![TU Delft logo]

Delft University of Technology

Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration

Al Sader, N.

DOI
[10.7480/abe.2023.16](https://doi.org/10.7480/abe.2023.16)

Publication date
2023

Document Version
Final published version

Citation (APA)
Al Sader, N. (2023). *Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration*. [Dissertation (TU Delft), Delft University of Technology]. https://doi.org/10.7480/abe.2023.16

Important note
To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration

Nuha Al Sader

Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration

Nuha Al Sader

A+BE | Architecture and the Built Environment | TU Delft BK

Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration

_____

Thesis

for the purpose of obtaining the degree of doctor
at Delft University of Technology
by the authority of the Rector Magnificus, prof.dr.ir. T.H.J.J. van der Hagen
chair of the Board for Doctorates
to be defended publicly on
Monday 9 October 2023 at 15:00 o'clock

by

Nuha AL SADER
MSc in Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands
born in Baghdad, Iraq

This thesis has been approved by the promotors.

Composition of the doctoral committee:

Rector Magnificus,	chairperson
Prof.dr. M. van Ham	Delft University of Technology, promotor
Dr. R.J. Kleinhans	Delft University of Technology, promotor

Independent members:

Prof.dr. W.K. Korthals Altes	Delft University of Technology
Prof.dr.ir. M.G. Elsinga	Delft University of Technology
Prof.dr. M. Kremer	University of Amsterdam
Prof.dr. H.J.M. Fenger	Erasmus University Rotterdam
Prof.dr. G.B.M. Engbersen	Erasmus University Rotterdam

Acknowledgements

سُبْحانَ الَّذِي سَخَّرَ لَنا هَذا وما كُنَّا لَهُ مُقْرِنِينَ

Exalted is He who has subjected this to us,
and we could not have [otherwise] subdued it
(Sura Al-Zukhruf, 13)

Contents

TOC

List of Tables

Summary

The relationship between citizens and government is constantly changing. Various tasks and responsibilities that are the domain of government, the market and civil society shift back and forth over the years. After the Second World War, for example, the Dutch government took on many tasks in the field of care and social security. The introduction of several laws, including the General Assistance Act in 1965, ensured that the care of the poor in society became the responsibility of the government. Whereas before the poor had to rely on charity from churches and private institutions, from 1965 welfare became a right and citizens could count on the government to help them. In the years that followed, growing prosperity and processes of individualisation and emancipation led citizens to expect more and more from the government. Access to services such as childcare and care for the elderly came to be seen as a natural right. Concerns about the sustainability of the welfare state began to emerge in the 1980s. The welfare state was said to have gone too far, making people passive, dependent and even calculating. Citizens were said to be relying too much on the government, undermining their ability to care for each other.

Since the 1990s, there has been a greater emphasis on market forces, privatisation and the corporatisation of government organisations to reach higher economic growth. Economic growth increased prosperity on average, but in deprived neighbourhoods it did not lead to fewer social problems. Since the 2000s, market forces and privatisation have been seen in an increasingly negative light in the political and social debate. Market forces and privatisation were supposed to serve the public interest rather than be an end in themselves (Stellinga, 2012). A strong belief in civil society as a solution, as a more effective alternative to the welfare state and market arrangements, underpins the current debate on how to solve pressing social problems (Brandsen et al., 2017).

Citizens are invited to play an active role in the public sphere and to be active citizens. The introduction of the 'Participation Society' in 2013 reinforced this ideal of active citizenship. Citizens are expected not only to take responsibility for their own problems, but also to take responsibility for problems in their own environment and to organise themselves to solve them. This is being heeded. More and more citizens are entering the public sphere and taking over tasks from the government, such as maintaining community centers, local playgrounds and neighbourhood green spaces. Against this background, this thesis examines the rise of (entrepreneurial)

citizens' initiatives in the Netherlands and how this is taking shape in the context of urban regeneration. The aim of this thesis is **to provide a better understanding of entrepreneurial citizenship and its manifestations in the context of urban regeneration in the Netherlands.** In order to achieve this main, four sub-questions have been developed, each of which is discussed in a separate chapter of this thesis.

Chapter 1 is an introduction to the central theme of this thesis: active and entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration. Chapter 1 explains the background to this thesis, the research questions, the data and methods chosen, and the further design of the thesis.

Chapter 2 forms the theoretical basis of this thesis. Chapter 2 answers the first (sub) question: *what social and political developments have led to a greater emphasis on active and entrepreneurial citizenship?* Chapter 2 shows that there is a growing appreciation of entrepreneurship in society and that this is influencing the way citizenship is talked about and thought about. This chapter is based on a review of the academic literature in the fields of public administration, active citizenship, social entrepreneurship and urban regeneration.

Chapter 3 examines the impact of the increasing appreciation of entrepreneurship on how cities position themselves and what expectations they express towards their inhabitants. Chapter 3 answers the second (sub)question: *how does the language of enterprise manifest itself in the urban policies of Dutch cities and how do local governments use this language to communicate expectations regarding the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of the city's inhabitants?* This chapter applies critical discourse analysis to policy documents of municipal governments, using the cities of Rotterdam and Delft as case studies. The analysis shows that 'enterprise language' is used to reinforce a local identity, to legitimise institutional changes in the way local government operates, and to formulate expectations about how residents (and professionals) should behave. 'Enterprise language' helps local governments to redefine their own roles and those of others in the face of changing institutional relations.

Chapter 4 zooms in on citizens' initiatives and focuses on a specific type of citizens' initiative, namely Community Enterprises (CEs). The concept of CEs as we know it in the Netherlands originated in the UK. CEs can be defined as 'independent not-for-profit organisations managed by community members and dedicated to delivering long-term benefits to the local community' (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). CEs manage buildings or land for the benefit of the local community, generate income from their exploitation and use the surplus to provide services to the local community (Bailey, 2012).

Chapter 4 focuses on the third (sub)question: *what are the main motivations of citizens to develop and maintain Community Enterprises (CEs)?* The literature on volunteering has provided a theoretical framework for exploring what motivates people to engage in public service. A well-known framework is the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary et al. (1998). This chapter uses this framework as a starting point, supplemented by additional literature. It uses semi-structured in-depth interviews with (20) key persons involved in (the organisation of) eight different CEs in different Dutch urban neighbourhoods. The case studies presented have certain similarities, such as the exploitation of a building, the creation of a business model and the reliance on volunteers, but they also have major differences in terms of their social objectives, their target group and the size of the organisation. Given this complexity, semi-structured in-depth interviews seemed to be the most appropriate method to answer the research question. The interviews revealed that the interviewees derive meaning from their involvement in CEs. It satisfies their need to help others, allows them to use knowledge and skills they are good at, and gives them feelings of satisfaction and enjoyment. Dissatisfaction (with government service provision) was also found to be an important part of the interviewees' motivations for developing and/or maintaining CEs.

Chapter 5 also focuses on CEs, but from a different angle. The (sub)question at the centre of Chapter 5 is: *what competencies do key persons involved in Community Enterprises (CEs) consider to be crucial for the development and maintenance of CEs in Dutch neighbourhoods?* This chapter is based on the same fieldwork as Chapter 4. Chapter 5 uses the The European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (EntreComp) has been used to guide the analysis in this chapter. EntreComp was developed by the European Commission and aims to support the entrepreneurial competence of European citizens and organisations (Bacigalupo et al. 2016). This framework seeks to create a common understanding of entrepreneurship as a set of competences. The underlying assumption is that entrepreneurial skills, knowledge and attitudes can be learned and that an entrepreneurial mindset benefits individuals and societies. Entrepreneurship as a competence is defined as "acting on opportunities and ideas and turning them into social, cultural or financial value for others" (Bacigalupo et al., 2016, p. 10). The interviews revealed that the following competencies are considered important for developing CEs: identifying community needs, loyalty to the mission and vision of the organisation, a sense of responsibility, an entrepreneurial mindset, knowing how to balance social and economic benefits, the ability to communicate with diverse people, an openness to experimentation, patience, self-awareness, digital skills and perseverance. These competencies are not always found in one person, but are spread across a number of people. In summary, the interviewees were effective in identifying local needs, showed a great sense of responsibility, had an entrepreneurial spirit, were able to deal with a wide

range of people, and showed a great deal of perseverance, especially in the face of setbacks and all kinds of obstacles along the way, not least in working with the local government. As most of the interviewees were not familiar with developing or maintaining a CE, they learned or developed many of these skills by doing.

Chapter 6 presents the overall conclusions of the thesis. The rise of (entrepreneurial) citizens' initiatives in the context of urban regeneration can be explained by several social and political developments. First, there has been a growing appreciation of entrepreneurship in society. This is not so much about entrepreneurship in the sense of starting a business, but more about the qualities associated with entrepreneurship. According to Deakin and Edwards (1993), these include qualities such as 'having initiative and drive; it is taking opportunities when they arise; it is independence from the state; it is having confidence and being responsible for one's own destiny; it is being driven by the work ethic; and it promotes self-interest' (p. 2.).

Second, the growing appreciation of entrepreneurial qualities is also increasingly becoming part of everyday language. The 'enterprise discourse' is not confined to the economic sphere and is increasingly beginning to dominate the public sphere. We see this, for example, in the way cities present themselves as 'entrepreneurial cities' and in the expectations placed on citizens. For example, citizens are increasingly expected to see themselves as 'businesses' by developing themselves and taking responsibility for themselves and each other. This discourse also seems to focus particularly on vulnerable groups in society, such as the young, the elderly and those on benefits.

Thirdly, we see that there is a group of citizens who also know how to embrace these entrepreneurial qualities and use them to improve their own living environment. This is a group, mostly highly educated, often with a self-employed background, who see opportunities to tackle social problems. This group is familiar with the systemic world of public organisations, is dissatisfied with the services provided by public organisations and believes that they can organise things better themselves. They have an eye for the wishes and needs of the local community and know how to bring different groups of people together to create places of value for the local community. Chapter 6 also looks at the shortcomings of this study. These shortcomings relate to methods, sample size and the impact of COVID-19 on the fieldwork. Chapter 6 also looks at new developments that are emerging and the opportunities these developments offer for follow-up research.

References

Bacigalupo, M., P. Kampylis, Y. Punie, and G. Van den Brande. 2016. *EntreComp: The entrepreneurship competence framework*: Publication Office of the European Union.

Bailey, N. 2012. "The Role, Organisation and Contribution of Community Enterprise to Urban Regeneration Policy in the UK." *Progress in Planning* 77 (1): 1–35. doi:10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001.

Brandsen, T., W. Trommel and B. Verschuere. 2017. "The state and the reconstruction of civil society." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83 (4): 676-693. doi:10.1177/002085231559246.

Clary, E. G., M. Snyder, R.D. Ridge, R. D, J. Copeland, A. A. Stukas, J. Haugen, and P. Miene 1998. "Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 74 (6): 1516-1530.

Deakin, N., and J. Edwards. 1993. *The enterprise culture and the inner cities.* London: Routledge.

Kleinhans, R., N. Bailey, and J. Lindbergh. 2020. "How community-based social enterprises struggle with representation and accountability." *Social Enterprise Journal* 16 (1): 60-81. doi:10.1108/SEJ-12-2018-0074.

Stellinga, B. 2012. *Dertig jaar privatisering, verzelfstandiging en marktwerking.* WRR webpublication no 65. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Samenvatting

De verhouding burger – overheid is voortdurend in beweging. Verschillende taken en verantwoordelijkheden die behoren tot het domein van de overheid, markt en civil society schuiven gedurende de jaren over en weer. Zo heeft de Nederlandse overheid na de Tweede Wereldoorlog veel taken op het gebied van zorg en sociale zekerheid voor haar rekening genomen. De invoering van verschillende wetten, waaronder de Algemene Bijstandswet in 1965, zorgde ervoor dat de zorg voor de armen in de samenleving bij de overheid kwam te liggen. Waar voorheen de armen aangewezen waren op liefdadigheid vanuit kerken en particuliere instellingen, werd sinds 1965 bijstand een recht en konden burgers rekenen op hulp van de overheid. In de jaren erna neemt de welvaart toe en processen van individualisering en emancipatie leiden ertoe dat burgers verwachten dat de overheid steeds meer taken op zich neemt. De toegang tot voorzieningen zoals kinderopvang en ouderenzorg worden steeds meer als een vanzelfsprekend recht gezien. Vanaf de jaren 80 ontstaan er zorgen over de houdbaarheid van de verzorgingsstaat. De verzorgingsstaat zou doorgeschoten zijn en mensen passief, afhankelijk en zelfs berekenend maken. Burgers zouden te gemakkelijk op de overheid leunen voor hulp waardoor het vermogen om voor elkaar te zorgen erodeerde.

Vanaf de jaren 90 wordt er meer ingezet op marktwerking, privatisering en verzelfstandiging van overheidsorganisaties om te komen tot hogere economische groei. Door economische groei werd de welvaart gemiddeld genomen groter, maar in achterstandswijken leidde dit niet tot minder sociale problemen. Vanaf de jaren duizend kwamen marktwerking en privatisering in het politieke en maatschappelijke debat in steeds negatiever daglicht te staan. Marktwerking en privatisering zouden ten dienste moeten staan van publieke belangen in plaats van een doel op zich te zijn (Stellinga, 2012). Een sterk geloof in het maatschappelijk middenveld als een effectiever alternatief voor de welvaartsstaat en de markt, ligt ten grondslag aan het huidige debat over hoe urgente sociale problemen het beste kunnen worden opgelost (Brandsen et al., 2017).

Burgers worden uitgenodigd om een actieve rol te spelen in het publieke domein en actieve burgers te zijn. Met de introductie van de 'Participatiesamenleving' in 2013 werd dit burgerschapsideaal verstevigd. Er wordt van burgers verwacht niet alleen verantwoordelijk te zijn voor hun eigen problemen maar ook verantwoordelijkheid te dragen voor problemen die zich in hun leefomgeving

voordoen en zich te organiseren om problemen op te lossen. Daar wordt gehoor aan gegeven. Steeds meer burgers betreden het publieke domein en nemen taken over van de overheid zoals het beheren van een buurtcentrum, het onderhouden van de lokale speeltuin en de verzorging van het groenonderhoud in de wijk. Tegen deze achtergrond schijnt dit proefschrift licht op de opkomst van (ondernemende) burgerinitiatieven in Nederland en de manier waarop dit in de context van stedelijke vernieuwing gestalte krijgt. **Het doel van dit proefschrift is om een beter begrip te geven van ondernemend burgerschap en de uitingen ervan in de context van stedelijke vernieuwing in Nederland.** Om dit hoofddoel te bereiken zijn vier deelvragen ontwikkeld, die elk in een apart hoofdstuk van dit proefschrift worden besproken.

Hoofstuk 1 bestaat uit een introductie op het centrale onderwerp van dit proefschrift: actief en ondernemend burgerschap in stedelijke vernieuwing. Hoofdstuk 1 gaat dieper in op de achtergrond van dit proefschrift, de onderzoeksvragen, de gekozen data en methoden en de verdere opzet van het proefschrift.

Hoofstuk 2 vormt het theoretisch fundament van dit proefschrift. Hoofdstuk 2 geeft antwoord op de eerste (deel)vraag: *welke maatschappelijke en politieke ontwikkelingen hebben geleid tot een grotere nadruk op actief en ondernemend burgerschap?* Hoofdstuk 2 laat zien dat er sprake is van een toenemende waardering voor ondernemerschap in de maatschappij en dat dit gevolgen heeft voor de manier waarop er over burgers gesproken en gedacht wordt. Dit hoofdstuk is gebaseerd op een review van de wetenschappelijke literatuur in de vakgebieden bestuurskunde, actief burgerschap, sociaal ondernemerschap en stedelijke vernieuwing.

Hoofstuk 3 gaat dieper in op de gevolgen van de toenemende waardering voor ondernemerschap voor de manier waarop steden zichzelf positioneren en welke verwachtingen zij uitspreken richting hun inwoners. Hoofdstuk 3 geeft antwoord op de tweede (deel)vraag: *hoe manifesteert 'de taal van het ondernemen' ('enterprise language') zich in het stedelijk beleid van Nederlandse steden en hoe communiceren steden met deze taal verwachtingen over het gewenste gedrag van de eigen inwoners?* Dit hoofdstuk past kritische discoursanalyse toe op beleidsstukken van gemeentelijke overheden, met de steden Rotterdam en Delft als casestudie. De analyse laat zien dat de taal van het ondernemen wordt ingezet om de lokale identiteit te versterken, institutionele verandering in het functioneren van de lokale overheid te legitimeren en om verwachtingen te formuleren over hoe inwoners (en professionals) zich zouden moeten gedragen. De 'taal van het ondernemen' helpt lokale overheden in hun poging om hun eigen rol en die van anderen opnieuw te definiëren in het licht van veranderende institutionele verhoudingen.

Hoofdstuk 4 zoomt in op ondernemerschap door georganiseerde groepen burgers en besteedt aandacht aan een specifieke vorm van ondernemerschap door burgers namelijk bewonersbedrijven. Het concept bewonersbedrijven zoals we deze in Nederland kennen, komt oorspronkelijk uit Engeland. Bewonersbedrijven kunnen worden gedefinieerd als "onafhankelijke organisaties zonder winstoogmerk, beheerd door leden van de gemeenschap en toegewijd aan het leveren van lange termijn voordelen aan de lokale gemeenschap" (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). Bewonersbedrijven beheren gebouwen of grond die worden gebruikt voor het belang van de lokale gemeenschap, genereren inkomsten door ze te exploiteren en gebruiken het overschot om diensten te verlenen aan de lokale gemeenschap (Bailey, 2012). Hoofdstuk 4 richt zich op de derde (deel)vraag: *wat zijn de belangrijkste drijfveren van burgers om bewonersbedrijven te ontwikkelen en in stand te houden?* De literatuur over vrijwilligerswerk bood een theoretisch raamwerk voor het achterhalen van de drijfveren die burgers kunnen hebben om zich in te zetten voor de publieke zaak. Een bekend raamwerk is de Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) ontwikkeld door Clary et al. (1998). Dit hoofdstuk gebruikt dit raamwerk als uitgangspunt aangevuld met additionele literatuur. Het maakt gebruik van (20) semigestructureerde diepte-interviews met sleutelfiguren die betrokken zijn bij (de organisatie van) acht verschillende bewonersbedrijven in verschillende Nederlandse stadswijken. De acht casestudies hebben bepaalde overeenkomsten zoals de exploitatie van een gebouw, het creëren van een businessmodel en de afhankelijkheid van vrijwilligers, maar ze hebben ook grote verschillen als het gaat om hun maatschappelijke doelen, doelgroep en organisatiegrootte. Gezien deze complexiteit waren semigestructureerde diepte-interviews de meest geschikte methode om onze onderzoeksvraag mee te beantwoorden. Uit de interviews is gebleken dat de geïnterviewden betekenis ontlenen aan hun betrokkenheid bij het bewonersbedrijf en deze plek hen voorziet in hun behoefte om anderen te helpen, om kennis en vaardigheden waar ze goed in zijn in te zetten en gevoelens van voldoening en plezier ontleend worden aan de betrokkenheid bij het bewonersbedrijf. Ontevredenheid (over de dienstverlening van de overheid) bleek ook een belangrijk deel uit te maken van de motivaties van de geïnterviewden om een bewonersbedrijf te ontwikkelen en/of te onderhouden.

Hoofdstuk 5 richt zich eveneens op bewonersbedrijven, maar vanuit een andere invalshoek. De (deel)vraag die centraal staat in Hoofdstuk 5 is: *welke competenties en vaardigheden hebben burgers nodig om een bewonersbedrijf op te richten en/of in stand te houden?* Dit hoofdstuk is gebaseerd op hetzelfde veldwerk als Hoofdstuk 4. Het European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (EntreComp) vormde leidraad voor de analyse. EntreComp is ontwikkeld door de Europese Commissie en heeft als doel de ondernemerschapscompetenties van Europese burgers en organisaties te ondersteunen (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). Het kader

probeert een gemeenschappelijk begrip te creëren van ondernemerschap als een reeks competenties. De onderliggende aanname is dat ondernemende vaardigheden, kennis en attitudes kunnen worden aangeleerd en dat een ondernemende mentaliteit individuen en samenlevingen ten goede komt. Ondernemerschap als competentie wordt gedefinieerd als "handelen naar kansen en ideeën en deze omzetten in sociale, culturele of financiële waarde voor anderen" (Bacigalupo et al., 2016, p. 10). Uit de interviews is gebleken dat de volgende competenties van belang zijn bij het ontwikkelen van CE's: identificeren van behoeften van de gemeenschap, loyaliteit aan de missie en visie van de organisatie, verantwoordelijkheidsgevoel, een zakelijke mentaliteit, weten hoe een balans te vinden tussen maatschappelijk nut en economisch nut, kunnen communiceren met diverse mensen, openstaan voor experimenten, geduld, zelfbewustzijn, digitale vaardigheden, en doorzettingsvermogen. Deze competenties komen niet altijd samen in één persoon, maar zijn verdeeld over meerdere personen. Concluderend kunnen we stellen dat de geïnterviewden de lokale behoeften effectief onderkenden, een groot verantwoordelijkheidsgevoel toonden, een ondernemende instelling hadden, in staat waren met uiteenlopende mensen om te gaan en veel doorzettingsvermogen toonden, vooral bij tegenslag en allerlei belemmeringen in het proces, niet in de laatste plaats in de samenwerking met de gemeente. Aangezien de meeste geïnterviewden niet bekend waren met het ontwikkelen of onderhouden van een CE, hebben zij veel van deze competenties al doende geleerd of verder ontwikkeld.

Hoofdstuk 6 presenteert de algehele conclusie van het proefschrift. De opkomst van (ondernemende) bewonersinitiatieven in de context van stedelijke vernieuwing kan verklaard worden door verschillende sociale als politieke ontwikkelingen. Ten eerste is er sprake van een toenemende waardering voor ondernemerschap in de maatschappij ontstaan. Daarbij gaat het niet zo zeer om ondernemerschap als in het starten van een onderneming, maar meer om kwaliteiten die met ondernemerschap geassocieerd worden. Zoals door Deakin en Edwards (1993, p. 2) stellen gaat het daarbij om kwaliteiten als "kansen grijpen wanneer ze zich voordoen, onafhankelijkheid van de overheid, verantwoordelijkheid voelen voor het eigen lot en gedreven zijn door werkethiek." Ten tweede, raakt de toenemende waardering voor ondernemende kwaliteiten ook steeds meer verweven in het dagelijks taalgebruik. Het 'ondernemerschapsdiscours' beperkt zich niet tot het economisch domein en begint steeds meer het publieke domein te domineren. Dit zien we bijvoorbeeld terug in hoe steden zich presenteren als 'ondernemende stad' en welke verwachtingen daarbij richting burgers uitgesproken worden. Zo worden burgers steeds meer geacht zich als een 'onderneming' te zien, door zich te blijven ontwikkelen en verantwoordelijkheid te dragen voor zichzelf en voor elkaar. Dit discours lijkt zich ook met name te richten op de kwetsbare groepen in de samenleving, zoals jongeren, ouderen en bijstandsgerechtigden.

Ten derde zien we dat er een groep burgers is die zich deze ondernemende kwaliteiten ook eigen weet te maken en in te zetten voor het verbeteren van de eigen leefomgeving. Dit is een groep, veelal hoogopgeleiden, met vaak ook een achtergrond als zelfstandige, die kansen zien om sociaal maatschappelijke problemen aan te pakken. Deze groep is bekend met de systeemwereld van publieke organisaties, is ontevreden met de dienstverlening van publieke organisaties en menen het zelf beter te kunnen organiseren. Daarbij hebben zij oog voor de wensen en behoeften van de lokale gemeenschap en weten zij verschillende groepen mensen met elkaar te verbinden, met als doel om plekken van waarde te creëren voor de lokale gemeenschap. In Hoofdstuk 6 wordt ook aandacht geschonken aan de tekortkomingen van dit onderzoek. Deze tekortkomingen bevinden zich op het gebied van methoden, het aantal casestudies, en de implicaties van COVID-19 op het veldwerk. Tevens gaan we in Hoofdstuk 6 dieper in op nieuwe ontwikkelingen die zich voordoen en welke mogelijkheden deze ontwikkelingen bieden voor vervolgonderzoek.

Referenties

Bacigalupo, M., P. Kampylis, Y. Punie, and G. Van den Brande. 2016. *EntreComp: The entrepreneurship competence framework*: Publication Office of the European Union.

Bailey, N. 2012. "The Role, Organisation and Contribution of Community Enterprise to Urban Regeneration Policy in the UK." *Progress in Planning 77* (1): 1–35. doi:10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001.

Brandsen, T., W. Trommel and B. Verschuere. 2017. "The state and the reconstruction of civil society." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83 (4): 676-693. doi:10.1177/002085231559246.

Clary, E. G., M. Snyder, R.D. Ridge, R. D, J. Copeland, A. A. Stukas, J. Haugen, and P. Miene 1998. "Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 74 (6): 1516-1530.

Deakin, N., and J. Edwards. 1993. *The enterprise culture and the inner cities.* London: Routledge.

Kleinhans, R., N. Bailey, and J. Lindbergh. 2020. "How community-based social enterprises struggle with representation and accountability." *Social Enterprise Journal* 16 (1): 60-81. doi:10.1108/SEJ-12-2018-0074.

Stellinga, B. 2012. *Dertig jaar privatisering, verzelfstandiging en marktwerking.* WRR webpublication no 65. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Citizen participation has long been part of policy-making in the Netherlands, but the extent and nature of citizen participation in the policy-making process has changed and evolved over time. Different forms of citizen participation, such as consultation, collaboration and co-production, follow each other up but can also coexist (Oude Vrielink and van de Wijdeven 2008; Boonstra and Boelens 2011; De Graaf et al., 2015; Teernstra and Pinkster 2016). The 1970s saw an increase in the number of citizens involved in non-traditional forms of political participation (such as single-issue action groups and social movements) (Michels, 2006). Various groups in society called for more citizen participation and direct democracy. It was during this period that the first local advisory councils emerged. However, the opportunities for citizens to influence politics and policy remained limited to participation after the government had made its own decisions (Michels, 2006).

In the 1990s, more interactive forms of policy-making emerged and citizens were increasingly perceived as co-producers of policy and given the opportunity to think along with the local government in the early stages of policy development. In the 21st century, citizen participation increasingly takes the form of citizens' initiatives (Oude Vrielink and van de Wijdeven 2008; Drosterij and Peeters 2011; Van Houwelingen et al., 2014). In this form of citizen participation, the initiative comes from citizens themselves. It starts with citizens who feel responsible for their living environment and from this sense of responsibility develop initiatives to make their living environment a better, nicer and safer place. The (local) government may or may not play a role in facilitating citizens' initiatives.

In parallel with the development of citizen participation in government policy, the relationship between government and citizens has also changed. In recent years, the government has increasingly appealed to citizens to take responsibility for themselves and their environment. In 2003, the Dutch cabinet introduced an 'action

programme' to modernise the government and stated that a modern concept of citizenship was also needed. At that time, the cabinet had in mind 'a citizen who is self-reliant, empowered and involved, which is not primarily expressed in the form of demands, complaints and appeals directed at the government, but rather in social self-organisation and initiatives' (Action Programme 'Another Government', Ministry of the Interior 2003, 5). The role of the government was also reinterpreted, from a strongly controlling government to a facilitating one.

In the context of urban regeneration policy, the consequences of changes in the relationship between government and citizens led to the national government's decision in 2012 to become less involved in tackling problems in deprived neighbourhoods. The government's previous urban regeneration projects and long-term funding were phased out. One of the triggers for this turning point was the financial and economic crisis of 2008, accompanied by a new political wind that led to significant budget cuts and the decentralisation of various tasks to local authorities. Instead of a strong steering role in urban regeneration, the national government opted for a more supportive role and transferred responsibility for spatial planning to the provinces and municipalities (Uyterlinde et al. 2017).

Local authorities had to cope with less funding from the national government, combined with a significant increase in tasks and responsibilities. The role of housing associations has also been reduced by legislation. Housing associations are an important actor in urban regeneration because of the number of properties they own. Approximately 43 percent of the total housing stock in the Netherlands consists of rental housing (CBS, 2022). Nearly 70 per cent of all rental properties are owned by housing associations, which is about 30 per cent of the total housing stock. In 2015, a revision of the Housing Act was passed, according to which housing associations must focus on their core tasks: building, renting and managing social housing. Housing associations were no longer able to invest large sums in improving the quality of life and restructuring neighbourhoods. Local authorities, faced with budget cuts and decentralisation, focused on tackling the individual problems of households and promoting self-empowerment, community responsibility and bottom-up initiatives. This was accompanied by the introduction of the 'Participation Society' (Fenger & Broekema, 2019) by the Dutch government. In the 'Participation Society', citizens are expected to take individual responsibility for the collective welfare (Fenger & Broekema, 2019). As a result of these societal and political developments, the attention of national and local governments and housing associations to the quality of life in urban neighbourhoods has decreased and the interpretation of citizens' role in urban regeneration has changed.

The withdrawal of national and then local government from neighbourhood policy and the government's promotion of active citizenship led to increased attention on active citizenship and social entrepreneurship (Ministry of the Interior, 2013). Bottom-up citizen-led initiatives were seen as a new breeding ground for urban regeneration. In some neighbourhoods, residents, faced with increasing problems of neighbourhood deprivation and low investment in their local environment due to the financial crisis, began to take matters into their own hands. Active citizens, characterised by an entrepreneurial spirit and a social approach, claimed their right to shape their local environment and started to intervene in the public domain. Active citizens developed or took over public spaces and ensured the provision of public services in various areas such as local safety and welfare, maintenance of public spaces, landscaping, healthcare and sustainable energy (Buijs et al., 2016). In various European countries, self-organising, active and entrepreneurial citizens are increasingly demanding their place in local welfare provision and social policy (Bailey, 2012). Concepts such as social entrepreneurship, social cooperatives, community enterprises and other initiatives that operate at the community level and seek to achieve social goals through the use of entrepreneurial skills and strategies have gained visibility and importance (Kleinhans 2017; Ham and Van der Meer 2015; Van de Wijdeven 2012). Such initiatives often cross private, public and non-profit sector boundaries and bridge institutional fields, facing conflicting institutional logics (Kleinhans et al., 2020). They have a strong hybrid character and can therefore not simply be linked to one sector. They have to deal with different organisations that operate according to different sets of values, norms, beliefs and practices. This can lead to tensions, contradictions and challenges when they interact or when decisions need to be made that involve reconciling conflicting perspectives. Dealing with conflicting institutional logics often requires careful negotiation, communication and compromise.

Although both governments and citizens seem to agree on a greater role for citizens in tackling local problems and local development, in practice citizens and governments are often not on the same page, leading to frustration and disappointment on both sides. Research by the 'Nationale Ombudsman' in the Netherlands showed that citizens' initiatives experience that local governments are slow to respond, give them too little space, are not easy to communicate with or try to push citizens' initiatives in a certain direction (the National Ombudsman, 2018). Other studies also show that local governments welcome citizens' initiatives that serve their own policy goals, but oppose those that do not (Van Dam et al., 2014, Kleinhans, 2017; Rijshouwer and Uitermark, 2017). Thus, there seems to be a contradiction between policy and practice. As citizens' initiatives can contribute positively to the liveability of urban neighbourhoods, it is important to better understand the mutual expectations of local governments and citizens and the

extent to which these expectations are (or are not) met. Therefore, we found it of societal relevance to explore the dynamics between what we defined in our study as 'entrepreneurial citizenship': the interplay between what governments envision as desirable entrepreneurial behaviour from citizens and what kind of entrepreneurial behaviour citizens themselves show in the context of urban regeneration.

The sociology and public administration literature has extensively discussed the relationship between citizens and government in general. However, less attention has been paid to perspectives on citizen-government relationships in the context of community entrepreneurship and urban regeneration. Most studies on community entrepreneurship have focused on the level of initiatives (Bailey, 2012, Bailey et al., 2018, Nederhand et al., 2016, Van Dam et al., 2014, Van Meerkerk et al., 2018). These studies have provided insights into the challenges initiatives face, what makes them more or less successful in achieving their goals and collaborating with others, and the strategies they use to become sustainable. However, little is known about the people behind these initiatives. Questions about what motivates people to develop citizens' initiatives and what skills they have and need to do so remain largely unanswered. We believe that a better understanding of citizens' motivations and skills can facilitate approaches by national and local governments to adequately support citizens who wish to develop entrepreneurial citizens' initiatives in their local environment. The aim of this thesis is **to provide a better understanding of entrepreneurial citizenship and its manifestations in the context of urban regeneration in the Netherlands.** This objective leads to four research questions, which are presented in the following section.

1.2 Scientific relevance and research questions

Urban regeneration is an inherently local process that has a direct impact on citizens' lives, and active citizenship is often directed towards finding solutions to neighbourhood problems. Active citizenship in an urban context often refers to citizens who contribute to the quality of life in their neighbourhood or (local) community by setting up citizens' initiatives (Van de Wijdeven, 2012). Citizens' initiatives can be defined as 'collective, informal, social or political activities by citizens as volunteers that aim to deal pragmatically with public issues in their communities' (Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2018, p. 1596). Active citizenship as a concept has developed as a critique of the consumerist and 'lazy' behaviour of citizens, reflecting (moral) duties and responsibilities imposed on citizens top-down (Newman

and Tonkens, 2011). In the context of urban regeneration, active citizenship seems to have evolved into a form of 'entrepreneurial citizenship', both in policy rhetoric and in everyday practice. Interestingly, this development is not exclusively top-down, but seems to be a mixture of top-down and bottom-up developments. On the one hand, governments encourage citizens to be active and entrepreneurial and to take responsibility for maintaining the quality of life in their neighbourhoods. On the other hand, entrepreneurial citizens themselves also demand more responsibility and more opportunities from governments to have a say in the development and organisation of (services in) their own neighbourhood (Hoekema 2007; Sterk et al., 2013; Ham and van der Meer 2015). Entrepreneurial citizenship therefore refers not only to duties and responsibilities, but even more to opportunities for citizens to create societal added value, which requires a different relationship with government(s), based on horizontal co-production rather than citizens responding to government-initiated arrangements.

Chapter 2 presents a theoretical exploration of the social and political developments that have led to the rise of citizens' initiatives in the context of urban regeneration in the Netherlands. It reviews the relevant international literature and combines insights from studies on governance, active citizenship, social and community entrepreneurship, and urban neighbourhoods with the central question being: *what social and political developments have led to a greater emphasis on active and entrepreneurial citizenship?* One of the developments that has led to a greater emphasis on active and entrepreneurial citizenship is the increased appreciation of entrepreneurial attitudes in society. According to Van Beek (1998), the increased appreciation of entrepreneurial attitudes also applies to the public sector, where references to terms such as 'individual responsibility' and giving space to citizens' 'own initiative' have become more widespread. The use of these terms has recently intensified in the Dutch discourse. With the introduction of a 'participation society' and 'DIY democracy', the Dutch government aims to give citizens more space to tackle social problems themselves through social self-organisation (Ministry of the Interior 2013). Several studies have suggested that an 'enterprise discourse' has become dominant in Western societies (Burrows and Curran 1991; Fairclough 1991; Armstrong 2005; Jones and Spicer 2005). This 'enterprise discourse' is said to have become 'hegemonic', permeating different spheres of society (Du Gay and Salaman 1992; Burchell 1993; Rose 1998; Du Gay 2004; Foucault, 2008; Marttila 2015; Bröckling 2016). The 'language of enterprise and entrepreneurship' has also become dominant in urban policy. Towards the end of the 1980s, urban scholars identified a shift in urban governance from 'managerialism to entrepreneurialism' (Harvey 1989). Since then, many urban researchers have focused on how cities are managed and governed as 'entrepreneurial cities' (Hall and Hubbard 1996; Jessop 1997, 1998; Griffiths 1998; Painter 1998; Williams 2000; Chapin 2002).

Although much has been written about how cities become more entrepreneurial, little attention has been paid to how cities manage their inhabitants to adapt their behaviour to the ideal of the 'entrepreneurial city'. Chapter 3 examines the use of entrepreneurial language and the promotion of entrepreneurship in Dutch urban policy, focusing specifically on how two Dutch cities use entrepreneurial language to influence and encourage their residents to engage in entrepreneurial behaviour. The central research question in this chapter is: *how does the language of enterprise manifest itself in the urban policies of Dutch cities and how do local governments use this language to communicate expectations regarding the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of the city's inhabitants?*

Chapters 4 and 5 offer a citizen's perspective on entrepreneurial citizenship. Both chapters focus on the development of Community Enterprises (CEs) in the Netherlands (bewonersbedrijven in Dutch). CEs can be defined as 'independent, not-for-profit organisations managed by community members and committed to delivering long-term benefits to local people' (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). CEs often manage buildings or land that are used for the benefit or social interest of the local community, generating income from their use and using the surplus to provide social services for their benefit area (Bailey, 2012). Managing buildings or land for the benefit of the community requires citizens to network and negotiate with stakeholders, build community support, generate income and seek to become financially self-sufficient to sustain themselves.

Ideal typically, organisations can be classified into three types of sectors; market, civil society and the state. But reality is often more diffuse (Pestoff 1998, Billis 2010). CEs can be considered hybrid organisations. They pursue both social goals and financial stability and combine elements from private, public and third sector organisations. In some respects, CEs resemble traditional voluntary organisations in terms of working with volunteers and receiving donations, and in other respects they resemble market players by providing services and/or products. The distinctions for example in terms of public/private or for-profit/non-profit are not clear-cut. Some CEs may be more market-oriented and other CEs may be more government-oriented. This orientation may also change during the further development of a CE. The hybrid nature of CEs can have different implications for the way in which active and entrepreneurial citizens engage with CEs. It can lead to a demand for a wide range of skills, from traditional business skills such as marketing and finance to social skills such as empathy and community building. It can also create a deep connection to the organisation through its social mission, leading to higher levels of intrinsic motivation and engagement.

Research on CEs has mainly focused on theoretically conceptualising CEs (Healey, 2015; Pearce, 2003; Peredo & Chrisman, 2004; Peredo & Chrisman, 2017; Somerville & McElwee, 2011; Spear et al., 2009; Wagenaar & van der Heijden, 2015), explaining their organisational forms (Bailey, 2012), exploring their durability (Van Meerkerk et al., 2018), and studying local institutional responses to their development (Kleinhans, 2017). These studies have helped us to understand what defines CEs, what conditions are important for their durability, and what (institutional) challenges they face. However, they provide little information on the motivations for engaging in CEs, the set of skills, knowledge and attitudes (competencies) that individual citizens need to establish and sustain CEs, and how individuals' competencies add up and grow when working together. Chapters 4 and 5 therefore aim to provide a better understanding of the motivations and competences of citizens involved in developing and/or maintaining CEs. The research question for Chapter 4 is *What are the main motivations of citizens to develop and maintain Community Enterprises (CEs)?* For Chapter 5 it is: *What competencies do key persons involved in Community Enterprises (CEs) consider to be crucial for the development and maintenance of CEs in Dutch neighbourhoods?*

1.3 Data and methods

The nature of the research questions requires a qualitative approach. Chapter 3, applies Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyse the language used in local policies to encourage entrepreneurial behaviour among residents. CDA is a suitable method because, in contrast to content analysis, it offers the possibility of examining the relationship between the text and the context in which it is produced (Fairclough 1995; Van den Berg 2004). To understand why a particular discourse becomes dominant, we also need to understand the context in which it is produced. CDA assumes that language contributes to the reproduction of power relations and inequalities in society, which the 'producers' and 'recipients' of a discourse are not always aware of. The critical element in CDA refers to exposing and 'breaking through' this process. Using CDA, we examine the language used by policy-makers to legitimise the ever-increasing expectations of citizens in urban neighbourhoods. Discourse analysis is often criticised for not focusing enough on the reception of discourses (Breeze, 2011). Therefore, in a small case study, we will also shed light on a telling example of how the language of enterprise is perceived by citizens and society.

Chapters 4 and 5, apply semi-structured in-depth interviews with key persons involved in (the organisation of) eight different CEs in Dutch urban neighbourhoods. Additional information about these CEs was obtained from their websites and annual reports. The eight case studies have certain similarities, such as the use of a (community) building, the creation of a business model and the reliance on volunteers, but they also have major differences in terms of their social goals, target group and organisational size. Given this complexity, semi-structured in-depth interviews were best suited to answer our research question. Semi-structured in-depth interviews offer the opportunity to gather rich, descriptive data through which we can much better understand the different contexts in which CEs develop and the motivations, skills and competences that individuals use (or develop) in these different contexts. Had we chosen to use surveys, the fixed format of surveys would have left us too little room to capture the nuances of individual perceptions and experiences.

1.4 Thesis outline

The structure of this thesis is as follows. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 provides the theoretical underpinning of this thesis.Chapter 2 provides an overview of the literature on active citizenship, urban regeneration and community entrepreneurship and shows what social and political developments have led to an increased emphasis on active and entrepreneurial citizenship in the context of Dutch urban regeneration. Chapter 3 provides an analysis of the language used by local governments to communicate expectations regarding the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of city residents. Chapters 4 and 5 are based on semi-structured in-depth interviews with active citizens involved in the development and maintenance of Community Enterprises (CEs). Chapter 4 discusses the motivations of active citizens, while Chapter 5 focuses on the competences of active citizens. Chapter 6 presents the overall conclusion, reflection on the findings, and addresses the limitations of this thesis. Chapter 6 also discusses new developments and the opportunities they offer for further research.

References

Armstrong, P. 2005. *Critique of Entrepreneurship: People and Policy.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bailey, N. 2012. "The Role, Organisation and Contribution of Community Enterprise to Urban Regeneration Policy in the UK." *Progress in Planning* 77 (1): 1–35. doi:10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001.

Bailey, N., R. Kleinhans, and J. Lindbergh. 2018. *An Assessment of Community-Based Social Enterprise in Three European Countries.* London: Power to Change.

Billis, D. 2010. *Hybrid Organizations and the Third Sector: Challenges for Practice, Theory and Policy.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boonstra, B., and L. Boelens. 2011. "Self-Organization in Urban Development: Towards a New Perspective on Spatial Planning." *Urban Research & Practice* 4 (2): 99–122. doi:10.1080/17535069.2011.579767.

Breeze, R. 2011. "Critical Discourse Analysis and Its Critics." *Pragmatics* 21 (4): 493-525. doi:10.1075/prag.21.4.01bre.

Bröckling, U. 2016. *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject.* London: Sage.

Buijs, A. E., T. J. M. Mattijssen, A. P. N. Van der Jagt, B. Ambrose-Oji, E. Andersson, B. H. M. Elands, and M. S. Moller. 2016. "Active citizenship for urban green infrastructure: fostering the diversity and dynamics of citizen contributions through mosaic governance." *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 22: 1-6. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.01.002.

Burchell, G. 1993. "Liberal government and techniques of the self." *Economy and society* 22 (3): 267–282. doi:10.1080/03085149300000018.

Burrows, R., and J. Curran. 1991. "The discourse of the enterprise culture and the restructuring of Britain: A polemic contribution." In *Paths of Enterprise: The Future of the Small Business*, edited by J. Curran and R. Blackburn, 17–33. London: Routledge.

Chapin, T. 2002. "Beyond the Entrepreneurial City: Municipal Capitalism in San Diego." *Journal of urban affairs* 24 (5): 565–581.doi:10.1111/1467-9906.00144.

CBS. 2018. Voorraad woningen en Regionale kerncijfers Nederland, gewijzigd op 19 december 2022. Retrieved from: opendata.cbs.nl/statline op 20 december 2022.

De Graaf, L., M. Van Hulst, and A. Michels. 2015. "Enhancing Participation in Disadvantaged Urban Neighbourhoods." *Local Government Studies* 41 (1): 44–62. doi:10.1080/03003930.2014.908771.

Drosterij, G., and R. Peeters. 2011. "De Nieuwe Burgerlijkheid: Participatie Als Conformerende Zelfredzaamheid [The New Bourgeois: Participation as Conforming Self-Reliance]." *Beleid En Maatschappij* 38 (4): 456–472.

Du Gay, P. 2004. "Against 'Enterprise'(But Not against 'Enterprise', for that Would Make No Sense)." *Organization* 11 (1): 37–57. doi:10.1177/1350508404039777.

Du Gay, P., and G. Salaman. 1992. "The cult[ure] of the customer." *Journal of management studies* 29 (5): 615–633. doi:10.1111/j.14676486.1992.tb00681.x.

Fairclough, N. 1991. "What might we mean by 'enterprise discourse'?" In *Enterprise Culture*, edited by R. Keat and N. Abercrombie, 58–71. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Media Discourse.* London: Edward Arnold.

Fenger, M., and B. Broekema. 2019. "From welfare state to participation society: austerity, ideology or rhetoric?" *In Social Policy Review 31: Analysis and Debate in Social Policy,* edited by E. Heins, J. Rees, and C. Needham, 101-124. Bristol: Policy Press.

Foucault, M. 2008. *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*, Translated by G. Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Griffiths, R. 1998. "Making sameness: Place marketing and the new urban entrepreneurialism." In *Cities Economic Competition and Urban Policy*, edited by N. Oatley, 41–57. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Hall, T., and P. Hubbard. 1996. "The entrepreneurial city: New urban politics, new urban geographies?" *Progress in human geography* 20 (2): 153–174. doi:10.1177/030913259602000201.

Ham, M., and J. van der Meer. 2015. *De Ondernemende Burger. De Woelige Wereld Van Lokale Initiatieven* [The Entrepreneurial Citizen. The Turbulent World of Local Citizen Initiatives]. Utrecht: Movisie.

Harvey, D. 1989. "From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 71 (1): 3–17. doi:10.1080/04353684.1989.11879583.

Healey, P. 2015. "Citizen-generated local development initiative: recent English experience." *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 19(2): 109-118. doi:10.1080/12265934.2014.989892.

Hoekema, A. 2007. "Oefenen in Coöperatieve Moraal [Practicing in Cooperative Morality]." In *Macht En Verantwoordelijkheid, Essays Voor Kees Schuyt*, edited by J. W. Duyvendak, G. Engbersen, M. Teeuwen, and I. Verhoeven, 231–240. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Jessop, B. 1997. "The entrepreneurial city: Re-imaging localities, redesigning economic governance." In *Realizing Cities: New Spatial Divisions and Social Transformation*, edited by N. Jewson and S. MacGregor, 28–41. London: Routledge.

Jessop, B. 1998. "The enterprise of narrative and the narrative of enterprise: Place marketing and the entrepreneurial city." In *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*, edited by T. Hall and P. Hubbard, 7–99. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Jones, C., and A. Spicer. 2005. "The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship." *Organization* 12 (2): 223–246. doi:10.1177/1350508405051189.

Kleinhans, R. 2017. "False promises of co-production in neighbourhood regeneration: the case of Dutch community enterprises." *Public Management Review* 19 (10): 1500-1518. doi:10.1080/14719037.2017.1287941.

Kleinhans, R., N. Bailey, and J. Lindbergh. 2020. "How community-based social enterprises struggle with representation and accountability." *Social Enterprise Journal* 16 (1): 60-81. doi:10.1108/SEJ-12-2018-0074.

Marttila, T. 2015. *Post-Foundational Discourse Analysis: From Political Difference to Empirical Research*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Michels, A. M. B. 2006. "Citizen participation and democracy in the Netherlands." *Democratization* 13(2): 323-339. doi.org/10.1080/13510340500524067

Ministry of the Interior. 2003. *Actieprogramma 'Ander Overheid'*. [Action Programme 'Different Government']. Den Haag: Ministry of the Interior.

Ministry of the Interior. 2013. *De Doe-Democratie. Kabinetsnota Ter Stimulering Van Een Vitale Samenleving* [The DIY Democracy. White Paper for Stimulating a Vital Society]. Den Haag: Ministry of the Interior.

Nederhand, J., V. Bekkers, and W. Voorberg. 2016. "Self-Organization and the Role of Government: How and Why Does Self-Organization Evolve in the Shadow of Hierarchy?" *Public Management Review* 18 (7): 1063–1084. doi:10.1080/14719037.2015.1066417.

Newman, J., and E. Tonkens. 2011. "Introduction." In *Participation, Responsibility and Choice. Summoning the Active Citizen in Western European Welfare States*, edited by J. Newman and E. Tonkens, 9-28. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Oude Vrielink, M., and T. van de Wijdeven. 2008. "Bewonersinitiatieven: Een Prachtkans Voor Wijken? [Citizen Initiatives: A Great Opportunity for Neighbourhoods?]." *Bestuurswetenschappen* 62 (3): 66–83.

Painter, J. 1998. "Entrepreneurs are Made, Not Born: Learning and Urban Regimes in the Production of Entrepreneurial Cities." In *The entrepreneurial city: geographies of politics, regime, and representation*, edited by T. Hall, and P. Hubbard, 259-274. Chichester: Wiley.

Pearce, J. 2003. *Social Enterprise in Anytown*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman. 2004. "Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise." *Academy of Management Review* 31 (2): 309-328.

Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman. 2017. "Conceptual foundations: Community-based enterprise and community development." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason,and S. Syrett, 151-178. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pestoff, V. 1998. *Beyond the market and state. Civil democracy and social enterprises in a welfare society*. Aldershot, Brookfield: Ashgate.

Rijshouwer, E., and J. Uitermark. 2017. "Citizenship as Enterprise: The Transformation of Amsterdam Community Centres into Community Enterprises." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason,and S. Syrett, 270–294. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Rose, N. 1998. *Inventing ourselves: Psychology, power, and personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Somerville, P., and G. McElwee. 2011. "Situating community enterprise: A theoretical exploration." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 23 (5-6): 317-330. doi:10.1080/08985626.2011.580161.

TOC

Spear, R., C. Cornforth, and M. Aiken. 2009. "The governance challenges of social enterprises: evidence from a UK empirical study." *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 80 (2): 247-273. doi:org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00386.x.

Sterk, E., M. Specht, and G. Walraven. 2013. *Sociaal Ondernemerschap in De Participatiesamenleving: Van De Brave Naar De Eigenwijze Burger* [Social Entrepreneurship in the Participatory Society: From the Good to the Opinionated Citizen]. Antwerpen: Garant.

Teernstra, A. B., and F. M. Pinkster. 2016. "Participation in Neighbourhood Regeneration: Achievements of Residents in a Dutch Disadvantaged Neighbourhood." *Urban Research & Practice* 9 (1): 56–79. doi:10.1080/17535069.2015.1045931.

Tonkens, E., and I. Verhoeven. 2018. "The civic support paradox: Fighting unequal participation in deprived neighbourhoods." *Urban studies* 56 (8): 1595-1610. doi:10.1177/0042098018761536.

The National Ombudsman. 2018. *Burgerinitiatief: Waar een wil is…. Onderzoek naar de rol van overheidsinstanties bij burgerinitiatieven.* Den Haag: de Nationale Ombudsman.

Uyterlinde, M., J. Van der Velden, N. Gastkemper 2017. Zeventig jaar stedelijke vernieuwing. Longread kennisdossier Stedelijke vernieuwing. Platform 31, Den Haag, november 2017.

Van Beek, K. 1998. *De Ondernemende Samenleving Een Verkenning Van Maatschappelijke Verandering En Implicaties Voor Beleid.* [The Entrepreneurial Society. An Exploration of Social Change and Implications for Policy]. Den Haag: WRR.

Van Dam, R., M. Duineveld, and R. During. 2014. "Delineating Active Citizenship: The Subjectification of Citizens' Initiatives." *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 17 (2): 1–18. doi:10.1080/1523908X.2014.918502.

Van den Berg, H. 2004. "Discoursanalyse." *KWALON* 9 (2): 29–39.

Van Houwelingen, P., A. Boele, and P. Dekker. 2014. *Burgermacht Op Eigen Kracht. Een Brede Verkenning Van Ontwikkeling in Burgerparticipatie* [Citizen Power. A Broad Exploration of Developments in Citizen Participation]. Den Haag: SCP.

Van Meerkerk, I., R. Kleinhans, and A. Molenveld. 2018. "Exploring the Durability of Community Enterprises: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis." *Public Administration* 96 (4): 651–667. doi:10.1111/padm.12523.

Van de Wijdeven, T. M. F. 2012. *Doe-democratie: Over actief burgerschap in stadswijken* [Do-democracy: About active citizenship in urban neighbourhoods]. Delft: Eburon.

Wagenaar, H., and J. Van der Heijden. 2015. "The promise of democracy? Civic enterprise, localism and the transformation of democratic capitalism." In *Reconsidering Localism*, edited by S. Davoudi and A. Madanipour, 126–145. London: Routledge.

Williams, G. 2000. "Rebuilding the entrepreneurial city: The master planning response to the bombing of Manchester City Centre." *Environment and Planning B* 27 (4): 485–506. doi:10.1068/b2626.

TOC

2 Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration in the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

In the Netherlands, active citizenship in the context of urban regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods seems to have evolved into 'entrepreneurial citizenship'. The concept of entrepreneurial citizenship combines top-down and bottom-up elements. National and/or local governments promote an ideal citizen with entrepreneurship skills and competencies to create more responsible and entrepreneurial citizens' participation in government-initiated arrangements. At the same time, bottom-up behavioural practices from citizens who demand more opportunities to innovatively apply assets, entrepreneurial skills, strategies and collaboration with other stakeholders are initiated to achieve their goals and create societal-added value. The aim of this paper is to better understand the origins of 'entrepreneurial citizenship', and its meaning in the Dutch context of urban regeneration. To do this, we will review the relevant international literature and combine insights from studies on governance, active citizenship, social and community entrepreneurship and urban neighbourhoods. We will also analyse how entrepreneurial citizenship can be locally observed in the Netherlands as reported in the literature.

TOC

2.1 Introduction

European countries struggle with a continuous decline in trust in the government and parliament among their citizenries (Norris 1999; Dogan 2005; European Commission 2018). In the Netherlands, trust in the government and parliament is, in general, higher than in most of the other European countries (Bovens and Wille 2008; European Commission 2018). But despite a positive public opinion on the functioning of the Dutch democracy, there is much political dissatisfaction among citizens. Many Dutch citizens believe that politicians listen inadequately, are too focused on their own interests and wonder whether politicians know what is going on in society (Den Ridder and Dekker 2015). More than half of the Dutch population (55%) believes that citizens should have more influence on policy, for example, through referendums (Den Ridder and Dekker 2015). Citizens increasingly show a critical attitude towards government performance, and governments increasingly need to operate in a context of diminished possibilities for top-down interventions (Norris 1999; Durose, Greasley, and Richardson 2009; Geurtz and Van de Wijdeven 2010).

In light of these developments, various levels of government in the Netherlands aim to facilitate and cultivate local and direct democracy by developing means to increase citizens' engagement with policies and issues concerning their living environment, across various domains (Action Plan Strengthening Local Democracy and Governance, Ministry of the Interior 2018). This has resulted in various manifestations and ways of framing the concept of active citizenship. In this paper, we focus on active citizenship in the context of urban regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods. Urban regeneration is an inherently local process, which has a direct effect on citizens' lives, and active citizenship is often directed at seeking solutions for problems in the neighbourhood. In the context of urban regeneration, active citizenship seems to have evolved into a form of 'entrepreneurial citizenship', both in policy rhetoric and in daily practices. Interestingly, this development is not solely top-down but seems to be a mix of top-down and bottom-up developments. On the one hand, governments encourage citizens to be active and entrepreneurial and to take responsibility for maintaining the quality of life in their neighbourhood. On the other hand, entrepreneurial citizens themselves also demand more responsibilities and more opportunities from governments to have a say in developing and organising (services in) their own neighbourhood (Hoekema 2007; Sterk, Specht, and Walraven 2013; Ham and van der Meer 2015).

TOC

The aim of this paper is to better understand the origins of 'entrepreneurial citizenship' and its meaning in the Dutch context of urban regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods, both from the perspective of the government and the citizen. In order to trace the origins of the concept of 'entrepreneurial citizenship', we first outline the development towards a more entrepreneurial society in general. We then discuss how citizenship is redefined in an increasingly entrepreneurial society and provide a conceptualisation of entrepreneurial citizenship. Next, we discuss the rise of entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration in the Netherlands. In the final section, we provide conclusions and suggestions for further research.

2.2 The development of an entrepreneurial society

Van Beek (1998) speaks of the development of an entrepreneurial society in which he points to the increased appreciation for entrepreneurship in the Netherlands since the early 1990s. Van Beek (1998), states that until the end of the 1970s, entrepreneurs were seen as the ones who had the power and the means to take good care of themselves at the expense of others and especially at the expense of the environment. This perception of entrepreneurs led to the development of policies aimed at protecting employees through social security arrangements and protecting the environment through commandments and prohibitions for the conduct of enterprises. He observes that during the early 1990s a remarkable change in the perception of entrepreneurs occurred. Entrepreneurs were no longer perceived as exploiters and even became role models. According to Van Beek (1998), this new appreciation for entrepreneurship is more about an attitude than about actually starting an enterprise. Attitudes that have traditionally been linked to entrepreneurship, such as the pursuit of independence, making investments and taking risk became more popular. This increased appreciation for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial attitudes would also apply to the public sector. All matters which require a collective responsibility such as healthcare, education and housing, have been reframed in terms of individual responsibility and giving space to citizens 'own initiative'.

The development that Van Beek (1998) observes is not limited to the Netherlands. Several scholars point to the emergence of a two-way societal movement of 'the becoming social of entrepreneurship and the becoming entrepreneurial of the social' (Steyaert and Hjorth 2008, 2). The latter is sometimes referred to as the 'entrepreneurialisation' of society and social life, indicating that entrepreneurial thinking, the core of capitalism, is no longer limited to business practices but enters the private lives of people more and more (Foucault, Davidson, and Burchell 2008; Bröckling 2016; Marttila 2015; Rossi 2017). Different studies from different disciplines show how entrepreneurship has become part of domains in which it previously was not part of.

For example, the literature on developments within the domain of educational policy shows how entrepreneurial skills and competencies have become integrated into school curricula (see, for example, Peters 2001; Down 2009; Dahlstedt and Fejes 2017). The same applies for studies focussing on the changed meaning of paid work in western societies in which is observed that employees are increasingly expected to be flexible and to work on their employability by updating their knowledge, networking skills and by timely switching careers if there are no jobs available within their sector (see, for example, Sennett 1998; Beck 2000; Stam and van der Vrande 2017). This paper focuses on the domain of urban regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods. Also in this domain, there is an increasing emphasis on entrepreneurship and on the importance of entrepreneurial skills and competencies of citizens. In particular, in urban regeneration policy, encouraging entrepreneurship to enhance the local economy is seen as a contribution to reducing poverty in disadvantaged neighbourhoods especially in times of limited economic growth (Teasdale 2010; Bailey, 2012; Williams and Williams 2017).

For politicians and policy-makers (local) entrepreneurs are considered potential drivers of local and community development, mainly because entrepreneurship is often associated with economic growth and prosperity, and a diverse set of positive characteristics are attributed to being an entrepreneur (Baumol, Litan, and Schramm 2007; Anderson and Warren 2011; Mason et al. 2015). Commonly identified traits and activities of entrepreneurs are: showing initiative, leadership, taking risks, being flexible, creative, being independent, having a strong work ethic, a daring spirit and being responsible (see also Keat 1991; Rose 1990; Gordon 1991; Du Gay 1996, 2004; Carr and Beaver 2002). Stayeart and Hjorth (2008) observe that particularly, social entrepreneurship has increasingly become an instrument for urban regeneration because it is perceived as an 'all-encompassing solution at a moment where faith in the more traditional models of non-profit, governmental and voluntary solutions is waning' (p. 7). In the context of deprived neighbourhoods and urban regeneration policies, the 'celebration' of entrepreneurship has resulted in ambivalent opinions. On the one hand, stimulating entrepreneurship in deprived neighbourhoods is seen as a crucial element in

strengthening economic development through the creation of jobs and increased labour productivity, as well as increasing social inclusion (Blackburn and Ram 2006; Welter, Trettin, and Neumann 2008; Lyons 2015). On the other hand, residents in deprived communities are often viewed to lack key entrepreneurial attributes, skills and social capital (OECD 2003; Williams and Huggins 2013, 168).

In the context of urban regeneration, entrepreneurship also emerges in policies 'to help citizens to help themselves', not only in the Netherlands but across different European countries (Kleinhans and van Ham 2017). In the Netherlands, citizens have increasingly become key players in maintaining the quality of life in disadvantaged urban neighbourhoods. Until 2015, the Dutch national government took a leading role in large-scale urban regeneration programmes and provided a top-down, national policy framework and big amounts of funding. From 2015 onwards, due to welfare cuts and processes of devolution and decentralisation, the Dutch national government withdrew from urban regeneration and implicitly moved responsibilities to local governments, housing associations, health-care organisations and citizens, to collaborate with each other to maintain the quality of life in urban neighbourhoods. In neighbourhoods where citizens perceived the effects of the welfare cuts, by the decline in public service provision, the rise of vacant buildings and unemployment rates, entrepreneurial citizens find opportunities to develop initiatives and to collaborate with different stakeholders to regain control over developments in their neighbourhood and maintain the quality of life (Verheije et al. 2014). In light of the above developments, the entrepreneurialisation of society increasingly leads to the entrepreneurialisation of citizenship in the context of urban regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods.

2.3 Redefining citizenship in the entrepreneurial society

It can be argued that entrepreneurship, or an entrepreneurial attitude, has always been part of citizenship like discussed in Weber's study on 'the Protestant Ethic'. However, some scholars argue that the expansion of the welfare state after World War II made the Protestant ethic diminish. Weber ([1905] 2001) observed in his well-known book 'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism' that the Protestants devotion to work and their abstention from spending their earnings was an intrinsic part of the Protestants vision of a pious life. For Weber ([1905] 2001), the

Protestant ethic with its focus on self-discipline, responsibilities and duties, fostered entrepreneurship and stood at the beginning of the rise of modern capitalism. In the Netherlands, many institutions that have developed into public institutions (such as housing associations, schools, hospitals, libraries, youth clubs and community centres) started as 'private (citizen) initiatives' in the nineteenth century by religious groups and the middle-class elite that in the course of the twentieth century became nationalized (Burger and Veldheer 2001; Dekker 2004). Van Doorn and Schuyt (1982), claim that the post-war growth of the welfare state made the Protestant ethic, but also the socialistic notion of collective solidarity, more or less redundant. Social rights stood at the base of the expansion of the post-war welfare state and created according to Marshall (1992) a new definition and practice of citizenship. These rights (also referred to as 'social citizenship') include the right of citizens to economic and social security through education, healthcare, housing and other services (Marshall 1992). Social rights made everyone, regardless of their position in society, entitled to live a worthy life. Van Doorn and Schuyt (1982) criticise the expansion of the welfare state and point to the resulting dependency relations between citizens and government which according to them created a widespread attitude of 'welfare consumerism' (p. 13). According to Van Doorn and Schuyt (1982), the expansion of social services and benefits created welfare dependency and stood in the way for citizens to be entrepreneurial and responsible. The type of criticism that Van Doorn and Schuyt (1982) show towards welfare state arrangements is also dominant in discourses on active citizenship as Verhoeven and Tonkens (2013) show in their research on the type of 'talk' used by the Dutch national government to encourage active citizenship.

According to Verhoeven and Tonkens (2013), the implementation of the Social Support Act in 2007 was at the heart of the active citizenship discourse in the Netherlands. The Social Support Act aims to promote participation and active involvement of all groups in society including vulnerable groups like elderly or disabled people. Verhoeven and Tonkens (2013) label the Dutch way of encouraging active citizenship as 'responsibility talk'. This type of talk blames citizens for misusing social welfare services and being irresponsible, not caring enough for each other and their neighbourhood. In this talk, because of their slackness, the government needed to spend too much money which led to necessary welfare cuts. Therefore, the citizen is the one to blame and the one who should solve the problem. This process of making citizens responsible for tasks that used to be the responsibility of state agents is also called 'responsibilization' (Rose 1999; Garland 2001; Ilcan and Basok 2004; Clarke 2005; Lacey and Ilcan 2006; Taylor 2007; Peeters 2013; Hammett 2018). Lacey and Ilcan (2006) describe the process of responsibilization as 'a shifting of responsibilities from governmental agencies and authorities to organizations and individual citizens for their own service provisions – citizens are not only active in this service provision, but are increasingly responsible for it' (p. 39).

Lacey and Ilcan (2006) discuss the notion of responsibilization from a governmentality perspective like many other scholars who wrote on this subject (see, for example, Rose 1999, 2000; Lemke 2001). From a governmentality perspective, responsibilization is perceived as a top-down 'governance technique', a way for governments to influence their citizens' behaviour in the desired direction. However, the literature discussing 'responsibilization' as a governance technique does not provide us with enough material to understand bottom-up developments, such as why sometimes citizens themselves demand more involvement and responsibilities from the government or why some citizens think they can provide better public services than the government. Gofen's (2015) study on citizens' entrepreneurial role in public service provision provides some more insight into this matter.

Gofen (2012, 2015) introduced the concept 'entrepreneurial exit' referring to 'a proactive exit in which citizens, dissatisfied with the form or quality of a public service, end or ignore their relationship with a governmental provider of the service. Simultaneously, they create an alternative rather than choosing among existing possibilities' (p. 405). Gofen (2015) identified three different motivations for citizens practising entrepreneurial exit. The first motive refers to citizens who reject government involvement in the service provision and take full responsibility for the provision themselves. The second motive refers to citizens who disapprove a specific aspect of the provision and take responsibility by providing this specific function. The third motive refers to citizens who try to put pressure on governments by temporary replacing the public provision themselves. Gofen (2015) studied 'entrepreneurial exit' within the Israeli context and identifies a movement that mainly develops bottom-up. In the Netherlands, many citizen initiatives and community enterprises seem to be driven by similar motivations (see, e.g., Hoekema 2007; Sterk, Specht, and Walraven 2013; Ham and van der Meer 2015). We will return to this observation in section 4, in the context of Dutch urban regeneration.

Sterk, Specht, and Walraven (2013) present the development of citizen initiatives in the Netherlands as a new form of societal value creation in which citizens themselves try to solve societal issues. According to Sterk, Specht, and Walraven (2013), this development is often (bottom-up) initiated by entrepreneurial citizens and social entrepreneurs who together are representing a new civil society. Entrepreneurial citizens are capable of being 'change makers' and work together with different stakeholders to create societal change (Sterk, Specht, and Walraven 2013). Hoekema (2007) rather speaks of 'citizenpoliticians' by which he refers to individuals who from time to time participate in interactive policy and planning processes and sees this as a personal 'life project'. For Hoekema (2007), this individual is an 'entrepreneurial citizen'. A common denominator in the conceptualisations of entrepreneurial citizens of Sterk, Specht, and Walraven (2013) and Hoekema (2007) is collaboration with various

stakeholders and aiming for societal change. Hoekema (2007) states that the advent of the entrepreneurial citizen is related to changes in the institutional order. The well-known shift from 'government' to 'governance' assumes that the national government can no longer intervene effectively in a top-down manner and is increasingly dependent on the market and civil society, making the relationship between the traditionally distinct spheres of the state, the market and civil society become more horizontal and based on cooperation and negotiation (Rhodes 1996; Peeters 2013). Also, citizens' increased average level of education, the request for more involvement from civil society and the market when it comes to organising society and the rise of communication technologies such as the internet, have opened up less hierarchical structures with different stakeholders being (or demanding to be) drawn into the policy process (Castells 2000). Public policy then becomes the responsibility of both government and civil society, adding new roles, expectations and responsibilities to citizens and including them as partners in governance (Meijer 2016).

Durose, Greasley, and Richardson (2009) note that in the literature 'there has been a clear focus on the organisational impact of governance, but less on the demands now made, of and by, citizens and how citizens themselves reflect and respond to these changing demands' (p. 212). This is why we argue that entrepreneurial citizenship is a relevant and distinctive concept because it can be understood as simultaneously bottom-up and top-down. When conceptualised top-down, entrepreneurial citizenship refers to the ways in which national and/or local governments (or other established institutions) address citizens as if they were (social) entrepreneurs and expect citizens to adopt typical entrepreneurial skills and competencies in the management of their daily lives and in response to institutional requests to participate in the design, management or delivery of public services (see, e.g., Osborne, Radnor, and Strokosch 2016). When conceptualised bottom-up, entrepreneurial citizenship refers to behavioural practices exerted by citizens who demand more responsibilities and opportunities from governments (or other key institutions) to have a bigger say in organising (local) society, and innovatively apply various entrepreneurial and collaborative skills, assets and strategies to achieve their goals and create societal-added value.

The predominantly entrepreneurial 'action element' and the aim to create societal added value in an innovative way makes entrepreneurial citizenship rather different from active citizenship. Entrepreneurial citizenship stems from dissatisfaction with government functioning and public service delivery and is driven by the aim for (social) change (Ham and van der Meer 2015). Entrepreneurial citizens aim to achieve societal added value in their direct living environment and seek innovation in the way in which they can deliver (public) services themselves. They develop initiatives that are public oriented, but in order to maintain such an initiative and

create societal-added value on the long run, thinking about how to generate profits and creating a business model is almost inevitable (Van der Zwaard et al. 2018). As such, entrepreneurial citizens incorporate a commercial element in their initiative from which profits are gained to be reinvested in the initiative and the locality. Citizen initiatives that creatively manage to combine generating profits and achieving social impact are more likely to succeed (Van Meerkerk, Kleinhans, and Molenveld 2018). As shown in the literature, active citizenship as a concept has developed as a critique of citizens consumerist and 'lazy' behaviour and reflects (moral) duties and responsibilities that are imposed upon citizens top-down. Hence, entrepreneurial citizenship not only refers to duties and responsibilities but even more to opportunities taken by citizens to create societal added value, requiring a different relationship with government(s) which is based on horizontal co-production rather than citizens responding to government-initiated arrangements.

As a conceptual starting point for the remainder of this paper, we provide the following definition of entrepreneurial citizenship. The concept of entrepreneurial citizenship combines a top-down induced citizen ideal from national and/or local governments promoting entrepreneurship skills and competencies to create more responsible and entrepreneurial citizens' participation in government-initiated arrangements, with bottom-up behavioural practices from citizens who demand more opportunities to innovatively apply assets, entrepreneurial skills, strategies and collaboration with other stakeholders to achieve their goals and create societal-added value.

2.4 The rise of entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, contemporary expressions of entrepreneurial citizenship are explicitly present in the context of urban regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods. In order to better understand entrepreneurial citizenship in this specific context, we need to understand what role citizens historically have played in Dutch urban regeneration in the first place.

2.4.1 ## Citizens' engagement in Dutch urban regeneration

Citizens' engagement in urban regeneration has for a long time been a top-down induced form of engagement also framed as 'citizen participation'. Although citizen participation has been a long time part of urban policy in the Netherlands, the level and nature of citizen participation in urban regeneration has changed and developed over time. Different forms of citizen participation follow each other up but can also coexist (Oude Vrielink and van de Wijdeven 2008; Boonstra and Boelens 2011; De Graaf, Van Hulst, and Michels 2015; Teernstra and Pinkster 2016). Starting in the 1970s, local governments informed citizens about urban regeneration policies and gave them the opportunity to have a say. However, citizens often only became involved after the policy had been established. During the 1990s, more interactive forms of policymaking arose and citizens were increasingly perceived as co-producers of policy and were given the opportunity to think along with the government in the early stages of policy development. From the twenty-first century onwards, citizen participation in urban regeneration increasingly takes the form of citizen initiatives (Oude Vrielink and van de Wijdeven 2008; Drosterij and Peeters 2011; Van Houwelingen, Boele, and Dekker 2014). In 2003, the Dutch cabinet introduced an 'action programme' to modernise the government and stated that a modern conception of citizenship is also required. The cabinet during that time period thought of 'a citizen who is self-reliant, empowered and involved, which is not primarily expressed in the submission of requirements, complaints and appeals directed against the government, but rather in societal self-organization and initiatives' (Action Programme 'Different Government', Ministry of the Interior 2003, 5). This conception of citizenship has been taken over on lower scale levels and more explicitly expressed in the form of entrepreneurial citizenship, like, for example, in the city of Rotterdam in which (ideal) residents of Rotterdam are presented as follows: 'The people of Rotterdam take the initiative and contribute towards the city's development. This has always been the case and will never change. The people of Rotterdam stand up for their city, their neighbourhood and their street. All over the city, you find entrepreneurial people who take on problems in society, identifying opportunities to bring about change.' (Participation Guideline Rotterdam, 2013, 1).

Thus, both national and local governments in the Netherlands promote the concept of entrepreneurial citizenship by picturing an ideal citizen with entrepreneurship skills and competencies, who feels responsible for solving problems that emerge in his/her direct environment and in doing so helps the government at the same time. The dominant thought is that if citizens feel more responsible for problems emerging in their direct environment and provide co-produced solutions for it, this might tackle the lack of trust and social cohesion, but also (welfare) consumerism,

social exclusion and eventually narrow the gap between citizens and government (Tonkens 2008; Hurenkamp, Tonkens, and Duyvendak 2011; Bailey and Pill 2015). How can we now observe expressions of entrepreneurial citizenship, and under which conditions does it become manifest in urban neighbourhoods? In the following sub-sections, we will discuss citizen initiatives and community enterprises because they are a good example of how entrepreneurial citizenship is practised in urban neighbourhoods.

2.4.2 Manifestations of entrepreneurial citizenship in the Netherlands

According to Van der Zwaard and Specht (2013), the ability of citizens to improve their own neighbourhood depends on how they experience their neighbourhood and on a diverse set of individual competencies, including entrepreneurial qualities, motivation and commitment, social skills and specific knowledge. The competencies can differ in importance depending on the type of activity citizens are engaged. While the more 'traditional' voluntary sector requires competencies related to bureaucratic and organisational knowledge and skills, the 'new' citizen initiatives require more entrepreneurial and social skills (Van der Zwaard and Specht 2013). Citizen initiatives fit in our definition of entrepreneurial citizenship as they are actively promoted by governments and in practice often started by citizens with entrepreneurial skills who aim to create societal-added value. In the Dutch literature 'citizen initiatives' refer to citizens who organize themselves and take the initiative to address a certain (social) matter they consider important instead of waiting for others to take the lead (Sterk, Specht, and Walraven 2013; Ham and van der Meer 2015). Tonkens and Verhoeven (2018) define citizen initiatives as: 'collective, informal, social or political activities by citizens as volunteers that aim to deal pragmatically with public issues in their communities' (p.2). Citizen initiatives cover almost all the social domains such as welfare, integration, safety, culture, but also more 'physical' domains such as landscape development, energy and mobility (Sterk, Specht, and Walraven 2013). This diversity also leads to a lack of numerical understanding of citizen initiatives. Citizen initiatives are not new, but have recently gained more public and political attention and seem to be increasing in number in the Netherlands.

Ham and van der Meer (2015) studied twelve citizen initiatives in the Netherlands and conclude that most citizen initiatives do not arise spontaneously, but are a response to government retrenchment or failure. One of the oldest examples of a citizen initiative in the Netherlands can be found in the 'Opzoomerstreet' in the Dutch

city Rotterdam, where during the late 1980s residents who were tired of the drug-related problems in their neighbourhood collectively swept and refurbished their street. This received much attention and many other streets followed their example. Nowadays, an 'Opzoomercampaign' is organised every year (in collaboration with the local government) to encourage citizens to develop initiatives in their streets that facilitate encounters between residents and improves the liveability of the neighbourhood. This citizen initiative in the 'Opzoomerstreet' can be seen as a specific case of 'entrepreneurial exit' in which citizens dissatisfied with a public service provide an alternative one.

Ham and van der Meer (2015) observed that the initiators of citizen initiatives nowadays are all entrepreneurs or people with entrepreneurial qualities. Also, Uitermark (2015) observed that citizen initiatives are often started and facilitated by people and communities that already have strong professional and/or social networks. In relation to this observation, different scholars warn for the 'Matthew effect' or use the 'survival of the fittest' argumentation, meaning that those who already possess a lot will benefit more than those who do not which will lead to more social inequality (Engbersen, Snel, and 'T Hart 2015; Snel, Custers, and Engbersen 2018; Tonkens and Verhoeven 2018). Studies aimed at identifying active and non-active residents in urban neighbourhoods show mixed results. Engbersen, Snel, and 'T Hart (2015) indicate that residents of relatively poor and ethnically diverse neighbourhoods in Rotterdam participate less in citizen initiatives than residents of more affluent and mainly white neighbourhoods. However, Van der Zwaard and Specht (2013) indicate that newly formed citizen initiatives attract more women, migrants and people with low education and low income in contrast to the traditional voluntary sector which mainly attracted old, white and highly educated men.

Various arguments are put forward by national and local governments to further encourage the rise of citizen initiatives (The DIY Democracy, Ministry of the Interior 2013). For instance, citizens are expected to have more knowledge of their local environment than the local government and thus better able to identify and address the needs of their neighbourhood. Furthermore, citizen initiatives will not only contribute to more 'customized' social services but also by collaborating with each other and helping one another citizens will also feel less alienated from each other, which is assumed to create more solidarity and social cohesion within neighbourhoods (Veldheer et al. 2012). Likewise, taking more responsibility for improving the neighbourhood would provoke feelings of 'ownership' leading to more self-sustaining communities, which is believed to improve the liveability and 'vitality' of a neighbourhood (Van der Heijden et al. 2011).

Advocates of a bottom-up movement perceive citizen initiatives as 'game changers' by engaging in public and political affairs and challenging the traditionally distinct spheres of the state, the market and civil society (Sterk, Specht, and Walraven 2013; Rotmans 2014). Critics indicate that in practice citizen initiatives mainly serve policy objectives and question the assumed changes in governance and related power redistribution (Van Dam, Duineveld, and During 2014; Rijshouwer and Uitermark 2017). According to Van Dam, Duineveld, and During (2014), local governments welcome citizen initiatives that serve their own policy objectives but oppose those who do not. Their view closely relates to the study by Rijshouwer and Uitermark (2017) on community centres transforming to community enterprises in Amsterdam. They argue that in practice 'civil society's entrepreneurialism is only selectively and strategically appreciated to the extent it can be incorporated into broader, market-oriented policies' (p. 272).

These studies show that Dutch local governments do not always appreciate citizens entrepreneurialism and sometimes even discourage it. This observation indicates that entrepreneurial citizenship is not simply being promoted without a clear goal, it is being promoted in the pursuit of policy ambitions (Ossewaarde 2007; Koster 2015). Rijshouwer and Uitermark (2017) also show in their research that citizen initiatives highly depend on support from local governments or other formal institutions and need to compromise and adjust some of their goals to meet the requirements set by local governments. Citizen initiatives depending on funding from local governments sometimes need to compete with other initiatives and act more 'business-like' in order to be assured of receiving funding. They need to show that they will able to proceed without funding in the future. Thus, in order to become successful, a citizen initiative needs to become more 'professionalized'. Having a business model or assets are important features for citizen initiatives to become sustainable (Van der Zwaard et al. 2018).

2.4.3 A specific example: community-based (social) enterprises

Community enterprises are a good example of entrepreneurial citizenship because community enterprises are led by citizens who make use of their entrepreneurial skills to generate profits which are reinvested in the community and the neighbourhood. Community enterprises are more commonly known and widespread in the UK than in the Netherlands. The Dutch version of community enterprises ('bewonersbedrijven') is also inspired by experiences in the UK. Bailey (2012) defines community enterprises as enterprises owned and managed by the community and similar to citizen initiatives, arise as a response to certain pressing social needs

which remain unmet by the public and private sector. Kleinhans and van Ham (2017), state that a community enterprise is more like an organisation or a business rather than an 'initiative' because a community enterprise often has both a commercial and a social aspect. The commercial aspect refers to engaging in trade, but without the aim to maximize profits for private distribution. Surpluses are reinvested in the business and the community (Bailey 2012; Kleinhans and van Ham 2017). A community enterprise serves a 'community of some kind', is owned and managed by members of that community and has a democratic governance structure (Somerville and McElwee 2011; Bailey, 2012). The enterprise part refers to the surplus that needs to be generated for the survival of the community enterprise in the long term. Community enterprises hold assets for the community benefit, generate income by exploiting them and use the surplus to provide social services for their area of benefit.

The features of community enterprises like their social goals, governance structures and business-models can differ because the way in which they develop is often context-specific (Varady, Kleinhans, and van Ham 2015; Kleinhans et al. 2015; Kleinhans 2017). Kleinhans (2017), states that community enterprises in the Netherlands often arise in response to social and financial challenges in former urban regeneration target areas. According to Kleinhans (2017) the scope of their activities tends to be limited to the area in which they are based. Therefore, 'community' here mainly refers to a group of people living and/or working in the same area. Citizens who tend to be involved are mainly citizens who were already 'active' in other forms of community activism like neighbourhood councils. While community activism has traditionally a quite opposing nature to the established political order, according to Van Meerkerk, Kleinhans, and Molenveld (2018) the success of community entrepreneurship depends for an important part on support from institutional actors and for community enterprises in the Netherlands, reaching the level of independence is highly exceptional (see also Bailey, Kleinhans, and Lindbergh 2018). Nederhand, Bekkers, and Voorberg (2016) state that Dutch local governments highly influences the shape and outcome of citizen initiatives and community enterprises by making use of complex governance techniques. Van Meerkerk, Kleinhans, and Molenveld (2018) indicate that high levels of social capital, combined with strong entrepreneurial leadership and a strong business model highly determine the durability of a community enterprise.

Based on the literature on citizen initiatives and community enterprises, we can conclude that both can be perceived as a manifestation of 'entrepreneurial citizenship' for several reasons. First, from a top-down perspective, local government facilitates citizen initiatives and community enterprises with the goal to create more responsible and entrepreneurial citizens who serve policy goals and objectives.

Second, from a bottom-up perspective, to initiate a citizen initiative or community enterprise entrepreneurial skills are needed, including developing (business) strategies and collaborating with other stakeholders to create societal change. Third, to be able to stand on their feet, entrepreneurial citizens often need to incorporate a commercial aspect in their initiative from which they gain profits that are reinvested in the initiative/enterprise and the locality they serve. Thus, it seems that entrepreneurial skills and strategies are important at all stages of starting a citizens' initiative or a community enterprise to making it a durable initiative or enterprise.

2.5 Conclusions and directions for further research

We started this literature review with the aim to better understand the origins of entrepreneurial citizenship in the context of Dutch urban regeneration. We can conclude that the origins of entrepreneurial citizenship in general, lie in an overall-increased appreciation for entrepreneurship in society which has affected our conception of citizenship, but also the changed governance structures that created space for entrepreneurial citizenship to exist (Van Beek 1998; Hoekema 2007). We have found that even though policymakers and politicians like to speak of entrepreneurial citizens and some literature mentions who can be considered an 'entrepreneurial citizen', it remains difficult to define 'entrepreneurial citizenship'. Based on our review of the literature on entrepreneurship and active citizenship, we have provided a definition of entrepreneurial citizenship. We believe that it was necessary to provide a definition because other concepts, such as active citizenship, citizen participation and responsibilization, mainly refer to top-down induced forms of governance in which the entrepreneurial character of citizenship practices is not well covered.

We define entrepreneurial citizenship as a concept that combines top-down with bottom-up processes. On the one hand, national and/or local governments promote an ideal citizen with entrepreneurship skills and competencies to create more responsible and entrepreneurial citizens' participation in government-initiated arrangements. On the other hand, there are bottom-up behavioural practices from citizens who demand more opportunities to innovatively apply assets, entrepreneurial skills, strategies and collaboration with other stakeholders to achieve their goals and create societal-added value. Different from other concepts

such as citizen engagement, responsibilization and active citizenship, the concept of entrepreneurial citizenship covers both top-down and bottom-up developments and gives entrepreneurship a central place in citizenship practices.

In the Netherlands, the field of urban regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods is a good example of how active citizenship has evolved into more entrepreneurial forms of citizenship. In urban regeneration, entrepreneurial citizenship is promoted top-down by governments but also manifests itself in many different bottom-up initiatives by citizens. In this paper, we focused on two specific manifestations of entrepreneurial citizenship that have received the most attention in the Netherlands namely, citizen initiatives and community enterprises. There are other ways in which entrepreneurial citizens organise themselves in urban neighbourhoods, for example, through co-operatives and collectives. These examples seem to have received less (policy) attention in the Netherlands as they are often not considered as 'new' or 'innovative' as citizen initiatives and enterprises are considered. The literature on citizen initiatives and community enterprises shows that entrepreneurial citizenship is not always valued by local governments, especially when it does not fit within existing policy frameworks.

Entrepreneurial citizenship might be a citizen-ideal for (local) governments, but difficult to practice for entrepreneurial citizens. Different challenges for entrepreneurial citizens aiming to develop a citizen initiative or a community enterprise are reported in the literature, such as the continuing dependency on local governments for funding and the inability to become autonomous and to remain sustainable (Van Dam, Duineveld, and During 2014; Rijshouwer and Uitermark 2017; Van der Zwaard et al. 2018; Van Meerkerk, Kleinhans, and Molenveld 2018). Having a sustainable community enterprise requires high levels of social capital, combined with strong entrepreneurial leadership and a strong business model as Van Meerkerk, Kleinhans, and Molenveld (2018) showed in their research. This has raised the question of whether entrepreneurial citizenship is in practice citizenship for 'professionals' because entrepreneurial citizenship requires skills not everyone can meet or be able to develop. The effect of entrepreneurial citizenship on social inclusion and social inequality has however been insufficiently examined. Most of the literature on citizen initiatives and community enterprises have been focused on defining the phenomenon, identifying its distinctive characteristics and more recently the factors of success, but has not reached the point to provide statistical information on the number and range of citizen initiatives and enterprises or their effect on, for example, liveability or social cohesion.

Overlooking our discussion of entrepreneurial citizenship, we might conclude that it is not a 'new' phenomenon in the Netherlands. Many public institutions in the Netherlands started as 'private (citizen) initiatives' in the nineteenth century (Burger and Veldheer 2001; Dekker 2004). As these public institutions nowadays encounter various difficulties, citizens try to find new and innovative ways to locally provide (public) services themselves. However, the context in which contemporary entrepreneurial citizenship is developing is very different from the context in which the private initiatives during the nineteenth century had developed. During the nineteenth century, various public services were facilitated by different religious groups and the middle-class elite often motivated by the Christian inspired love for one's neighbour or the protection of one's own interests (Burger and Veldheer 2001). Today, entrepreneurial citizenship is developing in a context of welfare state retrenchments and in the midst of discussions about citizens' rights and responsibilities and the role national and local governments should take. This is being translated into policies that actively stimulate citizens to undertake initiatives and to take the lead in solving social problems which was during the nineteenth century, not the case (Hoogenboom 2011). Also, whereas churches, labour unions and associations were central places where citizens organised themselves, the neighbourhood now seems to have taken this place instead. Furthermore, citizen initiatives nowadays cannot rely on a continuous stream of funding from philanthropists or the government and therefore develop entrepreneurial strategies (such as generating profits and reinvesting these profits in the locality) in order to be able to stand on their feet. Thus, entrepreneurial citizenship does seem to incorporate elements that are significantly different from practices in the past, however, to what extent it can be considered 'new' is debatable.

Whether the development of entrepreneurial citizenship will eventually lead to a more important and significant role for citizens in urban regeneration remains a question for further research. We encourage researchers to study further manifestations of entrepreneurial citizenship and to examine whether the initiatives entrepreneurial citizens develop become more professionalised and more sustainable over time. We have mainly focused on expressions of entrepreneurial citizenship in an urban context. In rural areas where due to population decline several public facilities are gradually disappearing, entrepreneurial citizens might be equally visible and important. We believe that providing a better understanding of the entrepreneurial citizen and their initiatives is essential, and an opportunity for scholars to further develop this cross-cutting field.

References

Anderson, A. R., and L. Warren. 2011. "The Entrepreneur as Hero and Jester: Enacting the Entrepreneurial Discourse." *International Small Business Journal* 29 (6): 589–609. doi:10.1177/0266242611416417.

Bailey, N. 2012. "The Role, Organisation and Contribution of Community Enterprise to Urban Regeneration Policy in the UK." *Progress in Planning* 77 (1): 1–35. doi:10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001.

Bailey, N., and M. Pill. 2015. "Can the State Empower Communities through Localism? An Evaluation of Recent Approaches to Neighbourhood Governance in England." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 33 (2): 289–304. doi:10.1068/c12331r.

Bailey, N., R. Kleinhans, and J. Lindbergh. 2018. *An Assessment of Community-Based Social Enterprise in Three European Countries.* London: Power to Change.

Baumol, W. J., R. E. Litan, and C. J. Schramm. 2007. *Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Beck, U. 2000. *The Brave New World of Work.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Blackburn, R., and M. Ram. 2006. "Fix or Fixation? the Contributions and Limitations of Entrepreneurship and Small Firms to Combating Social Exclusion." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 18 (1): 73–89. doi:10.1080/08985620500419566.

Boonstra, B., and L. Boelens. 2011. "Self-Organization in Urban Development: Towards a New Perspective on Spatial Planning." *Urban Research & Practice* 4 (2): 99–122. doi:10.1080/17535069.2011.579767.

Bovens, M., and A. Wille. 2008. "Deciphering the Dutch Drop: Ten Explanations for Decreasing Political Trust in the Netherlands." *International Review of Administrative Sciences 74* (2): 283–305. doi:10.1177/0020852308091135.

Bröckling, U. 2016. *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject.* London: Sage.

Burger, A., and V. Veldheer. 2001. "The Growth of the Nonprofit Sector in the Netherlands." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30 (2): 221–246. doi:10.1177/0899764001302004.

Carr, P., and G. Beaver. 2002. "The Enterprise Culture: Understanding a Misunderstood Concept." *Strategic Change* 11 (2): 105–113. doi:10.1002/jsc.579.

Castells, M. 2000. "Toward a Sociology of the Network Society." *Contemporary Sociology* 29 (5): 693–699. doi:10.2307/2655234.

Clarke, J. 2005. "New Labour's Citizens: Activated, Empowered, Responsibilized, Abandoned?" *Critical Social Policy* 25 (4): 447–463. doi:10.1177/0261018305057024.

Dahlstedt, M., and A. Fejes. 2017. "Shaping Entrepreneurial Citizens: A Genealogy of Entrepreneurship Education in Sweden." *Critical Studies in Education:* 1–15. doi:10.1080/17508487.2017.1303525.

De Graaf, L., M. Van Hulst, and A. Michels. 2015. "Enhancing Participation in Disadvantaged Urban Neighbourhoods." *Local Government Studies* 41 (1): 44–62. doi:10.1080/03003930.2014.908771.

Dekker, P. 2004. "The Netherlands: From Private Initiatives to Non-Profit Hybrids and Back?" In *The Third Sector in Europe*, edited by A. Evers and J.-L. Laville, 144–165. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Den Ridder, J., and P. Dekker. 2015. *Meer Democratie, Minder Politiek? Een Studie Van De Publieke Opinie in Nederland (More Democracy, Less Politics? A Study of the Public Opinion in the Netherlands).* Den Haag: SCP.

Dogan, M. 2005. "Erosion of Confidence in Thirty European Democracies." *Comparative Sociology* 4 (1): 11–54. doi:10.1163/1569133054621932.

Down, B. 2009. "Schooling, Productivity and the Enterprising Self: Beyond Market Values." *Critical Studies in Education* 50 (1): 51–64. doi:10.1080/17508480802526652.

Drosterij, G., and R. Peeters. 2011. "De Nieuwe Burgerlijkheid: Participatie Als Conformerende Zelfredzaamheid [The New Bourgeois: Participation as Conforming Self-Reliance]." *Beleid En Maatschappij* 38 (4): 456–472.

Du Gay, P. 1996. *Consumption and Identity at Work.* London: Sage.

Du Gay, P. 2004. "Against 'Enterprise'(But Not against 'Enterprise', for that Would Make No Sense)." *Organization* 11 (1): 37–57. doi:10.1177/1350508404039777.

Durose, C., S. Greasley, and L. Richardson. 2009. *Changing Local Governance, Changing Citizens.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Engbersen, G., E. Snel, and M. 'T Hart. 2015. *Mattheüs in De Buurt: Over Burgerparticipatie En Ongelijkheid in Steden* [Matthew in the Neighborhood: About Citizen Participation and Inequality in Cities]. Rotterdam: Kenniswerkplaats Leefbare Wijken.

European Commission. 2018. *Standard Eurobarometer 89. Public Opinion in the European Union.* Brussels: European Comission.

Foucault, M., A. I. Davidson, and G. Burchell. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1978-79.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garland, D. 2001. *The Culture of Control.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geurtz, C., and T. Van de Wijdeven. 2010. "Making Citizen Participation Work: The Challenging Search for New Forms of Local Democracy in the Netherlands." *Local Government Studies* 36 (4): 531–549. doi:10.1080/03003930.2010.494110.

Gofen, A. 2012. "Entrepreneurial Exit Response to Dissatisfaction with Public Services." *Public Administration* 90 (4): 1088–1106. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.02021.x.

Gofen, A. 2015. "Citizens' Entrepreneurial Role in Public Service Provision." *Public Management Review* 17 (3): 404–424. doi:10.1080/14719037.2013.822533.

Gordon, C. 1991. "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller, 1–51. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Ham, M., and J. van der Meer. 2015. *De Ondernemende Burger. De Woelige Wereld Van Lokale Initiatieven* [The Entrepreneurial Citizen. The Turbulent World of Local Citizen Initiatives]. Utrecht: Movisie.

Hammett, D. 2018. "Engaging Citizens, Depoliticizing Society? Training Citizens as Agents for Good Governance." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 100 (2): 1–17. doi:10.1080/04353684.2018.1433961.

Hoekema, A. 2007. "'Oefenen in Coöperatieve Moraal' [Practicing in Cooperative Morality]." In *Macht En Verantwoordelijkheid, Essays Voor Kees Schuyt*, edited by J. W. Duyvendak, G. Engbersen, M. Teeuwen, and I. Verhoeven, 231–240. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Hoogenboom, M. 2011. "Particulier Initiatief En Overheid in Historisch Perspectief [Private Initiative and Government in Historical Perspective]." *Beleid En Maatschappij* 38 (4): 388–401.

Hurenkamp, M., E. Tonkens, and J. W. Duyvendak. 2011. "Citizenship in the Netherlands: Locally Produced, Nationally Contested." *Citizenship Studies* 15 (2): 205–225. doi:10.1080/13621025.2011.549716.

Ilcan, S., and T. Basok. 2004. "Community Government: Voluntary Agencies, Social Justice, and the Responsibilization of Citizens." *Citizenship Studies* 8 (2): 129–144. doi:10.1080/1362102042000214714.

Keat, R. 1991. "Introduction: Starship Britain or universal enterprise?" In *Enterprise Culture*, edited by R. Keat and N. Abercrombie, 1–17. London: Routledge.

Kleinhans, R. 2017. "False Promises of Co-Production in Neighbourhood Regeneration: The Case of Dutch Community Enterprises." *Public Management Review* 19 (10): 1500–1518. doi:10.1080/14719037.2017.1287941.

Kleinhans, R., and M. van Ham. 2017. "The Support Paradox in Community Enterprise Experiments in the Netherlands." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 31 (4): 570–589. doi:10.1504/IJESB.2017.10004123.

Kleinhans, R., W. Doff, A. Romein, and M. van Ham. 2015. *Project Kennisontwikkeling Experiment Bewonersbedrijven – Eindrapportage* [Project Knowledge Development Experiment Community Enterprises – Final Report]. Delft: Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment.

Koster, M. 2015. "Citizenship Agendas, Urban Governance and Social Housing in the Netherlands: An Assemblage Approach." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 214–228. doi:10.1080/13621025.2015.1005951.

Lacey, A., and S. Ilcan. 2006. "Voluntary Labor, Responsible Citizenship, and International NGOs." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 47 (1): 34–53. doi:10.1177/0020715206063256.

Lemke, T. 2001. "'The Birth of Bio-Politics': Michel Foucault's Lecture at the Collège De France on Neo-Liberal Governmentality." *Economy and Society* 30 (2): 190–207. doi:10.1080/03085140120042271.

Lyons, T. S. 2015. "Entrepreneurship and Community Development: What Matters and Why?" *Community Development* 46 (5): 456–460. doi:10.1080/15575330.2015.1085194.

Marshall, T. H. 1992. *Citizenship and Social Class.* London: Pluto Press.

Marttila, T. 2015. *Post-Foundational Discourse Analysis: From Political Difference to Empirical Research.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mason, C., D. Reuschke, S. Syrett, and M. van Ham. 2015. *Entrepreneurship in Cities: Neighbourhoods, Households and Homes*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Meijer, A. 2016. "Coproduction as a Structural Transformation of the Public Sector." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 29 (6): 596–611. doi:10.1108/IJPSM-01-2016-0001.

Ministry of the Interior. 2003. *Actieprogramma 'Ander Overheid'*. [Action Programme 'Different Government']. Den Haag: Ministry of the Interior.

Ministry of the Interior. 2013. *De Doe-Democratie. Kabinetsnota Ter Stimulering Van Een Vitale Samenleving* [The DIY Democracy. White Paper for Stimulating a Vital Society]. Den Haag: Ministry of the Interior.

Ministry of the Interior. 2018. *Action Plan Strengthening Local Democracy and Governance*. Den Haag: Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2013. "Participatieleidraad Rotterdam [Particiaption Guideline Rotterdam]".

Nederhand, J., V. Bekkers, and W. Voorberg. 2016. "Self-Organization and the Role of Government: How and Why Does Self-Organization Evolve in the Shadow of Hierarchy?" *Public Management Review* 18 (7): 1063–1084. doi:10.1080/14719037.2015.1066417.

Norris, P. 1999. *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OECD. 2003. *Entrepreneurship and Local Economic Development: Programme and Policy Recommendations*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development.

Osborne, S. P., Z. Radnor, and K. Strokosch. 2016. "Co-Production and the Co-Creation of Value in Public Services: A Suitable Case for Treatment?" *Public Management Review* 18 (5): 639–653. doi:10.1080/14719037.2015.1111927.

Ossewaarde, M. R. R. 2007. "The New Social Contract and the Struggle for Sovereignty in the Netherlands." *Government and Opposition* 42 (4): 491–512. doi:10.1111/j.1477-7053.2007.00233.x.

Oude Vrielink, M., and T. van de Wijdeven. 2008. "Bewonersinitiatieven: Een Prachtkans Voor Wijken? [Citizen Initiatives: A Great Opportunity for Neighbourhoods?]." *Bestuurswetenschappen* 62 (3): 66–83.

Peeters, R. 2013. "Responsibilisation on Government's Terms: New Welfare and the Governance of Responsibility and Solidarity." *Social Policy and Society* 12 (4): 583–595. doi:10.1017/S1474746413000018.

Peters, M. 2001. "Education, Enterprise Culture and the Entrepreneurial Self." *Journal of Educational Enquiry* 2 (2): 58–71.

Rhodes, R. A. W. 1996. "The New Governance: Governing without Government." *Political Studies* 44 (4): 652–667. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x.

Rijshouwer, E., and J. Uitermark. 2017. "Citizenship as Enterprise: The Transformation of Amsterdam Community Centres into Community Enterprises." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason, and S. Syrett, 270–294. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Rose, N. 1990. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Routledge.

Rose, N. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Rose, N. 2000. "Governing Cities, Governing Citizens." In *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*, edited by E. Isin, 95–109. London: Routledge.

Rossi, U. 2017. *Cities in Global Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rotmans, J. 2014. *Verandering Van Tijdperk: Nederland Kantelt*. Boxtel: Aeneas.

Sennett, R. 1998. *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Snel, E., G. Custers, and G. Engbersen. 2018. "Ongelijkheid in De Participatiestad [Inequality in Participation City]." *Mens En Maatschappij* 93 (1): 31–57. doi:10.5117/MEM2018.1.SNEL.

Somerville, P., and G. McElwee. 2011. "Situating Community Enterprise: A Theoretical Exploration." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 23 (5–6): 317–330. doi:10.1080/08985626.2011.580161.

Stam, E., and V. van der Vrande. 2017. "Solopreneurs and the Rise of Co-Working in the Netherlands." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason, and S. Syrett, 21–40. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Sterk, E., M. Specht, and G. Walraven. 2013. *Sociaal Ondernemerschap in De Participatiesamenleving: Van De Brave Naar De Eigenwijze Burger* [Social Entrepreneurship in the Participatory Society: From the Good to the Opinionated Citizen]. Antwerpen: Garant.

Steyaert, C., and D. Hjorth. 2008. *Entrepreneurship as Social Change: A Third New Movements in Entrepreneurship Book*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Taylor, M. 2007. "Community Participation in the Real World: Opportunities and Pitfalls in New Governance Spaces." *Urban Studies* 44 (2): 297–317. doi:10.1080/00420980601074987.

Teasdale, S. 2010. "How Can Social Enterprise Address Disadvantage? Evidence from an Inner City Community." *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing* 22 (2): 89–107. doi:10.1080/10495141003601278.

Teernstra, A. B., and F. M. Pinkster. 2016. "Participation in Neighbourhood Regeneration: Achievements of Residents in a Dutch Disadvantaged Neighbourhood." *Urban Research & Practice* 9 (1): 56–79. doi:10.1080/17535069.2015.1045931.

Tonkens, E. 2008. *De Bal Bij De Burger. Burgerschap En Publieke Moraal in Een Pluriforme, Dynamische Samenleving* [Passing the Ball to Citizens. Citizenship and Public Moral in a Pluralistic, Dynamic Society]. Inaugural lecture, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UvA.

Tonkens, E., and I. Verhoeven. 2018. "The Civic Support Paradox: Fighting Unequal Participation in Deprived Neighbourhoods." *Urban Studies* 1–16. doi:10.1177/0042098018761536.

Uitermark, J. 2015. "Longing for Wikitopia: The Study and Politics of Self-Organisation." *Urban Studies* 52 (13): 2301–2312. doi:10.1177/0042098015577334.

Van Beek, K. 1998. *De Ondernemende Samenleving Een Verkenning Van Maatschappelijke Verandering En Implicaties Voor Beleid*. [The Entrepreneurial Society. An Exploration of Social Change and Implications for Policy]. Den Haag: WRR.

Van Dam, R., M. Duineveld, and R. During. 2014. "Delineating Active Citizenship: The Subjectification of Citizens' Initiatives." *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 17 (2): 1–18. doi:10.1080/1523908X.2014.918502.

Van der Heijden, J., R. van Dam, R. van Noortwijk, I. Salverda, and I. van Zanten. 2011. *Experimenteren Met Burgerinitiatief: Van Doe-Het-Zelf Naar Doe-Het-Samen Maatschappij* [Experimenting with Citizen Initiative: From Do-It-Yourself to Do-It-Together Society]. Den Haag: Ministry of the Interior.

Van der Zwaard, J., and M. Specht. 2013. *Betrokken Bewoners, Betrouwbare Overheid, Condities En Competenties Voor Burgerkracht in De Buurt*. Rotterdam: Kenniswerkplaats Leefbare Wijken.

Van der Zwaard, J., M. Specht, K. Fortuin, H. Vendeloo, K. Shipper, and T. van Wieringen. 2018. *Voorbij De Pioniersfase Van Bewonersinitiatieven. Verduurzaming Van Plekken Van Betekenis* [Beyond the Pioneering Phase of Citizen Initiatives. Sustainability of Places of Significance]. Rotterdam: Stichting de Verre Bergen.

Van Doorn, J. A. A., and C. J. M. Schuyt. 1982. *De Stagnerende Verzorgingsstaat* [The Stagnating Welfare State]. Amsterdam: Boom Uitgevers.

Van Houwelingen, P., A. Boele, and P. Dekker. 2014. *Burgermacht Op Eigen Kracht. Een Brede Verkenning Van Ontwikkeling in Burgerparticipatie* [Citizen Power. A Broad Exploration of Developments in Citizen Participation]. Den Haag: SCP.

Van Meerkerk, I., R. Kleinhans, and A. Molenveld. 2018. "Exploring the Durability of Community Enterprises: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis." *Public Administration* 96 (4): 651–667. doi:10.1111/padm.12523.

Varady, D., R. Kleinhans, and M. van Ham. 2015. "The Potential of Community Entrepreneurship for Neighbourhood Revitalization in the United Kingdom and the United States." *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 9 (3): 253–276. doi:10.1108/JEC-01-2015-0009.

Veldheer, V., J. Jonker, L. van Noije, and C. Vrooman. 2012. *Een Beroep Op De Burger. Minder Verzorgingsstaat, Meer Eigen Verantwoordelijkheid?* [An Appeal to the Citizen. Less Welfare State, More Individual Responsibility?] Den Haag: SCP.

Verheije, M., M. Mittelmeijer, E. van Steen, and L. Geeurickx. 2014. *Pioniers in De Stad. Wijkondernemers Delen Kennis En Praktijk* [Pioneers in the City. Neighbourhood Entrepreneurs Share Knowledge and Practice]. Amsterdam: Trancity-Valiz.

Verhoeven, I., and E. Tonkens. 2013. "Talking Active Citizenship: Framing Welfare State Reform in England and the Netherlands." *Social Policy and Society* 12 (3): 415–426. doi:10.1017/S1474746413000158.

Weber, M. [1905] 2001. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated and edited by Stephen Kalberg. New York: Routledge.

TOC

Welter, F., L. Trettin, and U. Neumann. 2008. "Fostering Entrepreneurship in Distressed Urban Neighbourhoods." *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 4 (2): 109–128. doi:10.1007/s11365-007-0069-5.

Williams, N., and C. Williams. 2017. "Entrepreneurship and Deprived Urban Areas: Understanding Activity and the Hidden Enterprise Culture." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason, and S. Syrett, 21–40. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Williams, N., and R. Huggins. 2013. "Supporting Entrepreneurship in Deprived Communities: A Vision Too Far?" *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 20 (1): 165–180. doi:10.1108/14626001311298466.

TOC

3 Enterprise discourses in Dutch urban policies

A comparison between two cities in the Netherlands

ABSTRACT   Local governments make use of 'enterprise language' to encourage citizens to adopt entrepreneurial behaviour in managing their daily lives and solving problems that emerge in their neighbourhood. In this paper, we examine the use of enterprise language and the promotion of enterprise in Dutch urban policy focusing specifically on how Dutch cities use enterprise language to influence and encourage their inhabitants to undertake entrepreneurial action. Our analysis shows how the language of enterprise helps cities to reinforce a local identity, to legitimize institutional change in local government functioning and to formulate expectations of how citizens (and professionals) should behave.

KEYWORDS   Enterprise language, Critical Discourse Analysis, Urban Policy, Entrepreneurial Cities, Entrepreneurial Citizens.

3.1 Introduction

Several studies have pointed out that an 'enterprise discourse' has gained dominance in Western societies (Burrows and Curran 1991; Fairclough 1991; Armstrong 2005; Jones and Spicer 2005). This 'enterprise discourse' is believed to have become 'hegemonic', infiltrating different domains in society (Du Gay and Salaman 1992; Burchell 1993; Rose 1998; Du Gay 2004; Foucault 2008; Marttila 2015; Bröckling 2016). The 'language of enterprise and entrepreneurship' has also gained dominance in urban policy. Towards the end of the 1980s, urban researchers noted a shift in urban governance from 'managerialism to entrepreneurialism' (Harvey 1989). Since then, many urban researchers have focused on how cities are managed and governed as 'entrepreneurial cities' (Hall and Hubbard 1996; Jessop 1997, 1998; Griffiths 1998; Painter 1998; Williams 2000; Chapin 2002). According to Jessop and Sum (2000) entrepreneurial cities have three defining features. First, an entrepreneurial city pursues 'innovative strategies intended to maintain or enhance its economic competitiveness vis-a`-vis other cities and economic spaces'; second, these strategies 'are not 'as if' strategies, but are more or less explicitly formulated and pursued in an active, entrepreneurial fashion; and third, entrepreneurial cities 'adopt an entrepreneurial discourse, narrate their cities as entrepreneurial and market them as entrepreneurial' (Jessop and Sum 2000, 2289).

Although much has been written on how cities are becoming more entrepreneurial, still little attention has been paid to how cities govern their inhabitants to adjust their behaviour to the ideal of the 'entrepreneurial city'. This paper examines the use of enterprise language and the promotion of enterprise in Dutch urban policy focusing specifically on how cities use enterprise language to influence and encourage their inhabitants to undertake entrepreneurial action. A wide range of concepts is associated with the term 'enterprise'. Fairclough (1991), for example, identified in his research that the word 'enterprise' can refer to an 'activity', a (personal) 'quality' or a 'business' and sometimes even a combination of these three. Deakin and Edwards (1993) refer to 'enterprise' mainly in terms of a (personal) 'quality' and define enterprise as: 'having initiative and drive; it is taking opportunities when they arise; it is independence from the state; it is having confidence and being responsible for one's own destiny; it is being driven by the work ethic; and it promotes self-interest' (p. 2). In similar wording, Du Gay and Salaman (1992) state that enterprise refers 'to the plethora of "rules of conduct" for everyday life' involving 'energy, initiative, calculation, self-reliance and personal responsibility' (p. 629). When examining the use of enterprise language in Dutch urban policies, we will, in line with Deakin and Edwards

(1993) and Du Gay and Salaman (1992), focus on 'enterprise' as a (personal) 'quality' or a 'rule of conduct' and the language used in Dutch urban policy to awaken enterprising qualities and attitudes among those who live and work in the city.

The use of enterprise language and the promotion of enterprise is grounded in the political rhetoric of free markets. Characteristic of the 'language of enterprise' is the emphasis on 'freedom of choice' (Drakopoulou-Dodd and Anderson 2001). This indicates that success or failure is dependent on the choices people themselves make (Rose 1999). Another characteristic of 'enterprise language' is the claim that everyone is born with 'entrepreneurial potential' (Drakopoulou-Dodd and Anderson 2001). One of the ways in which enterprise language is used in urban policy is by triggering this 'entrepreneurial potential' among residents of deprived neighbourhoods to tackle local problems that emerge in their neighbourhood. A change in behaviour is then expected from the ones least able to, while 'the privileged' are not required to do the same (or to the same extent). Several scholars have observed that especially those residents most in need, in the most deprived neighbourhoods, have the least capacity to solve problems in their own communities (Kisby 2010; Painter et al. 2011) and lack key entrepreneurial attributes and skills (Williams and Huggins 2013).

The influence the enterprise discourse has on urban policy can differ between different cities depending on how this discourse interacts with other discourses already situated in local urban policy and politics (Fairclough 1991). As through the language of enterprise (local) governments communicate their expectations of citizens, we think it is important to provide a better understanding of how this type of language works and how different cities interact with it. In this paper, we aim to provide by means of critical discourse analysis a better understanding of how the language of enterprise manifests itself in the urban policies of Dutch cities focusing specifically on how Dutch cities use the language of enterprise to influence and encourage their inhabitants to undertake entrepreneurial action. The following research question will be central in this paper: how does the language of enterprise manifest itself in the urban policies of Dutch cities and how do local governments use this language to communicate expectations regarding the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of the city's inhabitants? Discourse analysis is often criticised for focusing too little on the reception of discourses. Therefore, in a small case study, we will also shed light on a telling example of how the language of enterprise is perceived by citizens and society.

Jonas and While (2007) state that the emerging consensus among urban scholars is that 'all cities are becoming entrepreneurial and that 'differences between cities in terms of politics and policy outcomes are matters of degree rather than substance' (p. 126). However, Jonas and While (2007) argue that not all cities are entrepreneurial and that 'urban politics do matter and that the difference such

politics make are substantive rather than contingent' (p. 128). We therefore choose to compare the urban policies of two cities in the Netherlands, namely Rotterdam and Delft. These are two, almost adjacent cities located in the southwestern part of the Netherlands that both in their own way make use of entrepreneurial strategies to govern the city and its subjects. Although both cities are located in the same region, they are considerably different in terms of size, poverty levels and political orientation. The differences between the cities enable us to examine to what extent enterprise language manifests itself differently in the urban policies of both cities. This paper is divided into six sections, following the introduction. Section two and three describe the origins of the enterprise discourse and its rise in Dutch society and urban policy. Section four describes how the discourse analysis was conducted and which documents were selected. In the fifth section, we will present our findings and in the sixth section, we will discuss the conclusions and added value of this research to the current field of knowledge and provide suggestions for further research.

3.2 The rise of an enterprise discourse in society

Most studies on the rise of an enterprise discourse in society have focused on the British context (Burrows and Curran 1991; Fairclough 1991; Gray 1998; Drakopoulou-Dodd and Anderson 2001; Carr and Beaver 2002). In the British context, the rise of an enterprise discourse started with the introduction of an 'enterprise culture' by the British government in the late 1970s (O'Rourke 2010). The introduction of an 'enterprise culture' was meant to deal with the economic challenges during that time but also aimed to create a 'moral revolution' (Carr and Beaver 2002). According to Carr and Beaver (2002), the introduction of an enterprise culture was a governmental programme aimed to 'influence and transform the mind-set and conduct of a population' (p. 110) creating a culture in which citizens foster positive values towards entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial attitudes. Fairclough (2000) argues that the policies designed to create an 'enterprise culture' are a form of 'cultural governance' which he defines as 'governing by shaping and changing the cultures of the public services, claimants and the socially excluded, and the general population' (p. 61). In this context, 'culture' is interpreted very broadly. This interpretation of cultural governance is associated with the governmentality literature in which governance is viewed to take place through

strategies and technologies directed towards what Foucault terms 'the conduct of conduct' that is to say, 'a form of activity aiming to shape, guide or affect the conduct of some person or persons' (Gordon 1991, 2). This type of governing has continued in the UK under Tony Blair's Third Way and David Cameron's Big Society. For example, visible in David Cameron's speech on the Big Society where the stated that: 'The Big Society is about a huge culture change where people, in their everyday lives, in their homes, in their neighbourhoods, in their workplace don't always turn to officials, local authorities or central government for answers to the problems they face but instead feel both free and powerful enough to help themselves and their own communities' (Cameron 2010).

The rise of an enterprise discourse is also observed in the Netherlands. Van Beek (1998) observed that since the early 1990s there is an increased appreciation for entrepreneurship visible in Dutch society. Van Beek (1998) states that this increased appreciation for entrepreneurship mainly refers to entrepreneurial attitudes rather than starting an enterprise. According to Van Beek (1998), the increased appreciation for entrepreneurial attitudes also applies to the public sector in which references to terms such as 'individual responsibility' and giving space to citizens 'own initiative' have become more widespread. The use of these terms recently intensified in the Dutch discourse. By introducing a 'participation society' and 'DIY-democracy', the Dutch government aims to provide more space for citizens to tackle social problems themselves through societal self-organisation (Ministry of the Interior 2013). Examples of societal self-organisation are citizens who set-up a community enterprise, create a community garden or arrange healthcare services in their neighbourhood (Kleinhans 2017; Ham and Van der Meer 2015; Van de Wijdeven 2012). By introducing the 'participation society' and 'DIY-democracy' the Dutch government aims to remind citizens of their duty to care of themselves and their environment and to be 'active' and 'self-reliant'. This conception of citizenship is related to a neoliberal understanding of citizenship. According to Woolford and Nelund (2013) the 'ideal neoliberal citizen' has the following characteristics:

'First, the neoliberal citizen is active, which is often taken to mean participation in waged work. Second, the neoliberal citizen manages risk prudently or, in other words, is an actuarial subject capable of calculating and planning for potential threats and dangers. Third, the neoliberal citizen is a responsible person capable of self-management, selfgovernance, and making reasonable choices. Fourth, the neoliberal citizen is not reliant on government or social services for survival; instead, she or he is an autonomous, self-reliant, and empowered agent. Finally, the neoliberal citizen is an entrepreneur of self, who can maximize his or her personal interests, well-being, and quality of life through selfpromotion and competition.' (p. 304).

Woolford and Nelund (2013), examined in their research to what extent welfare recipients adapt themselves to the demands of neoliberalism. They conclude that most welfare recipients communicated neo-liberal values of being active, prudent, responsible, autonomous and entrepreneurial. Woolford and Nelund (2013) state that: 'they have, either strategically or inadvertently, learned to inflect their public speech with neoliberal discourses in order to present themselves as whole rather than discredited persons' (p. 313). As both social service providers and welfare recipients adjust themselves to 'the scripts of accountability and responsibility', this has resulted in their interactions to be 'characterized by the series of masks worn by the various performers rather than the hard work of getting to know one another, building trust, and forming helping relationships' (ibid., p. 313).

The abovementioned interpretation of citizenship shows how the use of 'enterprise language' has moved beyond the economic domain. Marttila (2015) for example states that: 'competences, such as creativity, self-responsibility, readiness to take risks and innovative spirit which were previously associated with entrepreneurs working in the private sector, are nowadays considered subject ideals covering the entire society' (p. 186). This statement can be endorsed by a large number of studies that emphasize the dominant role entrepreneurship plays in society. Extensive research has been conducted on 'entrepreneurial societies' (Gavron et al. 1998; Van Beek 1998; Von Bargen, Freedman, and Pages 2003; Audretsch 2007), 'entrepreneurial cities' (Harvey 1989; Hall and Hubbard 1996; Jessop 1997, 1998), 'entrepreneurial governments' (Osborne and Gaebler 1992; Rhodes 1996) and 'the entrepreneurial self' (Peters 2001; Foucault 2008; Betta, Jones, and Latham 2010; Bröckling 2016). Dutch authors have identified references to 'entrepreneurial citizens' in which elements of entrepreneurship shape the meaning and practice of citizenship in cities and urban neighbourhoods (see e.g. Al Sader, Kleinhans, and Van Ham 2019; Sterk, Specht, and Walraven 2013). It's important to note that even though the enterprise discourse has the status of being 'hegemonic' this does not mean that this discourse is not being resisted (Purcell 2002; Mitchell 2003). According to Purcell (2008) 'hegemonies are always resisted because groups that are disadvantaged by the dominant order will organize to resist it and to pursue alternatives' (p. 174).

Enterprise discourse in urban policy

One of the fields of Dutch urban policy in which the 'language of entrepreneurship' is prominently notable is the field of urban regeneration (of deprived areas). According to Howorth, Parkinson, and Southern (2009), enterprise and entrepreneurship are 'firmly established in the lexicon of regeneration and renaissance' (p. 282). It's therefore not surprising that urban regeneration policies often connect enterprise with deprived areas. In the Netherlands, urban regeneration programmes used to be large-scale and national-led programmes mainly focussing on improving the built environment in disadvantaged postwar neighbourhoods (Musterd and Ostendorf 2008; Kleinhans 2012). From 2015 onwards, in the aftermath of the economic crisis of 2008, the national government moved the responsibility (without the funding) for regenerating deprived areas to local governments, housing associations, healthcare organisations and citizens. For cities and local governments, this meant adjusting to a new role and the starting period of experimentation with new partnerships and new approaches to urban regeneration.

In developing these new approaches, an increasingly important role is being allocated to citizens and expectations of citizen's role in the development of their neighbourhood have become higher. Citizens are now expected to 'take matters into their own hands' and to take responsibility for maintaining the quality of life in their neighbourhood (Boonstra and Boelens 2011; VanMeerkerk, Boonstra, and Edelenbos 2013; Hamand Van der Meer 2015; Wagenaar and Van der Heijden 2015; Teernstra and Pinkster 2016; Kleinhans 2017; Rijshouwer and Uitermark 2017). This development has led to an increased emphasis on active citizenship in various local policies and more 'space' for citizens to undertake initiatives in their neighbourhood in different domains (e.g. healthcare, education, sports and culture). However, not every initiative that citizens undertake is welcomed by local governments. Rijshouwer and Uitermark (2017) state in their study on Dutch community centres transforming into community enterprises that in practice 'civil society's entrepreneurialism is only selectively and strategically appreciated to the extent it can be incorporated into broader, market-oriented policies' (p. 272). Cardullo and Kitchin (2018), who studied citizen participation in smart city initiatives also conclude that although smart city initiatives are framed as enhancing citizen engagement and citizen power, in practice they do not serve the interests of citizens but of the state and the market.

There are multiple dimensions of urban policy in which the language of enterprise manifests itself (for example as in promoting the 'entrepreneurial city' or 'entrepreneurial government'). New responsibilities and roles allocated to urban

residents by local governments can be related to the shift in urban governance from a 'managerial' approach towards an 'entrepreneurial' approach (Harvey 1989). This shift meant a 'reorientation of urban governance away from the local provision of welfare and services to a more outward-orientated stance designed to foster and encourage local growth and economic development' (Hall and Hubbard 1996, 153). According to Jessop (1993), the shift from urban government to urban governance is one of the developments that led to the rise of the 'entrepreneurial city', with an emphasis on innovation, new technology, labour market flexibility and a revision of social policy. Beyes (2009) states that the concept of entrepreneurial cities 'has engendered a political agenda that includes shifting public sector activities to the private sector, empowering urban residents to become entrepreneurs and focusing on place marketing and 'boosterism'' (p. 103).

In the literature on entrepreneurial cities the 'entrepreneur' in the entrepreneurial city is considered to be the municipal government (Harvey 1989; Sbragia 1996; Hall and Hubbard 1996; Jessop 1998; MacLeod 2002; Ward 2003; Jonas and While 2007; Lauermann 2018). In the Netherlands, municipal governments use 'enterprise language' in different ways. Dutch municipal governments have, as a result of national decentralisations and a transfer of responsibilities, reframed their role from service providers to 'facilitators' or 'enablers'. This means that civil servants and social workers need to adjust to a different role and focus on empowering rather than serving citizens. Empowering rather than serving is also one of the ten principles for becoming a more 'entrepreneurial government' introduced by Osborne and Gaebler (1992) in their book 'Reinventing Government'. The other principles include: 'steering rather than rowing', 'prevention rather than cure', 'earning rather than spending', 'funding outcomes, not inputs', 'meeting the needs of the customer, not the bureaucracy', 'from hierarchy to participation and teamwork', 'injecting competition into service delivery', 'transform rule-driven organization' and 'leveraging change through the market' (Osborne and Gaebler 1992). To promote innovation in Dutch municipal governments, civil servants are also requested to 'experiment' and think 'outside the box' and enable active and entrepreneurial citizens to co-develop their living environment.

According to Hoekema (2007), changes in the institutional order have led to more horizontal relations based on cooperation and negotiation between the traditionally distinct spheres of governments, markets and civil society and created the advent of the 'entrepreneurial citizen'. Entrepreneurial citizens are thus embedded within the broader development of entrepreneurial cities and entrepreneurial governments in a changing institutional order. In promoting the city and the local government as 'entrepreneurial' expectations about the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of citizens are also communicated. We will use the conceptions of the entrepreneurial

city, the entrepreneurial government, the entrepreneurial civil servant/social worker and 'entrepreneurial citizen' as conceptual dimensions during our analysis to better understand how cities communicate the desired entrepreneurial image of the city, of governmental institutions and of the people who live and work in the city.

3.4 Methodology

As mentioned in the Introduction, in this paper we will answer the following research question: how does the language of enterprise manifest itself in the urban policies of Dutch cities and how do local governments use this language to communicate expectations regarding the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of the city's inhabitants? To answer this question, we will evaluate the use of enterprise language and the promotion of enterprise in the urban policies of two Dutch cities. For this purpose, we have applied a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

3.4.1 Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

The basic assumption underlying discourse analysis is that language shapes our view of the world and is not neutral or simply mirroring reality (Hajer 2006). Discourse analysis is a useful approach to identify and understand how particular ideas are privileged as 'truth'. Michel Foucault, also seen as the founder of the discourse approach, defines discourse as 'a group of statements which provide a language for talking about, a way of representing the knowledge about, a particular topic at a particular historical moment' (Foucault in Hall 1997, 44). Fairclough (1995) builds further upon Foucault's definition and describes discourse as 'a language used in representing a given social practice from a particular point of view. Discourses appertain broadly to knowledge and knowledge construction' (p. 56). According to Fairclough (1995), there is a dialectical relationship between language and social reality, meaning that language shapes social reality but language is also shaped by social reality. In other words, in different social contexts, people tend to say different things. A discourse is therefore socially constructed but also socially conditioned.

For this study, CDA is a suitable method because CDA offers, in contrast to content analysis, the opportunity to examine the relationship between the text and the context in which it is produced (Fairclough 1995; Van den Berg 2004). To understand why a certain discourse becomes dominant, we also need to understand the context in which it is produced. CDA assumes that language contributes to the reproduction of power relations and inequality in society of which the 'producers' and 'recipients' of a discourse are not always aware of. The critical element in CDA refers to exposing this process and 'breaking through it'. By making use of CDA, we will examine the language used by policymakers to legitimize ever higher expectations of citizens in urban neighbourhoods. In a small case study, we will also shed light on how these expectations are experienced by citizens themselves.

3.4.2 Analytical approach and selection of policy documents

We chose to compare the urban policies of the city of Rotterdam with the city of Delft in the Netherlands. Rotterdam and Delft are both part of the Randstad, the urban agglomeration of the southwestern part of the Netherlands and part of the Metropolitan Region Rotterdam The Hague (MRDH). Rotterdam is the second largest city of the Netherlands with 644.373 inhabitants (Municipality of Rotterdam 2019a). Many neighbourhoods in Rotterdam are considered 'problem neighbourhoods' and some of them show high poverty levels (Hoff et al. 2016). In contrast to Rotterdam, Delft is a smaller city with 103.169 inhabitants and mainly one (big) 'problem neighbourhood' (Municipality of Delft 2019). On the political level, Rotterdam and Delft are two distinct cities. A right-wing party, named 'Liveable Rotterdam' has been the biggest political party in the city since 2003. Delft on the other side has been ruled by left-wing parties for a long time. The differences between the cities enable us to examine to what extent and how an enterprise discourse manifests itself differently in the urban policies of both cities.

The data collection was done through a multi-stage procedure. We used the municipality's online database to access policy documents and selected all documents in which we expected to find the municipality's vision on the city and its inhabitants. For example, coalition agreements often contain information on what the chosen coalition expects from the city's inhabitants, what matters they aim to focus upon and how they aim to achieve their goals during their coalition period. For this reason, we analysed coalition agreements over the periods 2006–2010, 2010–2014 and 2014–2018 for both Rotterdam and Delft. By analysing coalition agreements over a longer period, we aimed to examine whether an 'enterprise discourse' is apparent and whether it has intensified over time. Based upon our first

reading of the coalition agreements we subsequently selected further documents focussing on different social domains that are related to urban regeneration such as policy on healthcare, labour market and (citizen) participation. The cross-references made in the documents also enabled us to expand our corpus. We selected the documents which present a full policy program with a longterm perspective. Such policy programs are often extensive documents with a clear argumentation structure to legitimize the proposed policy. A chronological overview of the analysed coalition agreements can be found in Table 3.1 (p. 70 - 71). In this overview, we have included the coalition periods, parties and agreements and relevant national reports during each coalition-period. For the purposes of this paper, we analysed a total number of seven documents from the municipality of Rotterdam and six documents from the municipality of Delft. The coding procedure consists of several stages, making use of qualitative analysis software Altas.ti. In the first and predominantly inductive phase, we started by asking ourselves general questions like; what is the text is about? Who speaks and who is spoken to? What is presented as the 'truth' and what kind of arguments are provided to legitimize changes in policy? These questions were intended to make ourselves more familiar with our corpus. Secondly, we focused on the way's citizens are addressed and what roles and expectations are assigned to them (but also what role the city and the local government assigns to itself). Based on the literature, we searched for words which can be considered as cues for an enterprise discourse, such as 'initiative', 'responsibility' and 'active citizenship' and tried to understand in what context these concepts were used. The first reading of the coalition agreements made it visible that such concepts are mainly manifest in the domain of social policy with a strong focus on the neighbourhood level.

TABLE 3.1 Chronological overview of the analysed coalition agreements.

Coalition period	City	Coalition parties	
2006–2010	Rotterdam	– Labour Party (PvdA) – Christian Democrats (CDA) – People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) – GreenLeft (GroenLinks)	
	Delft	– Labour Party (PvdA) – People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) – GreenLeft (GroenLinks) – Technology Students In Politics (STIP)	
2010–2014	Rotterdam	– Labour Party (PvdA) – People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) – Democrats 66 (D66) – Christian Democrats (CDA)	
	Delft	– Democrats 66 (D66) – Labour Party (PvdA) – GreenLeft (GroenLinks) – Christian Democrats (CDA) – Technology Students In Politics (STIP)"	
2014–2018	Rotterdam	– Liveable Rotterdam (Leefbaar Rotterdam) – Democrats 66 (D66) – Christian Democrats (CDA)	
	Delft	– Democrats 66 (D66) – Technology Students In Politics (STIP) – GreenLeft (GroenLinks) – Labour Party (PvdA) – People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD)	
2018–2020	Rotterdam	– People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) – Democrats 66 (D66) – GreenLeft (GroenLinks) Labour Party (PvdA) – Christian Democrats (CDA) – Christian Union – Reformed Political Party (CU–SGP)	
	Delft	– GreenLeft (GroenLinks) – Technology Students In Politics (STIP) – Democrats 66 (D66) – People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) – Labour Party (PvdA)	

	Coalition agreements	National reports
	'Perspectief voor iedere Rotterdammer' [Perspective for every resident of Rotterdam]	Ministry of the Interior. 2010. Werkboek 'Help! Een Burgerinitiatief' [Handbook 'Help! A citizen initiative']
	'Ruimte zien en ruimte maken' [Acknowledging opportunities and making space]	
	'Ruimte voor talent en ondernemen' [Making room for talent and entrepreneurship]	Ministry of the Interior. 2011. Van Doe-het-zelf naar Doe-het-samen Maatschappij. Experimenteren met burgerinitiatief [From Do-it-yourself to Do-it-together Society. Experimenting with citizen initiative] The Council for Public Administration (Rob). 2012. Loslaten in vertrouwen. Naar een nieuwe verhouding tussen overheid, markt én samenleving [Having the confidence to let go. Towards a new relationship between government, market and society] The Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR). 2012. Vertrouwen in burgers [Confidence in citizens] The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP). 2012. Een beroep op de burger. Minder verzorgingsstaat, meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid? [An appeal on citizens. Less welfare state, more individual responsibility?] Ministry of the Interior. 2013. Regel die burgerinitiatieven [Arrange those citizen initiatives] Ministry of the Interior. 2013. De doe-democratie. Kabinetsnota ter stimulering van een vitale samenleving [The DIY Democracy. white paper for stimulating a vital society] The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP). 2014. Burgermacht op eigen kracht? [Citizen power on its own?]
	'Aan het werk' [Let's get to work]	
	'Volle kracht vooruit' [Full steam ahead]	Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. 2014. Implementation Participation Act. Movisie (commissioned by the Ministry of the Interior). 2015. De ondernemende burger [The entrepreneurial citizen]
	'Delft verdient het!' [Delft deserves it!]	
	'Nieuwe energie voor Rotterdam' [New energy for Rotterdam]	The Environment and Planning Act – to be implemented in 2021
	'De toekomst in uitvoering' [The future in progress]	

3.5   Analysis and findings

Based on our analysis of the policy documents we found that the 'enterprise discourse' is more dominantly visible in Rotterdam than in Delft. In the case of Rotterdam, we observed in accordance with the literature, the presence of a hegemonic enterprise discourse covering various (scale) levels, such as the city (the entrepreneurial city), the local government (the entrepreneurial government), the 'level' of professionals (the entrepreneurial professional) and citizens (the entrepreneurial citizen). This conceptual classification to (scale) levels will be used in the analysis below and the interpretation of the results. In the case of Delft, we did not observe the presence of a hegemonic enterprise discourse covering all these different levels. In Delft, the 'language of enterprise' is mainly used to legitimize change in municipal government functioning. However, all these different (scale) levels are mutually dependent. When the municipality of Delft states the aim to change into a more 'entrepreneurial government', this indirectly implies that others also should follow this way even though they are not explicitly portrayed as (evenly) entrepreneurial actors. In the following subsection, we will further elaborate on the differences and similarities between Rotterdam and Delft and how the entrepreneurial city, government, professional and citizen are given shape in both cities.

3.5.1   The entrepreneurial city

In the case of Rotterdam, the use of 'enterprise language' is more than just a way to legitimize change in government functioning or to tackle social disadvantage by promoting self-help. The language of enterprise is also used to reinforce a local identity and identification of citizens with their city. Being enterprising is believed to be part of the 'DNA' of Rotterdam, clearly demonstrated in to following citation: "The city where renewal and innovation is the standard. The standard in municipal policy and the standard in our city and its economy. Rotterdam and its people are driven by enterprise. There is no such word as 'cannot' and there is always room for improvement. Everyone in Rotterdam has the freedom to make something of his or her life, company, idea or dream. In Rotterdam, we are doers. As a city and as people of Rotterdam, we demonstrate guts, nerve but also empathy" (Coalition agreement Rotterdam 2014-2018, 3). In Rotterdam, a local identity is reinforced by presenting the city as 'international, enterprising and raw' and putting emphasis on values associated with entrepreneurship such as 'hard work and a 'can-do spirit'. With the introduction of the slogan 'Rotterdam. Make it happen' in 2014, the city clearly

communicates its expectations of the city's inhabitants. Inhabitants who 'make Rotterdam happen' are people who 'pursue innovation and entrepreneurship, who collaborate and connect, who move forward and have the guts to walk ahead of the crowd, who are bold and stick out their necks, who think about sustainable solutions, who discover, experience and take action' (Municipality of Rotterdam 2019b). It's clear that in Rotterdam, the construction of an entrepreneurial identity is not only meant to create an attractive image of the city for potential investors, but also to encourage the spirit of entrepreneurship among the city's inhabitants.

Although the enforcement of an 'local entrepreneurial identity' was also visible in the coalition agreements over the period 2006–2010 and 2010–2014, it intensified over the period 2014–2018. Compared to other coalition agreements, the coalition agreement over the period 2014–2018 is the only coalition agreement in which the entrepreneurial city, entrepreneurial government, entrepreneurial professionals and entrepreneurial citizens are all emphasized. Encouraging a 'can do mentality' and giving residents of Rotterdam more opportunities to have a say were the major subjects in this coalition agreement. In order to understand why the enterprise discourse became more prominently visible in this period, we should first understand the political shift that happened during that time in the city of Rotterdam.

In 2014, Liveable Rotterdam (Leefbaar Rotterdam) became the biggest party in the city and formed a coalition with the Christian Democrats (CDA) and a social-liberal party named D66. Much of the language used in the coalition agreement corresponds with the language used in the election manifesto of Liveable Rotterdam. The extent to which 'enterprise language' is manifested in urban policies and politics seems to be highly dependent on the political stances of the ruling political party, but also on contextual factors. Encouraging a 'can do mentality' in Rotterdam and spreading the language of optimism and empowerment was also a presumed way to pull the city and its residents out of the economic and financial crisis, of which the (financial) consequences for local governments combined with national decentralisations were clearly felt in 2014. Interestingly, in the following coalition agreement (2018–2022), the enterprise discourse is almost invisible. This can also be related to political changes in the city after the municipal elections in 2018, which led to increased political fragmentation. An unprecedented number of twenty parties with different political orientations were running for elections in Rotterdam. Liveable Rotterdam remained the biggest political party in the city but did not become part of the coalition because most of the other parties were unwilling to collaborate with this party. The coalition for the period 2018–2022 exists of six different left and right-wing parties, forming only a small majority in the local council. In the case of Delft, the imaging of the city as an entrepreneurial city started gradually from 2010 and by 2018, Delft started to attach the same entrepreneurial qualities to the city as Rotterdam, as demonstrated in the following citation:

"In Delft, we aim to make a difference. We do this by demonstrating nerve and guts. The municipality is an open authority, that listens and invites contributions, but we also aim to be an authority that takes control and sets the right course when needed. Delft should take the lead in innovations, stimulating and accelerating projects. We do not shy away from experiments: Delft is the perfect place to serve as a test bed for innovations and provide space for initiatives from the city" (Coalition agreement Delft 2018-2022, 4).

In constructing the city's identity, both cities attach value to the same entrepreneurial qualities such as demonstrating 'nerve and guts' and being open for change and innovation. In 2014, the city of Delft introduced the slogan 'Delft Creating History' with the city's core values being innovation, sustainability and hospitality (Municipality of Delft 2014). These core values need people 'who want to write history', well-educated people who are 'curious and receptive for new ideas', 'inventors and innovators', but also people who show 'hospitality and who help others are emphasised' (Municipality of Delft 2014). In Delft, the language of enterprise is mainly used to reinforce an external image of the city as 'historical city' and 'city of innovation and technology' to attract potential investors and tourists. The image of an 'entrepreneurial city' is not used to construct an identity to which residents of the city should live up to or feel connected to, as is the case in Rotterdam. In the case of Delft, encouraging a mentality change more often refers to changing the mentality within the own government functioning rather than changing the mentality of residents. This will be discussed in further detail in the subsection below.

3.5.2   The entrepreneurial government

In order to 'deal with the challenges the future will bring', the local government of Delft aims to become an 'entrepreneurial government' and describes this role as follows:

"We are pursuing our choice for 'more city' and 'less government' to transform Delft into a coordinating municipality. We are moving from being a municipality that implements policy to a networking, entrepreneurial one that prioritises the development of realistic policy and focuses on ensuring the intended socio-economic effects are achieved [.] The municipality sets the conditions, encourages and incentivises and has the confidence to 'let go'" (Coalition agreement Delft 2014-2018, 16-17).

References to 'entrepreneurial government' started in both Delft and Rotterdam in 2010. Dealing with risk and uncertainty are used as arguments for transforming into an 'entrepreneurial municipal government'. An entrepreneurial government is assumed to be better able to deal with crises and setbacks. In Rotterdam, the same narrative is used to legitimize change in government functioning, but also to assign a more prominent role to residents in this transition and to provide them with more 'space'. Both Rotterdam and Delft repeatedly state they want to provide more 'space' to others (thus legitimizing becoming a smaller government) and have the confidence to 'let go' (by facilitating non-governmental actors to take over or contribute to governmental services). In 2016, the city of Rotterdam introduced the Resilience Strategy of Rotterdam aimed at making the city of Rotterdam better able to cope with uncertainties and risks which would mark the 21st century. This strategy is part of the international 100 Resilient Cities program created by the Rockefeller Foundation (Municipality of Rotterdam 2016b). The main goal of this policy program is to make the city more robust, flexible and inclusive and prepared for the future which is expected to be full of threats and challenges. The introduction of this policy program fits within the dominant narrative that due to rapid changes, a top-down bureaucratic system is no longer effective and that to be effective, efficient and responsive, governments need to be entrepreneurial rather than bureaucratic (Osborne and Gaebler 1992; Du Gay 2004). 'Entrepreneurial' here mainly refers to responsiveness and being able to adjust to constant change. This also refers to citizens who are according to the mayor of Rotterdam key actors for making the city resilient. The Resilience Strategy aims to incorporate resilience in the daily thinking and acting of every resident of Rotterdam. As such, citizens and communities need to be more 'self-reliant' but also be 'strong' and participate in the 'we-society' (Municipality of Rotterdam 2016b). In both Rotterdam and Delft, enterprise language is used to shape and introduce the 'entrepreneurial municipal government'. Most of the ten principles of entrepreneurial governments listed by Osborne and Gaebler (1992), such as 'steering rather than rowing', 'empowering rather than serving' and 'preventing rather than curing' are to more or lesser extent implemented in shaping the entrepreneurial municipal government in both cities. In presenting what inhabitants can expect from the entrepreneurial municipal government, expectations of inhabitants and civil servants are also formed. Both Rotterdam and Delft aim to provide more 'space for others' with a specific emphasis on providing space for citizens to undertake initiatives. Citizens can expect that the municipal government will facilitate their initiative, but citizens are the ones supposed to start them.

3.5.3 The entrepreneurial professional

Since 2015, local governments in the Netherlands have become responsible for a number of tasks that used to be the responsibility of the national government such as youth care, help for job seekers and health care for the elderly and chronically ill (Rijksoverheid n.d.). This is part of the broader process of 'decentralising the social domain'. The idea is that local governments are 'closer' to citizens and therefore better able to provide customized support. At the same time, the national government aims to mobilize what is referred to as citizens 'own powers' (eigen kracht). This process of decentralisation has functioned as the starting point for local governments to change the way they work and to reflect upon their previous strategies with regard to social policy. Both Rotterdam and Delft state the aim to reduce the need for professional care (and thus the costs) and encourage living longer independently (for the elderly).

However, they use different language to achieve this goal. The dominant narrative in Rotterdam is that professionals working in the social domain (which includes welfare services, healthcare, upbringing, integration, social activation and education) have taken over too many responsibilities of their 'clients', making them dependent and not paying attention to their 'talents and powers'. Therefore, citizens are encouraged to take out the most of themselves. Reciprocity and doing something in return is presented as the norm. Especially those who ask for a certain service are obliged to give something back in return as demonstrated in the following citation:

"Creating opportunities for the people of Rotterdam and appealing to everyone to become involved. There is so much talent in Rotterdam. We aim to challenge that talent, because only if we bring out the very best in people, can Rotterdam look with confidence to its future. This is done on the basis of reciprocity. People receive an offer to take part. We ensure that is as attractive as possible. Anyone who deliberately and wilfully ignores these opportunities will have us to answer to" (Coalition Agreement Rotterdam 2006-2010, 2).

The abovementioned citation can be found in the coalition agreement of Rotterdam for the period 2006–2010. This coalition agreement focused on a strong 'social program', putting citizen participation, emancipation and citizenship high on the agenda. Especially welfare recipients, who are (perceived to be) unwilling to participate in society can expect to be sanctioned. This policy remained in all the coalition agreements thereafter. In 2015, we perceive that in the urban policies of Rotterdam, professionals are also explicitly addressed to adapt several entrepreneurial qualities, such as seeking new opportunities. Civil servants and professionals working in the social domain are expected to activate and empower citizens and in doing so they as well should be more entrepreneurial:

"Professionals are entrepreneurial. In their sphere of work, they are always in search of what is not yet known, they are inquisitive, easy to find and approachable for residents. Their main focus is to create demonstrably new opportunities for residents" (Nieuw Rotterdams Welzijn 2016-2019, 13).

In the urban policies of Delft, we found no references to a 'dependency culture' or 'entrepreneurial professionals'.

3.5.4   The entrepreneurial citizen

Both cities facilitate and encourage (entrepreneurial) citizen participation in various forms. This can range from citizen participation in terms of active citizenship such as taking care of your fellow neighbours to citizen participation in terms of entrepreneurial citizenship such as taking over governmental services in the form of the Right to Challenge or the Right to Cooperate (inspired by practices in the UK). In the case of Delft, the use of enterprise language has increased gradually over time. The first coalition agreement (2006–2010) opted for more citizen participation in the context of urban regeneration, but this did not take a very central place in the agreement. No references were made to active citizenship or entrepreneurial citizenship and citizens were addressed as 'customers'. In the second coalition agreement (2010–2014), the effect of the economic crisis is clear. This coalition agreement is mainly about government reforms, cutbacks and investments. A strong focus was put on redefining the role of the municipality. In order to deal with financial setbacks, the municipality should act as a 'directing municipality', the one who brings stakeholders together and facilitates and supports initiatives. This coalition agreement puts a stronger focus on collaboration with citizens and what is expected from citizens is more clearly formulated:

"Our aim is for all adults in Delft to be economically independent. We have confidence in people's own strength and provide support where necessary to enable residents to take on responsibility in accordance with their ability [.] We strive towards structural empowerment – reinforcing people's own strength: from awareness-raising through to advocacy and participation. From emancipation to participation in paid employment and care work. In the area of civic integration, we also lay the foundations for vibrant and active citizenship" (Coalition agreement Delft 2010-2014, 6-7).

References to active and entrepreneurial citizenship remained in the following coalition agreements. In Rotterdam, an enterprise discourse is already visible from the first coalition period (2006–2010) examined and continued to be dominant

until 2018. The municipality of Rotterdam has been working with an 'area-based' approach (wijkgericht werken) since 2009. This meant that policy intends to take into account the specific characteristics and problems of the area concerned and the target groups involved. In December 2012, the area-based approach transformed towards a 'Rotterdammer focused' way of working (Municipality of Rotterdam 2012). The aim of this transformation was to enhance citizen's involvement in policy making and to assign the new role of 'facilitator' to the local government. This development became more visible in the 'Participation Guideline' introduced on 14 November 2013. This guideline provided insights into the way the municipality of Rotterdam aims to shape (citizen) participation and sets the standards for how the municipality itself as an organization should function and deal with citizens and entrepreneurs who want to think along, participate, co-decide and take initiative. With the introduction of this guideline, the municipality of Rotterdam intended to realize a behavioural and mentality change (Municipality of Rotterdam 2013). Entrepreneurial citizens are mentioned in the 'Participation Guideline' and described as citizens who tackle social problems, see opportunities and thus bring about changes:

"The people of Rotterdam take the initiative and contribute towards the city's development. This has always been the case and will never change. The people of Rotterdam stand up for their city, their neighbourhood and their street. All over the city, you find entrepreneurial people who take on problems in society, identifying opportunities to bring about change" (Participation Guideline Rotterdam 2013, 1).

In our analysis, we found that the language of enterprise is used to address certain groups more often than others (such as welfare recipients, migrants, the elderly, and the youth). Especially, people who ask for something (like social benefits) are expected to give something back in return so that they 'learn to invest in themselves and grow' (Coalition agreement Rotterdam 2006–2010).

"We ask people on social welfare benefits to participate actively and not to remain idle. People must make maximum efforts to provide for themselves through paid employment. In individual cases, where paid employment maybe a step too far, we apply the principle of 'one good turn deserves another': we ask people on social welfare benefits to do training courses or voluntary work, community activities or to look after relatives at home. This is not just in return for their benefits, but because our main aim is for people to invest in themselves and grow" (Coalition agreement Rotterdam 2006-2010, 5).

Rotterdam was one of the first cities in the Netherlands that obliged welfare recipients to do voluntary work in return for their welfare benefits (Kampen, Veldboer, and Kleinhans 2019). This has led to much discussion and initial

disapproval from society. In the next sub-section, we will discuss this case in more detail to give an example of how the language of enterprise in urban policy is manifested and subsequently experienced by citizens and society.

3.5.5 'Giving back to the city'

In 2011, Rotterdam introduced the pilot 'Full engagement' in seven neighbourhoods. This pilot aimed to activate welfare recipients with a 'large distance to the labour market' with the ultimate goal to make them economically independent and stimulate outflow from social benefits (Municipality of Rotterdam 2011). Welfare recipients were expected to do voluntary work for at least 20 hours a week in return for their welfare benefit. When welfare recipients refused to do so they could get a cutback on their benefit. This 'Full engagement' pilot continued in 2013 under the name 'Societal effort' (Maatschappelijke inspanning) and was extended to seven more neighbourhoods. In 2015, the newly chosen coalition further developed the pilot into a full policy programme and emphasized the term 'Giving back' (Tegenprestatie). During this coalition period (2014–2018), an action plan was developed aimed to oblige all welfare recipients of 42 neighbourhoods in Rotterdam to 'give something back to the city' (which often meant doing mandatory voluntary work) by the end of the coalition-period (Municipality of Rotterdam 2015). Rotterdam has been ahead of many other cities and developments in national policy, because only on 1 January 2015 the Dutch national government obliged all Dutch municipalities to implement in their local ordinance that welfare recipients should do 'unpaid (societal) useful work' (Participation Act 2015). Municipalities were allowed to fulfil this obligation at their own discretion. This has led to some differences in which some municipalities use more sanctioning methods than others (Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment 2017).

The primary goal of current policies is not to reintegrate welfare recipients with a 'large distance to the labour market' (meaning they are not expected to find a paid job within 24 months) into regular jobs, but mainly to let them to do something in return for their benefits (Eleveld 2014). The argument is that when welfare recipients do something in return for their benefit, they gain work experience which helps them to find a paid job faster. Because the mandatory voluntary work welfare recipients need to undertake is often of little additional value for finding a job or improving their social status and position in society, it has received a considerable amount of criticism stating that this policy is 'humiliating' and 'harassing' welfare recipients (Kampen and Tonkens 2018). In different newspapers, images of welfare recipients picking up litter from the streets or collecting garbage (Van der

Linden 2015; Cats 2015; Walstra 2015; De Koning 2016) and stories of employees such as street sweepers and home care workers who got unemployed because welfare recipients took over their jobs arose (Cats 2015). In Figure 1 (p. 80), we have provided some examples of newspaper headlines on welfare recipients obliged to do voluntary work. One of the welfare recipients expressed his resentment in an interview with The Financial Daily Newspaper (Financieel Dagblad) and stated that he felt criminalized for being unemployed. The Federation of Dutch Trade Unions (FNV) created in 2012 a 'blackbook' filled with (negative) experiences to show that the voluntary work the welfare recipients need to do is a form of 'free labour' and leads to displacement on the labour market (FNV 2012). Peck and Theodore (2000) researched workfare programmes in the US and the UK, and conclude that these programs pay little attention to training and skills upgrading and pressurise participants into accepting contingent jobs. As a consequence welfare recipients move in and out of the labour market as a result of job-loss. Peck and Theodore (2000) argue that workfare programmes normalize contingent work and in turn the demand for contingent work facilitates the extension of workfare programmes, which means that participants are trapped in the lower reaches of the labour market. The same could be the case for the Netherlands. Especially welfare recipients who are deemed least employable (for whom investing in training and skills-upgrading would lead to high expenditures) might be trapped in doing mandatory voluntary work.

FIG. 3.1 FIG. 3.1. Newspaper headlines on welfare recipients obliged to do voluntary work.

Kampen and Tonkens (2018) provide a more nuanced view. They found that experiences of disempowerment or empowerment are dependent on the approach of the caseworker and how they engage with the changing needs of welfare recipients in the course of time. Kampen and Tonkens (2018) conclude that 'workfare policies can be exploitative or humiliating at one stage but empowering at another'. We have chosen to highlight this case because it shows that even though the language of enterprise is dominant in urban policy, this does not mean that it is not being resisted in practice.

3.6 Discussion and conclusion

Our analysis has shown how the language of enterprise in urban policy shapes the city's identity, legitimizes institutional change within local government functioning and with the goal being 'empowerment' formulates expectations of how citizens (and professionals) should behave. The language of enterprise helps local governments in their attempt to redefine their own role and that of others in a changing institutional order. In creating the image of an entrepreneurial city much is being expected from citizens. With increased emphasis in Dutch society on active citizenship, self-organisation, citizen participation and direct democracy the very meaning of citizenship is also being redefined. In the entrepreneurial city, citizens need to deal with a changed interpretation of 'citizenship', in which they are expected to undertake initiative, be entrepreneurial, independent and responsible. For civil servants and social professionals, this also means that they need to deal with a changed job-interpretation, in which they are expected to 'connect' with citizens and trigger them to undertake initiatives. For both groups, local governments use enterprise language to communicate expectations regarding their new roles. When the language of enterprise is used to empower, it targets specific groups such as people on welfare benefits. The targeted groups are invited and stimulated to reconceive their selves as a business and to invest and work on themselves. This finding seems to contradict some scholars who state that enterprise discourses are a neutral form of subjectification, not targeting specific groups, but everyone in society (Rose 1999; Bröckling 2016).

Furthermore, in accordance with Fairclough's (1991) study on enterprise discourses in political speeches in the UK, we can say that enterprise discourses in the urban policies of Rotterdam and Delft appear in different forms and in different domains,

depending on how the discourse interacts with other discourses already situated in these domains. For example, enterprise discourses in Rotterdam and Delft build upon and are reinforced by already existing discourses on 'city of work' and 'city of knowledge'. When comparing the urban policies of Rotterdam and Delft it became apparent that in Rotterdam, the language of enterprise crosses through several domains of urban policy, while in Delft this language is mainly used to legitimize change in the own governmental functioning. The question is why the language of enterprise has gained such dominance in the urban policy of Rotterdam, but not in Delft? The answer to this question most likely lies in the history, economy, culture and political orientation of each city. In Rotterdam, the language of enterprise, manifested in terms like working hard, and being courageous and strong, is used to describe the city and its residents and to take pride in showing how the city managed to develop itself as Europe's biggest port city after the city was heavily damaged during the Second World War. The creation of the popular image of Rotterdam as 'a city of work' has according to Oude Engberink and Miedema (2001) to do with its economic history as an industrial city, but also its social structure being 'highly proletarian' (p. 116). Oude Engberink and Miedema (2001) state that 'most of the population belonged to the working class, badly educated in formal terms, but trained on the job and possessing a high work ethic: a real blue collar world' (p. 116). Delft also used to have 'a thriving manufacturing centre' with most of it built as 'social housing for the factory workers' (Knight 1995, 243). However, after its industrial economy began to decline, Delft focused on presenting the city as a Knowledge City since the early 1990s (Fernández-Maldonado and Romein 2008). With the presence of the largest technological university in the country and several research institutions and knowledge-intensive firms, 'knowledge' seemed to be the strongest point of Delft's economy. In Delft, the language of enterprise is therefore manifested in terms of being innovative and open to change.

This study has contributed to a better understanding of how enterprise language 'works' and can be traced. In our analysis, we mainly focused on coalition agreements. Coalition agreements often convey a story about what should be done in the city and which problems should have priority. However, it could be that discourses on this level do not 'trickle down' to lower levels. By means of a small case study we have attempted to show that citizens are able to resist hegemonic discourses. Further research could, focus more in-depth on enterprise discourses on the level of individual practitioners. To what extent do civil servants, social workers or citizens actually recognize the presence of an enterprise discourse? And do they adapt to the entrepreneurial qualities expected of them in their daily lives? These can be potential questions for further research. We also observed that in Dutch urban policy, enterprise discourses increase or decrease in dominance depending on different factors, of which the economic situation of the city is seemingly the

most important one. In periods of financial setbacks, the usage of enterprise language comes more to the foreground than in times of economic prosperity. In most studies on the enterprise discourse, this discourse is perceived as having 'no serious rivals' (Du Gay and Salaman 1992). We are a bit sceptical in this regard and expect that in periods of prosperity, other discourses might prevail. For example, the latest coalition agreement in Rotterdam (2018–2022) put a strong emphasis on sustainability, better air quality and energy efficiency. We might say that the 'sustainability discourse' now seems to rival the enterprise discourse.

References

Al Sader, N., R. Kleinhans, and M. Van Ham. 2019. "Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration in the Netherlands." *Citizenship studies* 23 (5): 442–459. doi:10.1080/13621025.2019.1621266.

Armstrong, P. 2005. *Critique of Entrepreneurship: People and Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Audretsch, D. B. 2007. *The entrepreneurial society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Betta, M., R. Jones, and J. Latham. 2010. "Entrepreneurship and the innovative self: A Schumpeterian reflection." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 16 (3): 229–244. doi:10.1108/13552551011042807.

Beyes, T. 2009. "Spaces of intensity – Urban entrepreneurship as redistribution of the sensible." In *The Politics and Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship*, edited by D. Hjorth and C. Steyaert, 92–112. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Boonstra, B., and L. Boelens. 2011. "Self-organization in urban development: Towards a new perspective on spatial planning." *Urban Research & Practice* 4 (2): 99–122. doi:10.1080/17535069.2011.579767.

Bröckling, U. 2016. *The entrepreneurial self. Fabricating a new type of subject.* London: Sage.

Burchell, G. 1993. "Liberal government and techniques of the self." *Economy and society* 22 (3): 267–282. doi:10.1080/03085149300000018.

Burrows, R., and J. Curran. 1991. "The discourse of the enterprise culture and the restructuring of Britain: A polemic contribution." In *Paths of Enterprise: The Future of the Small Business*, edited by J. Curran and R. Blackburn, 17–33. London: Routledge.

Cameron, D. 2010. *Big Society Speech, 19*th *July 2010.*
https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/big-society-speech

Cardullo, P., and R. Kitchin. 2018. "Smart Urbanism and Smart Citizenship: The Neoliberal Logic of 'Citizen-Focused' Smart Cities in Europe." *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 1–18. doi:10.1177/0263774X18806508.

Carr, P., and G. Beaver. 2002. "The enterprise culture: Understanding a misunderstood concept." *Strategic Change* 11 (2): 105–113. doi:10.1002/jsc.579.

Cats, R. 2015. "Betaald werk onder druk door inzet van bijstandsgerechtigden." *Financieel Dagblad*, Accessed 28 December 2015. https://fd.nl/economie-politiek/1133286/betaald-werk-onder-druk-door-inzet-van-gratis-bijstandsgerechtigden#

Chapin, T. 2002. "Beyond the Entrepreneurial City: Municipal Capitalism in San Diego." *Journal of urban affairs* 24 (5): 565–581. doi:10.1111/1467-9906.00144.

De Koning, P. 2016. "Geen 'tegenprestatie' in de bijstand? Dan géén vrijheid." *NRC Handelsblad*, Accessed 14 November 2016. https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2016/11/14/geen-tegenprestatie-in-de-bijstand-dan-geen-vrijheid-5287725-a1531777

Deakin, N., and J. Edwards. 1993. *The enterprise culture and the inner cities.* London: Routledge.

Drakopoulou-Dodd, S., and A. R. Anderson. 2001. "Understanding the enterprise culture: Paradigm, paradox and policy." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 2 (1): 13–26. doi:10.5367/000000001101298747.

Du Gay, P. 2004. "Against 'Enterprise' (but not against 'enterprise', for that would make no sense)." *Organization* 11 (1): 37–57. doi:10.1177/1350508404039777.

Du Gay, P., and G. Salaman. 1992. "The cult[ure] of the customer." *Journal of management studies* 29 (5): 615–633. doi:10.1111/j.14676486.1992.tb00681.x.

Eleveld, A. 2014. "The Duty to Work without a Wage: A Legal Comparison between Social Assistance Legislation in Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom." *European Journal of Social Security* 16 (3): 204–224. doi:10.1177/138826271401600302.

Fairclough, N. 1991. "What might we mean by 'enterprise discourse'?" In *Enterprise Culture*, edited by R. Keat and N. Abercrombie, 58–71. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Media Discourse.* London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. 2000. *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.

Federation of Dutch Trade Unions (FNV). 2012. *Werken in de bijstand. Alles behalve gewoon goed werk.* Netherlands: FNV.

Fernández-Maldonado, A. M., and A. Romein. 2008. "A knowledge-based urban paradox: The case of Delft." In *Knowledge-Based Urban Development. Planning and Applications in the Information Era*, edited by T. Yigitcanlar, K. Velibeyoglu, and S. Baum, 221–240. New York: Information Science Reference.

Foucault, M. 2008. *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*, Translated by G. Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gavron, R., M. Cowling, G. Holtham, and A. Westall. 1998. *The Entrepreneurial Society*. London: IPPR.

Gordon, C. 1991. "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller, 1–51. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gray, C. 1998. *Enterprise and culture.* London: Routledge.

Griffiths, R. 1998. "Making sameness: Place marketing and the new urban entrepreneurialism." In *Cities Economic Competition and Urban Policy*, edited by N. Oatley, 41–57. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Hajer, M. 2006. "Doing Discourse Analysis: Coalitions, Practices, Meaning." In *Words matter in policy and Planning – Discourse Theory and Method in the Social Sciences*, edited by M. Van den Brink and T. Metze, 65 74. Utrecht: KNAG/Nethur.

Hall, S. 1997. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* Londen: Sage Publications.

Hall, T., and P. Hubbard. 1996. "The entrepreneurial city: New urban politics, new urban geographies?" *Progress in human geography* 20 (2): 153–174. doi:10.1177/030913259602000201.

Ham, M., and J. Van der Meer. 2015. *De ondernemende burger. De woelige wereld van lokale initiatieven [The Entrepreneurial Citizen. The Turbulent World of Local Citizen Initiatives]*. Utrecht: Movisie.

Harvey, D. 1989. "From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 71 (1): 3–17. doi:10.1080/04353684.1989.11879583.

Hoekema, A. 2007. "'Oefenen in coöperatieve moraal' [Practicing cooperative morality]." In *Macht en Verantwoordelijkheid, essays voor Kees Schuyt*, edited by J. W. Duyvendak, G. Engbersen, M.Teeuwen, and I. Verhoeven, 231–240. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Hoff, S., J. M. Wildeboer Schut, B. Goderis, and C. Vrooman. 2016. *Armoede in kaart 2016 [Poverty Map 2016]*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Howorth, C., C. Parkinson, and A. Southern. 2009. "Does enterprise discourse have the power to enable or disable deprived communities?" In *Entrepreneurship and Growth in Local, Regional and National Economies: Frontiers in European Entrepreneurship Research*, edited by D. Smallbone, H.Landström, and D. Jones-Evans, 281–311. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jessop, B. 1993. "Towards a Schumpeterian workfare state? Preliminary remarks on post- Fordist political economy." *Studies in political economy* 40 (1): 7–39. doi:10.1080/19187033.1993.11675409.

Jessop, B. 1997. "The entrepreneurial city: Re-imaging localities, redesigning economic governance." In *Realizing Cities: New Spatial Divisions and Social Transformation*, edited by N. Jewson and S. MacGregor, 28–41.
London: Routledge.

Jessop, B. 1998. "The enterprise of narrative and the narrative of enterprise: Place marketing and the entrepreneurial city." In *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*, edited by
T. Hall and P. Hubbard, 7–99. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

TOC

Jessop, B., and N.-L. Sum. 2000. "An entrepreneurial city in action: Hong Kong's emerging strategies in and for (inter) urban competition." *Urban Studies* 37 (12): 2287–2313. doi:10.1080/00420980020002814.

Jonas, A., and A. While. 2007. "Greening the entrepreneurial city? Looking for spaces of sustainability politics in the competitive city." In *The Sustainable Development Paradox: Urban Political Economy in the United States and Europe*, edited by R. Krueger and D. Gibbs, 123–159. New York: Guilford Press.

Jones, C., and A. Spicer. 2005. "The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship."

Organization 12 (2): 223–246. doi:10.1177/1350508405051189.

Kampen, T., and E. Tonkens. 2018. "Empowerment and Disempowerment of Workfare Volunteers: A Diachronic Approach to Activation Policy in the Netherlands." *Social Policy and Society* 1–14. doi:10.1017/s1474746418000143.

Kampen, T., L. Veldboer, and R. Kleinhans. 2019. "The Obligation to Volunteer as Fair Reciprocity? Welfare Recipients' Perceptions of Giving Back to Society." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 1–15. doi:10.1007/s11266-018-00082-4.

Kisby, B. 2010. "The Big Society: Power to the people?" *The Political quarterly* 81 (4): 484–491. doi:10.1111/j.1467-923X.2010.02133.x.

Kleinhans, R. 2012. "A glass half empty or half full? On the perceived gap between urban geography research and Dutch urban restructuring policy." *International Journal of Housing Policy* 12 (3): 299–314. doi:10.1080/14616718.2012.709669.

Kleinhans, R. 2017. "False Promises of Co-Production in Neighbourhood Regeneration: The Case of Dutch Community Enterprises." *Public Management Review* 19 (10): 1500– 1518. doi:10.1080/14719037.2017.1287941.

Knight, R. V. 1995. "Knowledge-based Development: Policy and Planning Implications for Cities." *Urban Studies* 32 (2): 225–260. doi:10.1080/00420989550013068.

Lauermann, J. 2018. "Municipal statecraft: Revisiting the geographies of the entrepreneurial city." *Progress in human geography* 42 (2): 205–224. doi:10.1177/0309132516673240.

MacLeod, G. 2002. "From urban entrepreneurialism to a 'Revanchist City'? On the spatial injustices of Glasgow's Renaissance." *Antipode* 34 (3): 602–624. doi:10.1111/1467-8330.00256.

Marttila, T. 2015. *Post-foundational discourse analysis: From political difference to empirical research*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (SZW). 2017. *Handhaving arbeidsverplichtingen*. Den Haag: SZW.

Ministry of the Interior (BZK). 2013. *De Doe-Democratie. Kabinetsnota Ter Stimulering Van Een Vitale Samenleving* [The DIY Democracy. White Paper for Stimulating a Vital Society]. Den Haag: BZK.

Mitchell, D. 2003. *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space*. New York: Guilford press.

Municipality of Delft. 2014. *Stadsvisie Delft 2030*. Delft: Gemeente Delft.

Municipality of Delft. 2019. "Data op maat." Delft.incijfers.nl. Accessed 18 June 2019. https://delft.incijfers.nl/jive?cat_show=Bevolking

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2011. *Rotterdam Werkt! Beleidskader Werk & Re-integratie 2011-2014*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2012. *Motie Rotterdammer gericht werken*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2013. *Participatieleidraad Rotterdam*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2015. *Plan van Aanpak Tegenprestatie. Aan de slag voor je uitkering*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2016a. *Nieuw Rotterdams Welzijn 2016-2019*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2016b. *Rotterdam Resilient Strategy. Ready for the 21st Century*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2019a. "Rotterdam in cijfers." Rotterdam.buurtmonitor.nl. Accessed 18June 2019. https://rotterdam.buurtmonitor.nl/jive?cat_open=Beleidsthema%27s/Demografie

Municipality of Rotterdam. 2019b. "Over Rotterdam. Make it happen." Rotterdammakeithappen.nl. Accessed 7 March 2019. https://rotterdammakeithappennl/gedachtegoed/

Musterd, S., and W. Ostendorf. 2008. "Integrated urban renewal in The Netherlands: A critical appraisal." *Urban Research & Practice* 1 (1): 78–92. doi:10.1080/17535060701795389.

O'Rourke, B. K. 2010. "Enterprise Discourse: Its Origins and its Influence in Ireland." In *Irish Business & Society: Governing, Participating & Transforming in the 21st Century*, edited by J. Hogan, F. D. Paul, and B. K. O'Rourke, 69–89. Dublin: Gill and McMillan.

Osborne, D., and T. Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Welsey.

Oude Engberink, G., and F. Miedema. 2001. "Governing Urban Regeneration: The Case of Rotterdam." *Geographische Zeitschrift* 89 (2/3): 114–124.

http://www.jstor.org/stable/27818904

Painter, J. 1998. "Entrepreneurs are Made, Not Born: Learning and Urban Regimes in the Production of Entrepreneurial Cities." In *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*, edited by T. Hall and P. Hubbard, 259–273. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Painter, J., A. Orton, G. Macleod, L. Dominelli, and R. Pandre. 2011. *Connecting localism and community empowerment*. Durham: Durham University, Department of Geography and School of Applied Social Sciences.

Participation Act 2015. Accessed 3 June 2019

https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0015703/2019-01-01

Peck, J., and N. Theodore. 2000. "'Work first': Workfare and the regulation of contingent labour markets." *Cambridge journal of economics* 24 (1): 119–138. doi:10.1093/cje/24.1.119.

Peters, M. 2001. "Education, enterprise culture and the entrepreneurial self." *Journal of Educational Enquiry* 2 (2): 58–71.

Purcell, M. 2002. "Excavating Lefebvre: The Right to the City and Its Urban Politics of the Inhabitant." *GeoJournal* 58 (2/3): 99–108. doi:10.1023/B:GEJO.0000010829.62237.8f.

Purcell, M. 2008. *Recapturing democracy: Neoliberalization and the struggle for alternative urban futures*. New York: Routledge.

Rhodes, R. A. W. 1996. "The new governance: Governing without government." *Political studies* 44 (4): 652–667. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x.

Rijksoverheid. n.d. "Decentralisatie van overheidstaken naar gemeenten." Rijksoverheid.nl. Accessed 1February 2019. https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/gemeenten/decentralisatie-van-overheidstaken-naar-gemeenten

Rijshouwer, E., and J. Uitermark. 2017. "Citizenship as enterprise: The transformation of Amsterdam community centres into community enterprises." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. Van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason, and S. Syrett, 270–294. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Rose, N. 1998. *Inventing ourselves: Psychology, power, and personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. 1999. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Free Association Books.

Sbragia, A. M. 1996. *Debt Wish: Entrepreneurial Cities, US Federalism, and Economic Development*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sterk, E., M. Specht, and G. Walraven. 2013. *Sociaal ondernemerschap in de participatiesamenleving: Van de brave naar de eigenwijze burger* [Social entrepreneurship in the participatory society: From the good to the opinionated citizen]. Antwerpen: Garant.

Teernstra, A. B., and F. M. Pinkster. 2016. "Participation in neighbourhood regeneration: Achievements of residents in a Dutch disadvantaged neighbourhood." *Urban Research & Practice* 9 (1): 56–79. doi:10.1080/17535069.2015.1045931.

Van Beek, K. 1998. *De ondernemende samenleving Een verkenning van maatschappelijke verandering en implicaties voor beleid* [The entrepreneurial society. An exploration of social change and implications for policy]. Den Haag: WRR.

Van de Wijdeven, T. M. F. 2012. *Doe-democratie: Over actief burgerschap in stadswijken* [Do-democracy: About active citizenship in urban neighbourhoods]. Delft: Eburon.

Van den Berg, H. 2004. "Discoursanalyse." *KWALON* 9 (2): 29–39.

Van der Linden, M. 2015. "Papier prikken is dwangarbeid." *NRC Handelsblad*, Accessed 27 November2015. https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2015/11/27/bl aderen-prikken-is-dwangarbeid 1560114a196406#/handelsblad/2015/11/27/#506

Van Meerkerk, I., B. Boonstra, and J. Edelenbos. 2013. "Self-Organization in Urban Regeneration: A Two-Case Comparative Research." *European Planning Studies* 21 (10): 1630–1652. doi:10.1080/09654313.201 2.722963.

Von Bargen, P., D. Freedman, and E. R. Pages. 2003. "The rise of the entrepreneurial society." *Economic Development Quarterly* 17 (4): 315-324. doi:10.1177/0891242403256783.

Wagenaar, H., and J. Van der Heijden. 2015. "The promise of democracy? Civic enterprise, localism and the transformation of democratic capitalism." In *Reconsidering Localism*, edited by S. Davoudi and A. Madanipour, 126–145. London: Routledge.

Walstra, E. 2015. "Re-integratie Rotterdam is schrikbewind." *Binnenlands Bestuur*, Accessed 28 May2015. https://www.binnenlandsbestuur.nl/sociaal/nieuws/re-integratie-rotterdam-is-schrikbewind.9476675.lynkx

Ward, K. 2003. "Entrepreneurial urbanism, state restructuring and civilizing 'New' East Manchester." *Area* 35 (2): 116–127. doi:10.1111/1475-4762.00246.

Williams, G. 2000. "Rebuilding the entrepreneurial city: The master planning response to the bombing of Manchester City Centre." *Environment and Planning B* 27 (4): 485–506. doi:10.1068/b2626.

Williams, N., and R. Huggins. 2013. "Supporting entrepreneurship in deprived communities: A vision too far?" *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 20 (1): 165–180. doi:10.1108/14626001311298466.

Woolford, A., and A. Nelund. 2013. "The Responsibilities of the Poor: Performing Neoliberal Citizenship within the Bureaucratic Field." *Social Service Review* 87 (2): 292–318. doi:10.1086/671072.

4 Understanding Citizens' Motivations for Developing Community Enterprises (CEs)

ABSTRACT   Citizens' initiatives (CIs) have developed in recent years in a wide range of areas (e.g. health, education, sport and culture) to address a variety of (social) problems. This study focuses on a specific form of CIs, namely Community Enterprises (CEs). CEs involve citizens taking over (or developing) public assets and using entrepreneurial skills and strategies to develop or strengthen the initiative. We conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with citizens involved in the development and maintenance of CEs to identify their main motivations for developing and maintaining CEs. Our findings show that CEs serve three main motivational functions, namely values, understanding and enhancement. First, CEs provide citizens with an opportunity to express their desire to help others and to find meaning in doing so. Second, CEs offer citizens the opportunity to use knowledge and skills they are good at. Thirdly, CEs provide citizens with opportunities to gain feelings of satisfaction and enjoyment.

KEYWORDS   Community Enterprises, Motivations, Volunteering, Active Citizenship, Social Entrepreneurship.

TOC

4.1 Introduction

Many European countries have implemented welfare state reforms (Newman & Tonkens, 2011). As the costs of pensions and healthcare rise due to an ageing population, the welfare state is seen as financially unsustainable and in need of fundamental change. In the Netherlands, the Dutch government declared in 2013 that it aims to transform the welfare state into a 'Participation Society' (Fenger & Broekema, 2019). In the 'Participation Society', citizens are expected to take individual responsibility for collective welfare (Fenger & Broekema, 2019). In the realisation of this transformation, the Dutch government places considerable emphasis on active citizenship (Dekker, 2019; Newman & Tonkens, 2011; Van de Wijdeven, 2012; Verhoeven & Tonkens, 2013). Active citizenship in a local urban context often refers to citizens who contribute to the quality of life in their neighbourhood or (local) community by setting up citizens' initiatives (Van de Wijdeven, 2012). In this context, Citizens' Initiatives (CIs) can be defined as 'collective, informal, social or political activities by citizens as volunteers that aim to deal pragmatically with public issues in their communities' (Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2018, p. 1596).

Recently, many Dutch citizens have shown that they are willing to take on more responsiblity to improve the quality of life in their local environment. Citizens are developing or taking over public spaces and ensuring the provision of public services in various areas such as local safety and welfare, landscaping, healthcare and sustainable energy (Brandsen et al., 2017). At the neighbourhood level, many residents become part of neighbourhood watch groups, manage public green spaces, organize neighbourhood cleaning campaigns, maintain the local playground, and establish local healthcare and energy cooperatives (Blok et al., 2020; Van Dam et al., 2015).

Some CIs are developing in response to cuts in public services such as community centres, libraries, swimming pools and community farms. For many local governments the sale of social real estate has been a means of controlling costs. Citizens who disagree with the cuts and who want to keep these public services available in their locality may start to provide these services themselves (Gofen, 2012). Other CIs are developed by citizens who recognize a lack of services that meet the needs of their communities and so develop new services themselves (Gofen, 2012). This often starts with someone having a good idea and finding like-minded others to initiate it. Thus, the development of CIs is not just a response to budget cuts or the result of policies aimed at promoting active citizenship, but also reflects citizens' own willingness to get involved in their local environment and their demands for more opportunities from governments to have a say in the development and organisation of services in their local environment.

In this study, we focus on a specific type of CI, namely Community Enterprises (CEs). The development of CEs involves taking over (or developing) public assets and using entrepreneurial skills and strategies to develop or strengthen the initiative. Most local governments offer citizens the opportunity to take over or develop a public service in their area, but with limited resources. Therefore, when citizens take over (the management of) public assets such as former public schools, community centres and libraries, they often manage the initiative in an entrepreneurial way by, for example, networking and negotiating with stakeholders, building community support, generating revenues and finding a way to become financially sustainable. Developing ECIs requires, extensive skills, knowledge and time. Most importantly, it requires citizens to be highly motivated for an extended period of time.

Studies on active citizenship provide some insights into how and why CIs develop. However, most studies have not paid much attention to CEs and citizens' personal motivations for engaging in or developing CEs. A better understanding of citizens' motivations can provide national and local governments tools to adequately respond to and support citizens who aim to develop CEs in their local environment. To fill this gap, this study answers the following research question: *what are the main motivations of citizens to develop and maintain Community Enterprises (CEs)?* We have drawn theoretical insights on motivations from the literature on volunteering, citizen participation and social and community entrepreneurship. In doing so, this study establishes links between separate streams of literature. To answer our research question, we conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with key persons from eight different CEs in the Netherlands.

The remainder of this study is structured as follows. In section two, we present a conceptual framework of citizens' motivations for developing CEs based on insights from different streams of literature. In section three, we explain the selection of cases and the analytical approach. In section four, we present our findings and in the final section, we present our conclusions and suggestions for further research.

4.2 Theoretical framework

Citizens who develop and or maintain CEs often do so on a voluntary basis. The literature on volunteering can help to identify the motivations underlying their actions. A well-known framework in the literature on volunteer motivations is the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary et al. (1998). Clary et al. (1998) applied a functional approach to the motivations underlying volunteering and identified six categories of motivations, which are listed in the table below (Table 4.1, p. 92).

TABLE 4.1 Six Motivational Functions Served by Volunteerism (Clary et al., 1998).

Motivational Function	Description
Values	Volunteering provides individuals the opportunity to express values related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others.
Social	Volunteering provides individuals the opportunity to be with one's friends or to engage in an activity viewed favourably by important others.
Career	Volunteering provides individuals the opportunity to obtain career-related benefits.
Protective	Volunteering helps individuals to escape from negative feelings and may serve to reduce guilt over being more fortunate than others and to address one's personal problems.
Enhancement	Volunteering helps individuals to obtain satisfaction related to personal growth and self-esteem.
Understanding	Volunteering provides individuals the opportunity to permit new learning experiences and the chance to exercise, knowledge, skills, and abilities that might otherwise go unpractised.

The VFI was developed on the basis of standardised questionnaires. The VFI was validated in a sample of 427 middle-aged Americans who were active volunteers and cross-validated in a sample of 532 American university students with and without volunteer experience. Respondents reported that the motivational functions *Values*, *Understanding*, and *Enhancement* were most important and that the motivational functions *Career*, *Social* and *Protective* were less important (Clary et al., 1998). Chacón, Pérez, Flores, and Vecina (2011) further specified Clary et al.'s framework by using open-ended questions to identify reasons for volunteering among 1515 volunteers. Their framework includes subcategories for the motivational functions *Values*, *Enhancement*, and *Understanding* and additional categories such as *Organisational Commitment* and *Interest in the Activity*. Volunteers gave an average of two motivations and the motivational function *Values* was identified to be most important mainly the subcategories *Community Concern (Specific Group)* and *Social Transformation Values*. Of second importance was the motivational function *Enhancement*, with the most prevalent sub-categories being *Enjoyment*,

Personal Growth and *Social Relations* followed by *Esteem Enhancement*. The VFI and the additional motivational functions found by Chacón et al. (2011) form our main theoretical framework. This framework has already been successfully translated and applied to the Dutch context (see e.g. Niebuur et al., 2019). In Table 4.2 (p. 95), we have listed the additional motivational functions and subcategories and examples of responses as identified by Chacón et al. (2011). Table 4.2 (p. 95) also includes additional motivations that we found in the literature on citizen participation and community and social entrepreneurship, which we will discuss in more detail below.

Gustafson and Hertting (2017) identified *Contributing one's knowledge and competence* and *Professional Competence* as important motivations for citizen participation (in government decision-making). *Professional Competence* refers to participation on a professional basis without any strong personal interest in the outcomes. The motivational function *Understanding* in the VFI mainly refers to learning new skills and not to practising skills one is good at. In order to represent motivations related to practising knowledge and skills, we have included *Practising Knowledge* as a subcategory.

Given the entrepreneurial nature of CEs, the literature on social and community entrepreneurship can also provide us with insights into citizens' motivations for taking entrepreneurial action. Healey (2015) examines civil society enterprises and notes that they emerge in response to several issues such as:

'dissatisfaction with large-scale organization of service provision, whether by government or private companies, a sense that the public sector is no longer able to relate to or provide for citizens' concerns, the shock of the closure of a valued facility or service, a concern to innovate in new directions and a commitment to sustain communities that would otherwise suffer neglect and lack of attention to their particular circumstances' (p. 111).

Welter (2011) states that community entrepreneurship emphasises 'social commitment, non-profit goals, and benefits for the wider community as (additional) drivers for entrepreneurship besides calculated and self-interested individual behaviour' (p. 170). According to Bailey (2012) community entrepreneurship emerges in response to certain deficiencies in public service delivery and the perception that these deficiencies are not being addressed by government institutions or the market. Kleinhans (2017), who studied community enterprises in the Netherlands, concludes that many community enterprises emerge in former urban regeneration target areas, where due to budget cuts several (public) facilities faced cutbacks or closures. In sum, it seems that citizens are triggered to take entrepreneurial action in their local environment when a valued service or facility

closes, when they are dissatisfied with public service delivery, and when they perceive that no other party will provide a solution for their problem. We have added *Dissatisfaction* and the different reasons on which dissatisfaction may be based as a new motivational function to the VFI framework.

In the literature, we found some similarities between citizens who develop CEs and social entrepreneurs. Both aim to create social impact through entrepreneurship and solving social problems is central to their business models. Thompson, Alvy, and Lees (2000) define social entrepreneurs as people who 'realize where there is an opportunity to satisfy some unmet need that the state welfare system will not or cannot meet…'. (p. 328). Social entrepreneurs do not aim to make a profit (for personal gain) but to create social value. Gabarret, Vedel, and Decaillon (2017) examined the entrepreneurial motivations (the motivation to create a new business) of social entrepreneurs. The first determinant of entrepreneurial motivation they identified is *Dissatisfaction* and the search for satisfaction. Dissatisfaction as a motivator was related to the personal level but also the level of firms and the state. The second determinant of entrepreneurial motivation is *Independence*. Independence is seen by social entrepreneurs as a means to achieve a social purpose. The final determinant of entrepreneurial motivation is *Opportunity*. The recognition of a gap or a social need is the driving force for the creation of the social enterprise. We have therefore added *Independence* and *Opportunity* as new motivational functions to our framework.

In sum, based on the discussion of the literature we have added the sub-category *Practising knowledge* to the motivational function understanding and new motivational functions *Dissatisfaction*, *Independence* and *Opportunity*. Table 4.2 (p. 95) shows all the possible motivations of citizens to develop CEs. This framework attempts to bridge the gap between the separate literature on volunteer motivations and the literature on citizen participation and (social) entrepreneurship.

TABLE 4.2 Motivations of Volunteers (Chacón et al. 2011) including additional motives: practising knowledge, dissatisfaction, independence and opportunity.

Motivational function	Sub-categories	Examples of Responses

Values	– Religious Values
	– Social Transformation Values
	– Reciprocity Values
	– Community Concern Values
	   – Helping a Specific Territory Values
	   – Helping a Specific Group Values
		– "my religious conviction"
		– "to build a better world"
		– "to help as I was helped"
		– "to do something for my community"
		– "to help children"

Social		– "my friends talked me into it"
Career		– "to acquire professional experience"
Protective		– "due to a personal problem"
Enhancement	– Esteem Enhancement – Personal Growth – Social Relations – Enjoyment	– "the need to feel useful" – "personal enrichment or growth" – "to meet like-minded people" – "I enjoy it and it's fun"
Understanding	– Self-knowledge – Practising knowledge	– "to know myself better" – "to contribute my own knowledge"
Organisational Commitment	– Institutional Commitment – Commitment to the Group	– "I like the organisation" – "I identify with the group"
Interest in the Activity	– Interest in the Specific Activity	– "I like the activity"
	– Interest in Activity with People	– "I want to work with people"
Dissatisfaction	– Public sector not able to provide for citizens' concerns – The closure of a valued facility or service – A concern to innovate in new directions – Lack of attention to the circumstances of certain people	– "because welfare organisations fail to meet citizens' needs" – "to keep the community centre for the neighbourhood" – "to develop a service that is different from government institutions" – "to help residents that are neglected by government institutions"
Independence		– "to achieve social purpose independent from government institutions"
Opportunity		– "because I recognized there was a need for this type of service"

4.3 Methodology

This study answers the question: *what are the main motivations of citizens to develop and maintain Community Enterprises (CEs)?* To answer this question, we conducted semi-structured qualitative in-depth interviews. In this section, we first describe the selection of cases and the recruitment of participants. We then provide more details on our analytical approach and background information on the selected case studies.

4.3.1 The selection of cases and the recruitment of participants

To select the cases, we first searched the internet for CEs in the Netherlands and contacted two national non-profit umbrella organisations that provide advice and financial support to various CEs in the Netherlands. Based on the characteristics of CEs as identified in the literature (see section 4.2), important criteria for the selection of CEs were that they were initiatives for and by citizens (led by the local community) who jointly manage assets (a piece of land or building), aimed at improving the neighbourhood physically, socially or economically (delivering long-term benefits to the local community), and combine social objectives and commercial activities (trading for the benefit of the local community).

Within the limits of our available resources, we contacted 14 CEs by email, telephone and social media and found 8 CEs willing to participate in our research. The others did not respond to the initial email and subsequent reminder. A full overview of the CEs examined can be found in Table 4.3 (p. 100). Section 4.3.3. "Background information case studies" (p. 97) provides more detailed information on the selected CEs. For each initiative, we interviewed between 1 and 4 key persons involved in the development and maintenance of the CE, for a total of 20 interviews. A full overview of the research participants can be found in Table 4.4 (p. 101). Fictitious names were used to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. All participants signed an informed consent form in accordance with GDRP and university research ethics guidelines. Interviews were conducted at the initiative's site and, from March 2020, online via Skype or Zoom, in line with Covid-19 restrictions.

We interviewed key persons with different roles within the CEs, such as board members, business leaders and coordinators. Half of the participants are volunteers; the other half receive some form of remuneration. Most of the participants who receive payment are self-employed. The professions of the participants include the arts, architecture,

business, education, government and health care, from which eight participants are retired. Almost all participants are highly educated. Of the 20 participants, 13 are local residents and 7 live or have lived elsewhere in the target neighbourhoods of the CEs. The age of the participants ranges from mid-twenties to mid-seventies. The number of men and women interviewed is equal (see Table 4.4 p. 101).

4.3.2 Approach

The interviews started with some structured open-ended questions (such as How did you become involved in the initiative? What are your roles and responsibilities? Why did you decide to get involved?), which were followed by further unstructured questions. The questions were derived from the literature review in section two. The interviewees were encouraged to talk about their daily activities within the initiative, how they got involved and why. The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The transcripts were manually coded and analysed. This was done by categorising and coding the interviewees' statements based on both pre-defined codes (deductive coding) and empirical data (inductive coding). The pre-defined codes were derived from the motivational functions listed in Table 4.2 (p. 95).

4.3.3 Background information case studies

The eight selected CEs are located in six different cities in the Netherlands and all started in the period 2010-2015. The first CE is CultuurWerkplaats Tarwewijk (CWT). CWT is a cultural community centre founded in 2014 and located in the Tarwewijk, a neighbourhood in the south of Rotterdam. CWT is initiated by women with a migrant background, men and women interested in literature and the history of the neighbourhood, and social and cultural entrepreneurs. CWT is working to become a social enterprise. By renting out rooms and offering catering services, they want to generate more income and become less dependent on subsidies and funds.

The second CE is Het Wijkpaleis. Established in 2015, Het Wijkpaleis is located in Middelland, a neighbourhood in the west of Rotterdam, and was initiated by local residents. Het Wijkpaleis is a community centre where residents can meet and learn skills by doing, such as repairing, cooking, sewing and programming. In 2020 they moved to a larger building, a former primary school. In the new building, one floor will be rented out to a primary school and the other two floors will house workspaces rented out to small business (creative) entrepreneurs for whom a social return

is agreed in their contract. The ground floor consists of public spaces such as a community kitchen, a textile workshop and a wood workshop.

The Nijkamphoeve communal farm has been in existence for more than 20 years and is located in Escamp, a district of The Hague. Until 2012, the farm belonged to the municipality of The Hague. In 2012, the municipality decided to sell the property. A group of residents wanted to keep the communal farm for the neighbourhood and decided to develop a business plan to take over the property. The municipality decided to sell the farm to the residents for the symbolic value of 1 euro. The residents renovated the farm and added a tea house. The community farm houses various farm animals, develops activities for children and is a place where students can do work experience and volunteers are trained as veterinary assistants.

The fourth CE is the community centre In de 3 Krone. In de 3 Krone is located in the centre of Utrecht and has been run by a subsidised welfare organisation since 1990. In 2013, the municipality stopped subsidising this organisation and decided to sell the property. Local residents and users of the community centre wanted to keep it for their neighbourhood. With the help of a social broker, they were able to rent the building for a longer period. Various social and creative activities are organised for local residents.

The fifth CE is Kruiskamp Onderneemt! (KO!). KO! is located in De Kruiskamp, a district of the city of Amersfoort. An abandoned and empty school was offered by the municipality to citizens for renovation and revival. A group of residents and entrepreneurs took up the challenge, renovated the building and turned it into a meeting place for the neighbourhood. KO! is a place where residents and entrepreneurs can meet, help and inspire each other. KO! rents out former classrooms for parties, sports activities, courses, meetings and other activities.

The sixth CE is Stichting Ik Wil. Stichting Ik Wil is located in the neighbourhood Woensel in the city of Eindhoven. Stichting Ik Wil was initiated by three local residents and was founded in 2013. The three initiators have a background in social work and have experienced that the system is not able to understand and help people living in poverty. They started by renting a room in an old church at their own expense to help local people to develop themselves. Their approach was recognised by the municipality and in 2019 they moved to a former primary school, which they rent from the municipality. The activities organised are aimed at stimulating and empowering people based on their talents.

The seventh CE is De Meevaart. This is a community centre located in the neighbourhood the Indische Buurt in Amsterdam and initiated in 2010. De Meevaart

is a large building of 1800 m^2. It has a theatre, an exercise room and a large kitchen on the ground floor where different groups cook weekly. There are also several larger and smaller rooms where regular users carry out their activities every week, but which can also be rented out for workshops, courses, congresses, meetings or book presentations. All activities are organised by local residents and local neighbourhood organisations.

The last CE is Hotel Buiten. Hotel Buiten is a community café/restaurant located next to the Sloterplas lake in Amsterdam. In 2012, residents and entrepreneurs took the initiative to revive a forgotten piece of green space at the Sloterplas. They started Hotel Buiten in a temporary construction shed. Since 2017, Hotel Buiten has developed into a meeting place for residents and visitors to the park and beach. The team behind Hotel Buiten consists of local residents. More than 60 residents helped to design the building and 180 people contributed financially to the building through crowdfunding.

TABLE 4.3 Background information CE.

Name	Location	Year of establishment	Basic aim (retrieved from website)	Website
Cultuur-Werkplaats Tarwewijk	Rotterdam	2014	To meet each other and to jointly develop activities aimed at establishing connections, improving one's own position and that of other neighbourhood residents. Art and culture play an important role in achieving this goal.	https://cultuurwerkplaatstarwewijk.nl
Het Wijkpaleis	Rotterdam	2015	To be a place where neighbours can meet and learn from each other's knowledge and skills through 'making together'.	https://www.facebook.com/hetwijkpaleis/
Community farm the Nijkamphoeve	The Hague	2012	To be an accessible neighbourhood farm. Bringing farm animals closer to people and children in particular. Create awareness for nature, the environment and sustainability in one's own living environment through nature and environmental education to children, parents and the elderly.	https://www.nijkamphoeve.nl/
In de 3 Krone	Utrecht	2013	To promote social cohesion between the residents of the city centre.	https://www.inde3krone.nl/home/3
Kruiskamp Onderneemt!	Amersfoort	2013/2014	To create a place to meet, to undertake activities together, to help each other, to work together and to make use of each other's qualities.	https://kruiskamponderneemt.nl/
Stichting Ik Wil!	Eindhoven	2013	To connect people and be a place where everyone belongs. To make people be able to take control of their own life as much as possible.	https://www.stichtingikwil.nl/
De Meevaart	Amsterdam	2011	To be a place where participation, meeting, learning, development and putting ideas into practice are central. A place for experimentation with new ideas and finding new ways for creating a more harmonious and inclusive society.	https://meevaart.nl/
Hotel Buiten	Amsterdam	2012/2017	To create a place where all types of residents and local parties do things together, enjoy things and meet each other.	https://www.hotelbuiten.nl/

TABLE 4.4 Background information interviewees (with fictitious names).

Interviewee	Gender	Occupation
Jane	Female	Artist/self-employed
Carla	Female	Retired nurse
Monica	Female	Retired facility manager
Leo	Male	Retired economist/self-employed
David	Male	Banker/employed
Linda	Female	Architectural historian/self-employed
Frank	Male	Retired civil servant
Joe	Male	Retired personnel management advisor and policy officer
Ian	Male	Retired civil servant
Vincent	Male	Retired head of high school internship office
Daniel	Male	Social worker/self-employed within initiative
Senna	Female	Social worker/self-employed within initiative
Jenna	Female	Therapist/self-employed
Roy	Male	Employed within initiative
Imran	Male	Computer scientist/self-employed
Mark	Male	Retired civil servant
Sara	Female	Self-employed within initiative
Melissa	Female	Artist/Self-employed within initiative
Julia	Female	Dancer/Self-employed within initiative
Anna	Female	Volunteer organization consultant/employed

4.4 Findings

The interviews revealed that citizens in our CE report different motivations for engaging in the development and continuation of CEs. In our findings below, we present our analysis of the motivational functions based on the theoretical framework outlined in section 2 (see Table 4.2, p. 95).

4.4.1 Motivational function: Values

The majority of interviewees (16 out of 20) are motivated by the motivational function Values. In particular, community concern values (14), social change values (7) and reciprocity values (2). Other values, such as religious values, were mentioned only once.

Community concern values were expressed in motivations where respondents indicated that they wanted to contribute to local community building and make the neighbourhood or city a nicer place to live. Several interviewees stated that they cared about their city, their neighbourhood and their neighbours. They like to help their neighbours and are proud of their neighbourhood and city. Community concern values were also expressed in a willingness to help specific groups that respondents felt were lagging behind in society or not receiving enough support, such as children growing up in poverty, people with disabilities or people who feel lonely.

Social transformation values were expressed in motivations in which interviewees indicated that they aim to make a difference and that they feel satisfied when they can see the impact their initiative has on individuals, the community or the neighbourhood. They feel that they are working on something that feels right and that they are contributing to something bigger than themselves. Some interviewees have goals such as creating a social movement or societal change. Sara, for example, believes that people in disadvantaged positions do not get the help they need from government institutions to develop themselves. She is happy to be part of an initiative that recognises the talents of disadvantaged people and gives them the right amount of attention and support, such as training. Seeing people from disadvantaged backgrounds develop and feel empowered gives Sara great satisfaction and she hopes this will have an impact on future generations, as she explains in the following quote:

"You see that you're doing something that has real added value for people's lives. You see them grow, you see them getting a new job or joining a study programme, you see them finding happiness, becoming a role model for their own children, and that's what it's all about. People often talk about wanting to change the world, but you'll never manage that with one or two people or a small club. But on a very small scale, in such a small country, in such a neighbourhood, you can change something that may have an even greater effect in the future" (Sara)

Reciprocity values were mentioned by two interviewees, Ian and Carla. Ian, a retired civil servant and board member of one of the initiatives, indicated that now that he was retired he wanted to spend his time helping people who were left behind in society. Ian felt that he should give something back to the community as he pointed out that he had always been paid by the community (through taxpayers' money). Carla had lived next door to the community centre for 35 years and used it frequently. When the community centre was about to close, she immediately volunteered to give something back to the place that had given her so much pleasure.

4.4.2 Motivational function: Dissatisfaction

In addition to values, dissatisfaction with the provision of government services was an important driver for just over half of our respondents (11). Dissatisfaction was an important driver for respondents who had taken over a former public service, such as a community centre or a communal farm. They used terms such as 'ridiculous', 'misguided', 'absurd' and 'stupid' to express their dissatisfaction with the local authority's decision to cut public services. When they heard the news of the closure of the public service, their first reaction was to resist and form an action group to keep the service open. For a few interviewees, dissatisfaction with the provision of government services was a driving force in finding new ways of delivering public services. Daniel, for example, had worked as a social worker and had come to the conclusion that local authorities and subsidised welfare organisations were unable to provide the help that people in disadvantaged situations needed. Together with two like-minded residents, he rented a space where they help their disadvantaged neighbours using a different approach to that of local government or subsidised welfare organisations. Daniel explains that in order to help people they need to 'be organised, but not become an organisation'. As they work from the 'lifeworld' of the residents, being seen as an organisation and becoming part of the 'system-world' could get in the way of sticking to their ideals and achieving their goals. In the following quote, Daniel explains why avoiding becoming part of the system world is so important to achieving their goal:

"It's really important that we are not seen as an organisation, but as engaged people, active residents who are together giving shape to a movement to do things differently, so that people living in poverty also get a chance. If you are seen as an organisation, you will be treated like one, and you will have to move along with the system as an organisation, and before you know it you've lost your individuality and you become money-driven, you own real estate, you have to take on staff and all at once you have little scope left to follow that idealism" (Daniel)

4.4.3 Motivational function: Enhancement

Another motivational function often mentioned was enhancement (11). Enhancement can refer to the need to feel useful, personal growth, social relations and enjoyment. Our interviewees mainly mentioned enjoyment. Interviewees said that they enjoyed various things about the initiative, such as the location, the way it was organised, the activities that were carried out, the people involved, the role they played, and seeing the fruits of their efforts and the impact their initiative had on their local environment. The interviewees were proud of what they had been able to set up and achieve. For example, Ana was happy to see that residents enjoyed visiting their community café/restaurant and that the space they had created had become part of the neighbourhood. These small changes to her local environment made Ana change the way she thought about contributing to society, as she explains in the following quote:

"When first of all there's no building, and then there is one and you go there with your children, then that's really great and it belongs there and more people are happy with it and it has a certain function. I used to think really big, I thought I would save the world at the very least, solve the issue of world peace, that must be possible, ha ha. And now I am happy just to pay attention to and look after and see what is happening right around me and to contribute to that" (Anna)

Motivations related to self-esteem, social relations and personal growth did not seem to be of much importance to our interviewees. Only one interviewee mentioned that he deliberately chose to get involved in order to get out of his own 'social bubble' and meet people he would not otherwise meet. Two interviewees, Mark and Jane, mentioned a type of motivation that could be related to personal growth, namely the search for a challenge. Mark and Jane both stated that they liked to be challenged and that they would not be involved in the initiative if it was in a neighbourhood with a limited number of problems. They both volunteered in neighbourhoods where the social and economic problems were greater than in their own neighbourhood. Mark, for example, stated:

"If you do something here, everyone thinks it's something special, and I don't get that feeling in my own neighbourhood. So I experience more challenge here". And Jane stated: *"Kralingen or Hillegersberg in a well-functioning neighbourhood, or in the centre (of Rotterdam) organising a place with cultural entrepreneurship where we can all cosy up together, I don't see any challenge in that at all. I have a fairly socially-minded approach, so there where the greatest poverty or misery is, that's where the challenge lies, not where things are going well"*

4.4.4 Motivational function: Understanding

The motivational function understanding was also mentioned quite often (10). The motivational understanding refers to new learning experiences and the opportunity to practice knowledge, skills and abilities. For nine interviewees, their involvement in the initiative gave them the opportunity to practice skills and knowledge they were good at. These interviewees were involved in the development of the initiative because they had certain skills and knowledge that were needed for the development and continuation of the initiative. They were either asked or offered to help. For example, some were former civil servants and knew how to deal with local government, or had a business background and were therefore well suited to being treasurer or business leader, or had the necessary leadership skills, such as Frank, who was asked by his relative to be chairman of the board:

"They didn't have a chairperson, and if I do something then I put my whole heart into it, and it makes no difference whether it's a petting farm or the ambulance service, or something else. I mean there are some people who know their business substantively, and I happen to have good leadership skills and know-how to smooth the way for things. I am also good at dealing with very difficult people. And of course, we have some of those, because we work with people who have a mild mental handicap" (Frank)

Of the nine interviewees who mentioned practising skills as part of their motivation, three stated that their involvement was purely professional and that they had no personal interest in the development or continuation of the initiative. The opportunity to learn new skills was mentioned only once, by our youngest interviewee, Melissa. Melissa is employed by the initiative as a location manager and volunteer coordinator. Her main motivation for accepting the job is to be able to contribute to the development of a place that is meaningful to the residents, where they can come together and learn from each other. At the same time, the flexibility of the job gives Melissa the opportunity to learn more. She can initiate her own projects and is able to identify her qualities and how to use them in relation to the people she works with.

Motivational function: Organisational commitment

Organisational commitment refers to motivations related to an emotional attachment to the organisation and the people involved in it. This motivational function usually refers to people who identify with the objectives of an organisation and therefore choose to volunteer within that organisation. However, most of our interviewees were initiators/co-developers of the initiatives and only a few got involved at a later stage. Interviewees who got involved at a later stage (4) mentioned that they were attracted by the aims and objectives of the initiative and therefore chose to get involved. Interviewees who were initiators/co-developers of the initiative expressed a sense of responsibility for the continuation of their work and the people involved. Jane, for example, mentioned that *"You started working with people here, and you keep going until it's finished, and until there's the possibility for other people to take over"*. Interviewees who took over a former public service, such as a community centre or a communal farm, often had an emotional connection to the place, either because they were frequent users of the building or because they had many memories associated with it.

4.4.6 ## Motivational function: Career

Although none of our interviewees indicated that career benefits were part of their motivation to get involved, their involvement did have an impact on their careers. Just under half of our respondents (9) received financial remuneration for the work they did for the initiative. This was often on a freelance basis and the rates charged were lower than the rates they would charge if they were working for a company. Some said that their involvement was detrimental to their careers, as they spent more time on the initiative than on their day job, which was their main source of income. One of our interviewees, Jane, who works as an artist, also said that 'in the art world it is looked down upon to do something like this'. Conversely, other interviewees mentioned that as a result of their involvement and the success of the initiative, they had developed a certain reputation and expertise among people interested in the development of citizens' initiatives. For example, Imran, who is often invited to speak about their initiative and to advise other initiatives:

"So I'm also asked a lot of times to give advice on things that resemble the Meevaart, in other cities, also in the city here, but sometimes also proposals for projects that I apply for funding for, and then it helps that I am closely connected to the Meevaart. So for me, for my own company and my own work, it has helped a lot. It also has a disadvantage, if that's all you do, then it's as if you belong there. I mean, I don't earn my money from the Meevaart, so I have to make sure I maintain a certain distance, without being distant" (Imran)

Being recognised and having a reputation directly linked to the initiative can overshadow other identities. Jenna, for example, gave up her previous job and threw herself into organising the initiative. She took on the role of community leader and was able to earn a salary. However, after a while she decided to stop, but found it very difficult to return to her former job as a therapist because everyone in the neighbourhood knew her as the head of the initiative and no one knew she was a therapist. Daniel also found a way to create a living for himself and others through the initiative, which is also part of the goal they have with the initiative as he explains in the following quote:

"If we want to increase sustainability, the resources need to be where they are most needed, and you need someone to arrange that. Imagine, you have a really great idea in mind, but it's not something you can do as a volunteer. You need a job as well. But wouldn't it be great if that was your job? So the finances you can get from funds or from the local municipality, and the costs you make in your own time, your hours as it were, that you could also claim them. And we do that in a way that is socially responsible, we don't charge high rates. Of course, you have to be able to adapt, because we want it to be honest and transparent, and that it is in order. But of course, that's our idealism. That we live and work together" (Daniel)

4.4.7 Other motivational functions: Social, Interest in the Activity, Opportunity, Independence, Protective

The motivational functions *Social*, *Interest in the Activity*, *Opportunity*, *Independence*, and *Protective* were found to be the least important. *Social* refers to motivation related to be with one's friends or to engage in an activity viewed favourably by important others. Some interviewees were asked to get involved by people they knew, but we did not have the impression that they felt some kind of peer pressure to get involved. *Interest in the Activity* refers to an interest in the activity involved in volunteering, rather than in volunteering itself or the aims of the organization. Our interviewees did not specifically mention an interest in a specific activity, but they enjoyed several aspects of the initiative. We grouped these motivations under the sub-category enjoyment. *Opportunity* and *Independence* refer to motivations related to the recognition of a need for a certain service and achieving social purpose independent from government institutions. *Opportunity* and *Independence* played a role in the development of some initiatives but were not mentioned as personal motivations for involvement. The motivational function *Protective* refers to motivations related to the need to escape from negative feelings and to address one's personal problems. No one in our study mentioned this type of motivation.

4.5   **Conclusion**

In the literature, Citizens Initiatives (CIs) are defined as volunteer activities by citizens "that aim to deal pragmatically with public issues in their communities" (Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2018, p. 1596). In this study, we focused on Community Enterprises (CEs) involving citizens who have taken over (the management of) public assets, who network and negotiate with stakeholders, build community support, generate revenue and try to become financially independent to sustain themselves. We conducted 20 semi-structured in-depth interviews with citizens involved in the development and continuation of eight different CEs in the Netherlands, with the purpose of answering the question: what are the main motivations of citizens to develop and maintain Community Enterprises (CEs)?

We used the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary et al. (1998) and the more detailed version by Chacón et al. (2011) as our main theoretical framework. The VFI framework is based on six categories of motivational functions for volunteering namely *Values*, *Social*, *Career*, *Protective*, *Enhancement*, and *Understanding*. Overall, based on our findings, we can conclude that CEs serve mainly three motivational functions, namely *Values*, *Understanding* and *Enhancement.* First, CEs provide citizens the opportunity to express their desire to help others and find meaning in doing so. Second, CEs provide citizens the opportunity to exercise knowledge and skills that they are good at. Third, CEs provide citizens the opportunity to gain feelings of satisfaction and enjoyment.

Contrary to previous studies we found the motivational function Understanding to perform a different role for our interviewees. As most of our interviewees were highly skilled, they were less likely to refer to learning new skills as part of their motivation and more likely to refer to using their skills and knowledge for a good cause. For example, some interviewees were involved on a 'professional' basis and did not have a personal interest or emotional connection to the initiative. This could be seen as a form of 'skills-based volunteering' referring to "the practice of using work-related knowledge and expertise in a volunteer opportunity" (Steimel, 2018, p. 133). We believe that motivational functions within the VFI framework should focus not only on what people can 'take', but also what they can 'bring' to an organisation. Further research could focus on 'skills-based volunteering' and help improve the VFI framework, providing more insight into the types of skills that skills-based volunteers bring, and whether their engagement differs from other volunteers.

We also found that dissatisfaction was an important part of our interviewees' motivations for developing and/or maintaining CEs. The different elements of dissatisfaction identified by Healey (2015) proved to be relevant (mainly dissatisfaction with government service provision). Dissatisfaction and the search for satisfaction are considered to be an important part of entrepreneurial motivation (the motivation to create a new business) (Gabarret et al., 2017). The level of dissatisfaction makes our interviewees' motivations rather different from other volunteer motivations found in the literature. It is also questionable whether in some cases we can still speak of volunteering. For example, some interviewees started as volunteers, but as the CE developed and became more financially sustainable, they were able to become paid staff within the CE. A few started out as paid staff, but they are often paid very little and their pay is not commensurate with the time and effort they put into the initiative.

The CEs we studied were all initiated in the period 2010-2015. During this period, the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis hit the property market hard, creating opportunities for citizens to take over vacant properties. As the property market recovered and the housing shortage increased, several CEs lost their space. Although it is too early to assess the impact of the Corona crisis on the development of CEs, it is likely that more office space will become vacant in the coming years as people continue to work from home. This raises the question of whether the pandemic will create new opportunities for the development of CEs.

Acknowledgements

References

Bailey, N. 2012. "The Role, Organisation and Contribution of Community Enterprise to Urban Regeneration Policy in the UK." *Progress in Planning* 77 (1): 1–35. doi:10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001.

Blok, S., M. Buuren, and M. Fenger. 2020. "Exclusivity of citizens' initiatives: Fuel for collective action?" *Journal of Civil Society* 16 (3): 243-259. doi:10.1080/17448689.2020.1794168.

Brandsen, T., W. Trommel and B. Verschuere.. 2017. "The state and the reconstruction of civil society." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83 (4): 676-693. doi:10.1177/002085231559246.

Chacón, F., Pérez, T., Flores, J., & Vecina, M. L. 2011. Motives for volunteering: Categorization of volunteers' motivations using open-ended questions. Psychology in Spain, 15(1), 48-56.

Clary, E. G., M. Snyder, R.D. Ridge, R. D, J. Copeland, A. A. Stukas, J. Haugen, and P. Miene 1998. "Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 74 (6): 1516-1530.

Dekker, P. 2019. "From Pillarized Active Membership to Populist Active Citizenship: The Dutch Do Democracy." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 30 (1): 74-85.

Fenger, M., and B. Broekema. 2019. "From welfare state to participation society: austerity, ideology or rhetoric?" *In Social Policy Review 31: Analysis and Debate in Social Policy,* edited by E. Heins, J. Rees, and C. Needham, 101-124. Bristol: Policy Press.

Gabarret, I., B. Vedel, and J. Decaillon. 2017. "A social affair: Identifying motivation of social entrepreneurs." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 31: 399-415. doi:10.1504/IJESB.2017.084845

Gofen, A. 2012. "Entrepreneurial Exit Response to Dissastisfaction with Public Services." *Public Administration* 90 (4): 1088-1106. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.02021.x.

Gustafson, P., and N. Hertting. 2017. "Understanding Participatory Governance: An Analysis of Participants' Motives for Participation." *American Review of Public Administration* 47 (5): 538-549. doi:10.1177/0275074015626298.

Healey, P. 2015. "Citizen-generated local development initiative: recent English experience." *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 19 (2): 109-118. doi:10.1080/12265934.2014.989892.

Newman, J., and E. Tonkens. 2011. "Introduction." In *Participation, Responsibility and Choice. Summoning the Active Citizen in Western European Welfare States*, edited by J. Newman and E. Tonkens, 9-28. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Niebuur, J., A. Liefbroer, N. Steverink, and N. Smidt. 2019. "Translation and Validation of the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) among the General Dutch Older Population." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 16 (17): 3106. doi:10.3390/ijerph16173106.

Steimel, S. 2018. "Skills-Based Volunteering as Both Work and Not Work: A Tension-Centered Examination of Constructions of "Volunteer"." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 29 (1): 133-143. doi: 10.1007/s11266-017-9859-8.

Thompson, J., G. Alvy, G., and A. Lees. 2000. "Social entrepreneurship – a new look at the people and the potential." *Management Decision* 38 (5): 328-338. doi:10.1108/00251740010340517.

Tonkens, E., and, I. Verhoeven. 2018. "The civic support paradox: Fighting unequal participation in deprived neighbourhoods." *Urban studies* 56 (8): 1595-1610. doi:10.1177/0042098018761536.

Van Dam, R., M. Duineveld, and R. During. 2014. "Delineating Active Citizenship: The Subjectification of Citizens' Initiatives." *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 17 (2): 1–18. doi:10.1080/1523908X.2014.918502.

Van de Wijdeven, T. 2012. Doe-democratie: Over actief burgerschap in stadswijken [Do-democracy: About active citizenship in urban neighbourhoods]. Delft: Eburon.

Verhoeven, I., and E. Tonkens. 2013. "Talking active citizenship: Framing welfare state reform in England and the Netherlands." *Social Policy and Society* 12 (3): 415 - 427. doi: 10.1017/S1474746413000158.

Welter, F. 2011. "Contextualizing Entrepreneurship—Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35 (1): 165-184. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00427.x.

5 **Developing Community Enterprises (CEs) in the Netherlands**

A competency approach

ABSTRACT   Citizens increasingly demand more responsibilities and opportunities from governments to have a say in organising (local) society, and innovatively apply various entrepreneurial and collaborative skills, assets and strategies to achieve their goals and create societal added value. This study focuses on Community Enterprises (CEs), which are not-for-profit organisations managed by community members and committed to delivering long-term benefits to the local community. The aim of the study is to identify the set of skills, knowledge and attitudes (competencies) required to develop and maintain CEs. Using qualitative in-depth interviews with key persons, we identified the competencies considered essential for the development of CEs. Our findings provide insights into the process of developing a CE, the types of decisions that those involved need to make, and the lessons they have learned. These findings can be used to further support the development of CEs.

KEYWORDS   Community Enterprises, Competencies, Volunteering, Entrepreneurial Competence Framework.

5.1 Introduction

The relationship between citizens and different levels of government has become strained. In several European countries, citizens have become more assertive and critical (Welzel & Welzel, 2014). They are seeking more democratic and transparent decision-making processes and more influence over developments in their local environment. At the same time, European governments have been withdrawing from (parts of) the public domain and assigning more responsibilities to citizens within this domain (Farmer et al., 2012). Governments are slowly giving citizens more opportunities to play a leading role in developing and managing public services in their local area. This development could create more space for private (citizens') initiatives and (social) entrepreneurship to realize public and social objectives (Farmer et al., 2012).

In the Netherlands, citizens are also showing a strong willingness to get involved in their local environment and are demanding more opportunities from governments to have a say in the development and organisation of services in their local environment. For example, Dutch citizens are increasingly participating in neighbourhood watch groups, collectively managing public green spaces, organising neighbourhood cleaning campaigns, maintaining the local playground and developing local healthcare and energy cooperatives (Blok et al., 2020; Van Dam et al., 2015). The academic literature uses different concepts to describe the wide variety of citizen-led entrepreneurial activities such as civil society enterprises (Healey, 2015), community enterprises (Bailey, 2012), self-organization (Uitermark, 2015), cooperatives (De Moor, 2013), or citizens' initiatives (Van Dam et al., 2015).

In this study, we focus on the development of community enterprises (CEs) in the Netherlands. CEs can be defined as "independent, not-for-profit organisations managed by community members and committed to delivering long-term benefits to local people" (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). CEs often manage buildings or land which are used for the well-being or social interest of the local community, generate income by exploiting them and use the surplus to provide social services for their area of benefit (Bailey, 2012). Managing buildings or land for the community benefit requires citizens to network and negotiate with stakeholders, build community support, generate revenue and try to become financially independent to sustain themselves.

The Dutch context provides an interesting context for studying CEs. In the Netherlands, shifts are taking place in the relationship between government and citizens. Recently, the Dutch government submitted the bill 'Strengthening (citizen)participation at a decentralized level' (in Dutch: Versterking participatie op decentraal niveau) aimed at strengthening local democracy and expanding the possibilities for citizen participation (Rijksoverheid, 2020). For example, local governments are encouraged to introduce the Right to Challenge, inspired by the Right to Challenge as applied in the context of the UK Localism Act. This will allow citizens and local associations to submit an alternative proposal for the implementation of local services in their direct living environment. This development seems to indicate that the government is willing to give citizens more space to organise local services which could mean that we will see an increase in the number of CEs in the Netherlands in the future.

Research on CEs has focused on theoretically conceptualising CEs (Healey, 2015; Pearce, 2003; Peredo & Chrisman, 2004; Peredo & Chrisman, 2017; Somerville & McElwee, 2011; Spear et al., 2009; Wagenaar & van der Heijden, 2015), explaining their organisational forms (Bailey, 2012), exploring their durability (Van Meerkerk et al., 2018), and studying local institutional responses to their development (Kleinhans, 2017). These studies have helped us to understand what defines CEs, what conditions are important for their durability, and what (institutional) challenges they experience. However, little is still known about the set of skills, knowledge and attitudes (competencies) that individuals need to set up and maintain CEs and how the competencies of individuals add up and grow when working together. A better understanding of the competencies that individuals apply in the development of CEs can provide (local) governments better tools to adequate reply to the needs of CEs. In this study, we aim, to fill this gap in the literature and provide a better understanding of the competencies required for setting up and maintaining CEs. The following research question will be central to this study: *what competencies do key persons involved in Community Enterprises (CEs) consider to be crucial for the development and maintenance of CEs in Dutch neighbourhoods?* To answer our research question, we conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with key persons from eight different CEs in the Netherlands.

The remainder of this study is structured as follows. In section two, we discuss the literature on CEs, focusing on what is already known about the competencies individuals need to develop and maintain CEs. In section three, we explain the selection of cases and our approach. In section four we present our findings, and in the final section we present our conclusions and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Community Enterprises: definition and characteristics

Community enterprises (CEs) are described as a subset of social enterprises (Pearce, 2003). CE can be defined as "independent, not-for-profit organisations managed by community members and committed to delivering long-term benefits to local people" (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). CEs have a hybrid character; they combine economic activities with social goals. In the literature, the following characteristics are attributed to CEs (Bailey et al., 2018; Healey, 2015; Kleinhans et al., 2020; Peredo & Chrisman, 2004):

1 **Led by the local community** – established by people living and/or working in a specific area;

2 **Owned by the local community** – independent, owned and/or managed by community members;

3 **Accountable to the local community** – locally accountable and highly committed to delivering long-term benefits to the local community;

4 **Trading for the benefit of the local community** – the organisation is not-for-private profit and seeks to generate a surplus that is reinvested in the business/and or community.

CEs can be seen as 'behavioural practices exerted by citizens who demand more responsibilities and opportunities from governments (or other key institutions) to have a bigger say in organising (local) society, and innovatively apply various entrepreneurial and collaborative skills, assets and strategies to achieve their goals and create societal added value' (Al Sader et al., 2019, p. 447). Other concepts used in the academic literature to describe citizen-led entrepreneurial activities are among others: civil society enterprises (Healey, 2015), self-organization (Uitermark, 2015), 'do-democracy' (Van de Wijdeven, 2012) and citizens' initiatives (Van Dam et al., 2015). As CEs hold assets for the community benefit, they develop spaces for encounters that can contribute to more contact between residents, greater involvement in the neighbourhood and better functioning of public services. An example of a CE is 'het Bruishuis' in the city of Arnhem. Het Bruishuis is a former elderly care home taken over by the local community. They rent out spaces to residents who need temporary accommodation. In exchange for a discount on the

rent, these residents do voluntary work in the building and the neighbourhood. In addition to renting out spaces, the building is also home to numerous organisations in the field of health care, culture and social services. Participation in a CE can also have a positive effect on the individual level. For example, through personal growth, appreciation, pleasure and the feeling of doing something meaningful to society.

In the Netherlands, CEs often take the legal form of a foundation (stichting). A foundation is an organisation that tries to achieve a social goal and does not aim to make a profit. A foundation must have a board of directors for day-to-day management and decision-making. The board usually consists of at least a chairman, a treasurer and a secretary. The management duties of the board include the financial management of the foundation. The board must keep the accounts and prepare an annual balance sheet and income and expenditure account. The annual accounts must be signed by each member of the board. Board members can be held accountable for mismanagement. Board members are not employed by the CE, but may receive financial compensation for their work. Depending on the size of the CE, the board members may be actively involved in the day-to-day running of the CE, or they may appoint an executive director who is responsible for managing the day-to-day operations. Unlike an association, a foundation has no members. As a result, there is no need for a general meeting to take important decisions. This does not change the fact that CEs (must) keep a close eye on their community to know what is needed, what is going on and what people can do for the CE. Profits can be made, provided that the distribution of these profits has a social purpose, i.e. that they are ploughed back into the organisation or into the social activities it develops.

CEs have developed in different places in the Netherlands, but many have developed in former target areas of national urban renewal programmes that have ended in 2015 (Bailey et al., 2018). As part of national policy to promote greater citizens' involvement and initiative, local governments in the Netherlands provide financial support to citizens who aim to deal with issues in their living environment. This support is usually awarded once and aimed at short-term, project-based initiatives. When citizens want to take on more structural responsibilities, as is the case for CEs, they must find a way to sustain themselves without structural government support. Therefore, CEs need sources of income. Their income comes from diverse activities such as renting out spaces in their buildings, providing services, trading as cafes, but also funding from large funding and support organisations or sponsorships from local businesses. To achieve this, CEs need people in their organisation with a wide range of skills, who can engage with the local community and stakeholders and build a sustainable organisation in the longer term.

5.3   Competences for developing CEs

The literature on CEs and entrepreneurship gives some insight into the competencies needed to develop and maintain a CE. Van Meerkerk et al. (2018) show in their research on CEs in the Netherlands that setting up a successful CEs requires a combination of 'social capital, entrepreneurial community leadership, supportive relationships with institutional key players and a strong business model' (p. 653). Active persons within CEs share many of the same characteristics as social entrepreneurs. For that reason, it is relevant to further zoom in on the characteristics of social entrepreneurs. According to Bailey (2012), a social entrepreneur is at the centre of many CEs and describes this person as an "unusual and often charismatic type of professional who has a range of skills crossing several traditional boundaries" (p. 14). Thompson, Alvy, and Lees (2000) define social entrepreneurs as people who 'realize where there is an opportunity to satisfy some unmet need that the state welfare system will not or cannot meet...'. (p. 328). The skills that social entrepreneurs within CEs need are according to Bailey (2012) "the skills of the entrepreneur to identify opportunities and ways of exploiting them, a clear vision about the social, economic and environmental objectives of the organisation, and an ability to motivate staff, the directors and the wider community in order to sustain the organisation and to ensure it prospers." (p. 14). Social entrepreneurs can transform the neighbourhoods and communities they serve by opening up possibilities for self-development (Leadbeater, 1997).

Thompson et al. (2000) state that the process of social entrepreneurship involves four steps being: perceiving an opportunity; engaging the opportunity with a mind to do something about it; ensuring something happens by acquiring the necessary resources; championing and leading the project. This process is similar to any kind of entrepreneurial action and also identified in The European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (EntreComp) developed by the European Commission. EntreComp is designed to support the entrepreneurial capacity of European citizens and organisations (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). The framework attempts to create a shared understanding of entrepreneurship as a set of competencies, and it can help us to understand competencies in the context of CEs. The basic assumption is that entrepreneurial skills, knowledge and attitudes can be learned and that an entrepreneurial mindset benefits individuals and societies. Entrepreneurship as a competence is defined as "acting upon opportunities and ideas and transforming them into social, cultural or financial value for others" (Bacigalupo et al., 2016, p. 10).

EntreComp defines three competence areas: 'Ideas and Opportunities', 'Resources' and 'Into Action'. Each area includes five competencies, which, together, form the building blocks of entrepreneurship as a set of competencies. Competence is defined as "a set of knowledge, skills and attitude" and skills are defined as "the ability to apply knowledge and use know-how to complete tasks and solve problems" (Bacigalupo et al., 2016, p. 20). The competence area 'Ideas and Opportunities' includes the following competencies: (1) spotting opportunities, (2) creativity, (3) vision, (4) valuing ideas and (5) ethical and sustainable thinking. The competence area 'Resources' involves the ability to follow-up an identified opportunity and includes the following competencies: (6) self-awareness and self-efficacy, (7) motivation and perseverance, (8) mobilising resources, (9) financial and economic literacy and (10) mobilising others. The competence area 'Into Action' involves the ability to transform ideas into practice and includes the following competencies: (11) taking the initiative, (12) planning and management, (13) coping with uncertainty, ambiguity and risk, (14) working with others, and (15) learning through experience. In Table 5.1 (p. 118 - 119) each competence is explained through a brief description. As the competencies listed can be applied to any entrepreneurial activity, we will use this framework as guide for the analysis of the competencies that individuals apply when developing and maintaining CEs.

TABLE 5.1 EntreComp Competence Areas.

Competences	Hints	Descriptors
Competence area: Ideas & Opportunities		
Spotting opportunities	Use your imagination and abilities to identify opportunities for creating value	– Identify and seize opportunities to create value by exploring the social, cultural and economic landscape – Identify needs and challenges that need to be met – Establish new connections and bring together scattered elements of the landscape to create opportunities to create value
Creativity	Develop creative and purposeful ideas	– Develop several ideas and opportunities to create value including better solutions to existing and new challenges – Explore and experiment with innovative approaches – Combine knowledge and resources to achieve valuable effects
Vision	Work towards your vision of the future	– Imagine the future – Develop a vision to turn ideas into action – Visualise future scenarios to help guide effort and action
Valuing ideas	Make the most of ideas and opportunities	– Judge what value is in social, cultural and economic terms – Recognise the potential an idea has for creating value and identify suitable ways of making the most out of it
Ethical and sustainable thinking	Assess the consequences and impact of ideas, opportunities and actions	– Assess the consequences of ideas that bring value and the effect of entrepreneurial action on the target community, the market, society and the environment – Reflect on how sustainable long-term social, cultural and economic goals are, and the course of action chosen – Act responsibly
Competence Area: Resources		
Self-awareness & self-efficacy	Believe in yourself and keep developing	– Reflect on your needs, aspirations and wants in the short, medium and long term – Identify and assess your individual and group strengths and weaknesses – Believe in your ability to influence the course of events, despite uncertainty, setbacks and temporary failures
Motivation & perseverance	Stay focused and don't give up	– Be determined to turn ideas into action and satisfy your need to achieve – Be prepared to be patient and keep trying to achieve your long-term individual or group aims – Be resilient under pressure, adversity, and temporary failure
Mobilising resources	Gather and manage the resources you need	– Get and manage the material, non-material and digital resources needed to turn ideas into action – Make the most of limited resources – Get and manage the competencies needed at any stage, including technical, legal, tax and digital competences
Financial & economic literacy	Develop financial and economic know-how	– Estimate the cost of turning an idea into a value-creating activity – Plan, put in place and evaluate financial decisions over time – Manage financing to make sure your value-creating activity can last over the long term
Mobilising others	Inspire, enthuse and get others on board	– Inspire and enthuse relevant stakeholders – Get the support needed to achieve valuable outcomes – Demonstrate effective communication, persuasion, negotiation and leadership

>>>

TOC

TABLE 5.1 EntreComp Competence Areas.

Competences	Hints	Descriptors
Competence Area: Into Action		
Competences	**Hints**	**Descriptors**
Taking the initiative	Go for it	– Initiate processes that create value – Take up challenges – Act and work independently to achieve goals, stick to intentions and carry out planned tasks
Planning & management	Prioritise, organise and follow up	– Set long-, medium- and short-term goals – Define priorities and action plans – Adapt to unforeseen changes
Coping with uncertainty, ambiguity & risk	Make decisions dealing with uncertainty, ambiguity and risk	– Make decisions when the result of that decision is uncertain, when the information available is partial or ambiguous, or when there is a risk of unintended outcomes – Within the value-creating process, include structured ways of testing ideas and prototypes from the early stages, to reduce risks of failing – Handle fast-moving situations promptly and flexibly
Working with others	Team up, collaborate and network	– Work together and co-operate with others to develop ideas and turn them into action – Network – Solve conflicts and face up to competition positively when necessary
Learning through experience	Learn by doing	– Use any initiative for value creation as a learning opportunity – Learn with others, including peers and mentors – Reflect and learn from both success and failure (your own and other people's)

Source: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (Bacigalupo et al., 2016).

5.4 Methodology

This study answers the question: *what competencies do key persons involved in Community Enterprises (CEs) consider to be crucial for the development and maintenance of CEs in Dutch neighbourhoods?* To answer our research question, we chose to conduct semi-structured in-depth interviews with key persons involved in the organisation of eight different CEs in Dutch neighbourhoods. The CEs have certain similarities, such as the use of a (community) building, the creation of a business model and the dependence on volunteers, but they also have major differences in terms of their social goals, target group and size of the organisation. Given this complexity, we found that qualitative in-depth interviews were best suited to answer our research question. Qualitative in-depth interviews offer the opportunity to gather rich, descriptive data through which we can much better

understand the different contexts in which CEs develop, and the set of skills and competences that individuals use (or develop) in these different contexts. Had we chosen to conduct surveys, we would have had too few responses to provide meaningful results, as the number of CEs in the Netherlands is still quite small. In the remainder of this section, we will first explain the selection of cases and the recruitment of participants. We will then provide more details on our analytical approach and background information on the selected case studies.

5.4.1 The selection of cases and the recruitment of participants

Two national non-profit umbrella organisations (LSA and KNHM) that advise and financially support CEs in the Netherlands were willing to act as intermediaries and put us in touch with several CEs. Based on the characteristics of CEs as identified in the literature (see section 5.2), important criteria for the selection of CEs were that they were initiatives for and by citizens (led by the local community) who jointly manage assets (a piece of land or building), aimed at improving the neighbourhood physically, socially or economically (delivering long-term benefits to the local community), and combine social objectives and commercial activities (trading for the benefit of the local community). We contacted 14 CEs by email, telephone and social media and found 8 CEs willing to participate in our research. We did not receive a response from the others after the first email, telephone call and subsequent reminder. A full overview of the CEs studied can be found in Table 5.2 (p. 122).

For each CE, we aimed to interview at least four key persons involved in the development and/or organisation of the CE, with a focus on board members and business leaders. However, we found that not every CE has an active board and sometimes only one business leader runs the place. The number of people interviewed therefore varied from CE to CE, ranging from one to four key persons interviewed per CE, for a total of 20 interviews. At the time we interviewed these key individuals, ten were in the role of business leader/location manager, nine were board members and one was a consultant. A full overview of the research participants is provided in Table 5.3 (p. 123). Fictitious names have been used to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. All participants signed an informed consent form before the interview began. Interviews were conducted at the initiative's site and, from March 2020, online via Skype or Zoom, in accordance with Covid-19 restrictions. We interviewed key persons with different roles within the CEs, such as board members, business leaders and coordinators. Half of the participants performed their role within the CE on a voluntary basis; the other half received a small financial payment for their activities. Most of the participants who received remuneration were self-employed.

The participants' professions were in the arts, architecture, business, education, government and health care, from which eight participants were retired. Almost all participants were highly educated. Of the 20 participants, 13 were residents and 7 lived in other neighbourhoods or were former residents of the target neighbourhoods of the CEs. The age of the participants ranged from mid-twenties to mid-seventies. There was an equal number of men and women.

The eight CEs studied are located in six different cities in the Netherlands, and all were initiated in the period 2010-2015 (see Table 5.2, p. 122). All but one are located in neighbourhoods that were previously target areas for urban regeneration. In 2007, the national government launched a national urban regeneration programme targeting areas characterised by an accumulation of social and economic problems such as early school drop-out, high unemployment, health problems, poverty, crime and feelings of insecurity (VROM, 2007). This national urban regeneration programme ended in 2015, after which the government embarked on a new era of decentralisation and privatisation in the public sector. Due to budget cuts, many community centres have been closed in recent years, along with neighbourhood meeting places. CEs have responded to this development by developing and/or taking over former community spaces. The basic aim of the eight CEs studied is to be a place where residents can meet, enjoy and/or develop themselves, but there are differences in the type of assets, aims and activities.

5.4.2   Approach

At the beginning of each interview, we encouraged our research participants to tell us more about themselves and how they became involved in CE. We then delved deeper into their specific role within the organisation and the skills and competencies they needed to fulfil that role. We asked our interviewees questions such as: 'What are your roles and responsibilities? What specific skills do you need to carry out these tasks? To what extent do you think you already had these skills when you started? To what extent have you had to develop certain skills and how have you done this?' The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. We used the EntreComp framework as a guide during the coding phase of the transcripts. We asked the interviewees questions related to the three competence areas, such as how the idea behind the initiative developed, how they found resources and how they put their ideas into action. We compared the interviewees' answers with the competences listed in the EntreComp framework to see which competences overlapped or could be added to the framework. The transcripts were coded and analysed using Atlas.ti coding software. This was done by categorising and coding the interviewees' statements

based on both predefined codes (deductive coding) and empirical data (inductive coding). The pre-defined codes were derived from the EntreComp framework. For example, when a research participant mentioned having a 'business mentality' as an important competence, we linked it to the competence 'financial and economic literacy' in the EntreComp framework. Some competences mentioned by research participants could not be linked to the EntreComp framework, such as knowing how to use social media. Therefore, we added 'digital competencies' as a new competence.

TABLE 5.2 Background information CEs.

Name	Place	Basic aim (retrieved from website)	Examples of activities
Cultuur-Werkplaats Tarwewijk	Rotterdam	To meet each other and to jointly develop activities aimed at establishing connections, improving one's position and that of other neighbourhood residents. Art and culture play an important role in achieving this goal.	Creative workshops: poetry, sewing, gardening, cooking, wood workshops. Art expositions, Providing help with Dutch language and administration.
Het Wijkpaleis	Rotterdam	To be a place where neighbours can meet and learn from each other's knowledge and skills through 'making together'.	Community meals, wood workshop, various creative and social activities.
Community farm the Nijkamphoeve	The Hague	To be an accessible neighbourhood farm. Bringing farm animals closer to people and children in particular. Create awareness for nature, the environment and sustainability in one's living environment through nature and environmental education to children, parents and the elderly.	Housing farm animals, community gardens available for rent, teahouse available for rent, selling products (farm-made honey), playground for children.
In de 3 Krone	Utrecht	To promote social cohesion between the residents of the city centre.	Community meals, art expositions, Mahjong/Bridge, creative workshops, spaces for rent.
Kruiskamp Onderneemt!	Amersfoort	To create a place to meet, to undertake activities together, to help each other, to work together and to make use of each other's qualities.	Cooking, gardening, workspaces, various spaces for rent.
Stichting Ik Wil!	Eindhoven	To connect people and be a place where everyone belongs. To make people be able to take control of their own life as much as possible.	Language courses, computer courses, sewing classes, painting, kids' activities, social support groups.
De Meevaart	Amsterdam	To be a place where participation, meeting, learning, development and putting ideas into practise are central. A place for experimentation with new ideas and finding new ways for creating a more harmonious and inclusive society.	Community kitchen, educational courses, theatre, language courses, cooking workshops, sports activities, computer courses.
Hotel Buiten	Amsterdam	To create a place where all types of residents and local parties do things together, enjoy and meet each other.	Community café/restaurant

TABLE 5.3 Background information interviewees (with fictitious names).

Interviewee	Gender	Occupation
Eva	Female	Artist/self-employed
Wendy	Female	Retired nurse
Vivian	Female	Retired facility manager
Henry	Male	Retired economist/self-employed
Julian	Male	Banker/employed
Celine	Female	Architectural historian/self-employed
Michael	Male	Retired civil servant
Edward	Male	Retired personnel management advisor and policy officer
Peter	Male	Retired civil servant
Paul	Male	Retired head of high school internship office
Simon	Male	Social worker/self-employed within CE
Amal	Female	Social worker/self-employed within CE
Irene	Female	Therapist/self-employed
Thomas	Male	Employed within initiative
Samuel	Male	Computer scientist/self-employed
Walter	Male	Retired civil servant
Dana	Female	Self-employed within CE
Emily	Female	Artist/Self-employed within CE
Ellen	Female	Dancer/Self-employed within CE
Lisa	Female	Volunteer organisation consultant/employed

5.5 Findings

The interviews revealed that our interviewees apply multiple competencies in the development and continuation of CEs and that most competencies could be linked to the EntreComp Framework. We, therefore, used the structure of the EntreComp framework to classify our results. In our findings below, we present our analysis of the competencies that the interviewees applied and/or learned at different stages of their development.

5.5.1 Ideas & Opportunities

The competence area 'ideas and opportunities' consists of the competencies: spotting opportunities, creativity, vision, valuing ideas and ethical and sustainable thinking (Table 5.1 p. 118 - 119). From the conversations we had with interviewees, we found spotting opportunities, vision and ethical and sustainable thinking to be most important. Most interviewees showed being able to spot opportunities for creating value in their communities and were able to identify the needs in their community that have not been met. Each of the CEs studied had a unique history in this regard. In two cases, CEs developed as a direct response to a decision by the local authority to close a valuable public building and sell the land. Residents who used the building and/or felt it was important that it remained available to the local community responded by forming an action group and (successfully) bidding for the building.

In two other cases, the CEs developed as Celine, one of our interviewees, mentioned by *"a bit of a random mix of people who came together and all thought: 'perhaps we can create something together that can help us meet more people, more easily, in our own neighbourhood'".* These CEs were developed by a group of residents who recognised a common unmet need and were willing to work together to address it. In two other cases, CEs were developed by a group of residents who were concerned about the decline of their neighbourhood and the many social and economic problems facing residents. Anticipating the bottom-up movement that the municipality wanted to create, they presented their ideas for managing community assets by and for residents to the municipality, which eventually supported their idea. In the last two cases, the idea of developing or taking over community assets did not come entirely from the residents themselves, but was brought to their attention by a professional working with or for the municipality. Residents interested

in the idea of managing community assets responded to this opportunity and worked together to develop their ideas about the type of facility they wanted to create. In one way or another, local government decisions, whether intentional or not, have in most cases played a role in creating opportunities for citizens to create value for their community. However, not all interviewees perceived it as an 'opportunity discovered', some interviewees felt that their involvement in the CE was something that happened naturally. They didn't actively seek it out, it just happened to them.

In all cases, setting up a CE starts with obtaining assets and defining the objectives of the CE. The importance of **developing a vision for the CE** and sticking to it was mentioned multiple times by interviewees. What does the CE stand for, what goals do they want to achieve and how do they want to achieve them? As CEs in the Netherlands often take the legal status of a foundation, they are obliged to establish byelaws (in Dutch called: *statuten*) and define their objectives therein. This requires knowing how to write a policy plan describing who takes on which role, what the objectives are, who the target group is, which activities will be carried out and what the financial situation will look like. It also requires thinking about which collaborations can be sought and how volunteers will be recruited. Multiple interviewees indicated that in practice, sticking to the ideals that were jointly drawn up during the founding phase is not always easy. Sometimes certain activities threaten to discontinue, for example, due to a lack of volunteers. At times like that, the question arises, how important do we find this activity and why is it important? Sometimes choices have to be made between activities that generate money but have no social impact and activities that cost money but do have a social impact. Achieving social impact is ultimately the goal of every CE, but at the same time, a source of income is needed to ensure its existence. To continue working on the CE's mission and vision, knowing how to find a balance between economic and social activities is essential. The more the CE grows the greater the risk of losing sight of the local community and the ideals you are trying to achieve. In the following quote, Simon summarizes working on the CE as a continuous search for the right resources whereas at the same time trying to remain close to your mission and vision:

"You're always looking for the right resources, without becoming money driven, so that you can always stay true to your mission. And keep each other alert when it comes to that. Being well organised, without becoming an organisation." (Simon, business leader)

The importance that interviewees attach to holding on to the ideals that you wish to pursue as an organization or community can be linked to the following competence that is often mentioned: **ethical and sustainable thinking**. Sustainable thinking in terms of sustainable material use, recycling or energy use was not often mentioned,

but ethical thinking was. Ethical thinking mainly referred to feelings of responsibility and commitment. Most interviewees found it very important to keep to agreements and promises made. They also felt responsible for the well-being of their volunteers and for making sure they are not being overburdened.

Resources

The competence area 'resources' consists of the competencies: financial and economic literacy, self-awareness and self-efficacy, mobilizing resources, mobilizing others and motivation and perseverance (Table 5.1, p. 118-119). We found mobilizing resources, self-awareness and self-efficacy, financial and economic literacy, and motivation and perseverance to be most important. When looking for resources, interviewees indicated that they always keep in mind that these resources should contribute to the mission and vision of the organisation. The mission and vision of CEs is in general to be a meaningful meeting space for the local community, close to their wants and needs, and to provide opportunities for personal satisfaction, development and growth. Interviewees pointed out the importance of reflecting on the course of action chosen, while at the same time, as Simon indicated in the previous quote, trying to avoid becoming a professional service provider. Professional service providers typically provide fixed services to their customers, whereas the idea behind a CE is that the local community determines what services are provided and give meaning to the CE by engaging in different activities every day. Ensuring that the CE *is* and *remains* a meaningful place for the local community requires flexibility and the ability to adapt to developments in the neighbourhood. This is why a continuous process of self-reflection is essential for most CEs as Dana, for example, explains in the following quote:

"To me, we're a social enterprise. And that means – as a social entrepreneur – to avoid becoming inflexible; you need to go with the flow, see what's happening in your neighbourhood, what's happening in the world, what is our position, and how can we address it all. That is a different perspective of an organisation of this kind than thinking: this is me, a welfare organisation for example, and this is what I have to offer, and that's it. If you don't have that, don't offer anything new, you become little more than a room rental company. And then you become inflexible, and nothing else." (Dana, business leader)

Most interviewees, like Dana, preferred to stay away from structure, hierarchy and professionalisation as much as possible and put emphasis on the fundamental differences between their CE and professional service providers. However, interviewees

also recognize that they have learned that a certain structure within the organisation is needed, especially once more people are involved. In the following quote Amal explains why they had to reconsider their stance against structure and professionalisation:

"We were very much anti-structure. We were totally allergic to the word: 'structure'. We avoided that at all costs, and the same goes for managers and hierarchy, but we are now getting to the point that we really need them. Otherwise people start to flap, to get lost in the chaos. So you need a degree of structure, but it has to serve your mission and vision, rather than being the priority." (Amal, business leader)

Developing and maintaining a CE seemed for many interviewees a process of 'trial and error'. None of our interviewees had developed a similar type of organisation before, but almost half of them (9 out of 20) did have prior experience with working for or together with a local government. Some also had experience as board members of other volunteer organisations. Even though most interviewees did not have prior experience with developing bottom-up organisations, more than half of our interviewees did show a high degree of **self-efficacy**. The moment they took on a particular task or role, they were convinced that they could successfully fulfil this task or role. These interviewees had often gained a lot of relevant experience in their working life that they could use in the CE. The following quote from Henry, who is the treasurer on the board of the CE, is a good example of a high degree of self-efficacy:

"To be a treasurer, theoretical knowledge and certainly also real-life experience of financial administration is very handy, even essential. I've held positions in finance at large organisations for most of my life. And I've also been the treasurer at various organisations. I would go so far as to say that financial administration holds no secrets to me." (Henry, board member)

Not all of our interviewees were experts in their role within the CE. When faced with a task for which they did not have the right knowledge and skills, interviewees showed a willingness to acquire new knowledge and skills. They were also well aware of the limits of their abilities and transferred tasks to others within the organisation when they knew they could not fulfil them. Samuel, for example, transferred after two years his role as a business leader to someone with more financial and economic know-how as finances became more difficult for him:

"I was good enough to establish the building and subsequently work on projects, but I think that running something like this demands a much greater level of professionalism than people think." (Samuel, (former) business leader)

Like Samuel, multiple interviewees indicated that a 'business mentality' is required. Most CEs studied had at least one person in the organisation with a financial or economic background, someone who has experience with developing a business plan, applying for funding, justifying subsidies or finding sponsors. This requires strategic thinking and knowing how to get multiple parties on your side. Also, we observed that there is at least one person in the organisation who becomes the 'face' of the organisation, someone who presents the CE to the public and maintains close contact with different stakeholders. This role requires the ability to speak publicly, make connections, and reach out to others. There is also at least one person in the organisation who is digitally competent. Most CEs studied have a website and make use of social media, especially Facebook, to present their projects and activities. This requires the ability to know how to reach your target audience, develop and maintain a social network, know how to use social media and what type of medium to use at what time.

Interviewees aim to develop a stable organisation and eventually be able to transfer their tasks to other volunteers. However, this is not easy to accomplish. The CE remains a non-profit organisation with a social mission whose surpluses will never be like a commercial organisation. There is a continuous lack of resources. This is one of the reasons why multiple interviewees indicated that working on the CE means working on something that's never finished. Thomas, explains in the following quote why he will be always needed in the organisation, which he found to be sometimes quite tiring:

"The job is quite intense, also because of our social function, which means we are not in it for the money and therefore always have to keep a good eye on our finances. It's because we are socially responsible that we will not achieve stable growth. It simply means that it's never... [finished]. We are exploring ways of making things more stable, but I'm always still needed in the process and that does make it tiring." (Thomas, business leader)

Another reason why working on the CEs feels like a never-ending project is because of the continuous turnover of volunteers, which makes the interviewees feel like they are starting all over every time. All the CEs depend on volunteers for the day-to-day activities, and as volunteers come and go, for some interviewees it feels like always filling up a vacuum in the organisation as Dana in the following quote explains:

"Of course, I'd love to see everyone leave and get a paid job. It just makes me really happy when people find their way, find something that they can be proud of and that makes them happier. Only I do miss them when they leave; you end up in something of a vacuum. I always have to ensure that everything stays whole as, for the rest, it's business as usual. You cannot tell people that there's no space available because it's dirty or there's no supervisor available to open the door, we simply can't." (Dana, general director)

Developing and maintaining a CE is very hard work, according to our interviewees. They need to deal with a very diverse group of people, lack of resources and insufficient support from the local government. Several interviewees mentioned asking themselves: why am I doing this? They motivated themselves by remembering the ideals they had when they started the CE. In face of the many challenges and obstacles they faced, interviewees showed perseverance. They felt responsible to the local community and were not willing to give up easily.

5.5.3   Into action

The competence area 'into action' consists of the competencies: taking initiative; coping with uncertainty, ambiguity and risk; working with others; planning and management; and learning through experience (Table 5.1, p. 118 - 1119). Interviewees mentioned working with others and learning through experience multiple times. CEs apply a non-hierarchical organisational structure with the principle of being a community of equals (however in reality some, by virtue of their role, have more to say than others). Working with others in a non-hierarchical organisational structure requires good communication skills. Taking into account the different objectives people have, requires having longer conversations and more patience. According to Lisa, communicating mutual expectations and setting boundaries is important to develop a good working relationship and shared understanding:

"I think it's important not to handle each other with kid gloves all the time, that's no help to anyone. You need to be clear about your expectations and boundaries. There's no need to get angry, but you must ensure you know where each other stands. And you sometimes have to be patient and keep chatting to each other for much longer than you initially thought, because it turns out that you disagree and you first need to properly deal with the matter and get through to each other" (Lisa, board member). (Lisa boardmember)

Learning to have patience was mentioned multiple times by our interviewees. Interviewees worked with volunteers from diverse educational and occupational backgrounds, and diverse cultures, lifestyle and abilities. Working with such a diverse group in a non-hierarchical organisational structure requires being able to put yourself in the shoes of others and to think collectively. Interviewees indicated that they have to deal with all kinds of people at different levels and that they are expected to be able to communicate with others at their level. Sometimes they have to deal with parties whose annual turnover is many times greater and against which

they are a very small party. In these situations, interviewees mentioned that they have learned to not see themselves as a small party, but to see themselves as equals everywhere they go. Irene describes this process as "citizen's emancipation":

"The entire process was something of an emancipation for me. I call it a citizen's emancipation. Because you have to show what you're made of, and learn that you are equal, not inferior, that it's just normal for you to be on the same level as a municipality, a government, wherever you go, but also in terms of the board, even though you work for the board." (Irene, (former) business leader)

Interviewees also showed not to be afraid of experimentation. They showed trust in the volunteers, invested in their skills development and step-by-step delegated more responsibilities to them. Interviewees were not afraid of making mistakes and to let others make mistakes. By doing they learned what works and what doesn't.

5.6 Conclusion

In this study, we focused on Community Enterprises (CEs) involving citizens who have taken over (the management of) public assets, who network and negotiate with stakeholders, build community support, generate revenue and try to become financially independent to sustain themselves. We conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with citizens involved in the development and continuation of eight different CEs in the Netherlands to answer the following question: what competencies do key persons involved in Community Enterprises (CEs) consider to be crucial for the development and maintenance of CEs in Dutch neighbourhoods? We used the Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (EntreComp) as a guiding framework for our analysis.

Our results show that the following competencies are considered important for developing CEs; identifying community needs (spotting opportunities), loyalty to the mission and vision of the organisation (vision), high sense of responsibility (ethical and sustainable thinking), having a business mentality and knowing how to balance between community benefit and economic benefit (financial and economic literacy), being able to communicate with diverse people and having patience (working with others), self-awareness and self-efficacy, digital competences, open to experimentation (learning through experience), and perseverance (motivation

and perseverance). These competencies do not come together in one person but are divided among multiple persons. In general, we found that our interviewees recognized local needs, showed a high sense of responsibility, had an entrepreneurial mindset, were capable of dealing with diverse people and showed much perseverance. As most interviewees were not familiar with developing or maintaining a CE, they learned or further developed many of these competencies by doing.

The competencies we identified are to a certain degree comparable to the competencies of social entrepreneurs as identified in the literature. For example, the competencies that social entrepreneurs within CEs need are according to Bailey (2012) "the skills of the entrepreneur to identify opportunities and ways of exploiting them, a clear vision about the social, economic and environmental objectives of the organisation, and an ability to motivate staff, the directors and the wider community in order to sustain the organisation and to ensure it prospers." (p. 14). However, we found that these competencies do not always come together in one person but are divided among multiple persons within a CE. Therefore, we recommend for further research to not only focus on the competences of individuals, but on the whole set of competences of persons involved in CEs.

We found the EntreComp Framework to be a useful framework to serve as a stepping stone for studying CE's. However, the conceptualisation of the competencies within this framework is in most cases too general. Many questions popped up when trying to link our results to the competencies in the framework. For example, concerning the competence 'spotting opportunities', can we still include it as a competency when the opportunity was brought to your attention by someone else? Can we also include it as a competency when you don't perceive it as an opportunity but as something that just came on your way? And what if someone's actions are mainly necessity driven and not opportunity driven? Also, the competence 'vision' focuses within the EntreComp framework mainly on developing a vision, but according to our interviewees developing a vision is not the hardest part, but sticking to it throughout the entire process is. So, should we classify 'loyalty to one's vision' under 'vision' or 'perseverance'?

This study makes several research contributions. The first is the approach of the concept of CEs through a competence perspective. As far as we know, such a perspective has not been applied before to CEs. The second is that it provides an insight into the process of developing a CE, the type of decisions that citizens need to make and the lessons they have learned. The third is the application of the EntreComp Framework in the context of CEs. We edited and adapted the EntreComp to the context of CEs as CEs are not directly comparable to other enterprises.

While our study makes several contributions, some limitations can be an opportunity for future research. The first limitation is that we mainly focused on the competencies of 'higher' level participants within CEs. In doing so, we risk neglecting the competencies of volunteers who are not involved in the management of the CE but engage in the operational day-to-day activities, such as receiving guests, supervising, offering (technical) support, preparing spaces for rental and keeping the building clean and tidy. We recognize that these volunteers provide the necessary conditions for the CE to operate and their input is just as important.

The second limitation is that our data is collected at one point in time. The CEs studied have been around for several years and have reached a certain degree of stability. They have proved successful and, in many cases, have also received recognition from the local government. As people come and go, they have also gone through organisational changes (and are still undergoing). We learned that there were several key persons at different stages of development, but we were unable to reach them because they had already left the organisation. As a result, we do not have a complete picture of the knowledge, skills and competencies these individuals have contributed. An ethnographic study in which the development of CEs would be tracked over time could develop a completer picture of the different competencies required in the different phases of development, and could also include volunteers on different levels within the organisation.

Acknowledgements

References

Al Sader, N., R. Kleinhans, and M. Van Ham. 2019. "Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration in the Netherlands." *Citizenship studies* 23 (5): 442–459. doi:10.1080/13621025.2019.1621266.

Bacigalupo, M., P. Kampylis, Y. Punie, and G. Van den Brande. 2016. *EntreComp: The entrepreneurship competence framework*: Publication Office of the European Union.

Bailey, N. 2012. "The role, organisation and contribution of community enterprise to urban regeneration policy in the UK." *Progress in Planning 77* (1): 1-35. doi:10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001.

Bailey, N., R. Kleinhans, and J. Lindbergh. 2018. *An assessment of community-based social enterprise in three European countries*. London: Power to Change.

Blok, S., M. Buuren, and M. Fenger. 2020. "Exclusivity of citizens' initiatives: Fuel for collective action?" *Journal of Civil Society* 16 (3): 243-259. doi:10.1080/17448689.2020.1794168.

TOC

De Moor, T. 2013. *Homo cooperans. Instituties voor collectieve actie en de solidaire samenleving*: Universiteit Utrecht, Faculteit Geesteswetenschappen.

Farmer, J., C. Hill, and S. Muñoz. 2012. *Community co-production: social enterprise in remote and rural communities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Healey, P. 2015. "Civil society enterprise and local development." *Planning Theory & Practice* 16 (1): 11-27. doi:10.1080/14649357.2014.995212.

Kleinhans, R. 2017. "False promises of co-production in neighbourhood regeneration: the case of Dutch community enterprises." *Public Management Review 19* (10): 1500-1518. doi:10.1080/14719037.2017.1287941.

Kleinhans, R., N. Bailey, and J. Lindbergh. 2020. "How community-based social enterprises struggle with representation and accountability." *Social Enterprise Journal* 16 (1): 60-81. doi:10.1108/SEJ-12-2018-0074

Leadbeater, C. 1997. *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*. London: Demos.

Pearce, J. 2003. *Social Enterprise in Anytown*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman. 2004. "Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise." *Academy of Management Review* 31 (2): 309-328.

Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman. 2017. "Conceptual foundations: Community-based enterprise and community development." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason, and S. Syrett, 151-178. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Rijksoverheid. 2020. Wetsvoorstel Versterking Participatie op Decentraal Niveau voor advies naar Raad van State. Retrieved from https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2020/06/05/wetsvoorstel-versterking-participatie-op-decentraal-niveau-voor-advies-naar-raad-van-state

Somerville, P., and G. McElwee. 2011. "Situating Community Enterprise: A Theoretical Exploration." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 23 (5–6): 317–330. doi:10.1080/08985626.2011.580161.

Spear, R., C. Cornforth, and M. Aiken. 2009. "The governance challenges of social enterprises: evidence from a UK empirical study." *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 80 (2): 247-273. doi:org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00386.x.

Thompson, J., G. Alvy, and A. Lees. 2000. "Social entrepreneurship – a new look at the people and the potential." *Management Decision* 38 (5): 328-338. doi:10.1108/00251740010340517.

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

Van Dam, R., M. Duineveld, and R. During. 2014. "Delineating Active Citizenship: The Subjectification of Citizens' Initiatives." *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 17 (2): 1–18. doi:10.1080/1523908X.2014.918502.

Van de Wijdeven, T. 2012. *Doe-democratie: Over actief burgerschap in stadswijken [Do-democracy: About active citizenship in urban neighbourhoods]*. Delft: Eburon.

Van Meerkerk, I., R. Kleinhans, and A. Molenveld. 2018. "Exploring the Durability of Community Enterprises: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis." *Public Administration* 96 (4): 651–667. doi:10.1111/padm.12523.

VROM. 2007. *Actieplan Krachtwijken. Van Aandachtswijk naar Krachtwijk*. Den Haag: VROM.

Wagenaar, H., and J. Van der Heijden. 2015. "The promise of democracy? Civic enterprise, localism and the transformation of democratic capitalism." In *Reconsidering Localism*, edited by S. Davoudi and A. Madanipour, 126–145. London: Routledge.

TOC

6 Conclusions and discussion

6.1 Background

Many European cities are struggling to maintain the quality of life and well-being of their citizens. They face unprecedented environmental, democratic, social and economic challenges. These challenges require new forms of cooperation between governments, market actors and citizens. Developing new relationships between these actors is a complex matter, given the changing discourses, expectations, roles, resources and opportunities rooted in different trends.

In recent years, European governments have implemented welfare state reforms (Newman & Tonkens, 2011). With the rising costs of pensions and healthcare due to an ageing population, many consider the welfare state to be financially unsustainable and in need of fundamental change. In the Netherlands, the Dutch government proclaimed in 2013 the need to transform the welfare state into a 'participation society', where citizens are expected to take personal responsibility for collective welfare (Fenger & Broekema, 2019). As part of this participation discourse, the Dutch government places considerable emphasis on active and entrepreneurial citizenship (Dekker, 2019; Van de Wijdeven, 2012; Verhoeven & Tonkens, 2013).

This thesis focuses on the role of active and entrepreneurial citizens in urban regeneration in the Netherlands – a field in which citizens have become an increasingly important actor. Until 2014, this policy area was characterised by a top-down national policy framework and hundreds of millions of investment capital from housing associations and other actors. With less funding from the national government and a significant increase in tasks and responsibilities, Dutch cities face the challenge of maintaining the quality of life in urban neighbourhoods. Partly for

this reason, they are experimenting with new partnerships and new approaches to urban regeneration (e.g. Van Meerkerk et al., 2013; Kleinhans, 2017).

In developing these new approaches, an important role is given to (active) citizens and civil society. Local governments expect citizens to feel more responsible for improving their neighbourhood and their socio-economic position, and invite citizens to develop initiatives to improve the living conditions in their neighbourhood. A specific type of language, 'enterprise language', appears in local policies to communicate these expectations.

There is more at stake than just activating citizens to take on more responsibility. European governments are also struggling with declining trust in national government among their citizens (European Commission, 2018). Citizens have become more assertive and critical (Welzel & Dalton, 2014). They want more democratic and transparent decision-making processes and more influence on developments in their local environment. While general trust in the Netherlands is generally higher than in many other countries (Bovens and Wille, 2008; European Commission, 2018), there is much dissatisfaction among citizens. Many Dutch citizens believe that politicians do not listen enough, are too focused on their own interests and wonder whether politicians know what is going on in society (SCP, 2015, SCP 2022).

Recently, many Dutch citizens have indeed shown their willingness to take more responsibility for improving the quality of life in their local environment. Citizens have started to ensure the provision of public services in various areas such as local safety and welfare, landscaping, healthcare and sustainable energy (Brandsen et al. 2017). At the neighbourhood level, many residents are part of neighbourhood watch groups, manage public green spaces, organise neighbourhood cleaning campaigns, maintain the local playground, and establish local health and energy cooperatives (Aalbers & Sehested, 2018; Blok et al., 2020; Buijs et al., 2016; Van Dam et al., 2015; Eijk, 2018; Mattijssen et al., 2019).

In taking on these responsibilities, citizens face a number of problems. These problems are often related to the co-operation with local governments, but also limitations related to skills and competences as most citizens' initiatives rely on volunteers. Citizens' initiatives can take different forms such as co-operatives and community enterprises (CEs). In this thesis, we have primarily focused on CEs. CEs can be defined as "independent, not-for-private-profit organisations managed by community members and committed to delivering long-term benefits to local people" (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). We see CEs as a manifestation of 'entrepreneurial citizenship', i.e. the interplay between what governments envision as desirable

entrepreneurial behaviour from citizens and what kind of entrepreneurial behaviour citizens themselves exhibit in the context of urban regeneration. The aim of this thesis is **to provide a better understanding of entrepreneurial citizenship and its manifestations in the context of urban regeneration in the Netherlands.** In order to achieve this aim, this thesis has sought to answer the following research questions, each of which forms a chapter of this thesis:

1   What social and political developments have led to an increased emphasis on active and entrepreneurial citizenship? (Chapter 2)

2   How does the language of enterprise manifest itself in the urban policies of Dutch cities and how do local governments use this language to communicate expectations regarding the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of the city's inhabitants? (Chapter 3)

3   What are the main motivations of citizens to develop and maintain Community Enterprises (CEs)? (Chapter 4)

4   What competencies do key persons involved in Community Enterprises (CEs) consider to be crucial for the development and maintenance of CEs in Dutch neighbourhoods? (Chapter 5)

In the summary of findings below, we first briefly discuss the research objectives and findings of each chapter. We then reflect on the findings in the discussion. Finally, we discuss the limitations of the research and make some recommendations for further research.

6.2 Summary of findings and conclusions

6.2.1 Chapter 2: Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration in the Netherlands

To provide a better understanding of the social and political developments that have led to an increased emphasis on active and entrepreneurial citizenship, Chapter 2 provided a literature review of the concept of entrepreneurial citizenship, combining literature on governance, active citizenship, social and community entrepreneurship and urban neighbourhoods. The literature review showed that the origin of entrepreneurial citizenship lies in a gradually increasing appreciation of entrepreneurship in society since the 1970s. According to some scholars, this appreciation has influenced our concept of citizenship, but also the changing governance structures that create space for entrepreneurial citizenship to emerge and flourish (Van Beek 1998; Hoekema 2007). Based on the literature review, we have developed a definition of entrepreneurial citizenship that was missing in the literature, and we provided examples of bottom-up entrepreneurial practices by citizens.

We define entrepreneurial citizenship as a concept that combines top-down and bottom-up processes, with national and/or local governments promoting an ideal citizen with entrepreneurial skills and competencies to create more responsible and entrepreneurial citizen participation in government-initiated arrangements. On the other hand, the concept involves bottom-up behavioural practices from citizens themselves demanding more opportunities to innovatively use assets, entrepreneurial skills, strategies and collaboration with other stakeholders to achieve their goals and create societal value. Unlike other concepts such as citizen engagement, responsibilization and active citizenship, the concept of entrepreneurial citizenship encompasses both top-down and bottom-up developments and places local citizen-led entrepreneurship at the heart of citizenship practices.

Examples of bottom-up entrepreneurial practices by citizens are the recently emerging Community Enterprises (CEs). Chapter 2 concluded that CEs are not a 'new' phenomenon in the Netherlands. Many public institutions in the Netherlands started as 'private (citizen) initiatives' in the nineteenth century (Burger and Veldheer, 2001; Dekker, 2004). Today, as these public institutions face various difficulties, citizens try to find new and innovative ways to provide (public) services locally. However, the

context in which contemporary bottom-up entrepreneurial practices by citizens are developing is very different from the context in which private initiatives developed in the nineteenth century. At that time, private initiatives were mainly facilitated by various religious groups and the bourgeois elite, and were often motivated by Christian-inspired charity or the protection of one's own interests (Burger and Veldheer, 2001). Today, citizens' bottom-up entrepreneurial practices are developing in a context of welfare state retrenchment and amidst debates about the rights and responsibilities of citizens and the role of national and local governments. This translates into policies that actively encourage citizens to take the initiative and lead in solving social problems. This form of citizen activation was not the case in the nineteenth century (Hoogenboom, 2011). Moreover, while churches, trade unions and associations were central places where citizens organised themselves, the neighbourhood has also become an important place for self-organisation. Moreover, contemporary citizens' initiatives cannot rely on a steady stream of funding from philanthropists or the state and therefore develop entrepreneurial strategies (such as generating profits and reinvesting them in the locality) in order to survive. Thus, entrepreneurial citizenship seems to include elements that are significantly different from entrepreneurial citizenship practices of the past.

6.2.2 Chapter 3: Enterprise discourses in Dutch urban policies; a comparison between two cities in the Netherlands

Chapter 3 illustrated how cities promote an 'ideal citizen' with entrepreneurial skills and competences in their urban policies. The promotion of this ideal is reflected in the 'enterprise language' in policy documents. The research question is: how does the language of enterprise manifest itself in the urban policies of Dutch cities, and how do local governments use this language to communicate expectations regarding the desired entrepreneurial behaviour of the city's inhabitants? In line with the work of Deakin and Edwards (1993) and Du Gay and Salaman (1992) on enterprise culture, by enterprise language we mean the focus on 'enterprise' as a (personal) 'quality' or 'rule of conduct' and the language used to evoke entrepreneurial qualities and attitudes in those who live and work in the city. Much has been written about how cities promote themselves as 'entrepreneurial cities', but little attention has been paid to how cities govern their inhabitants to conform their behaviour to the 'entrepreneurial city' ideal. Chapter 3 fills this gap, showing how two cities use the language of enterprise to construct the city's identity, legitimise institutional change within local government, and formulate expectations of how citizens (and professionals) should behave. The language of enterprise helps local governments to redefine their own and others' roles in a changing institutional order.

Using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), we compared the urban policies of the city of Rotterdam with those of the neighbouring city of Delft. Following Fairclough's (1991) study of enterprise discourses in political speeches in the UK, we concluded that enterprise discourses in the urban policies of Rotterdam and Delft appear in different forms and in different domains, depending on how the discourse interacts with other discourses already situated in these domains. Enterprise discourses in Rotterdam and Delft build on and are reinforced by pre-existing 'city of work' and 'city of knowledge' discourses.

In the case of Rotterdam, we observed the presence of a hegemonic enterprise discourse covering different (scale) levels, such as the city (the entrepreneurial city), the local government (the entrepreneurial government), the 'level' of professionals (the entrepreneurial professional) and citizens (the entrepreneurial citizen). In the entrepreneurial city, citizens have to deal with a changed interpretation of 'citizenship' in which they are expected to be proactive, entrepreneurial, independent and responsible. For civil servants and social workers, this means that they have to deal with a changed interpretation of their work, in which they are expected to 'connect' with citizens and encourage them to take initiatives. Especially welfare recipients are encouraged to do 'unpaid (socially) useful work'. For both citizens and professionals, local governments use enterprise language to communicate expectations about their new roles. When the language of enterprise is used to 'empower citizens', it is targeted at specific groups, such as welfare recipients. The target groups are invited and encouraged to re-conceptualise themselves as enterprises and to invest and work on themselves. This finding is at odds with some of the existing literature, where scholars have argued that enterprise discourse is a neutral form of subjectivation that targets everyone in society, rather than specific groups (Rose 1999; Bröckling 2016).

In the case of Delft, we did not observe the presence of a hegemonic enterprise discourse covering all these different levels. In Delft, the 'language of enterprise' is mainly used to legitimise changes in the functioning of the city government. However, we found that the above-mentioned levels are interdependent. When the municipality of Delft states that it wants to change into a more 'entrepreneurial government', this indirectly implies that citizens and professionals should also follow this path, even if they are not explicitly portrayed as (equally) entrepreneurial actors.

We conclude that the dominance of enterprise discourses increases or decreases depending on a number of factors, of which the economic situation of the city seems to be the most important. In times of financial downturn, the use of enterprise language comes to the fore more than in times of economic prosperity. In most studies of enterprise discourse, this discourse is perceived as having 'no serious

rivals' (Du Gay and Salaman 1992). However, we would expect other discourses to prevail in times of prosperity or in the face of 'new' challenges (or crises). For example, the most recent coalition agreement in Rotterdam (2018-2022) places a strong emphasis on sustainability, better air quality and energy efficiency. In other words, the 'sustainability discourse' now seems to be competing with the enterprise discourse.

<h3>6.2.3   Chapter 4: Understanding citizens' motivations in the development of Community Enterprises in urban neighbourhoods and Chapter 5: Developing Community Enterprises in the Netherlands: a competency approach</h3>

Chapter 2 and 3 focused mainly on the government's perspective on entrepreneurial citizenship. For Chapter 4 and 5, we wanted to offer a citizen's perspective on entrepreneurial citizenship. In both chapters we focused on the development of Community Enterprises (CEs) in the Netherlands (bewonersbedrijven in Dutch). CEs can be defined as 'independent, not-for-profit organisations managed by community members and committed to delivering long-term benefits to local people' (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). CEs manage buildings or land that are used for the benefit or social interest of the local community, generating income from their use and using the surplus to provide social services for their benefit area (Bailey, 2012). Managing buildings or land for the benefit of the community requires citizens to network and negotiate with stakeholders, build community support, generate income and seek to become financially self-sufficient to sustain themselves.

Chapter 4 and 5 aimed to better understand the motivations and competencies of citizens involved in developing and/or sustaining CEs. Research on CEs has focused on the theoretical conceptualisation of CEs (Healey, 2015; Pearce, 2003; Peredo & Chrisman, 2004; Peredo & Chrisman, 2017; Somerville & McElwee, 2011; Spear et al., 2009; Wagenaar & van der Heijden, 2015), explaining their organisational forms (Bailey, 2012), exploring their durability (Van Meerkerk et al., 2018), and studying local institutional responses to their development (Kleinhans, 2017). These studies have helped us to understand what defines CEs, what conditions are important for their durability, and what (institutional) challenges they face. However, they provide little information on citizens' motivations for engaging in CEs, the set of skills, knowledge and attitudes (competencies) that individuals need to establish and sustain CEs, and how individuals' competencies add up and grow when working together. Chapter 4 and 5 were based on the same fieldwork, consisting of semi-structured in-depth interviews with 20 key persons from eight different CEs in the

Netherlands. We also obtained additional information about these CEs from their websites and annual reports.

Chapter 4 began by drawing theoretical insights on motivations from the literature on volunteering, citizen participation and social and community entrepreneurship. In this way, we established links between the different streams of literature. A well-known conceptual framework on volunteer motivations is the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary et al. (1998). Clary et al (1998) applied a functional approach to the motivations underlying volunteering and identified six categories of motivations. The Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) and the more detailed version by Chacón et al. (2011) formed our main theoretical framework. We also included additional motivations found in the literature on citizen participation and community and social entrepreneurship.

We conclude that CEs serve three main motivational functions. First, CEs provide citizens the opportunity to express their desire to help others and to find meaning in doing so (similar to the motivational function 'Values'). Second, CEs provide citizens the opportunity to exercise knowledge and skills that they are good at (more or less similar to the 'understanding' motivational function). Third, CEs provide citizens the opportunity to gain feelings of satisfaction and enjoyment (similar to the 'enhancement' motivational function). Contrary to previous studies, we found that the motivational function 'Understanding' played a different role for our respondents. As most of our interviewees were highly skilled, they were less likely to refer to learning new skills as part of their motivation and more likely to refer to using their skills and knowledge for a good cause. For example, some interviewees were involved on a 'professional' basis and did not (initially) have a personal interest or emotional connection with the CE. This could be seen as a form of 'skills-based volunteering', which refers to 'the practice of using work-related knowledge and expertise in a volunteer opportunity' (Steimel, 2018, p. 133).

We also found that dissatisfaction was an important part of our interviewees' motivations for developing and/or maintaining CEs. The different elements of dissatisfaction identified by Healey (2015) proved to be relevant, particularly dissatisfaction with government service provision. Dissatisfaction and the search for satisfaction are considered to be an important part of entrepreneurial motivation (the motivation to create a new business) (Gabarret et al., 2017). Dissatisfaction makes our interviewees' motivations quite different from other volunteering motivations found in the literature, as dissatisfaction is often not mentioned as a motivation in the volunteering literature. It also seemed questionable whether in some cases we can still talk about volunteering. For example, some interviewees started as volunteers, but as the CE developed and became more financially

sustainable, they were able to become paid staff within the CE. A few started out as paid staff, but they are often paid very little and their pay is not commensurate with the time and effort they put into the initiative.

For Chapter 5 we used the European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (EntreComp) as a guiding framework for our analysis. EntreComp was developed by the European Commission and aims to support the entrepreneurial competence of European citizens and organisations (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). The framework attempts to create a common understanding of entrepreneurship as a set of competences. The underlying assumption is that entrepreneurial skills, knowledge and attitudes can be learned and that an entrepreneurial mindset benefits individuals and societies. Entrepreneurship as a competence is defined as 'acting upon opportunities and ideas and transforming them into social, cultural or financial value for others' (Bacigalupo et al., 2016, p. 10).

Chapter 5 revealed that interviewees apply multiple competencies in the development and continuation of CEs and that most competencies could be linked to the EntreComp Framework. We adapted the EntreComp framework and specifically applied it to the context of CEs in the Netherlands. The following competencies[1] in this framework also appeared in the interview responses and are considered to be important for developing CEs: identifying community needs (*spotting opportunities*), loyalty to the mission and vision of the organisation (*vision*), high sense of responsibility (*ethical and sustainable thinking*), having a business mentality and knowing how to balance between community benefit and economic benefit (*financial and economic literacy*), being able to communicate with diverse people and having patience (*working with others*), self-awareness and self-efficacy, digital competences, open to experimentation (*learning through experience*), and perseverance (*motivation and perseverance*). These competencies do not always come together in one person but are divided among multiple persons. In other words, we observed different configurations of competencies among respondents.

We conclude that our interviewees effectively recognized local needs, showed a high sense of responsibility, had an entrepreneurial mindset, were capable of dealing with diverse people and showed much perseverance, especially in the face of adversity and all kinds of barriers in the process, not the least in the co-operation with the municipality. As most interviewees were not familiar with developing or maintaining a CE, they learned or further developed many of these competencies by doing. The

---

[1]   In brackets and *italics*, the original terms from the Entrecomp Framework are mentioned, preceded by the phrasing of how they appeared in the in-depth interviews.

competencies we identified were to a certain degree comparable to the competencies of social entrepreneurs as identified in the literature. For example, the competencies that social entrepreneurs within CEs need are "the skills of the entrepreneur to identify opportunities and ways of exploiting them, a clear vision about the social, economic and environmental objectives of the organisation, and an ability to motivate staff, the directors and the wider community in order to sustain the organisation and to ensure it prospers." (Bailey, 2012, p. 14). However, we found that these competencies do not always come together in one person but are divided among multiple persons within a CE.

Chapters 4 and 5 made several contributions to the literature. The analysis of CEs (as a contemporary example of entrepreneurial citizenship) from a motivational and competence perspective has, to our knowledge, not been applied before.

By applying and adapting the Volunteers Function Inventory (VFI) and the Entrecomp Competence Framework to the context of CEs, our study has attempted to fill this gap and has shown how both frameworks can be applied to the context of CEs. Our studies have also contributed to the (still limited) knowledge about the process of developing a CE, the difficulties and dilemmas that citizens face when running a CE, the type of decisions that citizens have to make and the lessons they have learned. These findings can help national and local governments to develop more effective responses to support citizens who want to develop CEs in their local environment.

6.3 Discussion

Returning to our overarching aim of providing a better understanding of entrepreneurial citizenship and its manifestations in the context of urban regeneration in the Netherlands, we can conclude that there is a growing appreciation of entrepreneurship in society. This is not so much about entrepreneurship in the sense of starting a business, but more about the qualities associated with entrepreneurship such as taking opportunities when they arise, independence from the state, having confidence and being responsible for one's own destiny. Entrepreneurial citizenship is largely shaped by governments through hegemonic enterprise discourses and is practised by both skilled and 'unskilled' citizens who are strongly motivated by their desire to help others, making their skills useful, enjoy working with others, and are dissatisfied with government functioning.

TOC

As observed in this thesis and in other research (see e.g. Ham & Van der Meer, 2015, Kleinhans, 2017), (active) citizens and governments often have a different perspective on entrepreneurial citizenship. Local governments praise active and entrepreneurial citizenship in their policies through 'enterprise language'. This language is intended to activate the 'inactive' in society. The tone is normative and aims to instill a sense of duty and reciprocity, suggesting that this may be lacking in some groups, particularly those on social benefits. The local policies are aimed at activation and behavioral change, but look little ahead to what support citizens can expect once they have met the government's expectations. Those who respond to the call for more active and entrepreneurial citizenship, in our case citizens who develop and maintain CEs, are probably not the groups that governments wanted to target. This may explain why, in practice, local governments can be (deliberately) unsupportive and underestimate the value that bottom-up initiatives can bring to the living environment. In particular, local governments are reluctant to support initiatives that generate income to sustain themselves. For example, initiatives that generate money are excluded from subsidies. For many CEs, however, a business model is essential to achieve their social goals and sustain the CE in the long term. Even though CEs seem to be a perfect example of entrepreneurial citizenship and correspond to the behaviour change that governments want to see, the way in which (local) government deals with such initiatives is often still characterised by mistrust and rigidity. Even when active citizens are highly motivated and skilled, they can face great difficulties in achieving their social goals.

The definition of CEs used in this thesis was: "independent, not-for-profit organisations managed by community members and committed to delivering long-term benefits to local people" (Kleinhans et al., 2020, p. 61). In addition to this definition, we also specified the characteristics of CEs (as described in the literature). These characteristics are: managing buildings or land that are used for the benefit or social interest of the local community, generating income from their use and using the surplus to provide social services for their benefit area (Bailey, 2012) and led by the local community, owned by the local community, accountable to the local community and acting for the benefit of the local community (Bailey et al., 2018; Healey, 2015; Kleinhans et al., 2020; Peredo & Chrisman, 2004). Based on this, the important criteria for the selection of CEs were that they were initiatives for and by citizens (led by the local community) who jointly manage assets (a piece of land or building), aimed at improving the neighbourhood physically, socially or economically (delivering long-term benefits to the local community), and combine social objectives and commercial activities (trading for the benefit of the local community). While falling within the definition of CEs, the initiatives studied differ greatly in the way these characteristics are defined. Differences were found between the CEs studied in terms of the size of the initiative, organisational model, (social) objectives and commercial activities.

An important element of developing a CE is acquiring assets (such as land or property) to set up a business model. In our case studies, the buildings in which the CEs are located are either purchased by the local community (e.g. through crowdfunding), given by the local government to the local community for free (or a symbolic value), or owned by the local government, housing association or private investor and leased to the local community under a rental agreement. Thus, in some cases, the assets are *owned* by the local community and in other cases the assets are only *managed* by the local community. With regard to funding, CEs can receive subsidies from the local government and earn income from commercial activities such as renting out spaces. Some CEs studied mostly relied on subsidies provided by the local government, whereas other CEs mostly relied on donations and commercial activities. Some CEs were more focused on community empowerment than others. The hybridity of CEs can take place at different levels, which makes comparing CEs with each other a complex matter. However, the CEs themselves were not our unit of analysis, but the people behind these initiatives.

For active citizens, CEs are the result of the search for satisfaction arising from dissatisfaction with government policies and decision-making. The main motivational functions that CEs serve are related to positive feelings such as enjoyment or enrichment, but Chapter 4 also showed that dissatisfaction, particularly dissatisfaction with government service provision, is an important motivation for volunteers to become involved in a CE. If dissatisfaction persists and there is not a good working relationship with local government or other organisations, or if there are internal struggles between members, dissatisfaction can also lead to exhaustion and burnout. Sometimes active citizens can become so committed to the initiative that it becomes part of their identity or 'life project'. So, when things don't work out as expected, it can have a major impact on their lives. The decision to leave is often a very difficult one.

Research on citizens' initiatives addresses that developing citizens' initiatives are requires a variety of skills and knowledge (Ham and Van der Meer 2015; Van de Wijdeven 2012; Tonkens and Verhoeven, 2011). This also applies to CEs. However, CEs are also places where skills and knowledge can be learned or developed. Most interviewees had no previous experience of developing bottom-up organisations and for many the whole process was one of 'trial and error'. In the process, they learned what worked and what didn't. Interviewees also showed a great deal of confidence in their own and others' skills and were not afraid to make mistakes and to let others make mistakes. In this way, CEs are places where a large group of people can invest in their knowledge and skills development, underlining their value to the 'participation society'.

In the particular context of local community enterprises, we did not aim to search for the entrepreneurial citizen, but to examine how entrepreneurship by local community members is taking place. Not all our interviewees identified themselves as entrepreneurial citizens, some identified themselves more as social entrepreneurs, active citizens or simply volunteers. Entrepreneurship did not play an important role in the motivations of our interviewees to engage in CEs. However, the motivational functions identified do lead to the kind of behaviour that we defined as entrepreneurial for the purpose of this thesis being: "behavioural practices exerted by citizens who demand more responsibilities and opportunities from governments (or other key institutions) to have a bigger say in organising (local) society, and innovatively apply various entrepreneurial and collaborative skills, assets and strategies to achieve their goals and create societal-added value." Mainly the motivational function community concern values and dissatisfaction with the provision of government services seemed to trigger people to take entrepreneurial action. The CEs studied were run by citizens who recognize opportunities to contribute something to their living environment, collaborate with various organisations and set up a social business model to achieve their goals. Citizens apply entrepreneurial citizenship in different ways. Some strive for innovation in the things they do, while others are more conservative. Some a more business minded and others are more social. Some are great negotiators; others are better at bringing people together. It is the sum of people with different skills, competencies and motivations that allows a CE to develop and move forward.

In many interviews, it appeared that the 'life world' of citizens and the 'system world' of governments have drifted apart. Severe cuts in social services and problems in the implementation of government policies have increased citizens' mistrust of government. The perspectives of citizens have been neglected in the policies of recent years (SCP, 2022). Recently, this development has been recognised by national and local governments themselves. There seems to be a growing awareness that the two worlds need to be reconnected. Especially after various scandals, such as the Dutch childcare benefit scandal, where racial and ethnic profiling by the Dutch tax authorities came to light, causing irreparable damage to thousands of families. The importance of regaining citizens' trust, responding to their needs and being transparent in the decision-making process seems to be more widely recognised by national and local governments. Local governments can contribute to restoring trust by taking citizens' initiatives more seriously, providing customized support and assistance for example by funding or enabling accommodation, thinking in terms of possibilities rather than rules and providing clarity about possibilities. The Dutch government is trying to give active and entrepreneurial citizenship a better place in laws and regulations, for example in the Environment and Planning Act (in Dutch: de *Omgevingswet*) and the (draft) Act on Strengthening Participation at Decentralised

Level (in Dutch: de *Wet Versterking Participatie op Decentraal Niveau*). These laws are examples of new legal frameworks being developed to make trust, transparency and customisation more part of the way (local) governments work. Citizen participation in the policy-making process plays an important role in both laws. The idea is that by bringing local perspectives into the policy-making process at an early stage, the quality of decision-making will improve, trust in local government will increase and ultimately there will be more support for the policy in question. Legislation on citizen participation can help to involve citizens in the policy-making process, but this still requires a different interpretation of cooperation with citizens by local governments. If done wrongly, citizen participation in the policy-making process can lead to even more dissatisfaction among citizens. It helps if local governments do not just emphasize letting citizens participate in their own municipal plans and initiatives, but connect much more to citizens' own plans, experiences, wishes and possibilities. In addition, citizens differ in what they know, want and in what they are capable of doing. These differences should be the starting point when developing and implementing policies. For the time being, it remains to be seen how both laws will work out for citizens who, like our interviewees, want to contribute ideas and decisions about the environment in which they live.

6.4 Limitations of the research

While this dissertation makes several contributions, it also has some limitations. The first limitation is that the discourse analysis conducted focused mainly on coalition agreements. Coalition agreements often convey a story about what should be done in the city and which problems should be prioritised. However, it may be that discourses at this level do not 'trickle down' to lower levels of policy and implementation. We do not know to what extent civil servants, social workers or citizens actually recognise the presence of an enterprise discourse.

The second limitation is that we have focused mainly on the motivations and competencies of 'higher' level participants within CEs. In doing so, we run the risk of neglecting the motivations and competences of volunteers who are not involved in the management of the CE, but who are involved in the operational day-to-day activities, such as welcoming guests, supervising, providing (technical) support, preparing rooms for rent and keeping the building clean and tidy. We recognise that these volunteers provide the necessary conditions for the CE to operate and

that their input and perspective is equally important. Nor have we focused on the motivations and skills of the users of the CEs, whose presence and energy are also vital to the development and continuation of the CEs.

The third is that our data is collected at one point in time. The CEs studied have been in operation for a number of years and have reached a certain level of stability. They have proven to be successful and, in many cases, have been recognised by the local government. As people come and go, they have also undergone (and are still undergoing) organisational changes. We learned that there were several key persons at different stages of development, but we were unable to reach them because they had already left the organisation. As a result, we do not have a complete picture of the knowledge, skills and competencies that these individuals contributed and what their motivations were. Even since the interviews we conducted the CEs studied in this thesis have undergone several organisational changes.

Fourthly, part of our fieldwork was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. We started approaching CEs, planning and conducting the interviews in January 2020. We approached potential CEs by e-mail, telephone and social media. We also approached two national non-profit umbrella organisations (LSA and KNHM) that advise and financially support CEs in the Netherlands to act as intermediaries and to put us in touch with CEs. Initial contact with about half of the selected CEs was made with help from these umbrella organisations. The first COVID restrictions were introduced in March 2020 and continuously expanded thereafter. During this period, it was not easy to get into contact with representatives of CEs for different reasons, such as their closure during the pandemic, people being not familiar with online software such MS Teams or Skype, or afraid of being infected during a face-to-face interview. As a result, the response rate was on the low side and some of our face-to-face interviews had to be conducted online, in line with COVID-19 restrictions. With online interviews, there is always the possibility of technical failure. While most of the online face-to-face interviews went smoothly, in one case we experienced some technical problems related to a fluctuating internet connection, which led to interruptions during the interview.

6.5 Recommendations for further research

We encourage researchers to explore other manifestations of entrepreneurial citizenship. In this thesis, we focused mainly on CEs in an urban context. In rural areas, where public services are gradually disappearing due to population decline, entrepreneurial citizenship can be just as visible and important. Future research could focus more on rural areas and how entrepreneurial citizenship manifests itself there.

In addition, we examined CEs that developed during a specific period, namely 2010-2015. During this period, the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis hit the real estate market hard, creating opportunities for citizens to take over vacant properties. As the property market recovered and the housing shortage increased, several CEs lost or are in the process of losing their space. Competition for property has become fiercer in recent years. This new context may make it more difficult for CEs to develop and for current CEs to survive. Examining how CEs deal with loss of space and how they still maintain a foothold in these difficult circumstances could be an angle for further research. One of our case studies, is for example trying to collectively buy the property they currently rent through bonds. By issuing bonds, community members and others who like to support the CE can collectively participate in buying the property.

Furthermore, an ethnographic study following the development of CEs over time could provide a more complete picture of the different skills needed at different stages of development, and could also involve volunteers at different levels within the organisation.

References

Aalbers, C. B. E. M., and K. Sehested. 2018. "Critical upscaling. How citizens' initiatives can contribute to a transition in governance and quality of urban greenspace." *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* 29: 261-275. doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.12.005.

Bacigalupo, M., P. Kampylis, Y. Punie, and G. Van den Brande. 2016. *EntreComp: The entrepreneurship competence framework*: Publication Office of the European Union.

Bailey, N. 2012. "The Role, Organisation and Contribution of Community Enterprise to Urban Regeneration Policy in the UK." *Progress in Planning 77* (1): 1–35. doi:10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001.

Bailey, N., R. Kleinhans and J. Lindbergh. 2018. *An assessment of community-based social enterprise in three European countries.* London: Power to Change.

Blok, S., M. Buuren, and M. Fenger. 2020. "Exclusivity of citizens' initiatives: Fuel for collective action?" *Journal of Civil Society* 16 (3): 243-259. doi:10.1080/17448689.2020.1794168.

Bovens, M., and A. Wille. 2008. "Deciphering the Dutch Drop: Ten Explanations for Decreasing Political Trust in the Netherlands." *International Review of Administrative Sciences 74* (2): 283–305. doi:10.1177/0020852308091135.

Brandsen, T., W. Trommel, and B. Verschuere. 2017. "The state and the reconstruction of civil society." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83 (4): 676-693. doi:10.1177/0020852315592467.

Bröckling, U. 2016. *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject.* London: Sage.

Buijs, A. E., T. J. M. Mattijssen, A. P. N. Van der Jagt, B. Ambrose-Oji, E. Andersson, B. H. M. Elands, and M. S. Moller. 2016. "Active citizenship for urban green infrastructure: fostering the diversity and dynamics of citizen contributions through mosaic governance." *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 22: 1-6. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.01.002.

Burger, A., and V. Veldheer. 2001. "The Growth of the Nonprofit Sector in the Netherlands." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30 (2): 221–246. doi:10.1177/0899764001302004.

Chacón, F., T. Pérez, T, J. Flores, and M. L. Vecina. 2011. "Motives for volunteering: Categorization of volunteers' motivations using open-ended questions." *Psychology in Spain* 15 (1): 48-56.

Clary, E. G., M. Snyder, R.D. Ridge, R. D, J. Copeland, A. A. Stukas, J. Haugen, and P. Miene 1998. "Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 74 (6): 1516-1530.

Deakin, N., and J. Edwards. 1993. *The enterprise culture and the inner cities.* London: Routledge.

Dekker, P. 2004. "The Netherlands: From Private Initiatives to Non-Profit Hybrids and Back?" In *The Third Sector in Europe*, edited by A. Evers and J.-L. Laville, 144–165. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Dekker, P. 2019. "From Pillarized Active Membership to Populist Active Citizenship: The Dutch Do Democracy." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 30 (1): 74-85. doi:10.1007/s11266-018-00058-4.

Du Gay, P., and G. Salaman. 1992. "The cult[ure] of the customer." *Journal of management studies* 29 (5): 615–633. doi:10.1111/j.14676486.1992.tb00681.x.

European Commission. 2018. *Standard Eurobarometer 89. Public Opinion in the European Union.* Brussels: European Commission.

Fairclough, N. 1991. "What might we mean by 'enterprise discourse'?" In *Enterprise Culture*, edited by R. Keat and N. Abercrombie, 58–71. London: Routledge.

Fenger, M., and B. Broekema. 2019. "From welfare state to participation society: austerity, ideology or rhetoric?" *In Social Policy Review 31: Analysis and Debate in Social Policy,* edited by E. Heins, J. Rees, and C. Needham, 101-124. Bristol: Policy Press.

Gabarret, I., B. Vedel, and J. Decaillon. 2017. "A social affair: Identifying motivation of social entrepreneurs." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 31: 399-415.

Ham, M., and J. van der Meer. 2015. De ondernemende burger. De woelige wereld van lokale initiatieven [The Entrepreneurial Citizen. The Turbulent World of Local Citizen Initiatives]. Utrecht: Movisie.

Healey, P. 2015. "Civil society enterprise and local development." *Planning Theory & Practice 16* (1): 11-27. doi:10.1080/14649357.2014.995212.

Hoekema, A. 2007. "Oefenen in coöperatieve moral [Practicing cooperative morality]." In *Macht en Verantwoordelijkheid, essays voor Kees Schuyt*, edited by J. W. Duyvendak, G. Engbersen, M.Teeuwen, and I. Verhoeven, 231–240. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Hoogenboom, M. 2011. "Particulier Initiatief En Overheid in Historisch Perspectief [Private Initiative and Government in Historical Perspective]." *Beleid En Maatschappij* 38 (4): 388–401.

Kleinhans, R. 2017. "False promises of co-production in neighbourhood regeneration: the case of Dutch community enterprises." *Public Management Review* 19 (10): 1500 - 1518. doi:10.1080/14719037.2017.1287941.

Kleinhans, R., N. Bailey and J. Lindbergh. 2020. "How community-based social enterprises struggle with representation and accountability." *Social Enterprise Journal* 16 (1): 60-81. doi:10.1108/SEJ-12-2018-0074.

Newman, J., and E. Tonkens. 2011. "Introduction." In *Participation, Responsibility and Choice. Summoning the Active Citizen in Western European Welfare States*, edited by J. Newman and E. Tonkens, 9-28. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Pearce, J. 2003. *Social Enterprise in Anytown.* London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman. 2004. Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(2), 309-328.

Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman. 2017. "Conceptual foundations: Community-based enterprise and community development." In *Entrepreneurial Neighbourhoods: Towards an Understanding of the Economies of Neighbourhoods and Communities*, edited by M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason,and S. Syrett, 151-178. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Rose, N. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Somerville, P., and G. McElwee. 2011. "Situating Community Enterprise: A Theoretical Exploration." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 23 (5–6): 317–330. doi:10.1080/08985626.2011.580161.

Spear, R., C. Cornforth, and M. Aiken. 2009. "The governance challenges of social enterprises: evidence from a UK empirical study." *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 80 (2): 247-273. doi:org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00386.x.

Steimel, S. 2018. "Skills-Based Volunteering as Both Work and Not Work: A Tension-Centered Examination of Constructions of "Volunteer"." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 29 (1): 133-143.

Tonkens, E., and I. Verhoeven. 2011. *Bewonersinitiatieven: proeftuin voor partnerschap tussen burgers en overheid. Een onderzoek naar bewonersinitiatieven in de Amsterdamse wijkaanpak.* Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam/Stichting Actief burgerschap.

Verhoeven, I., and E. Tonkens. 2013. "Talking Active Citizenship: Framing Welfare State Reform in England and the Netherlands." *Social Policy and Society* 12 (3): 415–426. doi:10.1017/S1474746413000158.

Van Beek, K. 1998. *De ondernemende samenleving Een verkenning van maatschappelijke verandering en implicaties voor beleid.* [The entrepreneurial society. An exploration of social change and implications for policy]. Den Haag: WRR.

Van Dam, R., M. Duineveld, and R. During. 2014. "Delineating Active Citizenship: The Subjectification of Citizens' Initiatives." *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 17 (2): 1–18. doi:10.1080/1523908X.2014.918502.

Van Meerkerk, I., B. Boonstra, and J. Edelenbos. 2013. "Self-Organization in Urban Regeneration: A Two-Case Comparative Research." *European Planning Studies* 21 (10): 1630–1652. doi:10.1080/09654313.2012.722963.

Van Meerkerk, I., R. Kleinhans, and A. Molenveld. 2018. "Exploring the Durability of Community Enterprises: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis." *Public Administration* 96 (4): 651–667. doi:10.1111/padm.12523.

Van de Wijdeven, T. M. F. 2012. *Doe-democratie: Over actief burgerschap in stadswijken* [Do-democracy: About active citizenship in urban neighbourhoods]. Delft: Eburon.

Wagenaar, H., and J. Van der Heijden. 2015. "The promise of democracy? Civic enterprise, localism and the transformation of democratic capitalism." In *Reconsidering Localism*, edited by S. Davoudi and A. Madanipour, 126–145. London: Routledge.

Welzel, C., and R.J. Dalton. 2014. "From allegiant to assertive citizens." In *The civic culture transformed: From allegiant to assertive citizens*, edited by R.J. Dalton and C. Welzel, 282-306. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curriculum vitae

Nuha Al Sader was born in Bagdad, Iraq in 1993. She emigrated to the Netherlands in 1998 with her parents and siblings. In 2011, she started her bachelor in Sociology at the University of Rotterdam. Followed by two master degrees in Media and Culture and Urban Sociology at the same university. In 2017, shortly after completing her last master's degree, she started her PhD in Urban Studies at Delft University of Technology. During her PhD, she followed several courses, attended conferences and seminars and presented her research on multiple occasions. In 2021, she started working at the municipality of Venlo as a policy adviser on citizen participation and developed new policy on citizen participation using the knowledge she gained during her PhD.

List of publications

Peer-reviewed journal articles

Al Sader, N., R. Kleinhans, and M. Van Ham. 2019. "Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration in the Netherlands." *Citizenship studies* 23 (5): 442–459. doi:10.1080/13621025.2019.1621266.

Al Sader, N., R. Kleinhans, and M. Van Ham. 2020. "Enterprise discourses in Dutch urban policies; a comparison between two cities in the Netherlands." Urban Research & Practice 15 (1): 47-70. doi:10.1080/17535069.2020.1714710.

Other publications

Varady, D., R. Kleinhans, and N. Al Sader 2020. "What can Northwest European community enterprises learn from American community based organizations?" In *Research Handbook on Community Development*, edited by Rhonda Phillips, Eric Trevan and Patsy Kraeger, 104–123. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Al Sader, N., R. Kleinhans and M. Van Ham. 2020. Heeft 'Rotterdam. Make it Happen' zijn langste tijd gehad? Link: https://www.versbeton.nl/2020/08/heeft-rotterdam-make-it-happen-zijn-langste-tijd-gehad/

Submitted to a peer-reviewed journal

Al Sader, N., R. Kleinhans, and M. Van Ham. Understanding Citizens' Motivations for Developing Community Enterprises (CEs).

Entrepreneurial citizenship in urban regeneration

Nuha Al Sader

More and more citizens are entering the public domain and taking over tasks that traditionally belong to the government. For example, citizens increasingly run a community centre themselves, maintain the greenery in their neighbourhood and manage the local playground. To some extent, governments also encourage this behaviour and are disposing of social real estate. Against this background, this study examines the rise of citizens' initiatives in the Netherlands and how this takes shape in the context of urban regeneration. The study pays attention to a specific type of citizens' initiative, namely community enterprises. It applies qualitative research methods, such as semi-structured interviews with representatives of community enterprises and discourse analysis of policy documents. It examines the expectations governments have of active citizens and how this relates to the motivations and capacities of active citizens themselves. The study broadens our understanding of active citizens who utilizes their entrepreneurial skills and mindset to drive positive change, contribute to the well-being of their community, and address pressing societal challenges.