohesion fuel distrust in both focus areas. Despite shared national context and limited official commitment, both structures show effective internal leadership. Wijkallianties display more bureaucratic flexibility, whereas the Partnerraad acknowledges but does not adapt to environmental dynamics. Organizationally and managerially, both employ intentional but open participant selection, supporting balanced group dynamics. Wijkallianties apply diverse participation methods, while the Partnerraad relies on their single physical participation techniques and has only recently explored online engagement, limiting accessibility. Promotion is minimal in both, reflecting weak external communication. Only Wijkallianties leverage their boundary spanners as information sources but both structures reveal their delayed use. In process design, Wijkallianties include citizens early, fostering agreement through continuous communication, however, lacking structural clarity. The Partnerraad offers structure but delays citizen involvement and continuous agreement. Both ensure equal member-citizen roles, but unclear communication affects citizens clarity thereof. Facilitating citizens’ influence, the Partnerraad uses decision-maker-linked formats, which Wijkallianties lack. Institutionalization supports influence, though the Partnerraads’ rigidity and Wijkallianties’ limited independence hamper effectiveness. Citizen input is facilitated through Wijkallianties’ ongoing engagement and communication and through the Partnerraad’s planned evaluations with citizens. Overall, stakeholders recognize key barriers and need to address them through targeted facilitative factors.

5.1.2 Practical Conclusions

According to the study’s conceptualization of effective citizen participation (Figure 1), both structures involve true power redistribution by aligning with Arnstein’s (1969) ‘delegated power’ rung. Participants hold dominant decision-making power; Wijkallianties residents involved from the very beginning and the Partnerraad via its institutional embedding. Authorities keeping the final say on adaptation of citizens input prevents full citizen control. Comparing structures and considering effective

participation as genuine power, the Partnerraad's formal mechanisms ensuring citizen input influences official planning decisions and disrupting top-down governance can be interpreted as more effective in operational terms. Yet, its rigidity may hinder long-term effectiveness, especially in complex urban renewal contexts. While Wijkallianties aim for systematic, long-term transformation through flexibility and adaptation, this vision has yet to materialize. Its lack of formal influence mechanisms limits immediate impact.

Both structures offer valuable lessons that can be integrated in one another's approaches. The Partnerraad demonstrates realistic, implementable citizen influence within existing governance structures, while Wijkallianties envision sustained, transformative change over time. A formalized participatory structure that integrates Wijkallianties' adaptability with the Partnerraad's institutional legitimacy would support genuine systematic transformation and operational effectiveness. Citizen participation would be structurally anchored and responsive to local needs, enabling immediate impact and long-term transformation towards strengthened social cohesion.

Importantly, both structures claimed role of citizens as dominant decision-makers faces barriers in practice. As detailed in 5.1.1, both struggle with contextual barriers, while managing organizational and managerial dimensions well. Issues such as information asymmetry, initial distrust, and limited public official commitment hamper effective participation. Informing recommendations (5.2.1), structure evaluations reveal effective participation hinges on communication between structure leaders, the wider community, structure members, and public officials. Transparent, continuous communication of intentions and structure fosters information symmetry. By building trust and mutual understanding, effective internal communication facilitates committed leadership and coherent process design, while external communication ensures balanced group dynamics and meaningful citizen influence.

Overall, factors are interdependent, and an integrated structure design resulting from mutual learning is needed, with effective communication forming the foundation.

The framework's application supports citizen participation across contexts with similar conditions to Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest, for instance providing insights for comparable programs in countries such as the UK, Germany, and France. As it is tailored to vulnerable urban renewal contexts, it is a practical tool to identify barriers, strengthen facilitative conditions, and avoid repeating past mistakes.

5.1.3 Academic Conclusions

The indicator framework fills a significant theoretical gap by building on a synthesis and empirical validation of general frameworks for effective citizen participation and rare but relevant urban renewal- and vulnerability-focused models. Existing context-specific frameworks are particularly extended with underexplored contextual dimensions in participatory, vulnerable urban renewal settings. Evaluations revealing contextual barriers as the most prominent underscores the constructed framework's relevance and academic contribution.

5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 Practical Recommendations

Initiative evaluations inform practical recommendations for each participation structure, listed in Table 3. This highlights the framework's potential as a mutual learning tool.

Both	Wijkallianties	The Partnerraad
1) Develop clear external and internal communication strategies promoting structure existence, purpose, scope, and members' equal roles	1) Improve clarity on participation context through structured process design (e.g. Partnerraad's four-layer model)	1) Strengthen leaders' commitment by formalizing responsiveness and adaptation to citizens' input (e.g. Wijkallianties' flexibility)

2) Communicate to public officials the neutral, facilitative role of the structure to increase their financial, flexible, and concrete commitment and leadership 3) Ensure early involvement of boundary spanners	2) Replace large advice-sharing sessions with official decision-makers with focused interaction formations (e.g. Partnerraad's single member communication channel official decision-makers) 3) Move towards structural and financial independence to enhance citizens' trust and long-term structural sustainability (e.g. Partnerraad's independent structure)	2) Expand diversity of low-barrier participation techniques (e.g. Wijkallianties suitcase of methods) 3) Establish clear links to trusted community builders (e.g. Wijkallianties' facilitative use of Wijkverbinders as information sources) 4) Improve agreement on participation context through early citizen integration (e.g. Wijkallianties' citizen-informed participation structure design) 5) Strengthen structural adaptability through formalization (e.g. Wijkallianties' adaptable formalization)
---	--	---

Table 4: Recommendations

5.2.2 Academic Recommendations

Considering this study's contextuality and limited external validity, future research could extend the framework's applicability by refining it with programme managers, participation structure leaders, and citizens linked to comparable European programmes. Comparative case studies could validate current and reveal further context-specific variables to enhance the framework's relevance and transferability. Future research could also assess the impact of implementing the recommendations within vulnerable urban renewal areas, such as Amsterdam Nieuw-West and Den Haag Zuidwest. By monitoring and assessing implementation outcomes, researchers evaluate recommendations' contextual suitability and effectiveness. This allows for empirical validation of the framework's value and initiates further refinement to context.

Reference List

- Adamson, D. (2010). Community empowerment. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 30(3/4), 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443331011033319>
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 547–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Arnstein, S. (1969). A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Batty, E., Beatty, C., Foden, M., Lawless, P., Pearson, S., & Wilson, I. (2010). *The New Deal for Communities Experience: A final assessment*. Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University. <https://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/general/A%20final%20assessment.pdf>
- Bingsheng, L., Xueqing, W., Nini, X., & Wei, N. (2018). Critical Success Factors for the Management of Public Participation in Urban Renewal Projects: Perspectives from Governments and the Public in China. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, 144(3). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)up.1943-5444.0000467](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)up.1943-5444.0000467)
- Blijleven, W., & van Hulst, M. (2022). Encounters with the organisation: how local civil servants experience and handle tensions in public engagement. *Local Government Studies*, 48(3), 615–639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2020.1857247>
- Brock, A., Uytendinck, M., & de Meere, F. (2023). *Onderzoeksagenda Leefbaarheid en Veiligheid*. WijkWijzer. <https://www.wijkwijzer.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/WijkWijzer-Onderzoeksagenda-Leefbaarheid-en-Veiligheid.pdf>
- Bryson, J., Quick, K., Slotterback, C., & Crosby, B. (2013). Designing Public Participation Processes. *Public Administration Review*, 73(1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/23355431>
- Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung. (2017). *Zwischenevaluierung des Städtebauförderungsprogramms Soziale Stadt*, 52–61. Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung. https://www.gdw.de/media/2019/11/m10b_zwischenevaluierung-soziale-stadt-dl.pdf
- CBS. (2024). *SDG 10.1 Social cohesion and inequality*. Statistics Netherlands. <https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/visualisations/monitor-of-well-being-and-the-sustainable-development-goals/sdg-s/sdg-10-1-social-cohesion-and-inequality>
- Commission des Affaires Économique. (n.d.). LA POLITIQUE DE LA VILLE, UN TREMPIN POUR LES HABITANTS. *Senat*. <https://www.senat.fr/rap/r21-800/r21-800-syn.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 6. Sage Publications Ltd.
- do Amaral, M. P. (2022). Comparative Case Studies: Methodological Discussion. *Landscapes of Lifelong Learning Policies across Europe*, 41–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-96454-2_3
- Elliott, V. (2018). Thinking about the Coding Process in Qualitative Data Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(11), 2850–2861. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.3560>
- Gemeente Den Haag. (2022a). *Concept Programmaplan Brede Aanpak Zuidwest*. Gemeente Den Haag. <https://npzw.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/220242-Programmaplan-Brede-Aanpak-Zuidwest-DEF.pdf>
- Gemeente Den Haag. (2022b). *REGLEMENT PARTNERRAAD VOOR ZUIDWEST*. [Internal document.]
- Ghose, R. (2005). The complexities of citizen participation through collaborative governance. *Space and Polity*, 9(1), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562570500078733>
- Goodlad, R., & Meegan, R. (2005). Governance, Social Cohesion and Neighbourhood Participation. In N. Buck, I. Gordon, A. Harding, & I. Turok (Eds.), *Changing Cities: Rethinking Urban Competitiveness, Cohesion and Governance*, 188–203. Macmillan Education UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-21203-9_11
- Goodman, L. A. (1961). Snowball Sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32(1), 148–170. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177705148>
- Ianniello, M., Brusati, L., Fedele, P., & Iacuzzi, S. (2019). Obstacles and solutions on the ladder of citizen participation: a systematic review. *Public Management Review*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1438499>

- Kansenkaart. (2025). *Kansenkaart.nl*. <https://kansenkaart.nl/persoonlijkinkomen#6.78/51.973/4.563>
- Kim, S. (2014). *Citizen Participation, Transparency, and Public Trust in Government: Participatory Budgeting in Local Governments of Korea*, 35–68. Korea Development Institute. <https://doi.org/10.22740/kdi.rm.e.2014.03>
- Knott, E., Rao, A. H., Summers, K., & Teeger, C. (2022). Interviews in the social sciences. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-022-00166-y>
- Lawless, P., Foden, M., Wilson, I., & Beatty, C. (2009). Understanding Area-based Regeneration: The New Deal for Communities Programme in England. *Urban Studies*, 47(2), 257–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009348324>
- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties. (2022). *Nationaal programma Leefbaarheid en Veiligheid*. Rijksoverheid. <https://open.overheid.nl/documenten/ronl-b338d560857e5f1227939ee0e47ac14db6d6ee63/pdf>
- Modai-Snir, T., & van Ham, M. (2020). Reordering, inequality and divergent growth: processes of neighbourhood change in Dutch cities. *Regional Studies*, 54(12), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2020.1747607>
- Nachmany, H., & Hananel, R. (2023). The Urban Renewal Matrix. *Land Use Policy*, 131, 106744. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2023.106744>
- Nationaal Programma Leefbaarheid en Veiligheid. (2022). *Voortgangs-overzicht 2022-2024*. Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting en Ruimtelijke Ordening. <https://open.overheid.nl/documenten/7d35ea4e-1e1a-412b-b548-907994ac08fc/file>
- Nationaal Programma Samen Nieuw-West. (2024). *Jaarbeeld 2024*. <https://www.samennieuw-west.nl/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/jaarbeeld-2024.pdf>
- Nationaal Programma Zuidwest. (2023). *Gelijke kansen voor Zuidwest. Uitvoeringsplan Nationaal Programma Zuidwest. Den Haag Zuidwest 2023 - 2027*. <https://npzw.nl/uitvoeringsplan/>
- Nationaal Programma Zuidwest. (2024). *Voortgangsrapportage 2023 Nationaal Programma Leefbaarheid en Veiligheid Den Haag Zuidwest*. Verwey Jonker Instituut. <https://denhaag.raadsinformatie.nl/document/14642365/1#search=%22RIS320167%22>
- Partnerraad. (2024). *Strategie Partnerraad Den Haag Zuidwest*. [Internal Document]
- Quinn, J. J. (2009). When You Can't Find the Perfect Match: Using the Accumulated Most Similar Design in Case Studies. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 5(3), 250–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512160903038199>
- Richards, L., & Dalbey, M. (2006). Creating Great Places: The Role of Citizen Participation. *Community Development*, 37(4), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330609490193>
- Ročak, M., & Keinemans, S. (2023). The Eternal Struggle for the City: In Search of an Alternative Framework for Citizen Participation in Urban Regeneration Projects in Shrinking Cities. *Sustainability*, 15(16). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612653>
- Samen Nieuw West. (2025, March 25). *Domein: Eigenaarschap, inclusie en democratie - Samen Nieuw-West*. Samen Nieuw-West. <https://www.samennieuw-west.nl/domeinen/eigenaarschap-inclusie-en-democratie/>
- Samen Nieuw-West. (2022). *Samen Nieuw–We Waarom een Masterplan?* Samen Nieuw-West. <https://www.samennieuw-west.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Analyse-opgaven-Nieuw-West-voorbereiding-Masterplan-januari-2022.pdf>
- Samen Nieuw-West. (2024). *Wij Maken Samen Nieuw-West*. <https://www.samennieuw-west.nl/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Uitvoeringsprogramma-samen-nieuw-west-verdieping.pdf>
- Seawright, J., & Gerring, J. (2008). Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: a Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(294), 294–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912907313077>
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1077800410383121>
- UN DESA. (2020). World Social Report 2020: INEQUALITY IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING WORLD. United Nations. UN . <https://www.un.org/en/desa/world-social-report-2020>
- URBACT. (n.d.). *THE FRENCH “POLITIQUE DE LA VILLE”: URBAN POLICY AND CITY CONTRACTS*. URBACT. <https://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/2023-09/Local%20Pact%20France.pdf>

- Van den Bossche, C. (2019). *INEQUALITIES IN THE NETHERLANDS NETHERLANDS – ABOVE AVERAGE IN THE EU BUT THERE ARE WORRYING TRENDS*. <https://www.sdgwatcheurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/10.3.a-report-NL.pdf>
- van Meerkerk, I., & Edelenbos, J. (2014). The effects of boundary spanners on trust and performance of urban governance networks: findings from survey research on urban development projects in the Netherlands. *Policy Sciences*, 47(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1107701391812>
- Vanleene, D., Voets, J., & Verschuere, B. (2017). The Coproduction of a Community: Engaging Citizens in Derelict Neighbourhoods. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1126601799038>
- Walther, U., & Güntner, S. (2007). Soziale Stadtpolitik in Deutschland: das Programm „Soziale Stadt“. In D. Baum (Ed.), *Die Stadt in der Sozialen Arbeit: Ein Handbuch für soziale und planende Berufe*, 389–400. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/9783531907253_29
- Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, K. (2010). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London: Allen Lane.
- Williams, M., & Moser, T. (2019). The Art of Coding and Thematic Exploration in Qualitative Research. *International Management Review*, 15(1). <https://www.americanscholarspress.us/journals/IMR/pdf/IMR-1-2019/IMR-v15n1art4.pdf>

Appendixes

Appendix A: Interview Topic List

1. *Background and Role of Interviewee*
 - Relationship to the participation structure: current position and responsibilities
2. *Information symmetry in participation structure*
 - Communication strategies to inform citizens
 - Efforts to understand citizen's interests, goals, competencies
 - Integration of citizens' interests, goals, competencies into participation structure
3. *Trust and past experiences*
 - History of government-citizen collaboration
 - Sources of distrust
4. *Transformational leadership*
 - Commitment of public officials
 - Public officials' understanding of effective citizen involvement
5. *Group Dynamic*
 - Participant selection and diversity strategies
 - Use of various participation methods
 - Presence of dominant voices
 - Role of boundary spanners
6. *Process Design*
 - Strategy to ensure clarity and agreement of participation context (or perception thereof)
 - Strategy to ensure clarity of distinct roles (or perception thereof)
7. *Citizens final influence*
 - Mechanisms to evaluate success and gather feedback on participation structure
 - Processes for translating citizens input into concrete actions for project redesign
 - Perceived influence on participation structure and project redesign
8. *Key lessons learned*
 - Key barriers and potential solutions
 - Strongest aspects of participation structures
9. *Reflections and final thoughts*
 - Additional aspects not addressed
 - Suggestions for further contacts or resources

Appendix B: Code Book

Selective Code	Axial Code	Open Code	Example
<u>Information Symmetry</u>	Alignment between participation structure characteristics and context with citizens' abilities, interests, roles	Participation structure responding to citizens abilities and interests	<i>"So, you have to know what's bothering them, what's keeping them going, to activate them." – L1</i>
		Citizens understandings of government objectives	<i>"Now in Zuidwest they invested a lot of millions over here. But what fuels the citizens over here is that the citizens are not seeing where the millions go" – C3</i>
		Citizens understandings of participation restrictions	<i>"It cannot be transparent in the way people expect us to be transparent, because that will be in integrity." – M2</i>
	External Communication: alignment between participation structure and external stakeholders (visibility)	Communities awareness of participation opportunities and structure	<i>"The problem is that the Partnerraad is not known by many people. They have heard it, but we are not visible enough." – C3</i>
		Public officials understanding of participation structure	<i>"If you're going to be more open with your communications. I also think that the Gemeente is going to reach out to the Partnerraad more often." – C4</i>
	Internal Communication: alignment between members	Established participation structure goals, mission, vision across members	<i>"Otherwise, we are going to do a lot or we want a lot and in the end we are not going to reach anything because we don't get our goals straight." – C4</i>
		Awareness/understanding of strategy/structure across participation structure members	<i>"No, I haven't received them yet. If they got something, I haven't received them. I hope that they got something" – C4</i>
<u>Initial Mutual Trust</u>	Successful past citizen-state collaboration in neighbourhood redevelopment	Previous failed neighbourhood redevelopment	<i>"if you don't get it on the average measurement, if you don't do it, then this will be the next Schilderswijk of the Hague</i>

			<i>if four years, five years' time." – C3</i>
		Previous neglect of citizens input	<i>"I think that's the same in all Dutch cities and it has to do with the history of governance. How one central government went to local governments and the whole community developments became in the hands of the local governments. And then there was no money. A lot of civilians feel neglected and feel that our government thinks they are not relevant or they're not important." – C1</i>
	Social Cohesion in Area	Division	<i>"You have all these bubbles who are closed. So, people are pointed inside with their face." – C1</i>
		Friction	<i>"We have a neighbourhood where professionals and citizens are not working together because there's a lot of friction due to issues in the neighbourhood, but also between citizens. So, we have two quite big groups who are organised but they don't match with each other." – L1</i>
		Discrimination and racism	<i>"It has to do with politics. It has to do with race. It has to do with old and new." – L1</i>
<u>Leadership by Committed Public Officials and Participation Structure Leaders</u>	Leadership by Committed Public Officials	Financial/budgetary commitment	<i>"But the bigger problem is that the stadsdeel is not getting enough money to improve the system. But that's I think not only The Hague, but also Amsterdam." – C3</i>
		Importance of public officials keeping promises & acting accordingly	<i>"It's a contradiction because they have signed the content. They have signed that they want this, but if you go to see what they have to do, that's another level. So, it's difficult for them because</i>

			<i>they have to reach out. They have to change. They have to change their thoughts about the system” – M1</i>
	Leadership by Committed Participation Structure Leaders	Bureaucratic flexibility allowing system change (adaptation and responsiveness)	<i>"A lot of people are changing all the time and, to be honest, I'm one of them too. I'm the 4th programme manager in this programme. So yeah, that's all not helping. And I think when it comes to the Partnerraad that you see the same dynamics are changing, so you know. And I think that's the problem too." – M2</i>
		Incentive-Free Leadership	<i>"And we are volunteers. We are doing this voluntarily." – L2</i>
		Neutral and facilitatory leadership	<i>"As a neutral party, we're there for everyone. We are not here to take over. We're not here to make sure one party succeeds and the other one doesn't." – L1</i>
	Non-discriminatory and elitist leadership by public officials themselves affected/experienced with problems	Decision-making by openly discriminatory public officials	<i>"They do not trust that the government will do something about their problems because most people here are from a non-Western migration background. And especially now with PVV, being the biggest, which is, like, in their perspective and my perspective as well, by the way, a racist kind of party because they marginalize them even further and their religion, like, often Islam. And so, they do not trust the government, and they do not trust that they will, do like, that they will help them and, listen to their voices so that their efforts are not managed on greater scales." – C2</i>
		Decision-making by unaffected public officials	<i>"In the centre of the Hauge the Beleidswerdemeerker make plans for the quarters. I said to him the</i>

			<i>Beleidswerdemeerders are not living in the Hague. 50% of them at least are not living in the Hague. 40% is living on the sand. 10% is maybe living on the mud. That's the part of the Hague where people are less educated, more workers" – C3</i>
		Unsuitable solution designs	<i>"And mostly what I what I see and hear it's not just because people are not capable of long-term thinking. It's because the lack of trust, the lack of solutions which they think is the right solution." – L1</i>
<u>Representative and Balanced Group Dynamic</u>	Intentional but Open Participant Selection	Representation for maximum insight	<i>"That's the problem in these types of quarters. You don't know what happens in the background. That's why I have 90 teachers here from 30 to 40 cultures. Only when you have that you know everything that's going on. – L2</i>
		Open Participant Selection	<i>"A process in which, because it had to be inclusive, I chose for self-selection. Everybody is welcome. But in conducting critical conversations with everybody, giving critical information, you can help people make their own choices and their own right choices. So, people will kind of see the light that okay, perhaps this position is not for me, but I can help here and there" – C1</i>
	Use of multiple and diverse, also promotional participation techniques beyond participation structure members	Selection of multiple methods	<i>"Last meeting, now we have 14 or 13 members and of those 13, 6 weren't at the meeting. It's almost half, you know. And these meetings are set up for an entire year." – S2</i>
		Need to reach busy/unavailable/immobile/reliant citizens	<i>"This is the most important question. The most difficult question as well. You know, how do you get people who are struggling in daily life.</i>

			<i>With poverty, whatever. What they're doing, how do you get them into a position that they can actually help you give advice on things that matter for the how can you contact them?" – S2</i>
		Online methods	<i>"One of the things is that the advisory trajectories should have their own page on the website in which people could also react on the findings of the partner council to give input. – S2</i>
		Physical methods	<i>"Maybe it is better for the Partnerraad to visit some organizations within Southwest just to tell them about their existence." – C4</i>
		Promotional methods	<i>"I think they could use more tools to promote the Partnerraad." – M2</i>
	Early and facilitatory use of trustworthy boundary spanners linked to participation structure	Boundary spanners with clear link to participation structure	<i>"The importance of our community builders, I don't know if they were mentioned to you already, but the community builders are really people who are in the roots of the community and know so many people. I think the Partnerraad can use the community builders, but I'm not sure if that is already smoothly going. I think there is a lot to build." – M2</i>
		Early engagement of boundary spanners	<i>"They are doing good work at the moment. You see also the beleidsmarkers are also getting to the quarters in Zuidwest. Coming to the quarters. But, if you go into history, yeah they had to do it five years ago." – C3</i>
		Facilitatory boundary spanners	<i>"As in, we were going to help reach out to the people who usually don't come up front and after a while, when all is that sorted and the regular organisations have adopted that way of working, that's when we will start taking our hands</i>

			<i>off. We want the stakeholders that have always been there to adopt this." – L1</i>
		Trustworthy and connected to community	<i>"But your job as a community builder, you have to build something within the community. If you're not going to be a bit of personal, you cannot build something" – C4</i>
<u>Organized Participation Process Design</u>	Clarity and agreement on participation context	Clear structure to engagement - clarity	<i>" So, its a layered thing is like 4 phases: desk research, interviews with experts, making up our own mind analysis, testing that analysis with citizens, and then finalising the advice"- S2</i>
		Early and consistent engagement of citizens - agreement	<i>"What they really want to achieve is that everybody aboard the process will learn together what the Wijkalliantie has to become." – C1</i>
	Participants and leaders as Equals	Equal roles	<i>"We are equal and have the same saying within any issue." – L1</i>
<u>Citizens Final Influence</u>	Institutionalization and Independence of Participation Structure	Formal placement	<i>"Now when it comes to the Partnerraad, I think it's more formal than other ways of participation and they give some really good advice topics that the government has to make a decision of. So, they really deliver some pieces of paper advice that needs to be considered by the government. So, they cannot walk around it." – M2</i>
		Solicited and Unsolicited Advice-giving	<i>"And we are giving our advice and they can ask us for advice. The mayor and the councils of the Hague can ask advice. But we can also give them advice without them asking" – C3</i>
		Independence of participation structure	<i>"I had to fight, for example, to when it comes to the budget of the Partnerraad. I had to fight to make sure</i>

			<i>the budget of the Partnerraad wasn't part of the national programme, but it's part of the standing organisation." – S2</i>
		Flexibility	<i>"The way I know them I can imagine it can also change along the road. I can imagine that it's also fluid, that what has to be done will be done. More like a lifeline. I mean the national programme will be here for 18 more years. My recommendation would be already to scratch that. Things will change. Also, our thinking has changed and if we're not capable of doing that, then we should make space for new people." – C1</i>
	Formal evaluation of citizen input in participation design	Engagement of citizens in participation structure design	<i>"We are also letting people participate about how even that should be. We're trying to have to work from bottom up, that means every decision making, however small it is, it should have citizens talking. And deciding about it. So, we don't have a blueprint for Wijkalliantie. What we have is an inspiration, a utopia of the neighbourhoods. That's what we share. And it's up to citizens how they want to reach it." – L1</i>

		Formal evaluation of participation structure design	<i>"The general director, he is the one doing the evaluation. So, his team will work together with me and the daily board of the Partnerraad to make up a number of indicators on which we will evaluate and then we will do the evaluation. That will be a preliminary report that we have a year to, you know, work on things that come out of the evaluation and the final evaluation will be done the end of 2026. And this is being laid out in the regulations of the Partnerraad, which has been accepted by the local council in November of 2022." – S2</i>
--	--	---	--

Table 5: Codebook

Appendix C: Privacy Checklist and Consent Form

PRIVACY CHECKLIST

CHECKLIST PRIVACY RELATED ASPECTS IN RESEARCH

INSTRUCTION

This checklist must be completed for every research carried out by researchers (staff and students) from the Department of Public Administration and Sociology (DPAS). This checklist must be completed before starting to collect data or approach participants. Students can get help from their supervising teacher when completing this checklist.

This checklist is a mandatory part of the thesis and must be uploaded to Canvas before data processing is started. Consult the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) when completing the checklist. This can be consulted on Canvas. The FAQ contains guidelines that guarantee privacy.

If you have any doubts about specific aspects of your research, discuss this with your EUR thesis supervisor in order to together find a solution.

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Title of the project: Effective Citizen Participation in Vulnerable Urban Development Areas – A Comparative Analysis of the “National Program for Liveability and Safety” Initiatives in the Netherlands

Name and email address of student: Melina Albani, 728416ma@eur.nl

Name and e-mail address of thesis supervisor: Sofia Pagliarin, pagliarin@ihs.nl

Start date and duration: January 2025 – June 2025

Is the research being conducted within DPAS? YES

If NOT: at or for which institution or organization will the study be conducted?
(for example, an internship organization)

Research is being conducted within DPAS as well as within the Hague Southwest Thesis Lab

PART II: TYPE OF RESEARCH STUDY

Indicate what type of research your study involves by circling the correct answers:

1. Are natural persons involved in the research? YES
 - If YES, go to Part II
 - If NO, go to PART IV

2. Is personal data processed as part of the research? Personal data relates to identified or identifiable natural persons. This includes both direct and indirect data. Interpret indirect personal data in the broadest sense of the word. Indirect personal data can be any data that can be indirectly traced to a person. YES

If YES, justify below for what purpose the personal data is processed

The only personal data point that is being processed is the participants' position within the NPLV organization (e.g. participation structure programme manager). This is needed as it is a selection criterion for participants. The purpose of conducted interviews is to finalize findings from theory through research with people involved in the participation structures of NPLV, so knowing their precise position/occupation is needed for research credibility.

3. Are special personal data processed as part of the research? Special personal data: NO
- Race or ethnic origin;
 - Political views;
 - Religious or philosophical beliefs;
 - Trade union membership;
 - Genetic data;
 - Biometric data for the unique identification of a person, for example fingerprints or facial images;
 - Information about mental or physical health; and/or
 - Information regarding a person's sexual behavior or sexual orientation.

If YES, justify the purpose of the processing for each personal data

/

4. Are minors (<16 years old) involved in the study, or other vulnerable groups who cannot give consent? For vulnerable groups, the residents of a women's refuge, refugees, and people with intellectual disabilities should be considered. NO

If YES, justify your answer below

/

5. Will you pseudonymize any collected (special) personal data? YES
 With pseudonymization, identifying data is separated from non-identifying data and replaced by artificial identifiers.

Consider, for example, replacing the name and address data of each respondent with a unique respondent number. As a result, it is not visible to outsiders who the person to which these personal data belong is. Only the person who can make the link between the respondent number and the name and address details is able to link the personal data. Sufficient measures must be taken to make it impossible for unauthorized persons to link these files.

If YES, explain how you pseudonymize the personal data

Each respondent's name will be replaced with a unique respondent number and consistently referred to by this number or, if given permission, by their position in the NPLV programme.

PART II – PERMISSION

Use the following table to assess whether a consent form should be prepared.

Type of data set	Informed consent form?
Collection of data set with personal data	Yes, a consent form must be prepared for all respondents.
Collection of data set with special personal data	Yes, a consent form must be prepared for all respondents. Important! Explicit consent is required for the processing of special personal data.
Collection of data set with personal data of vulnerable groups	Yes, a consent form must be prepared for all respondents. Important! If minors are involved in a study, the following rules apply: • Under 16 years of age: permission from respondent (if possible) and parent/guardian • Older than 16 years and younger than 18 years: permission from respondent.
Research with field observations without manipulations for which participants do not have to be identified	No, no consent form is required.
Data files in which no personal data is processed	No, no consent form is required.
Reuse of existing data set with the permission for reuse in future research in the same research area	No, there is no consent form in the following cases: 1. With initial research, the respondents gave permission for the data set to be reused for future research in the same field. 2. The owner of the initial research has publicly informed that the dataset is being reused for future research in the same field.
Reuse of existing data set without the permission for reuse in future research in the same research area	Yes, a consent form must be prepared for all respondents. Important! Do you not have the contact details? Then ensure that the data owner informs the public about the reuse of the dataset for future research. For example, by means of a Privacy Statement.

* Add your information and consent form in Appendix I (if applicable).

PART IV: DATA COLLECTION

7. From whom/what do you collect your data?

Note: indicate this per individual data source (interviews, questionnaire research, observations, etc.)

Firstly, interview data is collected for the purpose of my master thesis research within the department DPAS.

Secondly, interview data is collected for the Municipality of The Hague. The research is happening in collaboration with the Thesis Lab The Hague Southwest. Hence, the final research based on collected data will be provided to the Municipality of The Hague in the form of recommendations.

8. How will you collect your data?

Note: indicate this per individual data source (interviews, questionnaire research, observations, etc.)

Data will be collected through interviews.

9. What is the (expected) sample size?

The expected sample size is 10.

10. What is the size of the population from which you draw a sample?

No specific size of population. There are only a couple of people part of the selected NPLV initiatives that are responsible for participation structures. These are hoped to be engaged in the research.

PART V – DATA STORAGE AND COPIES

11. Where do you store the data obtained in the short term?

Note: Indicate this per individual data source, for example for test data on paper and for digital data files.

Digital data files will be stored in Microsoft OneDrive

12. How long will you keep the data?

Note: Indicate this per individual data source, for example for test data on paper and for digital data files.

The digital data files are stored for a period of ten years. Data will be deleted or made anonymous so that they can no longer be traced to a person at the end of this period, at the latest.

13. Who is responsible for the direct daily management, storage, and backup of the data related to your research?

Melina Albani

14. Who has access to your research and underlying data set and with whom is it shared?

Please note - ensure that only authorized persons have access to your research and underlying data set.
For example, access to certain documents that are stored on your computer.

Upon request, the thesis supervisor, second reader, and Thesis Lab The Hague Southwest/Municipality of the Hague has access to the data set underlying the research.

15. How (often) will you make backup copies of your research data for short-term security?

Once a week, with the automatic backup of OneDrive.

PART VI: SIGNATURE

Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the privacy guidelines whilst conducting your research. Erasmus University Rotterdam recommends that you use the FAQs to ensure that the data is authentic, of high quality, and processed correctly. This also means that you inform participants about the research and that you guarantee its confidentiality when storing and using personal data.

Deviating from the proposed advice from Erasmus University Rotterdam, as included in the FAQs, falls under your responsibility.

I hereby declare that the study will be conducted in accordance with the privacy guidelines of the Department of Public Administration and Sociology of the Erasmus University Rotterdam. I have answered all questions truthfully.

Name student: Melina Albani

Name EUR supervisor: Sofia Pagliarin

Date: 05.04.2025

Date: 06.04.2025



CONSENT FORM

Information sheet for thesis research Effective Citizen Participation in Vulnerable Urban Development Areas: A Comparative Analysis of the "National Program for Liveability and Safety" Initiatives in the Netherlands

Under the supervision of Sofia Pagliarin, Melina Albani is examining effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban development areas within the context of the Dutch National Programme for Liveability and Safety.

This research can be realized with the help of your participation.

Melina is interested in experience with the context, management, and organization of the participation structure of the NPLV programme you are affiliated with.

There are no right or wrong answers.

<i>Why this research?</i>	This research aims to identify the factors that facilitate or hinder effective citizen participation in vulnerable urban development areas, specifically within the context of the Dutch Nationaal Programma Leefbaarheid en Veiligheid (NPLV). To achieve this, stakeholders with knowledge of the participation structures in NPLV initiatives from one of the four largest Dutch cities will be consulted. The insights gathered from these stakeholders will inform policy and practical recommendations tailored to the NPLV programme in The Hague Southwest. In particular, the research will focus on strengthening the role and functioning of the “Partnerrad”, the local participation structure of The Hague Southwest, to support more effective citizen engagement. In doing so, the study contributes to the broader ambitions of the NPLV, which seeks to redevelop vulnerable urban areas through inclusive, decentralized decision-making processes that involve local communities. This research is being conducted as part of a Master's project at Erasmus University Rotterdam.
<i>Process</i>	You will participate in a study in which we will gather information through interviewing you and recording your answers via audio or video recording. A transcript of the interview will be produced.
<i>Confidentiality</i>	We will do everything we can to protect your privacy as well as possible. In addition to the student, only the thesis supervisor, second reader, and internship company of the student will have access to all information you provide. The research will not mention your name. If you give permission, your position in the NPLV program structure will be shared in the research.
<i>Voluntary participation</i>	You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. Your participation is voluntary, and you can stop whenever you want. If, during the research, you decide to terminate your participation, the information that you have already provided will be used until the moment that consent is withdrawn. Do you want to stop participating in this research? Then contact Melina via 728416ma@eur.nl or +31 6 42668930.
<i>Data storage</i>	Anonymous data or pseudonyms will be used in the thesis. The audio recordings, forms and/or other documents that are created or collected in the context of this thesis will be stored securely. The research data is stored for a period of ten years. Data will be deleted or made anonymous so that they can no longer be traced to a person at the end of this period, at the latest.

*Submitting a question
or complaint*

If you have specific questions about how your personal data is handled, you can direct your question to Melina via 728416ma@eur.nl or +31 6 42668930. You can also submit a complaint to the Dutch Data Protection Authority if you suspect that your data has been processed incorrectly.

By signing this consent form I acknowledge the following:

- | | Yes | No |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 I am sufficiently informed about the research. I have read the information sheet and have had the opportunity to ask questions. These questions have been answered sufficiently and I have had sufficient time to decide on my participation. | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2 I volunteer to participate in this study. It is clear to me that I can terminate participation in the study at any time, without providing a reason. I don't have to answer a question if I do not want to. | ☐ | ☐ |
| 3 I give permission to process the data collected about me during this research as explained in the attached information sheet. | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4 I give permission for audio recordings to be made during discussions and a transcript of my answers to be produced. | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5 I give permission for use my answers as quotes in the student's thesis. | ☐ | ☐ |
| 6 I give permission to state my position within the NPLV programme in the quotes referred to above. | ☐ | ☐ |
| 7 I give permission to store the data collected from me and to use it in a pseudonymized form for all further research where it can be used at a later date. | | ☐ |

☐

Appendix D: Final Indicator Framework for Effective Citizen Participation in Vulnerable Urban Renewal Areas

	Concept	Indicator	Values
Contextual Factors	Information Symmetry / Asymmetry	Degree of alignment between participation structure characteristics and scope with vulnerable citizens' abilities, interests, and expectations through clear external and internal communication	Strong/Moderate/Weak Alignment
	Initial Mutual Trust / Distrust	Existence and quality (success) of past state-citizen partnerships Social cohesion in area	High/Medium/Low Quality Strong/Moderate/Weak Social Cohesion
	Transformational / Non-Transformational Leadership	Degree of public official's commitment through financial investment and concrete action in accordance with claimed support	High/Medium/Low Commitment
		Degree of public official's and participation structure leader's commitment through bureaucratic flexibility (adaptation and responsiveness)	High/Medium/Low Flexibility
		Degree of participation structure leaders' commitment through incentive-free, professional, and relational leadership	High/Medium/Low Commitment
Organizational & Managerial Factors	Representative and Balanced / Dominating and Unbalanced Group Dynamic	Intentional but open participant selection	Strong/Moderate/Weak Openness and Intention
		Use of multiple, diverse, open, and promotional low-barrier participation techniques	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use
		Early and facilitatory use of trustworthy professional facilitators/boundary spanners linked to participation structures	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use
	Organized / Disorganized Participation Process Design	Clarity and mutual agreement on participation context through early, inclusive engagement of citizens and a structures process design	High/Medium/Low Clarity and Agreement
		Clarity on the equal roles of stakeholders	High/Medium/Low Clarity
	Citizens final / no final influence	Presence of focused interaction formats	High/Medium/Low Focus

		Institutionalization, independence, and adaptability of participation process Deliberate actions for use of citizen input in participation structure redesign	Full/Partial/No Institutionalization and Adaptability Strong/Moderate/Weak Use
--	--	---	--

Table 6: Indicator Framework for Effective Citizen Participation in Vulnerable Urban Renewal Areas

Amsterdam Nieuw-West:

46

		Degree of participation structure leaders' commitment through incentive-free, professional, and relational leadership	<i>"We have to confirm to them and not them to us" (M1, participation structure leaders)</i> High/Medium/Low Commitment <i>"You cannot be the professional that does everything one way because we have always done it that way [...]. Everything you learnt is not relevant right now" (C1, professional)</i>
Organizational & Managerial Factors	Representative and Balanced / Dominating and Unbalanced Group Dynamic	Intentional but open participant selection	Strong/Moderate/Weak Openness and Intention <i>"A process in which, because it had to be inclusive, I chose for self-selection. Everybody is welcome. But in conducting critical conversations with everybody, giving critical information, you can help people make their own choices and their own right choices. So, people will kind of see the light that okay, perhaps this position is not for me, but I can help here and there" (C1, openness)</i> <i>"One of the people that worked there connected me to the alliance" (C2, intention)</i>
		Use of multiple, diverse, open, and promotional low-barrier participation techniques	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use <i>"We use public evidence [as] this gives us enough space to get each [problem] on the table, but also to use whatever intervention is</i>

	Citizens final / no final influence	Presence of focused interaction formats Institutionalization, independence, and adaptability of participation process Deliberate actions for use of citizen input in participation structure redesign	High/Medium/Low Focus <i>“You’re looking at 100 people maybe in one room, with the mayor and other stakeholders. The question remains, how much voice or how strong is the power and influence of one group” (C2)</i> Full/Partial/No Institutionalization and Adaptability <i>“The Gemeente is a partner who gives the most money have the most power. We want to be independent, that’s the difficulty” (M1, independence)</i> <i>“I can imagine it can also change along the road. More like a lifeline. Things will change” (C1, adaptability)</i> Strong/Moderate/Weak Use <i>“It’s up to citizens how they want to reach [goals]” (L1)</i>
--	-------------------------------------	--	--

Table 7: Evaluation of Wijkallianties

Den Haag Zuidwest:

	Concept	Indicator	Values
Contextual Factors	Information Symmetry / Asymmetry	Degree of alignment between participation structure characteristics and scope with vulnerable citizens’ abilities, interests, and expectations through clear external and internal communication	Strong/Moderate/Weak Alignment <i>“The problem is that the Partnerraad is not known by many people” (C3)</i> <i>“If they got something, I haven’t received them. I hope they got something” (C4)</i>

	Initial Mutual Trust / Distrust	Existence and quality (success) of past state-citizen partnerships Social cohesion in area	High/Medium/ Low Quality <i>"The neighbourhood is like, we don't know if we can trust them because they don't listen to us"</i> (C4) Strong/Moderate/ Weak Social Cohesion <i>"What often happens is that there's a divide between people"</i> (L2)
	Transformational / Non-Transformational Leadership	Degree of public official's commitment through financial investment and concrete action in accordance with claimed support Degree of public official's and participation structure leader's commitment through bureaucratic flexibility (adaptation and responsiveness) Degree of participation structure leaders' commitment through incentive-free, professional, and relational leadership	High/Medium/ Low Commitment <i>"The problem is that the stadsdeel is not getting enough money to improve the system"</i> (C3) High/Medium/ Low Flexibility <i>"They walk against the wall, thinking its not possible"</i> (M2, in reference to public officials) High /Medium/Low Commitment <i>"Doing this voluntarily"</i> (L1, incentive-free)
Organizational & Managerial Factors	Representative and Balanced / Dominating and Unbalanced Group Dynamic	Intentional but open participant selection	Strong /Moderate/Weak Openness and Intention <i>"It was an open invitation to everybody"</i> (C3, openness) <i>"We asked a number of very active citizens in Southwest to apply to be a member of the Partnerraad"</i> (S2, intention)

		Use of multiple, diverse, open, and promotional low-barrier participation techniques	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use <i>"How do you get people who are struggling in daily life [...] into a position that they can actually help you give advice on things that matter?" (S1)</i> <i>"I think they could use more tools to promote the Partnerraad." (M2, promotional)</i>
		Early and facilitatory use of trustworthy professional facilitators/boundary spanners linked to participation structures	Strong/Moderate/Weak Use <i>"Our community builders, people who are at the roots of the community" (M2)</i> <i>"There is a lot to build" (M2)</i> <i>"They had to do it five years ago" (C3, early)</i> <i>"Finding the right ones is absolutely key" (S2, trustworthy)</i>
	Organized / Disorganized Participation Process Design	Clarity and mutual agreement on participation context through early, inclusive engagement of citizens and a structures process design	High/Medium/Low Clarity and Agreement <i>"It's layered in 4 phases: desk research, interviews with experts, making up our mind analysis, testing that analysis with citizens, and then finalizing the advice" (S1, clarity)</i>
		Clarity on the equal roles of stakeholders	High/Medium/Low Clarity <i>"Everything is equal. If you have any certain</i>

			<i>point, you can discuss it with any member” (C3)</i>
	Citizens final / no final influence	Presence of focused interaction formats Institutionalization, independence, and adaptability of participation process Deliberate actions for use of citizen input in participation structure redesign	High/Medium/Low Focus Full/Partial/No Institutionalization and Adaptability <i>“We really deliver advice that needs to be considered by the government. They cannot walk around it” (C3, institutionalization)</i> <i>“The Partnerraad is independent, has nothing to do with the with the City Council. We can give advice to the major and the alderman if they ask us. But we can also give them advice if they don’t ask” (C3, independence)</i> Strong/Moderate/Weak Use <i>“The general director will work together with me and the daily board to make up a number of indicators on which we will evaluate. And this is laid out in the regulations of the Partnerraad” (S1)</i>

Table 8: Evaluation of the Partnerraad