SOCIAL INNOVATION: THE ROLE OF THE MUNICIPAL POLICYMAKER

Student	BSc. M.A. Vos
Student ID	420709
Thesis supervisor	Dr. V. Lub
Second supervisor	Dr. J.M. Wittmayer (DRIFT)
Second reader	Dr. J. Holland
MSc	Sociology - Urban Studies
	Faculty of Social Sciences
	Erasmus University Rotterdam
Date	August 6, 2017

ABSTRACT

Over the past two decades, Dutch government aims to stimulate the self-organizing capacity and responsibility of citizens in the context of the participatory society. As a result, municipal policymakers have the complex task to stimulate active citizenship in Dutch cities. Therefore, this qualitative study explores the current roles of the municipal policymaker in relation to members of Social Innovation (SI) initiatives. The analysis of the Critical Turning Points (CTP) and additional in-depth interviews identified four roles of the municipal policymaker: the provider, the mediator, the co-creator and the innovator. In all four roles, the municipal policymaker influences the development of SI-initiatives positively or either negatively. The present study concludes that the roles of the municipal policymaker in relation to members of SI-initiatives are considered complex and challenging. In the context of the Dutch participatory society, the role of the municipal policymaker contributes to a representative democracy and is considered to be in a transitional phase.

KEYWORDS

1. INTRODUCTION

In Dutch cities, governments, citizens, and other actors currently explore alternative forms of collaboration. This can, for example, be observed in Amsterdam, where a group of active citizens determines how to spend the municipal budget in their neighbourhood and ask themselves simple questions such as: Where does this money come from? How is this money spent? And is it possible to spend it differently? Currently, these citizens work together with representatives of the municipality to stimulate budget transparency, and at the same time strengthen a participatory democracy by influencing the decision-making process of the municipality. These new forms of collaboration are considered as Social Innovation (SI) initiatives. Another example is Living Labs: small (online) communities, based on the principle of co-creation, where research and innovation concerning societal issues take place. Or, in Ecovillages, in which citizens unite in local communities to increase their independence and self-sufficiency to live and work in a sustainable way (Pel & Bauler, 2014).

SI-initiatives can be linked to the participatory society in the Netherlands. As a result of welfare state reforms, this political ideal gained ground when the government introduced the Social Support Act which emphasizes individual responsibility, self-organization, and active

citizenship (Putters, 2014; Tonkens, 2014). In 2010, the participatory society reached momentum when the government implemented the national coalition agreement 'Freedom and Responsibility', focusing on redistributing tasks and responsibilities between state and society (Engbersen et al., 2010). Thus, the role of the government here is reinterpreted: from controlling and directing, to facilitating and supporting citizens. The government aims to make citizens responsible for the provision of libraries, homework counselling, playgrounds, kindergarten, or elderly care. Nonetheless, many initiatives are dependent on the support of public authorities. Rather than abstention, citizens' initiatives need interest, engagement, and support from local government (Bakker et al., 2012). This means that their role is to provide citizens the necessary regulatory and financial resources for initiatives to succeed, by improving its accessibility, quality, and affordability (BEPA, 2010).

In this context, the relationship between government and citizen has been frequently debated (ROB, 2012; WRR, 2012). Proponents argue that active citizenship contributes to a representative democracy due to an increase of government transparency, contestability, two-way dialogue, and integration of citizens' initiatives into government structures (BEPA, 2010). On the other hand, critics argue that policies aimed at active citizenship are a cover for governments' budget cuts and privatization. According to Muehlebach (2011), reform policies are the products of a 'dehumanizing' neoliberalist state. Due to the uneven distribution of social and economic capital, citizens vary in their self-organizing capacity, which increases socioeconomic inequality in society (Tonkens, 2014). Uitermark (2015) contributes to this discourse and states that when governments minimize responsibilities and resources, future initiatives are doomed to fail due to the absence of pre-existing organisational structures. Uitermark (2015) believes that there are currently inspiring examples of successful initiatives, but are exceptional and ambivalent as well.

In 2015, the responsibility and tasks to stimulate active citizenship have been decentralized to municipalities to minimize the gap between government and citizen. However, it appears to be a complex task for municipalities to provide each citizen the legislation and means to involve them in internal and decision-making processes of the organisational structure (EBMR, 2016). Therefore, this study focusses the role of the municipal policymaker in relation to active citizens that are members of SI-initiatives. In the field of transition research focused on social innovation, a conceptual start has been made through disentangling the different actors in transition (Fischer & Newig, 2016), the involved power relations (Avelino & Wittmayer, 2015), and through a sociological focus on the concept of 'roles' (Wittmayer et al., 2016). In

this conceptual framework, there is a need to formulate a typology that nuances and specifies the reinterpreted role of the municipal policymaker from the point of view of social innovation.

Thus, the aim of this study is to empirically explore the different roles of the municipal policymaker. This leads to the following questions: *What are the current roles of the Dutch municipal policymaker in relation to members of SI-initiatives? And how are the roles considered in terms of the SI-initiatives' development?* The roles of the municipal policymaker will be theoretically explored in academic literature first. Then, the theoretical insights will be elaborated by collecting qualitative empirical data. In the final section, these findings will be shortly summarized and discussed in the light of the Dutch participatory society discourse.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Active citizenship

Since the late 70s, the relationship between government and citizen has slowly been changing. On the one hand, citizens became more outspoken and assertive, and on the other hand, companies did not want to deal with the bureaucratic culture of local and national government (Wijdeven, Van de Graaf & Hendriks, 2013). From the perspective of neoliberal politicians, the welfare state reproduces passive citizenship, and especially in the case of disadvantaged groups (i.e. abusing social services). To become a full member of society, the importance of participation and fulfil obligations towards society has been underestimated. Hereafter, a first transition in reconsidering the meaning of citizenship occurred in the 1980s. Instead of questions regarding obtaining citizenship or legal status, the focus shifted to what is considered a desirable form of citizenship. From civil rights to civil duty: stimulating active citizenship became increasingly visible in politics and policy documents (ROB, 2012)

Over the past decade, active citizenship received renewed attention in politics and policy documents. In this discourse, the focus shifted from civil duties to moral awareness. Currently, arguments for active citizenship are ideological: governments promote a vital society in which citizens are invited to play an active role in the public domain. This development has consequences for the interpretation of the roles of both parties. Top-down, governments reduce their responsibility and power, and bottom-up, citizens are expected to take initiative and influence public legislation (Tonkens, 2008). This second transition in the reinterpretation of the meaning of active citizenship can be explained by the concept of 'social innovation'. Haxeltine et al. (2016) define social innovation as 'changes in social relations, involving new ways of doing, organizing, framing and knowing how to deal with societal challenges' (p. 5).

Instead of a neoliberal view, social innovation is focused on the satisfaction of human need through building relations upon local scale (Jégou, 2015; Moulaert et al., 2013).

2.2. Mediating

The transition from a welfare state to a participatory society has consequences for the municipal policymaker as well: the responsibility and tasks to stimulate active citizenship have been decentralized to municipalities. Therefore, the municipal policymaker acts as a 'mediator' between city council and citizens. The mediator communicates with citizens, colleagues, and other local actors to increase their knowledge of the urban area. This way, municipal policymakers can make pragmatic considerations and decisions in the formulation and implementation of participatory policies. It is also required for municipal policymakers to enhance discretionary autonomy. Discretion, the space to make choices based on self-assessment, is considered an important aspect for municipal policymakers. Without this discretionary space, it would be difficult to judge individual initiatives: flexibility is necessary to deal with this complexity. Therefore, the municipal policymaker searches for a balance between compassion and flexibility and, objectivity and strict regulation (Lipsky, 1980).

The role of the municipal policymaker can be linked to the collaborative governance approach. Ansell and Gash (2007) define collaborative governance as 'a mode of governance that brings multiple stakeholders, either individuals or organisations, together in common forums to engage in consensus-oriented decision making' (p. 543). Bakker et al. (2012) analysed the municipal organisation in their role as 'facilitator' from the collaborative governance approach. The authors formulated multiple conditions to successfully facilitate citizens' initiatives. First, Bakker et al. (2012) argue that, in terms of network structuration, the municipal organisation develops new rules in areas such as making district-approach policy and establishing grant schemes for subsidising initiatives. This way, the municipal organisation creates favourable conditions to stimulate initiatives and recruit participants (e.g. specification of conditions under which financial resources are provided). Second, network management is important to mobilize initiatives: municipal organisations make various efforts to compensate for the limited availability of time, skills and social relations (with citizens and local organisations). Also, the municipal policymaker can increase the flexibility of municipalities. However, communications between municipal policymakers and citizens create obstacles in taking initiative (e.g. formal language and bureaucratic procedures) (Bakker et al. 2012).

2.3. Co-creation

Currently, it appears to be a complex task for municipal policymakers to work with citizens as equal partners in a co-creation process: this requires a cultural change within the municipal organisation. This can lead to tensions since both parties are used to their traditional role. Engbersen et al. (2010) identified three challenges for the municipal policymaker in developing a new relationship with citizens. The first challenge is to increase engagement: this means that they have to listen to citizens and facilitate their initiatives. The deviation of interests of citizens and municipal administration could create tension: this why it is important to consider both interests. The second challenge is to learn specific skills in terms of making contact and working with citizens. The municipal policymaker has to be informed on existing conflicts and recent developments of citizens' initiatives. The third challenge for the municipal policymaker is to deal with internal resistance from the municipal administration: the bureaucratic culture could create obstacles. It is important for the municipal policymaker to be there for citizens and minimize obstacles to create more space for citizens' initiatives (Engbersen et al., 2010).

Voorberg, Bekkers, and Tummers (2014) distinguish three types of co-creation between citizen and municipal policymaker: (a) citizens as co-implementer: involvement in public services which refer to the transfer of activities that in the past have been carried out by government, (b) citizens as co-designer: involvement regarding the content and process of public services and (c) citizens as initiator: citizens that start the initiative to formulate public services. The authors argue that, in a co-creation process, it is suggested for municipal policymakers to involve citizens as early as possible. Moreover, they identified three factors to make public organizations compatible for citizen involvement in a co-creation process. The first factor is the presence of a communication infrastructure and training facilities for both citizens and public officials. Second, the attitude of public officials is considered important to involve citizens as equal partners: this attitude is, however, often not stimulating for co-creation. The third factor is the presence of a 'risk-avoidance' culture in public sector organizations. The involvement of citizens is traditionally considered uncontrollable and unreliable, therefore, the current organisational structure is inadequate to integrate citizens' initiatives (Voorberg et al., 2014). Also, Roberts et al. (2013) argue that many public actors consider co-creation as unreliable, because of the unpredictable behaviour of citizens. This attitude can be explained by the unwillingness to lose status and control of public officials.

Municipal policymakers can stimulate the involvement of citizens in co-creation processes by lowering the participation costs or providing them financial support. Also, an inviting policy towards citizens to generate a feeling of ownership stimulates the co-creation

process. And instead of asking citizens about complicated policy issues, municipal policymakers should offer them a direct choice (Voorberg et al., 2014).

2.4. Policy entrepreneur

Based on the findings of Voorberg et al. (2014), it is assumed that the attitude of most municipal policymakers is not inviting to involve citizens in co-creation processes. However, a 'policy entrepreneur' can be appointed in the municipal organisation to stimulate co-creation processes with citizens (Fuglsang, 2008). Timmermans, Van der Heiden and Born (2014) found that the personality profile of a policy entrepreneur differs from other policymakers. The authors linked the policy entrepreneurs' activities, behaviours, and competences to different personality models. They found that the characteristics of the role of the policy entrepreneur can be described as 'open for experience', 'unconventional' and 'creative'. They also discovered that policy entrepreneurs are more able to persuade, influence and mobilize others (Timmermans et al., 2014).

2.5. Roles

The concept of roles is helpful to explain the relation of the municipal policymaker to society. Roles are situated in between the individual actor and society and are defined as "a shared reality to which actors can refer and which offers a connection to regularities in the cultural environments" (Wittmayer et al., 2016, p.5). From a functionalist perspective, it is being universally agreed upon which social position, relations, rights, duties and collective expectations (e.g. norms, beliefs, preferences) belongs to a role. In other words, roles from this perspective are pre-given and an individual 'plays' different roles through characteristic behaviour based on behavioural expectations. Eventually, deviant behaviour can result in exclusion or protest from society (Biddle, 1986; Goffman, 2011). In this study, the role description of the municipal policymaker consists of recognizable activities, attitudes, and responsibilities in relation to members of SI-initiatives. However, this ideal type role description is subject to ongoing negotiations and change about what is considered desirable (be more 'facilitative') and problematic (be less 'controlling') in participatory society discourse. The divergence between an individual's role understanding and the shared role understanding could lead to difficulties for the individual municipal policymaker in terms of how to 'play' each role accurately according to what is considered desirable according to society.

To conclude this section, the literature identifies three important aspects of the current role of the municipal policymaker in relation to active citizenship. Table 1 shows three

important themes of the new role of the municipal policymaker, namely: 'mediating', 'co-creation' and 'policy entrepreneur'. Based on this conceptual framework, the different roles of the municipal policymaker will be further empirically explored in the following part.

Table 1. *Theoretical overview*

Theme	Conditions	Literature
Mediating	In-between citizens and city council; discretionary autonomy; balance between compassion and flexibility and, objectivity and strict regulation; collaborative governance approach; network structuration; network management.	Lipsky (1980) Ansell & Gash (2007) Bakker et al. (2012)
Co-creation	Cultural change; challenges (increase engagement, learn new skills, deal with internal resistance); involve citizens in an earlier stage of the process; three types of co-creation (co-implementer, co-designer and citizen as initiator); improve compatibility public organizations and citizens in co-creation: communication infrastructure and training facilities, attitude of public officials (unwillingness to lose status and control) and a risk-avoidance culture in municipal organisation.	Engbersen et al. (2010) Roberts et al. (2013) Voorberg et al. (2014)
Policy entrepreneur	Appoint policy entrepreneur in municipal organisation; personality profile: open for experience, unconventional, creative; persuade, influence and mobilize others.	Fuglsang (2008) Timmermans et al. (2014)

3. METHODOLOGY

This section describes the methodology used in this thesis. The thesis has two main methods of research, namely: analysis of the Critical Turning Points (CTP) database and additional interviews.

3.1 CTP database

The CTP database is the main source of data in this study. CTPs are decisive moments in the development of SI-initiatives which causes a change of course (Pel & Bauler, 2014). The CTP database is compiled by a team of researchers involved in the "TRANsformative Social Innovation Theory" (TRANSIT) research project, which focusses on how SI-initiatives contribute to societal change. Since July 2017, the CTP database is publicly accessible on the TRANSIT website. The database consists of 80 in-depth case studies of SI-initiatives across 27 (mostly European and Latin American) countries. With the use of a timeline, each SI-initiative describes six CTPs to show its development in chronological order. Moreover, one CTP (ca. 2000 words) consists of six categories: contents, co-production, related events, contestation, anticipation, and learning (shown in Appendix 1) (Pel et al., 2017). The CTP data is based upon interviews held by one of the researchers with on average four respondents that are internally or externally involved in a SI-initiative (e.g. policymaker, Alderman or the leader of the SI-initiative). An overview of the CTP respondents is shown in Appendix 2, Table 1.The research team have had a large influence in the construction of the CTPs. Instead of presenting the interview results directly as CTPs, the data contains researchers' own analysis, interpretations and paraphrasing of the interviews. The researcher categorized the data into one of the six categories to construct sufficiently distinct, understandable and interesting CTPs.

3.2. Interviews

The additional source for data-analysis are the results of three interviews with municipal policymakers, who are active in the cities of Amsterdam, The Hague, and Rotterdam. The role of the municipal policymaker in relation to members of SI-initiatives is considered complex, therefore the addition of interviews is necessary to comprehend this relation. The main goal of the in-depth interviews is to complement and validate the roles of the first CTP data-analysis. The respondents have been found through the researcher's own network and the contacts of the Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT). It became clear that the name of the 'policymaker' has been differentiated into a wide variety of names (e.g. area advisor, district manager, or project manager). Nonetheless, the occupation of these respondents are considered

a municipal policymaker: this is why they are referred to as such in the results section. Initially, five interviews were conducted. Unfortunately, it became clear that two of these respondents were, in fact, no actual municipal policymakers, but an area networker and a strategic advisor. Eventually, these respondents have been removed, because in this study the choice has been made to empirically explore the roles of the municipal policymaker from its own perspective.

The interviews took place at the offices of the respondents. Although this setting was quite formal, the interaction proceeded in a personal and open way. The interviews lasted on average 45 minutes and have been semi-structured, meaning that there were some core topics that came back in every interview but there also was the possibility to deviate from those topics when other interesting information came forward. The core topic involved the experience of the municipal policymakers' behaviours, attitudes, and views of their profession in the context of the participatory society. The additional core topic involved the extent to which the municipal policymakers recognized the roles in comparison to their own experiences.

The first respondent that has been interviewed is Peter Hazewindus: a project manager in Amsterdam West, an area of the city with problems in terms of liveability and safety due to large groups of disadvantaged citizens. As a policymaker, he is involved in social programs (e.g. Kwetsbare Wijkenaanpak) and other social projects concerning labour and participation. Peter has been active at the municipality of Amsterdam for 15 years, of which three years in his current position. The second respondent is Cindy Yick, an area advisor in Rotterdam Delfshaven, an area that is faced with social and safety problems as well. Every two years she writes, based on requirements of the city administration and information collected in the area, a policy plan in terms of hospitality. She informs citizens and entrepreneurs directly, or through an area networker, in terms of what the possibilities are concerning the policy in the area. For ten years, she works at the municipality of Rotterdam, of which more than six years as an area advisor. The third respondent is Wendelijn Oolders, a district manager focused on sustainability in The Hague Loosduinen, an area in which social and safety problems occur as well. Her role is to stimulate sustainable citizens' initiatives and reduce problems in the neighbourhood. For almost 14 years, she works for the municipality of The Hague, of which almost two years in her current position. An overview of the respondents is shown in Appendix 2, Table 2.

3.3 Data-analysis

The online CTP database is equipped with a search functionality which made it possible to exclude all SI-initiatives that showed no involvement with municipal policymakers. The main search function followed a thematic logic of searching by keyword ('tags') or for full-text

searches, i.e. for any combination of words. To determine whether members of SI-initiatives were involved with municipal policymakers, the following keywords and full-text searches have been used: 'local/regional governments', 'challenging institutions', 'lobbying', 'local administration', 'policymaker' and 'civil servant'. The remaining SI-initiatives have been transferred to an Excel sheet which shows the initiatives' country of origin, related CTPs, and when the CTP happened. The last step in this selection process was to exclude all initiatives from analysis that were situated outside The Netherlands and all CTPs that took place before 2010[1]. Finally, the CTP data consists of 16 CTPs that are part of 5 SI-initiatives: 'Participatory Budgeting Amsterdam', 'Living Labs Eindhoven', 'Basic Income Association, 'Impact Hub Amsterdam' and 'Ecovillage Bergen' (a detailed description is shown in Appendix 3).

The selected CTPs have been read thoroughly with a clear focus on the role of the municipal policymaker. Then, the CTPs have been summarized in keywords and, by using an Excel sheet, categorized into 'activities', 'attitudes', or 'responsibilities'. By searching for overlapping keywords in each category, the keywords have been merged into codes. The codes have been checked on iteration, which resulted in several codes (see Table 2 in the next section) that covered for the substance of the different keywords. Through analysing the codes in each category, the best matches have been selected which eventually led to the concept version of four different role descriptions of the municipal policymaker's activities, attitudes, and responsibilities in relation to members of SI-initiatives. The influence of the municipal policymaker on the development of SI-initiatives has been analysed by reading the CTPs 'co-production' and 'contestation'. This way, it became clear if the municipal policymaker has had either a positive or negative influence to make the CTP of the SI-initiative happen. These findings have been shortly summarized and categorized into one of the four roles.

Then, the interviews with three municipal policymakers have been held and transcribed afterwards. Similar to the CTP data, the interview data has been read carefully and categorized into the existing codes one of the four roles and categories (activities, attitudes, responsibilities) by using the same Excel sheet. This second analysis has been added to the concept version and this resulted in the final role descriptions of the municipal policymaker. Finally, the role descriptions have been 'brought to life' by using quotes from both the CTP data and the interviews in the results section.

---

[1] The participatory society was embraced by Dutch government as a political ideal around 2010 (Engbersen et al., 2010)

3.4. Validity and reliability

Regarding the validity of the CTP data, the TRANSIT researchers have tried to ensure the quality of the CTP cases by increasing diversity of the respondents (position in the initiative, acquaintance with particular topics, early and later members). This has avoided dramatically unbalanced or biased cases. The four different respondents per CTP has allowed for a degree of data triangulation, i.e. different viewpoints on certain moments in time. However, the CTP database provides situational case studies, based on individual perceptions of the respondents that emphasize some aspects whilst backgrounding others. The researcher determined and indicated the essence of respondents' answers, so the CTP data is, in fact, presented as the researchers' own reality construction. Therefore, this qualitative data has been interpretatively analysed (Pel et al., 2017). To increase the validity of the present study, the CTP data has been complemented with in-depth interviews with municipal policymakers. The interviews have been recorded and transcribed in order to be able to analyse this qualitative data afterwards. Finally, core topics have been used during the semi-structured interviews in order to increase the validity of the respondents' answers. To stimulate the reliability of the measuring instruments in this study, code schemes and analysis have been used to process the CTP data and the interview results. Moreover, code schemes of the CTP data and interviews have been analysed thoroughly and checked on overlap and mismatches to be able to transfer codes into the right roles and categories.

4. RESULTS

The four roles of the municipal policymaker in relation to members of SI-initiatives are the provider, the mediator, the co-creator and the innovator. In the first part, these four roles will be described in general. In the pages that follow, each individual role will be presented using exemplary cases and quotes of SI-initiatives, complemented with the interview results.

4.1. The four roles

In the role of the provider, the municipal policymaker determines whether members of SI-initiatives are provided with necessary regulatory and financial resources. Thereby, the municipal policymaker formulates and implements policies based on decisions made by the municipal administration. In other words, the members of the SI-initiative have to meet the policy requirements of the municipality. Instead of receiving information, the municipal policymaker sends information to members of SI-initiatives. For example, the municipal policymaker makes sure that members of the SI-initiative receive all necessary information

about what is or is not possible in the development of the SI-initiative. Or, the municipal policymaker authorizes (or ends) subsidies and permits of SI-initiatives and checks if members follow regulations. In this role, the attitude of the provider is professional, clear and pragmatic towards members of SI-initiatives. The municipal policymaker takes full responsibility in the outcomes of the implementation of policies that aim to improve the liveability, social cohesion, and safety of the urban area.

In the role of the mediator, the municipal policymaker involves members of SI-initiatives to formulate, adjust and implement policies. During this process, the municipal policymaker collects (through an area networker or participation broker) information about the wishes and needs of members of the SI-initiative. The municipal policymaker tries to understand how they live, what challenges they face and what priorities they have. The collected information is being integrated into policies: this increases sustainability and continuation of SI-initiatives. In this role, the municipal policymaker serves as a 'linking pin' between the interests of members of SI-initiatives and city council. The attitude of the municipal policymaker is open, aware and flexible towards members of SI-initiatives. In this role, the municipal policymaker takes full responsibility in the outcomes of the implementation of policies as well.

In the role of the co-creator, the municipal policymaker collaborates with members of the SI-initiative as equal partners in a co-creation process. Together they formulate and implement policies. In this co-creation processes, the co-creator involves the city council in order to legitimise the SI-initiative in dominant structures of the municipal organisation. Therefore, the attitude of the co-creator has to be collaborative, optimistic and convincing. In contrast to the municipal policymaker in the first two roles, the co-creator shares responsibility in the outcomes of the implementation of policies with members of SI-initiatives.

In the role of the innovator, the municipal policymaker formulates and implements policies together with members of SI-initiatives as an equal partner as well. The difference with the co-creator is the experimental minded character of this role, because here, the municipal policymaker aims to develop a smart[2] and social city. The municipal policymaker experiments in the form of social prototyping and interventions in the public domain. The attitude of the municipal policymaker in this role is progressive, unconventional and entrepreneurial. Similar to the previous role, the innovator involves the city council to legitimise the SI-initiative in dominant structures of the municipal organisation. The municipal policymaker shares

---

[2] A smart city is an urban development vision to integrate information and communication technology (ICT) and Internet of things (IoT) technology in public and private services (Cocchia, 2014)

responsibility with members of the SI-initiative of the outcomes of policy implementation. Table 2 displays an overview of the activities, attitudes, and responsibilities of the four roles in relation to members of a SI-initiative.

Table 2. *Roles municipal policymaker*

	Provider	**Mediator**	**Co-creator**	**Innovator**
Activities	Inform members, authorize or end subsidies and permits, check if rules are followed.	Collect information, listen and support members, bring parties together, deal with tension.	Collaborate with members as equal partners, deal with tension.	Experiment (social prototyping, interventions) together with members, deal with tension.
Attitudes	Professional, clear, pragmatic.	Open, aware and flexible.	Collaborative, optimistic and convincing.	Progressive, unconventional, entrepreneurial.
Responsibilities	Formulate and implement policies, full responsibility outcomes of implementation.	Formulate, adjust and implement policies, full responsibility outcomes of implementation.	Formulate and implement policies together with members, shared responsibility outcomes of implementation.	Formulate and implement policies together with members, shared responsibility outcomes of implementation.

4.1.1 The provider

In 2015, the municipality ended the lease of the location of Impact Hub Amsterdam. This location was owned by one of the city departments, which allowed them to sell the building to a private company. From the perspective of one of the members of the SI-initiative, this process was characterised by discussion and legal contestation, with "pages and pages of documents on very specific things". Even though the decision of ending the lease was clear, there was no clarity of how this decision was made by the municipality and what the consequences for the

SI-initiative were. According to one of the members, the information of the municipality was unclear and they did not know what their rights were. There was no public consultation with the local neighbourhood, despite the fact that this was a public building and taxpayer money is being sold to a private actor. In the role of the provider, the municipal policymaker did not take responsibility to search for alternative solutions for the members of the SI-initiative to keep their building. The lack of information provision in the decision-making process of the municipal policymaker was considered contradictory because the marketing department used this SI-initiative as an inspiring example to promote social entrepreneurship in the city.

In the role of the provider, the municipal policymaker informed members of Ecovillage Bergen about the requirements to build the village and also checked whether rules and regulations were followed. This created tension because the members of the SI-initiative wanted to establish an alternative way of living and working, and this did not meet the municipal programme of requirements. The decisions made by the municipal policymaker resulted in frustration of the members of the SI-initiative. Instead of listening to their wishes and needs, the municipal policymaker only implemented policies: these restrictions were considered critical by the members of the SI-initiative for the development of the initiative. Eventually, the members of the SI-initiative 'surrendered' and accepted the requirements of the municipal policymaker. As described by one of the members:

"(...) For example, this thing here [an artistic structure in the garden], requires a permit. In the building on the culture square there are things that require permits. Even the stage that was constructed requires a permit. And they are very precise, so there are always 20 things that they find problematic." (Ecovillage Bergen – Asbestos conflict with municipality and closing of the gates)

The municipal policymaker in The Hague reflected on the importance of the role of the provider. In this role, she informs citizens what is and what is not possible in citizens' initiatives (e.g. available subsidies). This way, citizens know what steps are needed during the start and the process of the initiative. The activities of the municipal policymaker in Rotterdam shows similarities: she informs and advises citizens what is possible in terms of the pre-formulated policy plan that is written every two years. This plan indicates what is desirable and allowed in the area. She tries to describe this policy plan as broad as possible in order to prevent tensions with citizens over requirements during the two years that follow. The municipal policymaker in The Hague explained:

"It's a dilemma. On the one hand, you want to formulate as few rules as possible to make it as easy for citizens to start something. On the other hand, you need to formulate regulations and enforce these, because citizens have to

be protected as well, this is the municipalities' primarily goal. This is what makes my job difficult because then we are the 'bad guys'. I always try to find a balance in this."

4.1.2 The mediator

In the role of the mediator, municipal policymakers were mainly sympathetic towards SI-initiatives and try to help the members to legitimise Ecovillage Bergen in the city council. After multiple deliberations with the municipal policymaker, the members of the SI-initiative developed a plan to argue for deviation of the requirements. This resulted in a process of submitting documents, government reviews, public consultation, and waiting for authorization of the municipal policymaker (in the role of the provider). One of the members explained:

"It is not an impossible tension. We talk to the enforcer and try to find solutions. It's not quite as black and white. For politicians, it is easy to talk because they do not have to enforce the rules. They say 'just go ahead, how awfully nice'. But when you ask them whether they can arrange for it, they cannot." (Ecovillage Bergen - Asbestos conflict with municipality and closing of the gates)

The municipal policymaker in Amsterdam reflected on his role as mediator: over the past few years he observed an increased level of involvement of citizens while formulating policies:

"In the past, I formulated a policy plan in advance, without consulting citizens, and this plan was implemented. Afterwards, if citizens disagreed with the results of implemented policies, citizens could discuss possible issues with the municipal policymaker or other available civil servants."

The municipal policymaker in Rotterdam explained that policy plans are based on the information she receives from her colleagues (participation brokers or area networkers) that work and talk directly with citizens in the neighbourhood. Additionally, the municipal policymaker in Amsterdam tries to translate the needs of citizens into projects as much as possible. For example, he organised a project in which campers are placed in the neighbourhood in order to be able to talk with citizens, drink coffee, and listen to their stories. Furthermore, the municipal policymaker is open and aware about developments of participation processes in other countries. As he explained:

"I have visited England because there they are more developed when it comes to participation processes, this is called the 'Right to Challenge'. For example, if there is a cafe for sale in a village, residents can claim this cafe because this is important for the community (...). So the rights that citizens in England have, have gone way beyond ours."

In the role of the mediator, the municipal policymaker in The Hague formulates policies that connect to what is already happening in the neighbourhood. Instead of inventing new initiatives,

she tries to stay close to the needs and wishes of the citizens as much as possible. She does this by organizing meetings with citizens and think about the future of the neighbourhood. The municipal policymaker thinks it is important to be physically present in the neighbourhood, so she often works in the community centre where she observes conversations between citizens in order to know what is truly happening in the area. For example, she noticed that lower-educated citizens, in comparison to the higher educated, need more guidance and support while working on an initiative. If there are conflicts or uncertainties, these citizens will get suspicious towards the district manager, and their involvement decreases. The municipal policymaker in The Hague thinks this a shame because citizens are initially enthusiastic, their confidence increases, and things will eventually work out anyway if only they would search for alternative methods. She explains that when dealing with such conflicts, she does not have the time to give the citizens enough attention: this is why she appointed a participation broker to guide these citizens.

The municipal policymaker thinks it is necessary, but difficult, to formulate and implement policies and, at the same time, search for space to deviate from legislation. However, the municipal policymaker thinks it is important to develop participatory policies:

"It is important to create space for tailor-made guidance, but at the same time, it is necessary to make arrangements. In this process, we have to ask ourselves: How far are we going? What if an initiative fails? You want to have some requirements for initiatives to start, or else you get all sorts of random initiatives. On the other hand, you want to maintain your flexibility as well. It is good to keep reflecting on this process."

4.1.3. The co-creator

In the role of the co-creator, the municipal policymakers got involved in participatory budgeting when a group of active citizens asked them to make financial data available. These municipal policymakers were already exploring how they could make financial data public, with the use of an online application: the 'neighbourhood budget instrument'. The municipal policymakers discovered that they could involve members of the SI-initiative in a co-creation process. This meant that a new practice was implemented: members of the SI-initiative collaborated with municipal policymakers and the outcomes have been taken up in new policies. Initially, other municipal policymakers were not willing to co-create and share information with members of the SI-initiative and colleagues: this influenced the co-creation process negatively. One of the area coordinators explained:

"It always comes with a kind of fear that people have to fight for their own place. And this makes knowledge a kind of power, sharing knowledge with everybody and especially with the neighbourhood is then not the easiest" (Participatory Budgeting Amsterdam - Re-organization municipality of Amsterdam).

In the role of the co-creator, the municipal policymakers convinced those colleagues that were not used to co-create with members of the SI-initiative and functioned as representatives to promote and advocate this new way of working. Due to convincing their colleagues, the attitude of these municipal policymakers positively changed. Nonetheless, internal resistance continued on a central level: the district board considered budget monitoring not a task for citizens because formally the authority belongs to them. In general, municipal policymakers sympathize with SI- initiatives, but once they have to legitimise on a central level, municipal policymakers experience resistance. Eventually, the attitude of the district board changed positively as well. However, the tension between the 'system world' and the 'life world' remains because changes in dominant organisational structures are hard to accomplish. As one of the members of the SI-initiative explained:

"(…) And then suddenly we do it as the system wants. It is fine that the system wants to accommodate, but will this work? Is this really the answer to the problems of the neighbourhood?" (Participatory Budgeting Amsterdam - Letting go of human rights perspective)

Eventually, the city council decided that in 2017 20% of the neighbourhood budget falls under the responsibility of the members of the SI-initiative. The acceptance of this resolution was crucial because it took budget monitoring a step further: from monitoring and advising on policies, to providing members of the SI-initiative decision-making authority. After 'Participatory Budgeting Amsterdam' was legitimized by the district board, municipal policymakers had to change their role: from a provider or mediator towards a co-creator. Suddenly, municipal policymakers had to co-create with citizens to determine the neighbourhood budget. Initially, the municipal policymaker considered this co-creation process as an obstacle because they felt that they had to invest a lot of extra time and were afraid to let go of power. In the role of the co-creator, the municipal policymakers that were already experienced in co-creation processes convinced their colleagues due to increasing their understanding of the SI-initiative.

However, the municipal policymaker in The Hague and Rotterdam explained that there are co-creation initiatives such as participatory budgeting in Amsterdam, but this is not yet officially implemented as a new practice in these two cities. The municipal policymaker in The Hague concluded that the integration of participatory processes in municipal structures has to be researched because the wish of municipalities and citizens to work together is there, but she does not know how to translate this into practice:

"I tell citizens that come to me with questions how to organize the initiative that we actually do not know exactly either because they are one of the first that ask me this kind of questions."

4.1.4 The innovator

In the role of the innovator, the municipal policymaker worked in a project team and together they experimented by changing the colours and intensity of light, experimenting with scent and changing the design of the terraces on a prominent street in the nightlife of Eindhoven. Because this Living Lab received enthusiastic responses from the city council, the municipal policymaker managed to develop a team of citizens, entrepreneurs, and researchers to work together in this SI-initiative. The team collected data through sensors to track the behaviour of the users of the street. The activities were aimed to increase knowledge on the ways in which the liveability in cities could be improved. Eventually, the SI-initiative received more subsidy from Provincial Council because the team had a new and innovative way of organizing the SI-initiative. They used the 'quadruple helix approach' in which municipality, citizens, entrepreneurs, and researchers worked together as equal partners. Furthermore, the municipal policymaker explained that not planning the process in detail helped the project significantly:

" (...) There are many people who have good ideas that do not flourish, then the time is probably not right. (..) But you cannot plan it all. You cannot say, for example, that now there will suddenly be a very nice atmosphere on Stratumseind. Also, you cannot write down: In five years, we will have a smart city, we list all the ingredients and we make the itinerary by which it happens, it does not work like that." (Granting of a Provincial subsidy for Stratumseind 2.0 – Living Labs Eindhoven).

However, it was considered challenging for municipal policymakers to authorize innovative ideas in formal policies in a bureaucratic institution. These policies had to be officially approved by the city council: this was considered difficult because innovation often has no clearly defined end target or product. Many SI-initiatives often received enthusiastic responses from the city council, but when the SI-initiative matured and developed in a way that could change the dominant structure, this often created tension in higher layers of the organization.

In the role of the innovator, the municipal policymakers tried to institutionalize the basic income in higher layers of the organization. In this SI-initiative, local public actors were needed to provide lobbying power and legitimization. This is why the members of the SI-initiative took initiative and used their social network to organize a meeting with local public actors to stimulate the institutionalisation of the basic income. Due to the media hype caused by critical and progressive journalistic platforms 'De Correspondent' and 'Tegenlicht', municipal policymakers picked up the idea. They considered how current basic income experiments could

be integrated within their existing social policies. Subsequently, a group of municipal policymakers, in the role of the innovator, decided to coordinate their plans and lobby for basic income-inspired experiments within the organisational structure of the municipality.

This was the start of an experimental trajectory that contained a lot of negotiating, fitting in regulations, and searching for a general framework for the diverse experimentation proposals. Eventually, after a number of compromises and adaptations, the Secretary of State allowed the municipal policymakers to experiment within policy constraints. However, the municipal policymakers experienced resistance with decision-making on a national level because of the right-wing 'toughness' of national-level policies.

In the role of the innovator, the municipal policymakers told during interviews that all three municipalities experiment with initiatives such as the basic income or Living Labs. Nonetheless, the municipal policymakers themselves do not regularly act in the role of the innovator. The municipal policymaker in The Hague feels that many policymakers do not realize that it is possible to deviate from rules and to set policy adjustments on the agenda of the city council. She reflected on her fellow policymaker colleagues:

"I can imagine that if you have spent a lot of time and effort in formulating a policy document, it is difficult to change this immediately, you want to hold on to this policy for a while. These policymakers often like participatory pilots in the neighbourhood, but tend to transfer the activities to the participation brokers. I would like to discuss some ideas with them, but often they do not respond very positive."

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study explores the current roles of the municipal policymaker in relation to members of SI-initiatives. Also, these roles have been analysed in terms of the SI-initiatives' development. After analysis, four different roles have been identified: the provider, the mediator, the co-creator and the innovator. In this part, the four roles will be discussed in the context of the Dutch participatory society discourse and in what way these findings contribute to the field of transition research focused on social innovation.

In the role of the provider, it is experienced as problematic for members of SI-initiatives when the municipal policymaker takes no responsibility and provides unclear information. Thus, clear communication stimulates the relationship with members of the SI-initiative. In this role, the municipal policymaker formulates and implements policies based on legislation made by the municipal administration, these rules and regulations could contradict the needs of members of SI-initiatives. Similar to the discretionary autonomy theory of Lipsky (1980), the

municipal policymaker has to find a balance while considering which role to take: being objective and following strict regulations (provider) or being compassionate and flexible (mediator/co-creator/innovator). To conclude, the municipal policymaker has to find the right balance in which role to take: compromising his or her position due to the violation of legislation or satisfy the wishes and needs of members of SI-initiatives?

In the role of the mediator, the municipal policymaker is, as well as the former role, positioned in-between citizens and municipal administration, except here, he or she accommodates to the wishes and needs of members of SI-initiatives. Therefore, the municipal policymaker has to be committed having an open attitude towards members of SI-initiatives and deal with possible conflict that could have been caused by decisions made in the role of the provider. Moreover, members of SI-initiatives that possess lower levels of self-organizing capacity need more guidance in participatory processes. This is why it is considered important to use the help of an area networker or participation broker who increases valuable knowledge and, if necessary, guides members in the development of SI-initiatives.

In the role of the co-creator, it is found to be challenging for municipal policymakers to authorize SI-initiatives on a central level because internal processes can be slow. Furthermore, the municipal policymaker often experiences contestation because not all city administrations are immediately interested in being involved in co-creation. Therefore, the municipal policymaker has to be persistent to continue the development the SI-initiative. Moreover, it appears that many municipal policymaker colleagues feel that they have to invest a lot of extra time and are afraid to let go of power, for them co-creation is considered an obstacle. This can be explained by the finding that many municipal policymakers feel uncomfortable or afraid because they are not familiar to work as equal partners with members of SI-initiatives. These results confirm the earlier findings of Roberts et al. (2013) that many public actors consider co-creation as unreliable because of the unpredictable behaviour of citizens and that they are unwilling to lose status and control. However, this study suggests that increasing municipal policymakers' understanding of co-creation positively influences their attitude.

In the role of the innovator, it is found to be challenging for municipal policymakers to legitimize SI-initiatives as well. In municipal organisations, there has to be room for risks, experimentation and organic growth in order for SI-initiatives to develop. This finding contradicts the argument of Voorberg et al. (2014) that municipal organisations maintain a 'risk-avoidance' culture. Therefore, municipal policymakers have to accept that innovation comes with challenges. Furthermore, this study indicates that many SI-initiatives rely on available subsidies, which is an unsustainable situation since most initiatives end when subsidy does. To

prevent this dependency, the municipal policymaker could focus on the governance and finance of the initiative. It is recommended for the municipal policymaker to have a plan and assign a leader during the start of the SI-initiative. This plan involves questions as: What resources do we need? Who has access to those resources? Who is responsible for what? It is also recommended to keep the initiative silent when the municipal policymaker expects that the SI-initiative will experience resistance on a central level. Because once the initiative achieves more success, the city administration is more likely to legitimize the SI-initiative.

This study argues that the roles of the municipal policymaker in relation to members of SI-initiatives are considered complex and challenging because he or she has to consider the interests of different parties. At the same time, he or she has to determine what role is most suitable in each situation, be capable to switch between the roles at the right moment and 'play' each role accurately as well. Moreover, the four roles are subject to the presence of intrinsic motivation of the municipal policymaker to play this role. When the municipal policymaker decides to act in a role that does not fit the situation properly, this will demotivate citizens to be involved in SI-initiatives. Also, the claim of the municipal organisation to be a smart or social city could be contradictory for members of SI-initiatives. This is a critical moment to reflect and learn from the municipal policymakers' choice to act in a particular role: this requires a good amount of resilience, reflection and flexibility of the municipal policymaker. Thus, the municipal policymaker has to possess a wide range of characteristics in order to succeed in his or her profession.

However, the roles of both the co-creator and innovator ask for a significantly different mindset and approach in relation to the first two roles. As suggested by Voorberg et al. (2014) a communication infrastructure and training facilities could positively influence the willingness of the municipal policymaker to act in the role of the co-creator or either the innovator. Moreover, this study supports the recommendation of Fuglsang (2008) to appoint policy entrepreneurs within the municipal organisation who are capable to act in the role of the co-creator and the innovator. In other words, this study suggests that the implementation of the four roles of the municipal policymaker can be separated into two types of policymakers: the traditional (provider and mediator) and the progressive (co-creator and the innovator). To conclude, based on the definition social innovation of Haxeltine et al. (2016), the roles of the co-creator and the innovator in relation to members of SI-initiatives are considered a form of social innovation because this involves changes in social relations, involving new ways of doing, organizing, framing and knowing in the context of the participatory society.

Currently, most municipal policymakers mainly switch between the role of the provider and the mediator: the roles of the co-creator and the innovator are not as common. This finding contradicts the political ideal of a participatory society. However, the number of municipal policymakers that choose for alternatives and act in the role of the co-creator or innovator seems to be increasing. Therefore, the present study indicates that the role of the municipal policymaker in Dutch participatory society is considered to be in a transitional phase. The role of the municipal policymaker contributes to a representative democracy: they stimulate transparency of organisational activities, stimulate contestability, two-way dialogue, and try to integrate citizens' initiatives into the organisational structure. Nonetheless, due to the bureaucratic and risk-avoidance culture of the municipal organisation, internal resistance is experienced, so therefore, municipal policymakers, in the role of the co-creator and the innovator, still have a long way to go.

The present study is a master thesis. This limited the amount of available time to research this topic more comprehensively. In addition, future transition research focused on social innovation can compare the Dutch roles of the municipal policymaker with the British municipal policymaker. The Big Society in the United Kingdom shows similarities with the participatory society but already has been developed further. This way, the Dutch roles can be compared, validated and lessons can be learned from this alternative framework. To conclude, the role descriptions are ideal types (i.e. these roles do not exist as such in reality) and socially constructed, therefore the descriptions are open for further negotiation in future research.

REFERENCES

Ansell, C. and Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 18, 543–571.

Avelino, F. and Wittmayer, J. (2015). Shifting power relations in sustainability transitions: a multi-actor perspective. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning.* DOI:10.1080/1523908X.2015.1112259.

Bakker, J., Denters, B., Oude Vrielink, M. and Klok, P.J. (2012). Citizens initiatives : how local governments fill their facilitative role. *Local government studies*, 38 (4). 395 - 415. ISSN 0300-3930.

Biddle, B. (1986). Recent development in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12. 67-92.

Bureau of European Policy Advisors (BEPA) (2010). *Empowering people, driving change: Social Innovation in the European Union.* European Commission.

Cocchia A. (2014). Smart and Digital City: A Systematic Literature Review. *Smart City*. Dameri R., Rosenthal-Sabroux C. (eds). Progress in IS. Springer, Cham.

EBMR (2016). Een kwestie van kiezen. Naar een complementaire democratie voor alle Rotterdammers. *Onderzoeksrapport Evaluatie Bestuurlijk Model Rotterdam 2016.*

Engbersen, R. Fortuin, K., Hofman, J. (2010). Bewonersbudgetten, wat schuift het? Ervaringen van gemeenteambtenaren met bewonersbudgetten. *Publicatiereeks over burgerparticipatie.* Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties.

Fischer, L. and Newig, J. (2016) Importance of Actors and Agency in Sustainability Transitions: A Systematic Exploration of the Literature. *Sustainability Transitions, 8* (476).

Fuglsang, L. (2008). Capturing the Benefits of Open Innovation in Public Innovation: A Case Study. *International Journal of Services, Technology and Management,* 9 (3 –4). 234. doi:10.1504/IJSTM.2008.019705.

Goffman, E. (1959[2011]). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* New York: Anchor Books.

Haxeltine, A., Avelino, F., Pel, B., Kemp, R., Dumitru, A., Longhurst, N., Chilvers, J., Sogaard Jorgensen, M., Wittmayer, J., Seyfang, G., Kunze, I., Dorland, J. & Strasser, T. (2016). *TRANSIT WP3 deliverable D3.3 - A second prototype of TSI-theory.* TRANSIT: EU SSH.2013.3.2-1 Grant agreement no: 613169.

Jégou, F. (2015). Social innovation in cities. *URBACT II capitalization.* Saint Denis, URBACT.

Lipsky, M. (1980[2010]). *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation

Lynch, K. D. (2007). Modeling role enactment: linking role theory and social cognition. Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 37: 379–399. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.2007.00349.x.

Moulaert, F. MacCallum, D., Mehmood, A. and Hamdouch, A. (Ed.). (2013). *The international handbook on social innovation: collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research.* Edward Elgar Publishing.

Muehlebach, A (2011). *The Moral Neoliberal. Welfare and Citizenship in Italy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. ISBN: 9780226545400.

Pel, B. and Bauler, T. (2014) WP5: Cases and Evidence – Meta analysis; Initial considerations on quali-quantitative analysis, *TRANSIT memo October 2014.*

Pel et al. (2017). The Critical Turning Points database: concept, methodology and dataset of an international Transformative Social Innovation comparison. *TRANSIT Working Paper #10.* Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT), Rotterdam.

Pestoff, V. (2006). Citizens and Co-Production of Welfare Services. Childcare in Eight European Countries. *Public Management Review*, 8 (4). 503–519. doi:10.1080/14719030601022882.

Putters, K. (2014). Rijk Geschakeerd. Op weg naar de participatiesamenleving. *Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau,* Den Haag.

ROB (2012). Loslaten in vertrouwen: naar een nieuwe verhouding tussen overheid, markt en samenleving. *Raad voor het openbaar bestuur,* Den Haag.

Roberts, A., Townsend, S., Morris, J., Rushbrooke, E. Greenhill, B. Whitehead, R. Matthews, T. and Golding, L. (2013). Treat Me Right, Treat Me Equal: Using National Policy and Legislation to Create Positive Changes in Local Health Services for People with Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 26 (1). 14–25. doi:10.1111/jar.12009.

Timmerman, J., Van der Heiden, S. and Born, M (2014). Policy entrepreneurs in sustainability transitions: Their personality and leadership profiles assessed. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 13. 96-108. Delft University of Technology & Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Tonkens, E. (2014). *Vijf misvattingen over de participatiesamenleving.* Afscheidsrede. University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Uitermark, J. (2015). Longing for Wikitopia: The study and politics of self-organisation. *Urban Studies,* 52(13): 2301–2312. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098015577334

Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., and Tummers, L. (2014). A Systematic Review of Co-Creation and Co-Production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review.* doi: 10.1080/14719037.2014.930505.

Weinberger, K., and Jütting, J. P. (2001). Women's Participation in Local Organizations: Conditions and Constraints. *World Development,* 29 (8). 1391–1404. doi:10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00049-3.

Wijdeven, T., Van de Graaf, L. and Hendriks, F. (2013). *Actief burgerschap: lijnen in de literatuur.* Tilburg: Tilburgse School voor Politiek en Bestuur.

Wise, S., Paton, R. A. and Gegenhuber, T. (2012). Value Co-Creation through Collective Intelligence in the Public Sector: A Review of US and European Initiatives. *Vine 42,* (2). 251–276. doi:10.1108/ 03055721211227273.

Wittmayer, J., Avelino, F., van Steenbergen, F. and Loorbach, D. (2016). Roles in Transition: Insights from role theory for understanding sustainability transitions; a case study. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transition.*

WRR (2012). *Vertrouwen in Burgers.* Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

APPENDIX I: CTP CATEGORIES

Contents	What did this CTP consist of, and when did it happen? In what way did it constitute a CTP?
Co-production	What actors/events made the CTP happen?
Related events	What earlier events were crucial for the CTP to happen, and which later events were evoked by it?
Contestation	What struggles and discussions were involved with the CTP?
Anticipation	Had one seen the CTP coming?
Learning	What has been learned from the CTP?

Note. Data retrieved from Pel et al. (2017).

APPENDIX 2: RESPONDENTS

Table 1. CTP respondents

Name	Position	CTP	SI-initiative
Firoez Azarhoosh	Member	Forced co-production	PB Amsterdam
Mellouki Cadat	Member	Letting go of human rights perspective	PB Amsterdam
Mellouki Cadat	Member	Launch of Neighbourhood budget instrument	PB Amsterdam

Martine Koehein	Area Coordinator Municipality	Re-organization municipality of Amsterdam	PB Amsterdam
Firoez Azarhoosh	Member	Uptake of common work practices in policy cycles	PB Amsterdam
Martine Koehein	Area Coordinator Municipality	Partial budget authority to citizens	PB Amsterdam
Gaby Sadowski	Strategic Advisor Municipality	The realization that citizens need to be engaged truly	Living Labs Eindhoven
Tinus Kanters	Project Leader Municipality	Granting of a Provincial subsidy for Stratumseind 2.0	Living Labs Eindhoven
Henri Koolen	Area Manager Municipality	Citizens' initiative BIEB faces challenges	Living Labs Eindhoven
Robert Elbrink	Head of Strategy Department Municipality	A brave coalition agreement for Eindhoven	Living Labs Eindhoven
Henri Koolen	Area Manager Municipality	Citizens' initiative in Prinsenjagt faces challenges	Living Labs Eindhoven
Alwin Beernink	Project Manager Municipality	A vision for Strijp-S	Living Labs Eindhoven
Sjir Hoeijmakers	Member	Establishment network of experimentation initiatives	Basic Income Association
Tatiana Glad	Member	Ending the lease of the Westerpark	Impact Hub Amsterdam
Jan Cuperus & Fredjan Twigt	Members	Asbestos conflict with municipality and closing of the gates	Ecovillage Bergen

Conni Michel & Fredjan Twigt	Members	Current stalemate: waiting for planning permissions	Ecovillage Bergen

Table 2. Interview respondents

Name	Profession	Municipality
Peter Hazewindus	Project manager	Amsterdam
Cindy Yick	Area advisor	Rotterdam
Wendelijn Oolders	Disctrict manager	The Hague

APPENDIX 3: SELECTED SI-INITIATIVES

Participatory Budgeting (PB) Amsterdam

In 2011, a group of active citizens founded the Centre for Budget Monitoring and Citizen participation (CBB) in the Indische Buurt in Amsterdam. Today, the community and the municipality work together in a co-creation process. The community practices budget monitoring (checking the municipal budgets and formulating own priorities), and the municipality focusses on the neighbourhood budget instrument (an online web application providing financial data to the public). Together they aim for more budget transparency on the local level and strengthen participatory democracy.

Living Labs Eindhoven

Initiated by the municipality of Eindhoven, Living Labs is a way of thinking and working that is materialized in various places in the city. This SI-initiative is focused on linking technological innovation including ICT application to citizen engagement and citizen-centered developments.

Basic Income Association

The Basic Income Association is founded in 1991 in order to promote the institutionalization of a basic income. Members of Left-wing political parties, union organizations, and collectives of unemployed citizens have been on the basis of the initiative.

Impact Hub Amsterdam

Impact Hub Amsterdam is part of the international Impact Hub community of social innovators. This SI-initiative inspires, helps and links professionals in sustainability together so that they can make more impact. They do this by building and facilitating a strong network, organizing events, providing workplaces and developing acceleration programs.

Ecovillage Bergen

Ecovillage Bergen is an ecovillage in the Netherlands. It covers a land of 15 hectares in the town of "Bergen", 50 km above Amsterdam and 6 km from the North Sea cost. The land concerns a former, unused military terrain. A group of 7 people purchased the land in May 2013 and is now working towards creating an ecovillage for approximately 80 people.