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Preface

For me this thesis marks the end of my student years and the beginning of a workingmen’s life. In the last years, I finished my VWO with, maybe, a little too much ease. Finding it hard to adapt to the university speed at the mechanical engineering bachelor. This made me decide to step down a level and complete mechanical engineering on the Fontys. During that time, I learned that the diehard technics does not interest me enough, and that it is not my forte. I chose a softer path in the programme and continued that, when I returned to the university. The construction management and engineering master, of which this thesis is the closure, focuses more on the process and management side of technology. This suited me very well and motivated me to make this second university attempt a success.

In the search for a subject for this graduation thesis, I wanted to do something different than I was used to. In the past years, I worked for several contractors and focused on the management and maintenance part of mechanical installations in buildings. The search for something different brought me to the province of Noord-Brabant, with the opportunity to focus on the process of spatial (re)development. The opportunity to get to know the Dutch government and their way of working was attractive. Further, the topic, a bottom-up approach in spatial (re)development, proved to be innovative. A research into an area in which the province itself is still searching for the way to act, made this research very interesting but at the same time difficult. Many things where unclear or vague and turned out to be different than I had expected at the first glance. Problems where complex and rooted in various fields, far from this research its scoop. This thesis answers a few small problems and mentions necessary additional research.

In this research, I had to opportunity to speak to a great variety of people. I want to thank the interviewees for making time for me, the Mijn Mooi Brabant team for taking me in and helping me with all my questions. In addition, I was very happy with the support I got form my mother and aunt, helping me typing out the thousands of words from the interviews. Nicole to stay nice to me, even when I did not have that much time for her sometimes. My final thanks go to my supervisors for their time and effort, especially Han Qi for setting the, surprising and short deadlines and Rudy van Stratum for his constructive criticism.

I hope, this research helps the province of Noord-Brabant to be more efficient and helps to get a better idea how to approach the upcoming participation society. Finally, thanks to everybody that made it, at least this far trough my thesis and I hope you do not give up now. Enjoy reading and hopefully this thesis is helpful.

Remco Mulder
Summary
English Summery

In the last tenure, 2011 - 2015, the province of Noord-Brabant set itself the goal to improve the live and business climate of the province. One major topic in that vision is the enhancement of the spatial quality in Noord-Brabant. Numerous spatial (re)development programs are initiated targeting different themes and subjects of spatial quality. In addition, the society is changing to a society where the public is increasingly active on policy areas that used to be predominantly governmental. This societal state is called the participation society. It challenges the familiar, top-down, approach of the regional governments. Governments need to operate as equal actors in networks with the initiative coming bottom-up. In search of new approaches of governance, the province of Noord-Brabant started the experimental programme, Mijn Mooi Brabant. This programme approached the challenge of enhancing spatial quality bottom-up, with initiatives from society. The programme is now at their ends after four years and the province is eager to know how this approach is received by its participants, and how it can be improved. Therefore, the goal of this research is to evaluate, the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society, and appoint its positive and negative aspects. After the positive and negative aspects are made clear recommendations are presented to the province of Noord-Brabant about how to improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society.

As mentioned, society is changing, it always has, and it always will. This bottom-up process forces the government to adapt, and that process inevitably lags behind. Reinforced by the inflexibility of the large organisation a government is, it struggles to fulfil the demand of the public. That demand is a government that facilitates initiatives from the public, helping the public to act on the governmental domain, on behalf of the public and their collective interests. That collective interest in this research is the enhancement of spatial quality, and spatial (re)development is what the province is facilitating in the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme. Not only has the demand of the public, but also the belief that public participation contributes to the legitimacy of the provincial policy, driven the focus on participation. In those processes, the province has a double role. Firstly, they are participant and want the process to succeed to reach their goals. Secondly, the province is a permitting governmental body, and has to check if plans comply with the law. In addition, a Dutch governmental body has to oblige with the principles of good governance. This can cause the two role to have different interests in the spatial (re)development process. However, they are the basis of the Dutch democracy. The spatial (re)development process contains of four steps, from exploration via planning and realisation, to exploration. In the first three, the province is involved. The fact that the province, in this spatial (re)development process, is an equal actor in a network, is new for a province. Networks are dynamic and are marked by interdependencies. The Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is operating in those networks with a, for the province, alternative approach. Focusing on enhancing initiatives in the pre-subsidy stage, in order to maximise their result. This approach is experimental and tries to provide to the need of the public.
The Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is used as case study due to the uniqueness of the approach. The data in this case study is gathered through ten semi-structured interviews. Four embedded units, initiatives of the programme are selected. Those embedded units needed to build a physical structure and where supposed good and bad examples with no direct cause for the problems. In those embedded units one or two interviewee are selected. The total of ten interviewees are completed by three interviewees on a strategic level of which one is from a different province. The gathered data is analysed using grounded theory.

From the data analysis, the positive and negative aspects of the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach are clarified. As positive aspects, the interviewees all mentioned the financial support, or subsidy. Further, the ambition and plan enhancement done in the pre-subsidy stage was experienced as very useful. That ambition is the main driver of the process, and the organised workshops and academies provided welcome opportunities to share and connect to the other initiatives and their ambitions. The large network, especially in the educational field, and the tools used in the programme are the main assets of the programme. As negative aspect, the interviewees mentioned time as the main problem. This manifests itself in different ways. Firstly, the focus of the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme lies on the pre-subsidy stage. This together with the preparation of the subsidy scheme takes over half the four-year time horizon of the province, leaving little time for the realisation phase. Further network process negotiations are slow due to the lag of authority given to government representatives. Finally, the permitting processes proved to be slow, and the double role the province caused indignation among initiators with a province in the process that, in a different role, can block the initiative. This led to a decrease in ambition, which is mentioned as the key driver of the process. When the interviewees were asked about their view of the role of the province, financial supporter was the most important. However, they see a new added value for the province in the ambition enhancing and connection role. This is backed up by the fact that resources are becoming limited. When the added value of the province is projected on the spatial (re)development process steps, it is noticeable that it is concentrated in the exploration and planning phase, except for the subsidy, which is focused on the realisation phase. It is remarkable that the subsidies are granted for a phase in the process that the province is hardly involved in, and the provincial effort is judged on the product while the province only influences the process to design the product.

Finally, recommendations can be made to the province to improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach. Firstly, the province should focus on the exploration and planning phases of the spatial (re)development process, where their network and knowledge inputs are most effective and they are an equal player in the network. This leads to a shorter lead-time of the initiatives and allows the province to take on initiatives throughout the tenure and be more adapted to the public agenda. Further, the province should choose initiatives critically. If the province wants to be close to the public, chose public initiatives. Those public initiatives even benefit the most from this approach, due to their limited of experience, knowledge, and funds. Further, the province should evaluate on the exploration and planning phases, and strive for a good network process instead a finished physical product. Use the budget to facilitated the process, maintain the network, and hire experts. Get rid of the traditional subsidies, which focus on the wrong achievements and cause most of the bureaucracy.
Dutch Summery

In de afgelopen bestuursperiode, 2011 – 2015, heeft de provincie Noord-Brabant zichzelf het doel gesteld om het leef- en vestigingsklimaat in de provincie te verbeteren. Eén van de grote thema’s in die visie is het verhogen van de ruimtelijke kwaliteit in Noord-Brabant. Verschillende ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelingsprogrammas zijn geïnitieerd, gericht op de verschillende thema’s en onderwerpen van ruimtelijke kwaliteit. Daarnaast veranderd de samenleving naar een samenleving waarin de bevolking steeds meer actief is op terrein van de overheid. Deze samenleving wordt ook wel de participatiesamenleving genoemd en het daagt de traditionele top-down aanpak van overheden uit. Overheden moeten als gelijkwaardige actoren werken in netwerken, met initiatieven vanuit de samenleving. In de zoektocht naar nieuwe manieren van beleidsvoering, heeft de provincie Noord-Brabant, het experimentele Mijn Mooi Brabant programma gestart. Dit programma benaderd de uitdaging van ruimtelijke kwaliteit bottom-up, met initiatieven vanuit de samenleving. Het programma is bijna afgerond en de provincie in opzoek naar manieren om deze te verbeteren. Daarom is het doel van dit onderzoek het evalueren van de Mijn Mooi Brabant aanpak van ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkeling in de participatie samenleving. Het benoemd de negatieve en positieve aspecten en geeft aanbevelingen aan de provincie Noord-Brabant over verbeterpunten van de Mijn Mooi Brabant aanpak.

De maatschappij is in verandering, dat is altijd zo geweest en het zal altijd zo blijven. Dit bottom-up proces verplicht de overheid zich aan te passen en dat proces loopt onvermijdelijk achter. Versterkt door de inflexibiliteit van haar grote organisatie, heeft de overheid moeite om aan de vraag van de samenleving te voldoen. Deze vraag is een overheid die initiatieven vanuit de samenleving faciliteert en de samenleving helpt te acteren, namens de samenleving en haar gezamenlijke belang, in het overheidsdomein. Dat gezamenlijke belang is in dit onderzoek het verbeteren van ruimtelijke kwaliteit. Het ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces is wat het Mijn Mooi Brabant programma faciliteert. Niet alleen de vraag vanuit de samenleving, maar ook de overtuiging dat deze inspraak bijdraagt aan de legitimiteit van het provinciaal beleid, drijft de nadruk op burgerparticipatie. In deze processen heeft de provincie een dubbele rol. Ten eerste is de provincie deelnemer aan het proces en streven naar een succesvol proces om haar doelen te bereiken. Ten tweede is de provincie een vergunningverlenend overheidsorgaan en heeft de taak om plannen te toetsen aan de wet. Bij deze rollen spelen de beginselen van goed bestuur een belangrijke rol, deze regels de basis van de Nederlandse democratie. Die dubbele taak kan leiden tot verschillende belangen tussen de twee rollen in het ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelingsproces. In het ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelingsproces is de provincie betrokken bij de eerste drie fases; de exploratie-, planning- en realisatiefase. Het is nieuw voor de provincie dat zij in dit ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelingsproces een gelijke actor is in een netwerk. Netwerken zijn dynamisch en worden gekenmerkt door onderlinge afhankelijkheid. Het Mijn Mooi Brabant programma is actief in die netwerken met een, voor de provincie, alternatieve benadering. Gericht op het verbeteren van de initiatieven in de pre-subsidie fase, om hun resultaat te maximaliseren. Deze aanpak is experimenteel en probeert aan de vraag van de samenleving te voorzien.

Het Mijn Mooi Brabant programma wordt gebruikt als casestudy door het unieke karakter van de aanpak. De gegevens in deze studie wordt verzameld door tien semigestructureerde interviews. Vier embedded units, initiatieven van het programma zijn gekozen als
onderzoeksterrein. In deze embedded units worden één of twee interviews gehouden. Het totaal van de tien geïnterviewde worden aangevuld met drie geïnterviewde op strategisch niveau waarvan één uit een andere provincie. De verzamelde gegevens worden geanalyseerd met behulp van grounded theory.

De data-analyse geeft de positieve en negatieve aspecten van de Mijn Mooi Brabant aanpak weer. De geïnterviewde noemen als positief aspect allemaal de financiële steun of subsidie van de provincie. Daarnaast wordt de, in de pre-subsidie fase, gezette stappen in het verbeteren van de ambitie en de plannen van de initiatiefnemers als zeer nuttig ervaren. Die ambitie is de belangrijkste motor van het proces en de georganiseerde workshops en academies voorzien in welkomte mogelijkheden om die ambitie te delen en verbinding te maken met de andere initiatieven. Het grote netwerk, vooral in het onderwijsveld, en de instrumenten die gebruikt worden in het programma zijn de belangrijkste troeven van het programma. Als negatieve aspect wordt tijd als belangrijkste genoemd. Dit manifesteert zich op verschillende manieren. Ten eerste ligt de focus van het Mijn Mooi Brabant programma op de pre-subsidie fase. Dit samen met het voorbereiden van de subsidieregeling neemt meer dan de helft van de vierjarige tijdsduur van de provincie in beslag. Hierdoor blijft er weinig tijd over voor de realisatiefase. Verder zijn procesonderhandelingen in het netwerk traag als gevolg van het gebrek aan zeggenschap bij ambtenaren. Tot slot bleken de vergunningsprocedures langer te duren dan verwacht en de dubbele rol van de provincie veroorzaakte verwarring onder de initiatiefnemers. Een provincie is partner in het proces in de ene rol en blokkeert het initiatief in de andere rol door de verschillende belangen. Op de vraag welke rol de provincie heeft werd financieel ondersteuner als belangrijkste genoemd. Echter, zien de geïnterviewde een nieuwe toegevoegde waarde voor de provincie in de ambitie verbeterende en koppelende rol. Dit wordt ondersteund door het feit dat de middelen van de provincie beperker worden en de provincie op zoek moet naar een nieuwe functie. Wanneer de toegevoegde waarde van de provincie wordt geprojecteerd op de ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelingsproces is het opvallend dat de provincie in de exploratie en planningsfase enkel de subsidie is gericht op de realisatiefase. Het is opmerkelijk dat de subsidies worden toegekend voor een fase in het proces waarin de provincie nauwelijks betrokken is, en de provinciale inspanning wordt beoordeeld op het product, terwijl de provincie hier in de uitvoering weinig invloed op heeft.

Tot slot kunnen er aanbevelingen worden gedaan aan de provincie om de Mijn Mooi Brabant aanpak te verbeteren. Ten eerste moet de provincie zich richten op de exploratie- en planfase van de ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelingsproces. Hier is het netwerk en de kennis inbreng het meest effectief en is de provincie een gelijkwaardige partner in het netwerk. Dit leidt tot een kortere doorlooptijd van de initiatieven en laat de ruimte voor de provincie om initiatieven aan te nemen over de gehele bestuursperiode. Zo kan de provincie beter afstemmen op de publieke agenda. Verder dient de provincie initiatieven kritisch kiezen. Als de provincie dicht bij de samenleving wil zijn moeten enkel burgerinitiatieven worden ondersteund. Die burgerinitiatieven profiteren ook het meest van deze aanpak, vanwege hun beperkte ervaring, kennis en financiële middelen. Verder dient de provincie te worden beoordeeld op exploratie- en planningsfase, en moet zij streven naar een goed proces in plaats van een fysiek product. Gebruik de budgetten om het proces te verbeteren, het netwerk te onderhouden en deskundige in te huren. Traditionele subsidies passen niet meer, deze richten zich op de verkeerde prestaties en veroorzaken het grootste deel van de bureaucratie.
Abstract

Society is changing and this bottom-up process forces the government to adapt. Reinforced by the inflexibility of the large organisation a government is, it struggles to do so and fulfil the demand of the public. That demand is facilitates initiatives from the public that act on the governmental domain, on behalf of the public and their collective interests. The province is involved in the first three steps of the process of spatial (re), exploration, planning and realisation. The fact that the province is an equal actor in a process network is new for a province. Networks are dynamic and are marked by interdependencies. The Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is operating in those networks with a, for the province, alternative approach. Focusing on enhancing initiatives, provided by the partners of the province, in order to maximise their result. This research shows that the provincial organisation, but more importantly the governmental organisational structure are not very suitable for the public participation process. Law and regulations are the biggest hurdle, however the majority protect the core values of the Dutch democracy, and are not likely and advisable to change fast. In order to deal with the situation the province should focus on the exploration and planning phases of the spatial (re)development process, where their network and knowledge inputs are most effective and they are an equal player in the network. This leads to a shorter lead-time of the initiatives and allows the province to take on initiatives throughout the tenure and be more adapted to the public agenda. Further, the province should choose initiatives critically. If the province wants to be close to the public, chose public initiatives. Those public initiatives even benefit the most from this approach, due to their limited of experience, knowledge, and funds. Further, the province should evaluate on the exploration and planning phases, and strive for a good network process instead a finished physical product. Use the budget to facilitated the process, maintain the network, and hire experts. Get rid of the traditional subsidies, which focus on the wrong achievements and cause most of the bureaucracy.
1. Introduction
1.1 Problem Definition

In the last tenure, 2011 - 2015, the province of Noord-Brabant set itself the goal to improve the live and business climate of the province. One major topic in that vision is the enhancement of the spatial quality in Noord-Brabant. Numerous spatial (re)development programs are initiated targeting different themes and subjects of spatial quality. In addition, the society is changing to a society where the public is increasingly active on policy areas that a used to be predominantly governmental. This societal state is called the participation society. It challenges the familiar, top-down, approach of the regional governments. Governments need to operate as equal actors in networks with the initiative coming bottom-up. In search of new approaches of governance, the province of Noord-Brabant started the experimental programme, Mijn Mooi Brabant. This programme approached the challenge of enhancing spatial quality bottom-up, with initiatives from society. This approach focuses on initiatives put forward by partners of the province, who are believed to be closer to society. Another very similar programme, from a different provincial cluster, Erfgoed & Erfgenamen programme joined the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme and used the same process. These programmes are the focus of this research and are considered as one, unless stated otherwise. Both programmes are now at their ends after four years and the province is eager to know how this approach is received by its participants, and how it can be improved.

1.2 Research Objective

The goal of this research is to evaluate, the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society, and appoint its positive and negative aspects. After the positive and negative aspects are made clear recommendations are presented to the province of Noord-Brabant about how to improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society.

1.3 Research Question

1.3.1 Main Research Question

How can the province improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society?

1.3.2 Sub Research Questions

Literature

1. What is public participation?
2. What are the characteristics of a spatial (re)development process?
3. What are the characteristics of a governance network?
4. What is the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process?

1 The partners of the province are shown in Appendix A Partners of the province of Noord-Brabant
Interviews & Documents

5. What are, according to the regional governments, the possible problem areas in public participation spatial (re)development?

6. What are the, by the participants determined, positive aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?

7. What are the, by the participants determined, negative aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?

8. What should, according to the participants, the role of a regional government be in public participation spatial (re)development processes?

Data analysis

9. How are the positive and negative aspects related to the role of the regional government in public participation spatial (re)development processes?

1.4 Expected Results

It is expected that time is one of the major negative aspects in the process of spatial (re)development in the participation society. Time, because of the four-year agenda of the province and the bureaucracy that a governmental body brings with itself. In addition, four years is considered a short time for a building process. Further political discontinuity and the political agenda is expected to cause trouble. During the tenure, different matters are important for the political administration, which can lead to short-sighted decision making. Further, finance is expected to be an important aspect, almost all the initiatives are not directly profitable and need the money to be realized. Finally, the selection procedure might fail to filter the initiatives that have real potential, and because the provincial budget needs to be spend, they will be less critical if that proves to be difficult. On the positive side, the provincial subsidy is expected to provide stronger financial position of the initiatives and enable them to start the initiative. In addition, the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach is expected to be a positive aspect in the process.

1.5 Research Limitations

This research is part of the Construction Management and Engineering master program of the Eindhoven University of Technology. The thesis represents 30 ECTS, which roughly equals five months fulltime. Therefore, the time to perform the research is limited. For this reason, the research includes only a single spatial (re)development programme, Mijn Mooi Brabant, from a single province, Noord-Brabant. This limits the possibilities to generalize conclusions and recommendations upon other spatial (re)development programmes. Within this program, not all initiatives and its participants can be approached. With the selection of the interviewees is focused on the best sample size possible nevertheless, the data gathered might not be fully complete. In addition, the interviews are only coded by the researcher, this makes biased coding possible and might affect the results. Further, this research provides recommendations to the province, but the time is too limited to test or evaluate the effects of the recommendations. Further, this research is focused on spatial (re)development initiatives from the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, and specifically initiatives that build a physical structure. These initiatives are focused on relatively small and site-specific building projects. This means that the results of this research are limited to that kind of public participation.
spatial (re)development processes. Finally, it is not the goal of this research to judge the impact of the initiatives and the effect public participation, on the spatial quality.

1.6 Research Design

Figure 1 shows the research design. The research design allows the reader to follow the steps and enables repetition of the research.

![Research Design Diagram]

*Figure 1: Research Design*
1.7 Reading Guide

This research is divided in five chapters. First, the introduction, which is already at its end, introduces the problem. The next chapter, chapter 2, is the glossary, describing the most important definitions in this research. This chapter is followed by chapter 3, the theoretical framework, providing a clear inside in the main subjects of this research. Chapter 4, research model, contains all the data of this research and the analysis of that data. This chapter concludes with the recommendations of this research. The final chapter contains the conclusion, discussion, and possibilities for further research.
2. Glossary
2.1 Glossary

**Actor** A player in a network.

**Bureaucracy** The mostly large, predictability, and stability-oriented organization, with high degree of standardization.

**Governance Networks** A network in which the government is an equal actor, with the goal agenda setting and/or policy preparation, formulation, implementation, and/or evaluation in its governmental domain.

**Information Age** A period in human history characterized by the shift from traditional industry, which the industrial revolution brought through industrialization, to an economy based on information computerization.

**Network** A number of actors with different interests, which are dependent on each other for the realization of their goals.

**Network Society** A society where the key social structures and activities are organized around electronically processed information networks.

**Participant** A natural or legal person that is involved in the initiative of project.

**Participation State** A social system in which the public voluntary enter into relationships with each other, outside the private sphere to act in the common interests of the public, whereby the state participates and facilitates in this process.

**Public Participation** The involvement of the public in the governmental domain, on behalf of the public and their collective interests.

**Spatial (Re)Development** the vision and action to change the physical structure of the landscape, in order to change the functioning of the landscape system, in an economic, physical, social, and environmental way.

**Spatial Quality** the, by the assessor assigned value, which is built-up from it use, future and perceptive value, of a physical structure of a landscape for the function in which it foresees.

**Stakeholder** A natural or legal person that has an interest in the initiative of project.

**Subsidy** The entitlement to financial resources provided by an administrative authority for the purpose of certain activities of the applicant, other than as payment for goods or services supplied to the administrative authority.

**Welfare State** A social system whereby the state assumes primary responsibility for the welfare of its citizens, as in matters of health care, education, employment, and social security.
3. Theoretical Framework
3.1 Abstract

Society is changing, it always has, and it always will. This bottom-up process forces the government to adapt, and that process inevitably lags behind. Reinforced by the inflexibility of the large organisation a government is, it struggles to fulfil the demand of the public. That demand is a government that facilitates initiatives from the public, helping the public to act on the governmental domain, on behalf of the public and their collective interests. That collective interest in this research is the enhancement of spatial quality, and spatial (re)development is what the province is facilitating. The process of spatial (re)development contains four steps, from exploration via planning and realisation, to exploration. In the first three, the province is involved. The fact that the province, in this spatial (re)development process, is an equal actor in a network, is new for a province. Networks are dynamic and are marked by interdependencies. The Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is operating in those networks with a, for the province, alternative approach. Focusing on enhancing initiatives, provided by the partners of the province, in order to maximise their result.

3.2 Introduction

The main research question in this research is:

How can the province improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society?

This question holds a few subjects that need to be clarified by means of a literature study. First, this research is set on the area of the participation society. This chapter starts with a distraction of the history that led the Netherlands to the point we are now. To use that participation society, public participation is used however, what is public participation? That is the first sub research question that is answered in this chapter. The second major subject of this research is the spatial (re)development process. Therefore, the second sub research question is; what are the characteristics of a spatial (re)development process? When public participation is used in the spatial (re)development process in the public domain the province has to operate in a network, leading to the third sub research question; what are the characteristics of a governance network? Next, the basis of this research, the alternative approach of Mijn Mooi Brabant, to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society is described. Leading to the last sub research question; what is the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process? Finally, the results are discussed to provide a good basis for the rest of the research.

3.3 Method

According to Cronin, Ryan, & Coughlan, (2008) there are two major methods of doing a literature study. The first is the traditional or narrative literature review. This provides a comprehensive background for understanding current knowledge and highlighting the significance of new research. The second method is called systematic literature review, and is used to answer well-focused questions about the practice. In this research, the narrative review approach is more applicable. The method consist out of five steps; selecting a review
topic, searching the literature, gathering, reading and analysing the literature, writing the review, and referencing.

3.4 Results

This chapter provides a detailed description of the topics that are related to the problem in this research. Those major topics are public participation, spatial (re)development processes, governance networks, and the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach.

3.4.1 Dutch Governments and Society

Because this research is set in the governmental domain, it is necessary to understand this domain a bit more. Therefore, this chapter discusses the history of the Netherlands and the governmental changes that follow on changes that accrued in the society, giving some clarity about the origin of the situation. Further, it briefly discusses the role of the Dutch government and regional governments, to provide a general picture and put things in perspective.

A Brief History of the Changing Society and an Adapting Dutch Government

Public governance is, according to Bovens et al. (2012), in dynamic interaction with the social environment. Demographic, economic, social, and technological developments have influence on and are influenced by public governance (Noordegraaf, 2004). This interaction is there, and has been there as long as there is governance. Bovens et al. (2012) describes the transformation of the Dutch public governance over the years, with the Republic of the United Netherlands (1648-1795) at the basis of the modern Netherlands public governance. With the growing resistance to the nobility and side by side with the French revolution, the Bataafse Revolution (1794-1799), caused the fall of the Republic of the United Netherlands and the unitary state made its appearance. This became in 1815 the Kingdom of the Netherlands with the first national constitution. The government responsibility was limited to the classic republic tasks such as; foreign affairs, defence, colonies, justice, internal administration and finance. The industrialisation (around 1870 in the Netherlands) required for more government intervention, especially in the care and services domains. Municipalities started utility companies and the government started urban planning to cope with the growth of the cities. Technical ministries where founded, like the Ministry of Transport, Public Works, and Water Management and regulated their policy field top-down. The Welfare State was born. The economic crisis of 1929 fortified the development of the Welfare State. The trust of the European countries in the self-correcting market economy proved to be wrong. Therefore, the Dutch government started large employment programs. After the Second World War (1939-1945), the government focused on the reconstruction of the Netherlands with a strong grip on the stability of economic growth. There was a wide social and political conception, that the government should ensure a livelihood to their citizens. The economic crisis of 1979 caused more and more criticism about the welfare state. The business community strongly insisted on the limitation of government interference. The government should focus on the headlines. They should set norms about what must be accomplished, but be much less involved by the way how that must be done. This combined with financial reforms started the privatization of former government task such as, housing associations, rail transport company (NS) and utility companies (NUON & Essent). This was the first step for the government to focus more on policy making instead of controlling the whole market. By letting companies preform former governmental tasks, the government changed form a strictly top-down to partly bottom-up
organisation. Companies provided social services within the boundaries set by the government. In the nineties, the government saw the need for administrative reformation. This to enhance the relationship between the government and the public and to improve the efficiency and effectivity of the government. This has led to decentralisation from the Dutch national government to regional and local governments, and enhanced the more bottom-up approach.

The nineties were also the time in which a new technology provided a revolutionary change in society. These changes make the society, as we know it today. The development of the internet changed two major pillars of society, communication and information (Castells, 2001). Castells (2001) calls the twentieth century the Information Age, with an abundance of information, good or bad, available for people. The communication technologies allow people to communicate faster, more often and for greater distances, helping globalisation to develop further. This developed a society that is connected, and is internally interconnected. Castells & Cardoso (2005) call this the Network Society. This also leads to major changes in the way governments work (Bovens et al., 2012; de Bruijn & ten Heuvelhof, 2011). The government is no longer a single overarching governing body, but multiple bodies with different interests and priorities that are connected by complex networks to each other and everything else in the world. This completely changed the relationship between a government and its citizens. Transforming a vertical relationship to a more horizontal one (Hajer, 2011), with an even stronger focus of bottom-up governance. At the same time, there is discussion about the rigorous retraction of the government. The economic crises of 2008 showed that it can also have major social risks (Bovens et al., 2012). Van der Heijden (2015) observes that, due to cutbacks and bad management, the quality of (semi-) governmental services had dropped.

These political and societal movements are one of the major reasons for citizens to become more involved on policy areas that a used to be predominantly governmental. They take matters in their own hand, starting their own electricity communities, community care programs, and initiate building projects that enhance their communities. Hajer (2011) calls this the Energetic Society and states that the Dutch government has to use this energy to accomplish sustainable growth. In the king's speech of 2013 the king mentioned the change from a Welfare State to the Participation State (Ministerie van Algemene Zaken, 2013), with public participation as the most important pillar. The idea became popular the last years, but it is not new. The need for change was already mentioned in 1974, in the Social and Cultural Report 1974 (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, 1974).

The Role of Dutch Governments
The role of the Dutch governments can be divided into four categories namely; ordering, performing, directing, and arbitrating functions (binnenlandsbestuur, 2014). Examples of these functions are:

- Making collective and democratic decision-making possible at various levels of government, considering the interests of the whole Dutch society;
- Implementing the democratic decisions taken;
- Contributing, through policy, to the solution of social and social problems;
- Maintaining public order and rule of law through, education and law enforcement;
- Regulating the relations between the members of society;
- Preventing the worst forms of inequality;
- Perform tasks that other parts of the community not or not sufficiently represent;
- Regulating the market and correcting market failures;
- Etcetera.

These roles can be can be carried out by the different levels of government. The allocation of these tasks is subject to change, and not always attributed to a single level of government.

**The General Principles of Good Governance**

These examples, of the role of the government, are mostly imbedded in the law and regulations of the Netherlands. The main law is the constitution, which everyone must abide by. However, for this research the General Administrative Law Act 1992 (Awb) is very important. The General Administrative Law Act 1992 describes general rules for the relationship between administrative authority’s and individual citizens, companies, and suchlike. One of these general rules are the General Principles of Good Governance (abbb). These principles prescribe how the government, and its decentralized bodies, should behave in decision-making. A few examples are, the fair-play principle (art. 2:4 Awb 1992), carefulness principle (art. 3:2 Awb 1992), prohibition of détournement de pouvoir (art. 3:3 Awb 1992), reasoning principle (art. 3:46 Awb 1992). These principles are there to protect the democracy, and are one of the major reasons for the difference, in the way of working between commercial companies and governmental institution.

**The Role of Dutch Provincial Government**

The provinces of the Netherlands have been appointed to seven core functions (IPO, 2015). These core functions are:

1. Sustainable spatial development, and water management;
2. Environment, energy and climate;
3. Vital countryside;
4. Regional accessibility and regional public transport;
5. Regional economy;
6. Cultural infrastructure and preservation;
7. The quality of public administration in local governments.

These seven core functions can be broadly interpreted and allow the different provinces to give different meanings to those functions. This makes describing the role of the province very hard, especially in detail. One thing is clear; the government has a double role. The first is filling in and investing in the seven core functions. The second is controlling the changes that parties want to make to those seven areas of provincial interest. This research is focused on the function sustainable spatial development, and water management.

**Conclusion**

At this time the participation society is breaking through, citizens become more involved on policy areas that a used to be predominantly governmental. Partly caused by governmental cutbacks, partly by believe they can do a better job for themselves and others. When we look at the history of governmental change, it seems that all governmental changes are caused by societal changes, in other words bottom-up. Societal changes mainly occur when large technological breakthroughs are made, electricity or the internet, or a major economic crisis hit the world, mortgage crisis of 2008. These event are very hard to predict and their effect even harder. Therefore, when a government reacts to a societal change, they will unavoidably lag behind on what society is asking or requires. In addition, the government is a very large body, which has to comply with the principles of democracy, making the government inflexible and slow. Only one thing is for sure, when the government fits the requirements of society,
society will change again. When we look at the province itself, it needs to fulfil two roles, improving their seven core interests and controlling improvements to those interests, made by themselves or others. A double role that can be tricky and difficult to execute and communicate. This research helps the Dutch regional government to catch up with the current needed governmental change, keeping in mind the difficulties a provincial government has.

3.4.2 Public Participation

As mentioned, public participation is one of the major topics of the research. Therefore it is essential to find out what it exactly is, why is it used, how it can be used, and what the known problems are. This chapter provides a detailed description from literature to answer those and other questions. Setting a clear basis for the rest of this research.

The Definition of Public Participation

There are many different definitions of public participation. This paragraph sums-up a few found in the literature, and describes the key part that is discovered.

Verhoeven (2011) divides public participation into two groups. The first is political participation and social public participation.

“Political participation are activities undertaken voluntarily by citizens, aimed at influencing the creation or implementation of public policies.”

“Social participation is participation in the public space. It’s about relations between citizens themselves where they develop activities without the involvement of actors from political system”

Van Houwelingen et al. (2014) makes a similar distinction, namely policy influencing and self-reliant participation. The definitions of Smith (1993):

“Public participation encompasses a group of procedures designed to consult, involve, and inform the public to allow those affected by a decision to have an input into that decision.”

and Peeters (2012):

“Public participation is: a way of policymaking in which citizens, individually or organized, directly or indirectly, get the opportunity to influence the development, implementation, and/or evaluation of policies.”

The definitions are all similar in their basis. For this research public participation is defined as, the involvement of the public in the governmental domain, on behalf of the public and their collective interests.

The Reason for Public Participation

There are always two sides to a story, and this is no different for the reason for public participation. The two sides are the public, and the government. This paragraph sums-up their motivations.

The public approach

The major reason that governments change their approaches is the fact they are lagging behind on society and citizens are taking matter into their own hands. This is the main
movement that drives the bottom-up focus of this time. The main reasons, found in the literature, why the public is more involved with government policies are:

- The higher average education level of the public. Citizens do not unquestioningly adopt government policies, they want a good explanation and will ask questions if they are not satisfied with the explanation given (van Houwelingen et al., 2014).
- Easy accessible information and self-education, provided by information technologies, extremely strengthens the first argument (Hajer, 2011).
- The welfare state is on its return, and the economic crisis of 2008 forced the government to cutbacks. Forcing people to take a more active role. At the same time, the quality of the already reducing social services and amenities lowered, which citizen now think they can do better. (van der Heijden, 2015).

Next to the societal argument, there are also personal reasons why people get more involved in governmental policies. Verba et al. (1995) and Denters et al. (2013) divide these personal reasons into four categories:

- Solving social problems, generally in their own neighbourhood.
- Doing their civic duty, they feel obligated to contribute to society and their own neighbourhood.
- Doing it for fun, they enjoy working with people in the neighbourhood and getting to know them.
- Doing it out of self-interest, to solve problems that directly relate to themselves.

The governmental approach
There a various motives why a government incorporates public participation. Although these motives differ for every government, policy, and project, the upcoming motives can be found widely spread in the literature. These motives are:

- Increasing the legitimacy of policies, by tuning policies to behavioural routines, experiences, and priorities of citizens and creating a broad acceptance and support base in society of policies proposals. In short learn from each other (Hurlbert & Gupta, 2015; Ministerie van VROM, 2007).
- Increasing the effectivity of policies, by using the citizens expertise of the real world, to avoid policies have unforeseen and undesirable effects. Also citizens can look beyond known solutions and come up with surprising suggestions, giving a different perspective on policies issues and solutions and offer new perspectives (Ministerie van VROM, 2007; Pröpper & Steenbeek, 1999).
- Increasing the efficiency of policies, by reducing the time necessary for formulating and especially implementing policies. Due to the fact there is less resistance, because problems are already clear during the process (Herweijer & Pröpper, 2008; van Houwelingen et al., 2014)
- Reducing government expenses, due to the financial crisis in 2008 the government has to make cutbacks, and is asking more form the public (Ministerie van Algemene Zaken, 2013).
- Reducing the gap between government and the public, by listening to the public and act again as representatives of the public (van Houwelingen et al., 2014).
- Promoting a more open and integrated government, by the governments obligation to take the views of the public seriously and not be preoccupied with its own internal divisions and struggles (Mostert, 2003).
The Level of Public Participation

The idea of public participation is not new. A few decades ago, public participation was already a hot topic for social and political researchers. For instance, Arnstein (1969) tried to categorise different types of public participation in, what is known as The Ladder of Citizen Participation, see Figure 2.

In the ladder, Arnstein (1969) divides eight levels of public participation, six if the non-participation is not included. Those six are divided in tokenism, where citizens are involved but cannot decide, and citizen power, where they are involved and have power to decide. This ladder concept remained popular throughout the years with different interpretations for Veldboer (1996), Edelenbos et al. (2001) and Hurlbert & Gupta (2015). Edelenbos et al. (2006) combines his version of the participation ladder (J. Edelenbos et al., 2001) with Pröpper & Steenbeek (1999) seven governance styles. This combination is shown in Table 1, providing a clear presentation of the role citizens and governments have in the different participation levels and governance styles. The levels Citizen Control or Co-Decide are often referred to a governmental participation, because the government participates in initiatives of the public. The appropriate level of public participation is hard to predict, Rowe & Frewer (2000) state that it depends on the specifics of any particular project of process, for instance the execution of the law is conceded a governments task and is not likely to be transferred to the public. This research will focus on the co-produce and co-decide levels of public participation, with the collaborative and facilitative style of governance.
Table 1: Degree of Participation and Styles of Governance (Jurian Edelenbos et al., 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Ladder (J. Edelenbos et al., 2001)</th>
<th>Governance Styles (Pröpper &amp; Steenbeek, 1999)</th>
<th>Role of the Citizen</th>
<th>Role of Governments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant is not involved</td>
<td>1. Closed authoritarian style</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Carries out autonomous policy and provides no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Inform</td>
<td>2. Open authoritarian style</td>
<td>Target audience for research/information, does not provide input</td>
<td>Carries out autonomous policy and provides information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consult</td>
<td>3. Consultative style</td>
<td>Consulted interlocutor</td>
<td>Determines policy and provides the opportunity for comments, but do not need to attach any consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advise</td>
<td>4. Participative style</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Determines policy, but is open to other ideas and solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Co-Produce</td>
<td>5. Delegative style</td>
<td>Co-Deciding, within constraints</td>
<td>Determines policy within preconditions, respecting the predetermined conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Collaborative style</td>
<td>Collaborative partner on the basis of equality</td>
<td>Governance works and decides on the basis of equality with participant together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Co-Decide</td>
<td>7. Facilitative style</td>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Provides support and leaves policymaking to participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Participation in the Process of Governance

Edelenbos et al. (2006) states that in all government levels, national, regional/provincial and local government, public participation can be applied. All these government levels work by roughly the same process of governance. Hoogerwerf & Herweijer (1989) divide this process into five policy sub-processes, see Figure 3, and state that public participation can be used in all of those sub-processes.

- Agenda setting is the process in which societal problems be brought to the attention of the policymakers. In the case of Mijn Mooi Brabant, this is the declining spatial quality in Brabant.
- Policy preparation is the process of answering the questions, what must happen? Who has to make it happen? How is must happen? And what must be the results? In the Case of Mijn Mooi Brabant this is fact that Mijn Mooi Brabant is started.
- Policy formulation is the process of defining the content of the programme. What kind of initiatives? How to subsidies them? And designing the process of the programme.
- Policy implementation is the application of the means selected for the chosen purpose. In the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, this is searching for and realising of the initiatives.
- Policy evaluation is assessing the process, the satisfaction and if the problem is solved, or improved.

This research focuses on the provincial government, in which the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme executes the policy formulation and implementation tasks.
One remark has to be made, as long as the government decides what they are going to do, the process has a top-down structure. If the public takes over a stage, the process turn into a bottom-up structure. This leads to a mixture of top-down and bottom-up structures in the process and the meeting point is different for every theme and programme. Some tools can be used to decide when to uses which level of participation. Creighton (2005) and de Bruijn et al. (2008) suggest an actor scan to identify all the actors involved in the problem, process, or decision. This makes clear if the public an actor. Webler et al. (2001) suggest that the next step is to clarify if the participants can mean anything in the problem, process or decision. If the decision is already made or the law forbids the involvement, it is likely to be useless to involve the public. If there is room and use for public participation, the decision can be made to use it. In this decision, other reasons can play along, public parties can possess information that is important to making good decisions or the public must be involved in implementation, so commitment to the decision by the public is essential.

When the decision is made to involve the public, the level of involvement, see the ladder of Arnstein (1969) Figure 2, must be identified. This is an important decision for different reasons. This because public participation cost time and money, so it is important to use this for subjects where the public is able to contribute. Second, the time of involvement is crucial. According to Mostert (2003) involvement is best at the start of the process, when changes to the plans are still possible, costly implementation problems could thereby be avoided. Another complication of too late involvement is the fact that the public feels ignored and this can result in disappointment, soured public relations and less public acceptance rather than more (Ministerie van VROM, 2007; Mostert, 2003). The planning of the level and time of public involvement should be thought trough.

The Considerations in Public Participation

This paragraph discusses the subjects that should be considered before starting with public participations. The subjects are not directly negative but it is important that the government body knows and considers these possible problems in their decision-making.

Democratic Equality

With participation as a part of democracy, it is very important to keep an eye out for democratic equality. This because major international and national studies (Thomassen, 2011; S. Verba et al., 1995; Sidney Verba, Schlozman, Brady, & Nie, 2012) conclude that the participation involvement is not a good reflection of society, and the highly educated autochthonous men over fifty are the most likely to participate. Other studies contradict these results (Denters et al., 2013; van Houwelingen et al., 2014), but it is essential to consider this knowledge, and avoid political injustice.

Decision Quality

Another point of consideration is the quality of decisions. According to Mostert (2003) the public is sometimes seen as short sighted, ill informed, selfish and too emotional or lacking in democratic attitude (The same can often be said of politicians and experts). This can be
addressed by providing good information (Pröpper & Steenbeek, 1999) and stimulating social learning in the process.

**Conclusion**

Important in public participation are the reasons to participate. This works two ways, the government must make clear where, in the process of governances, they want or need the public and at what level. Not all topics are suitable for every level of participation or it might be that the public does not want to be involved, because they are not interested. Further, the timing of participation is important. If the public is involved in one of the governance steps, they need to have the possibility to contribute in the decision-making, which is suitable for the level of involvement that is given. Finally, the government must be critical about participating in public initiatives. The initiative needs to be an initiative on behalf of the public and their collective interests. Not just an individual that want something done and thinks that the community wants that to.

This research will focus on the co-produce and co-decide levels of public participation, with the collaborative and facilitative style of governance, within the policy formulation and implementation tasks of the province.

### 3.4.3 The Spatial (Re)Development Process

In the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, the province facilitates spatial (re)development to enhance the spatial quality of Noord-Brabant. Spatial redevelopment is a process, and that process is a major topic in this research. To understand this more, this chapter provides a short description of the meaning of spatial quality, spatial (re)development, and the process of (re)development.

**The Definition of Spatial Quality**

Spatial quality is a difficult concept to define. First of all term spatial quality is rare in the English literature, in the context of land use and planning. Other terms such as: landscape quality, environmental quality and quality of life, are more commonly used but not complete (Janssen-Jansen, Klijn, & Opdam, 2009). Secondly, it is often used without specifying what is meant. In this perspective, it is interesting to see that the definition the Dutch government is using is very old. It dates back to the beginning of our era, when the roman architect Vitruvius said that a building must meet three principles: utilitas (usefulness), firmitas (durability) and venustas (beautifulness). The ministry of VROM used this to describe spatial quality, defining space to be qualitative if it has use value, future value and the perceptive value (Ministerie van VROM, 1990). This definition is also used in the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme (Mijn Mooi Brabant, 2011). This definition is very broad and Hooimeijer et al. (2001) argues that the perception of those values is partly subjective and different for every assessor. For instance beauty is never experienced the same by everybody, this is contrast with pollution that can be measured. Janssen-Jansen et al. (2009) name this the subjective dimension of spatial quality. According to Janssen-Jansen et al. (2009) this can be described by a three way iterative system, see Figure 4. In this figure, space is conceived as a physical system that can perform a number of functions, functions that we assign value. The preforming of the functions is objectifiable but the assigning value to that functioning is subjective.
In this report, spatial quality is the, by the assessor assigned value, which is built-up from it use, future and perceptive value, of a physical structure of a landscape for the function in which it foresees.

The Definition of Spatial (Re)Development

In the literature various terms are used to describe the phenomenon spatial (re)development, such as renewal, regeneration, and rehabilitation (Zheng, Shen, & Wang, 2014). These terms are very similar, with differences in the way the (re)development is done. Further the prefix refers to the development of existing things (Zheng et al., 2014). The word spatial is used in this research to refer to the place where the (re)development takes place. The term urban is very often used to refer to the urban area that is (re)developed. The last part of the term is development. In the dictionary described as “the process in which someone or something grows or changes and becomes more advanced” (Cambridge University Press, 2015). Ercan (2011) describes the urban regeneration as a “comprehensive and integrated vision and action to resolve the multi-faceted problems of urban areas and to improve the economic, physical, social, and environmental conditions of deprived areas”. Also Roberts & Sykes (1999) use those four factors in the urban redevelopment process. Therefor in this report the definition of spatial (re)development is, the vision and action to change the physical structure of the landscape, in order to change the functioning of the landscape system, in an economic, physical, social, and environmental way.

The Spatial (Re)Development Process

The spatial redevelopment process follows generally the same steps as most other construction processes. Figure 5 shows these steps, which are; exploration, planning, realisation and operation (J. F. M. Koppenjan, 2005). The difference is found in the goal of the process and the elaboration of the five steps. Especially in public participation processes, the initiative is coming from the public. This research is focused on the first three steps, from exploration via planning to realisation.

![Figure 4: Diagram of the Objective and Subjective Component of Spatial Quality (Janssen-Jansen et al., 2009)](image)

![Figure 5: The Phases of Project Development (J. F. M. Koppenjan, 2005)](image)
Conclusion
Enhancing spatial quality is the main goal of the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme. This is done through the spatial (re)development process, which makes that an important subject in this research. This chapter showed that, that goal is hard to make clear. It is very broad and, even more problematic, different for everybody and every organisation. This also allows a broad interpretation within the programme. On the other hand, the definition ensures a board perspective, which can be used to think about subjects in the initiatives that are easily overlooked. This research is focused on the first three steps, from exploration via planning to realisation, of the spatial (re)development process, because that is where the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is involved.

3.4.4 Governance Networks
As mentioned before, the world has changed and with that, the position of the government. As stated by de Bruijn & ten Heuvelhof (2011), the makeability myth, a government that can implement its goals with only political will, no longer exists. The government is operating as an equal player within the network, and the probability of successful governance, with no support of other players in the network, is small. The policy processes have changed and the government has to change with them. This chapter describes the characteristics of those governance networks.

The Characteristics of Networks
Klijn (2005) and de Bruijn & ten Heuvelhof (2011) describe the characteristics of networks, and compare these with the characteristics of, the hitherto conventional, hierarchy structure. The first characteristic of a network is pluriformity. Pluriformity refers to the great variety of, actors, products, interests, instruments of power, et cetera, in networks. This in contrast with a hierarchal structure, which has a uniform character. This has several implications for interventions. First, the reach of an intervention. All actors are different and will react different to an intervention. To address this customization is an option, but in a network with a large number of actors, this is uncontrollable. In addition, different actors interpret interventions differently, with the risk that an intervention has no impact. On the other hand, pluriformity provides opportunities. The different interpretation from the actors lead to a more easy adoption of the intervention. The intervention might even be a more affective one because the actors make it fit for themselves, this is called constructive ambiguity. Another opportunity is the large change that an intervention is successful for at least one actor, this can lead to indirect control if that actor has a power over other actors in the network. Further pluriformity provides the opportunity to use a divide and conquer strategy, this means that in a network, actors are divided and it is not likely that they group together against an intervention that is made.

The second characteristic is reticence. Because the different actors have different interests, they can be reticent by an intervention. However, the reticent actor wants to be left alone by the intervening actor. Therefor the reticent actor wants to kill the effectivity of an intervention, suggesting at the same time this is not happening. A reticent actor is powerful in order to be able to be reticent, this is an opportunity for the intervening actor. If they have the support of the reticent actor, there is a powerful ally for the intervention.
The third characteristic is interdependency between actors, which can be expressed in different variables: finance, power, information, and etcetera. This characteristic can lead to exploitation of actors over which they have power, with the consequence that an actor feels used and will try to get revenge leading to chaos in the network. Interdependency can also lead to lack of clarity and laborious and slow decision-making. Actors have difficulties to see all interdependencies and take a long time figuring this out. Further, the quality of decision-making can be low, because all the interests of the interdependent actors must be fulfilled. Nevertheless, possibilities are there to, interdependencies obligate temperate behaviour, and a higher complexity makes more trade options available. Finally, the presence of different actors can lead, due to different views and interest, to content enrichment.

The last characteristic is that a network is dynamic, pluriformity, reticence, and interdependencies change during the process.

In this research, the focus is on governance networks. Koppenjan & Klijn (2004) define governance networks as:

“More or less stable patterns of social relations between mutual dependent actors, which form around policy programs and/or cluster of means and which are formed, maintain, and changed through a series of games”

Sørensen & Torfing (2009) define governance networks, more extensively, as:

“A stable articulation of mutually dependent, but operationally autonomous actors from state, market and civil society, who interact through conflict-ridden negotiation that take place within an institutionalized framework of rules, norms, shared knowledge and social imaginaries; facilitate self-regulated policy making in the shadow of hierarchy; and contribute to the production of ‘public value’ in a broad sense of problem definitions, visions, ideas, plans and concrete regulations that are deemed relevant to broad sections of the population.”

This research defines governance networks as:

**More or less stable patterns of social relations between interdependent, operationally autonomous, and pluriform actors, which form around policy programs and/or cluster of means and which are formed, maintain, and changed through a series of negotiation rounds.**

**Decision-Making in Networks**

The three basis characteristics of a network, pluriformity, reticence, and interdependency, make especially decision making in networks complex. Table 2 compares hierarchy and network decision-making.

*Table 2: Hierarchy and Network Decision Making* (de Bruijn & ten Heuvelhof, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly and Sequentially</td>
<td>Irregular and No Clear Sequential Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases</td>
<td>Rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Actors</td>
<td>Actors Enter and Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Arena, Process With Clear Start And Finish</td>
<td>Multiple Arena’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Content Stable</td>
<td>Content Problem Shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive to Consider Issues Structured</td>
<td>Incentive to Consider Issues Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency and Predictability</td>
<td>Move Along and Unpredictability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
De Bruijn & ten Heuvelhof (2011) state that decision making in networks is whimsical. This whimsicality can be divided into two components: Content Whimsicality, the problems, there content and the involved actors, shifts continually. The second component is Process Whimsicality, the process of decision-making is unpredictable and not structured. In order to be able to come to decisions, a process design is needed and this process needs to be managed.

**Process Design**

As mentioned before process management is necessary in networks to structure the decision-making and ensure that goals can be reached. In order to do so a process design is needed.

*The Core Elements of a Process Design*

The first important subject is the core elements of a process design, which criteria must be fulfilled by a process design. The first description is from de Bruijn et al. (2008), they state that a good process is an: open process, in which core values of actors are safe, with enough incentives to ensure progress and speed, and guarantees quality of content of the results. Webler et al. (2001) describe more detailed criteria, however less encompassing. They found that a good public participation process should be legitimate, promote a search for common values, realize democratic principles of fairness and equality, promote equal power among all participants and viewpoints, and foster responsible leadership. This promotes equal power among all participants and viewpoints criteria need a bit more explanation. This does not mean that every actor should have equal power, because that is unreasonable. However, it focuses on the avoiding abuse of power by strong actors, and levelling the playing field by creating an open process in a way that no backroom decisions are made by the strong players.

The two definitions of a good process are very similar, using the description form de Bruijn et al. (2008), will include the principles of Webler et al. (2001).

*Design Principles of a Process Design*

The next step is to ensure that the core principles are secured in the process. De Bruijn et al. (2008) formulated design principles that are able to do that, see Table 3. These ideas are reflected in in other studies (de Bruijn & ten Heuvelhof, 2011; J. Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004; Sandström, Bodin, & Crona, 2015; Webler et al., 2001)

Table 3: Design Principles of Process Design (de Bruijn et al., 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All relevant parties are involved in the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Content decisions are transformed into process-related agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transparency of process and process management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Core Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Central values of the actors are safeguarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commitment to the process, not the result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Commitments may be postponed by the actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The process knows exit-rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. The process knows prospects of profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are quick wins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The process has a high power staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conflicts are embedded in the process as deep as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Command and control is used as a catalyst for the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Substantive insights are used facilitative; the roles of experts and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested are separated and interconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The process is a process of content variation to selection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Evaluation of the Network Performance

The problem is that networks are very complex and their performance is not easily assessed (Kenis & Provan, 2009; Sørensen & Torfing, 2009). Also the different goals of the different actors make it difficult to pick a single goal by which to measure the outcome of these processes (Klijn, Steijn, & Edelenbos, 2010). Another part of that complexity becomes clear in the research of Kenis & Provan (2009). They identified three exogenous dimensions of network effectiveness, namely, governance form, type of inception (voluntary versus mandated), and developmental stage. These are exogenous factors because, while they are key determinants of the extent to which a particular evaluation criterion is appropriate for assessing network performance, they are largely outside the control of network members.

This means that the performance of a network is limited by the external factors that form the network itself, and when a networks performance is evaluated, this should be taken into account. Further, the performance of networks is assessed as poorly, because the network may be assessed based on inappropriate or unreasonable criteria. This leads to a network, under the best endogenous conditions, will still under-perform. If for instance, if a building project deals with building permit application processes that take all the time that there is to complete the building, they will not finish in time, and if time is a performance criteria the network will under-perform, but this is not directly the fault of the network.

Conclusion

The government’s way of working is changing from a hierarchical structure to a network structure. This has implications for the governments and for this research, the province. First of all the way the performance of the network is evaluated. This is still done in the way hierarchical processes are evaluated, for instance a physical realisation deadline. This is troublesome for a network structure because the evaluation should be about the functioning of the network. Of course time is a factor but not if exogenous factors influences that time. In addition, networks should hold interdependent parties. If for instance nobody is depending on a power of the province, a province should not be involved. On the other hand, if the province is not dependent on others, those others should not be involved. When parties are involved in the network they should have high power, this speeds up the negotiations and makes progress in the network process possible. This also counts for the province, which is almost impossible in the current governmental structure of the Netherlands. Finally, quick wins should be designed in the process, to keep parties interested. However, to do this, parties should be clear about what kind of wins they need. This makes transparency important and not only in the actors needs but also in the process structure.

3.4.5 Mijn Mooi Brabant, the alternative approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society.

The Mijn Mooi Brabant approach is an answer to the provincial goal to make more use of the energy in society. A government that no longer imposes, but allows. Traditionally, the province decides top-down what needs to happen in the province, targeting very specific problem areas. At the start of the tenure the province allowed a few experimental programmes to use a new approach, one of those programmes is Mijn Mooi Brabant. As start, the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme defined three principles, initiatives, education, and campaign. This research is focused on the initiatives. These initiatives are; leading in the programme, should come from society, and are driven by transparency and market forces. To obtain initiatives, the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme works with a selection of broad criteria, see Table 4, which
do not specify a place or type of initiative. In the table, the small difference between the Mijn Mooi Brabant and the Erfgoed & Erfgenamen programmes is visible.

Table 4: Most Important Selection Criteria Mijn Mooi Brabant and Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Mijn Mooi Brabant</th>
<th>Erfgoed &amp; Erfgenamen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The realization before 2015</td>
<td>The realization before 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing, at least 50%</td>
<td>Co-financing, at least 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to spatial quality</td>
<td>Contribution to spatial quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical, tangible, accessible</td>
<td>Physical, tangible, accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create movement</td>
<td>Create movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional distribution</td>
<td>Regional distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalable</td>
<td>Use volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with education</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From society</td>
<td>From society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of the traditional top-down approach, the programme asked its partners to provided initiatives. This was done believing that the partners are close to society and will present initiatives that come from society, ensuring a bottom-up approach. The partners provided numerous initiatives. The province organised roundtable conversations with the proposed initiatives. Appendix B Time Path of the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme shows the steps taken in the process. This figure is made in cooperation with Frank van der Steen (2015). On October 31st 2012, the Erfgoed & Erfgenamen programme is added to the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, and follows the same process. The first meeting are to explore the possibilities, and to check on the knock out criteria; financially feasible, finished in time, visitable, added value for the province, and urgency for the participants. Than the initiatives where assessed on their use, future and perceptive value. When they proved promising, additional roundtable conversations are organized. These are used to enhance the ambition of the initiative and prepare for the subsidy application. During this meetings various experts where involved, form inside the province or from their network, to help with problem they encountered. In addition, various workshops and academies are organised to bring the initiatives closer together and allow them to use the provincial network in benefit of their initiative. Finally, the roundtable conversations leaded to a value map and a picture map of the initiatives, crystalizing their goals and making it easy to see those goals. By those maps, the final selection was made. Here is the major difference between the programmes, the Mijn Mooi Brabant initiatives where selected by a committee is containing the provincial deputy, the cluster director and a consultant. The Erfgoed & Erfgenamen programme initiatives where selected by the project leaders of the two programmes. This total process was highly iterative and initiatives where involved in different points in time. This is why final selection moments are held a few times.

After the selection was made, the subsidy scheme was finished and opened up for everyone. The subsidy was granted in order of entry, of complete applications. This where, of course, the initiative selected in the beginning and where helped by the province. Appendix C Mijn Mooi Brabant Initiatives, presents an overview of the initiatives started in the programme, their subsidy applicant, and if the initiatives were, in my view, initiated by the public. The uniqueness of this approach is the time and effort that is put into the pre-subsidy process, combined with open/broad criteria, and the way initiatives where brought in.
3.5 Discussion

The government, fortunately, is restricted to the law. These laws ensure a government, which takes into account the interests of the whole population in their actions. One of the downsides is the fact that the government is not flexible and changes slowly. Together with an unavoidable reaction, instead of action, to societal changes, the government always has to catch up in a changing society and answering to new requests from the public. The challenge now is making good use of the public in areas that where traditionally governments organized top-down. This means operating in networks, close to the public. This literature study found some points of interest that lay the basis for the rest of the research.

The first important issue is clarifying for what provincial core functions public participation is desirable, and at what level. There need to be interdependencies between the public and the province. In addition, the province should be critical to a participating public. This public needs to participate for the public and not strictly for their own interest, in order to make it useful to involve the public. This is connected to the obligations a province has, such as considering the interests of all citizens. When public participation is desirable and possible, the government should realise that they are involved in a network. They need to clarify the goals of the network and for the different actors in the network. In the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, this is enhancing spatial quality. Spatial quality has a very broad definition in the province, making it hard to evaluate if the goal is reached. The goals of the players should be transparent and it is the same for the process structure. Further, networks work in games, or negotiation rounds. In these rounds, it is important that parties have representative power. This is a big problem for the province, and other governmental bodies, because the authority of their representatives is limited by the law.

In the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, some interesting things are notable. First, a lot of time and effort is put in, to improve the initiatives before the subsidy grant was given. That time and effort has several faces and can be personalised for every initiative. This is what makes the programme unique. However, this close involvement of the province and the way the subsidy is granted allows for biased selection, personal but also political by the strong involvement of the deputy. Also, in my opinion, not all initiatives are supported by society and the selection process might not be the most transplant there is. Further, the time it took to design a subsidy scheme used up half the tenure, which leaves little time for the realisation of the initiatives. Finally, the majority of the subsidies are not grated to the public but to other governmental bodies, or entrepreneurs.

Figure 6 shows the research area of this thesis. The provinces, as a regional government, is the starting point of this research. From this point, the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is examined. Within the policy process, this programme is responsible for the policy formulation and policy implementation. Those policy process steps are at the same time the boundaries of this research. In the policy steps different levels of public participation can be used, this research focus on the co-produces and co-decide levels. Simultaneously to the policy process, the spatial (re)development process is developing. From this process the exploration, planning and build phases are the playground or the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, and therefore also the boundaries of this research.
4. Research Model
4.1 Abstract

The provincial organisation, but more importantly the governmental organisational structure are not very suitable for the public participation process. Law and regulations are the biggest hurdle, however the majority protect the core values of the Dutch democracy, and are not likely and advisable to change fast. In order to deal with the situation the province should focus on the exploration and planning phases of the spatial (re)development process, where their network and knowledge inputs are most effective and they are an equal player in the network. This leads to a shorter lead-time of the initiatives and allows the province to take on initiatives throughout the tenure and be more adapted to the public agenda. Further, the province should choose initiatives critically. If the province wants to be close to the public, chose public initiatives. Those public initiatives even benefit the most from this approach, due to their limited of experience, knowledge, and funds. Further, the province should evaluate on the exploration and planning phases, and strive for a good network process instead a finished physical product. Use the budget to facilitated the process, maintain the network, and hire experts. Get rid of the traditional subsidies, which focus on the wrong achievements and cause most of the bureaucracy.

4.2 Introduction

After the foundation is laid in the theoretical framework and the main subjects are clarified, the next step in the research can begin. This step is practically focused with as heart the data gathered from interviews. The interviewees give their practical view of the programme and allow the researcher to indulge in a few initiatives. To get a better view and to be able to ask more direct questions, possible problem areas are searched for within the provincial boundaries. Answering sub research question 4: What are, according to the regional governments, the possible problem areas in public participation spatial (re)development? When the interviewees are selected, scripts can be made and the data gathering and analysing can begin. This leads to the answering of the remaining sub research questions:

5. What are the, by the participants determined, positive aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?
6. What are the, by the participants determined, negative aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?
7. What should, according to the participants, the role of a regional government be in public participation spatial (re)development processes?
8. How are the positive and negative aspects related to the role of the regional government in public participation spatial (re)development processes?

After all the sub research questions are answered, this chapter can be concluded with answering the main research question:

How can the province improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society?
4.3 Method

This chapter provides a detailed description of the research methodology. The methodology provides the scientific foundation of the research and ensures the substantiation of the results.

4.3.1 Research Process Design

According to van Aken et al. (2012), there are two basic structures for carrying out fieldwork in business or management. The first is the empirical cycle (de Groot, 1969), this process is focused on verifying hypotheses and producing scientific knowledge. The second process is the regulative cycle (van Strien, 1997), this process is focused on problem solving. This research follows the first three steps of the regulative cycle, problem definition, analyses and diagnosis, solution design. The intervention step is beyond the reach of this research, this also means that it cannot be evaluated at this time.

![Regulative Cycle](image)

Figure 7: The Regulative Cycle (van Aken et al., 2012)

4.3.2 Case Study Research

The goal of this research is to advise the province of Noord-Brabant how they can improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant method, focussed on the process of spatial (re)development. This in the belief that regional governments should operate more closely to the people and play the role of the facilitator. Due to this relatively new approach for regional governments, there is little literature available about this subject. The case study research methodology is very useful for knowledge and theory building and the “how” questions that the researcher wants to answer here (Pratt, 2009; Yin, 2009). In addition, the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is unique and experimental. Which is why, the province is interested in what can be improved. Therefore, a case study research methodology is used, focussed on the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme. To obtain the needed data for an in-depth understanding of the processes and motivations within the case study, an interpretative qualitative research approach is recommended (Boeije, 2005). This will provide a much deeper understanding of the programme and will be able to discover hidden positive and negative aspects, than a quantitative method. There are six types
of qualitative data that can be collected for case study research namely; documents, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant observation and physical artefacts (Yin, 2009). The main data source in this research are interviews. Interviews will provide an in-depth insight in the positive and negative aspects of the programme. Besides interviews, other data sources are used as well. According to Cooper & Schindler (2014) the use of multiple sources of data allows triangulation to improve construct validity of the research.

Case Selection
The research has a single-case design, with the Mijn Mooi Brabant programmes as case. As mentioned before this programme is selected because it is a unique and experimental programme. A programme that is an example of the new way the provincial government wants to or even needs to act. Within the case four embedded units of analysis, four initiatives of the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, make the research an embedded single-case study. Baxter & Jack (2008) cite the benefit of embedded case design to illuminate the case through analysis “within the subunits separately (within case analysis), between the different subunits (between case analysis) or across all of the subunits (cross-case analysis)”. The last option is not possible with a single-case study. Only four embedded units are selected due to time limitations, which can lead to an incomplete picture of the situation.

Sampling
Selecting the embedded units within the case is the next step. The Mijn Mooi Brabant programme hold nineteen initiatives, but only four embedded units can be handled in the limited time. Making a selection can be done in different ways, van Aken et al. (2007) state that for qualitative research theoretical sampling is used, because it “typically aims to generate new insights into phenomena and the underlining mechanisms that explain the effects”. According to Stake (1995) cases should be selected “to maximize what we can learn”. Creswell (1997) defines the concept of purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling means, “that the inquirer selects individuals and sites for study because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study.”

Keeping van Aken, Stake and Creswell in mind, this research selects four initiatives using ‘maximum variation’ sampling strategy (Creswell, 1997). This means that the initiatives selected are divided over the two programmes, Mijn Mooi Brabant and Erfgoed & Erfgenamen, and should build a physical structure. In addition, the initiator of the initiative is as different as possible and thought to be useful. This means that problems in the initiative are not caused by a major event, unrelated to this research. Further, the initiatives where selected for the possibility to interview two different people. Unfortunately, this proved harder to accomplish than expected, leading to one initiative with only one interviewee. Table 5, shows the selected embedded units and their interviewees.
The Soete Moeder and Leer- en Buur Tuin initiatives are chosen because they are, in my opinion, real public participation initiatives. The Soete Moeder is also the only initiative from the Erfgoed & Erfgenamen programme. The Bedrijfsvaartuig initiative is chosen because the initiator is a commercial company with a social goal and the Dijkdenken initiative is chosen because the initiator is a governmental body. The last two are, in my opinion, not supported by the public directly however, they provide an insight in the reasoning of the province to select those initiatives.

### 4.3.3 Interviews

As already mentioned, interviews are the most important data source of this research. Within the four chosen embedded units, the triangulation strategy is used to identify the interviewee. Using the triangulation strategy ensures that the data collected from the interviews is a good representation of the real world. Therefore two participants are selected from each initiative for an interview, all with different functions within the initiative. These seven interviews result in the main data for this research. In addition to the seven interviews, two interviews are conducted within the Mijn Mooi Brabant organisation, to get an extra perspective on the topics. The last interviewee is selected within a different Dutch regional government, but involved in a similar programme. This provides a different perspective on the topics and an idea of the generalizability of the result.

#### Interviewees

In total, this research holds ten interviews. Table 5 shows the interviewees and their function in the initiatives. Figure 8 show the geographical location of the initiatives selected. The selection is made based on triangulation. First, the initiator of the initiative was selected, this succeeded for every initiative. The second interviewee for that initiative was selected to be as diverse as possible. This leaded to a student, an involved individual, and a municipality project leader. The other interviewees where selected on their specific function. One having a good overview over the programme, one with a strategic function in the province of Noord-Brabant, and the last with a strategic function in another province, but with detailed knowledge of a similar programme.

---

2 In one of the initiatives, it was only possible to interview one person.
The number of needed interviews is hard to predict beforehand. The optimal amount of interviews is reached when an extra interview does not reveal new information (Guest, 2006). Glaser & Strauss (1967) call this theoretical saturation. Therefore, the number of interviews needed is dynamic, but time is limited. When saturation is not reached after ten interviews, it will not be possible to add more interviews. This can reduce the quality of the results.

Interview Design

Turner (2010) & McNamara (2015) define four different formats for interview designs:

1. Informal conversational interview,
2. General interview guide approach,
3. Standardized open-ended interview,
4. Closed, fixed-response interview.

For this research, standardized open-ended interview, or semi-structured interviews, are used for the data collection. The standardized open-ended interview is extremely structured in terms of the wording of the questions, but are worded so that responses are open-ended. The questions in the interview framework can be changed if the current questions do not provide the answers needed. This interview technique is a recommended form of interviewing in qualitative research (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Boeije, 2005; Cooper & Schindler, 2014; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Yin, 2009). The interview needs to be structured to guide the interview, ensure that all topics are discussed and make data comparable, but the openness will allow for unexpected insights and prevents a biased interviewer (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The interview will not receive the questions beforehand. This is done to prevent conceived and reserved answers to the questions. The drawback of this choice is that it is possible that the answer will be less profound, because the interviewees have to answer directly.
Formulating the questions for the interviews is done according to the Central Research Question (RCQ) → Theory Question (TQ) → Interview Question (IQ): pyramid model, developed by Wengraf (2001), see Figure 9.

RCQ  How can the province improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society?

TQ A  What are the, by the participants determined, positive aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?

TQ B  What are the, by the participants determined, negative aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?

TQ C  What should, according to the participants, the role of a regional government be in public participation spatial (re)development processes?

The interviews take around 45 minutes and participants are only interviewed once. To allow the discussion about sensitive subjects, the data gathered cannot be traced back to the interviewee. This prevents the interviews being shallow and enables the development of new insights and theories. Appendix D Interview scripts, contains the interview scripts, and shows the evaluation of questions during the research.

4.3.4 Data Analysis

The interviews are conducted to get an insight in the opinion of different involved actors about the role and added value of the regional government of public participation spatial (re)development processes. The interviews produces raw data that has to be turned into findings and conclusions. This is a difficult process. To turn raw data into systematic and structured data, two strategies can be used: the grounded theory approach and the template approach (van Aken et al., 2012). The grounded theory approach develops theory out of raw qualitative data (Corbin & Strauss, 2007; van Aken et al., 2012). The template approach is uses to test theories with the raw qualitative data, using existing concepts and theories (Goulding, 2002). Because this research is focussing on generating new insights in the field of public participation in regional governments for spatial (re)development, the grounded theory approach is the most suited. The interviews are recorded and transcribed. Using the computer software called ‘NVivo10’ the data was coded and analysed.

Grounded theory is used to analyse the raw qualitative form the interviews. Glaser & Strauss (1967) developed grounded theory and divided the structuring of the data in three steps: exploration (open coding), specification (axial or theoretical coding), and reduction (selective coding).
The first step of data analysis is open coding. Coding can also be described as, labelling or calorizing (van Aken et al., 2012). Corbin & Strauss (2007) describe open coding as breaking apart and delineating concepts to stand for blocks of raw data. Important in the open coding process is that there is no existing coding scheme, but that the codes are developed during the coding. This ensures the openness of the analysis process. There are two strategies for open coding data (van Aken et al., 2012). The first strategy is asking questions. This implies that the researcher reads a part of the data and ask, what is this about? What is the context? Etcetera. Answering all the questions makes it easier to code the data. The second strategy is data comparing. Comparing data from different interviewee with different characteristics shows differences and similarities, which the researcher can put into words. When a large number of codes are used, the codes can be grouped into categories, to make the data more clear.

Appendix E Open Coding Results shows the results of the open coding process. Due to the large number of nodes, nodes have to be grouped. Appendix F Open Coding Results Grouped shows the grouped nodes. This means that a nodes such as Ambition has a wide meaning, for instance Enthusiasm and Initial Idea are coded under the node Ambition.

The second step in the data analysis is axial or theoretical coding. In the process of theoretical coding, focuses on finding relationships between the open codes and/or the categories. These relationships can take many different forms such as cause-and-effect relations, or sequential. Appendix E Theoretical Coding Results shows the result of this coding. It show the frequency a node that are coded together with another node, visualising probable relationships.

The last step is selective coding. In selective coding, the found relationships in the first two steps are crystalized until relations are saturated. This means that no new relations are discovered. This may enquire more data collection and because relations have become clearer, the researchers is able to ask very specific questions. This is done in paragraph 4.4.3.

4.4 Results

This chapter presents all the results of this research. The results are derived from several resources. The first paragraph presents all documents important in the process and observations made during the research period. The second paragraph summarises the data gathered form the interviews and puts it in perspective. The third paragraph analyses the data gathered form the interviews. This is done by describing in detail the relationship found and interpreting the answers of the interviewees. Finally, the data is put together and discussed.

4.4.1 Documents and Additional Information

Subsidy

Subsidy is the way an administrative authority can support non-governmental bodies with financial resources. It is describes as: “the entitlement to financial resources provided by an administrative authority for the purpose of certain activities of the applicant, other than as payment for goods or services supplied to the administrative authority” (art. 4:21 Awb 1992). The General Administrative Law Act 1992 describes, in title 4.2, all regulation concerning subsidies. The further shaping of the way subsidies are granted lies with the provinces
themselves. The province of Noord-Brabant describes this regulation in the General Subsidy Regulation Noord-Brabant 2014. Article 7 of this act provides four possible forms of subsidy: project subsidy, operating subsidy, budgetary subsidy, or incidental subsidy. These forms have different characteristics with different goals. These different types of subsidies can be provided in different ways: in the form of a sum of money, in the form of a loan, or in the form of a guarantee (art. 7 General Subsidy Regulation Noord-Brabant 2014). Further, the General Subsidy Regulation Noord-Brabant 2014 (art. 14) describes four ways that subsidy programmes have to distribute grants. These ways are: in order of entry, by means of a tender system, proportionally, or by lottery. Every subsidy programme has to write a subsidy scheme with these kinds of regulations for this specific programme. This subsidy scheme is than opened for a certain period and everybody can sign in for the subsidy.

**Evaluations of the Programmes**

The two programmes are evaluated individually. However, because the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme is extended with a year that programmes only had a ‘Review and Preview’ and the evaluation of the Erfgoed & Erfgenamen is not finished yet, so cannot be used in this research.

The report states the hits and mishits of the programme, and the findings can be found in the report Mijn Mooi Brabant: Terug- en Vooruitblik (JNB & Complan BV., 2015)

**Hits**

Mijn Mooi Brabant is a catalyst for spatial quality in Brabant. In their role as driver, they provided an impulse for the initiatives. Co-financing increased the realization probability, and the contents support resulted in broadening and upscaling of the initiatives. In addition, the province improved the awareness of the importance of spatial quality and made spatial quality visible. The used visualisation method is considered clear, making the redline though the programme easy to follow. The space in the programmes was used to let the three pillars, initiatives, education, and campaign, excel, and link up with Erfgoed & Erfgenamen. The input of students for the initiatives created a surprising added value through their refreshing perspective. With the students as major component, the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme created a vast network of partners by organising academies, masterclasses and thematic meetings, and finally the region perception has been enhanced locally.

**Mishits**

One of the biggest mishits is the expectation of the timeframe. It turns out that some goals require more time than there is available. Especially securing spatial quality in curricula of educational institutions proves harder than expected. Further, the projects to improve spatial quality prove to be more time consuming than expected and will exceed the deadline. This is caused by the way of working, inside out, because the province needs to respond to changes that arise. Further, improving the initiatives turns out to be time-consuming and different aspects of the process are underestimated such as, formal procedures, politics, financing, and disagreements. In addition, the growing network of the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme needs to be maintained better and the relation with the internal organisation of the provinces needs more attention. This requires better communication towards the province and the network. Finally, the role of the province was not always clear for the different participation and needs more clarity.
Public participation in the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme

When Appendix C Mijn Mooi Brabant Initiatives is examined, and the initiatives are reflected to the definition of public participation: the involvement of the public in the governmental domain, on behalf of the public and their collective interests, the outcome is mixed. First, in my opinion, Erfgoed & Erfgenamen has used public participation more, with six out of seven initiatives. Mijn Mooi Brabant reaches only three out of eleven. In almost all the public participation initiatives, the subsidy is also granted to the public, predominantly organized in a foundation. This is possibly a good selection criteria for the future. I do believe that the initiative work from a collective interest for the public, and not for their own good, but that should be evident to provincial programmes.

Current Vision for the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme

In the five months this research is in progress, the province did not stand still. The Mijn Mooi Brabant programme has been extended with one year to able initiatives to finish without losing their subsidy. In addition, the future of the programme took shape, and is now waiting for approval of the states. To provide an insight in the plans a small summery is presented.

The idea is to establish on one or more workplaces where initiators are facilitated to enhance each other, achieving concrete sustainable results of a high quality. These workspaces are on neutral ground where people can meet and share experience, knowledge and expertise. Focusing on the long term, with an integral approach and social challenges as starting point. Using the tools developed in the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme, the key elements of the workplace are:

- Reinforcing initiators qualitatively in the realization of their initiatives, from an integrated approach, together with businesses, using experts and professionals and talented students.
- Strengthen officials of the province, municipalities, and water authorities qualitatively in their work on related programs. They flex work one or more days in the workshop, share knowledge, and stimulate each other to improve.
- Providing the opportunity to young professionals to participate and contribute to specific sustainable tasks.
- Connecting and upscaling of concrete results on provincial themes and advising on policy

A Brabant workplace that surprised, enhances, enriches, deepens and books concrete results in this administrative period can make a significant contribution to ‘Movement in Brabant’.

NOSB Rapport

During this research, van der Steen et al. (2015) published a research about networked working, a case study about the way the province Zuid-Holland deals with the participation society. It is an interesting report with overlap to this research. The main findings are described here and can be used to look at the generalisability of this research.

Networked working is here to stay, but not as the way of working but as an alternative alongside the tradition ways of working. The challenge is selecting the right way. Different considerations are relevant. The first is normative, do you want to leave subjects to the society of close to the administrative organisation. The second consideration is based on the content. What is the problem about and what the best way to tackle it is. The final consideration is technical. Is the use of instruments practically feasible? The art of good governance is making
the right choice as soon as possible in the process but keep in mind that that is not always possible. Thus, this means that the provincial organisation must be able to choose for networked working. Which is difficult, because procedures in the organisation are not made for networked working. Further networked working requires other competences and instruments, which are not self-evident. For instance, administrative instruments, policies, agreements, and organization systems are simply not always suitable for networked working. Therefore networked working requires a different kind of organisation, an organisation that can deal with different systems, of which one is networked working, but still applies to the requirements of good governances. Systemisation of networked working is the big challenge. Networked working has also political consequences, the representative democracy continues to be in place, but participative democracy develops beside it. This pressurises the current democratic institutes and there is need for structure to facilitate networked working better. This is expressed in the way political ambitions and goals are formulated. That ambition must unleash social energy and channel that energy, not capture and contain it.

Conclusion

In the process of Mijn Mooi Brabant, there are a few notable events. First of all the time path appears too short to accomplish the goals of the programme, especially the realisation of the initiatives took longer than expected and started very late into the programme. This is caused by the way of working, procedures, and financial trouble in the initiatives. The way of working is what makes this programme unique, and is to be the strength of the programme. Enhancing the initiatives using internal and external experts, in the start of their process and preparing the initiatives for a subsidy application, proves useful, but disregards the basic goal of the subsidy instrument. This shows the need for new forms of subsidy. In addition, that preparation time, including designing a subsidy scheme, took over two years. This left only two years to comply with the subsidy requirement, physical result. With the added value of the province in the start of the process, the goals of the subsidies focused on the end. The problems are also noticed in other provinces, such as Zuid-Holland, with no clear solution yet. When the public participation in the programme is examined, it is disappointing that only half is an actual public participation process. The programme also has its strong points. The network created and used is vast, especially the education part is well developed and is perceived very positive. The co-financing increased the realization probability and made spatial quality visible. The future vision of the Mijn Mooi Brabant lags, in my opinion, the clarity in what the province wants. Further, it not a good idea to disassociate it this much form the province itself and turn it into a “neutral” ground, called a workshop. The provincial ground is neutral because, everybody knows what a government is expecting from partners on their ground. The government does not need to create a revenue model for this, in contrast to a foundation that takes over. Further, the focus on the strong elements of the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach is good however, also lags detail. Finally, the name workplace feels like it is not embracing the whole idea of the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach. This can lead to a public that does not know why they should go there.
4.4.2 Data Summery

In this chapter, the data gathered in this research is summarised and explained. Further, this chapter shows the consistency of the data and tries to clarify the way the data analysis is structured.

Interview Information

The first thing that is interesting to know is where the data comes from, and how is distributed among the interviewees. This to prevent the situation that the research results are based on one interviewee. The data is gathered from ten interviews, coded to 26 nodes, and containing 1272 references to these nodes. Table 6 shows a summary of the data gathered form each interviewee. For instance, on average 80% of the nodes are mentioned by every interviewee and all the references to the nodes are evenly distributed. There is only one exception and that is the interview with Chen Moa. This interview is comparatively short, and contains the least references to the lease number of nodes. Besides this one case, the data is distributed evenly among the interviewees, which increases the value of this research.

Table 6: Interview Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Duration (min)</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adri Everveen</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8423</td>
<td>13,3%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anja Niewind</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7166</td>
<td>11,3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne van Kuijk</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5526</td>
<td>8,7%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>12,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen Mao</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dries Onclin</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6656</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har Kuijpers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6567</td>
<td>10,3%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>9,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Pul</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5694</td>
<td>9,0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Dekkers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5274</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>10,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dano</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7304</td>
<td>11,5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>10,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Saris</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8859</td>
<td>14,0%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>464</strong></td>
<td><strong>63503</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1272</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewees versus Nodes Information

Secondly, the distribution of the coded nodes is interesting. Table 7 shows which nodes are referred to the most and by which interviewees. For instance the four nodes: Ambition, Participant – Stakeholder, Provincial Role and Subsidy are used by all interviewees and account for over 35% of all references. This is an indication that those nodes might be important. In addition, an evenly distribution of referenced nodes over the interviewees suspects a more broadly based point of interest. Interesting to see is the similarities of the references from participants in the same initiative. Apparently, they are interested in, or run into the same things. The three external interviewees have a logical focus on nodes that are more abstract. Finally, the saturation in this research is reached. No new insights where discovered in the last interviews. Especially the few large subjects where saturated. This increases the reliability of this data.

Table 7: Interviewees versus Nodes Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Number of References</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Referred Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Ambition</td>
<td>12 14 6 2 13 26 24</td>
<td>13 9 2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>9,5%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Critical Project Selection</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>7 15 7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
<td>4 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Education</td>
<td>3 3 0 4 2 3 0</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
<td>7 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Financial Struggle</td>
<td>10 2 0 1 0 8 3</td>
<td>1 0 4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>7 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Government</td>
<td>3 1 0 11 12 0 6</td>
<td>3 3 12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4,0%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Interests</td>
<td>3 3 4 4 5 6 10</td>
<td>1 9 1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,6%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Interests Difference</td>
<td>1 3 2 8 4 4 4</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Knowledge Impulse</td>
<td>5 5 1 2 3 2 9 3</td>
<td>8 6 2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3,5%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Knowledge Limited</td>
<td>1 3 3 2 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>7 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Laws and Regulations</td>
<td>10 18 5 11 8 0 2</td>
<td>5 1 0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4,7%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Experience Limited</td>
<td>1 1 6 5 1 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 5 12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>6 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Network</td>
<td>13 1 8 0 4 6 4 6 4</td>
<td>8 13 6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>9 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Organisational Process</td>
<td>7 2 0 1 1 0 0 3</td>
<td>1 6 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,8%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Organisational Structure</td>
<td>1 2 0 11 7 0 1</td>
<td>3 2 4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: Organizational Justification</td>
<td>0 1 0 3 8 0 0</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,7%</td>
<td>6 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Participant - Stakeholder</td>
<td>8 17 11 7 9 20 14</td>
<td>12 14 11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9,7%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: Politics</td>
<td>4 10 0 4 6 4 8</td>
<td>1 10 10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td>9 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Poor Communication</td>
<td>2 6 4 4 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
<td>6 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: Professionalisation</td>
<td>3 1 0 4 0 1 6</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Project Delay</td>
<td>7 9 2 17 13 13 13 1</td>
<td>7 2 3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5,8%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: Provincial Involvement</td>
<td>7 5 3 5 5 11 5 2 10</td>
<td>1 5 1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4,2%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: Provincial Role</td>
<td>14 6 4 16 10 9 11</td>
<td>19 22 15</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9,9%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23: Publicity</td>
<td>7 2 0 1 1 0 6</td>
<td>1 5 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24: Risks</td>
<td>3 8 0 0 1 7 5</td>
<td>0 2 0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,0%</td>
<td>6 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: Subsidy</td>
<td>18 14 2 6 8 11 5</td>
<td>19 11 5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7,8%</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Tools</td>
<td>4 0 2 1 2 10 9</td>
<td>7 8 3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,6%</td>
<td>9 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Used Codes | 24 24 15 23 23 18 21 21 21 19 1272 | % | 92% | 92% | 58% | 88% | 88% | 69% | 81% | 81% | 73% |
Theoretical Coding Results

Finally, the nodes are plotted against the nodes, to look for relations between the nodes. This leads to a matrix of 26x26, with the number of references a node in combination with another node has. The full matrix is included in Appendix E Theoretical Coding Results. In that matrix, all 325 possible connections are visualised. Of those 325 possible connections, 275 connections have at least one combination. Because it is impossible, in the time scheduled for this research, to examine all these relations, a selection is made. This is the selective coding process. This selection is made by looking for the node relations that have the most references. The relations that are examined have more than 15 references. Using this selection a total of fifteen relations will be examined. Table 8 shows the combinations with the number of references. These fifteen combinations account for almost 30% of all the combinations made in the 325 possible combinations.

Table 8: Nodes versus Nodes Information Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 : Ambition</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 : Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 : Interests</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 : Knowledge Impulse</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 : Laws and Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 : Network</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 : Organisational Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 : Participant - Stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 : Project Delay</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 : Provincial Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : Provincial Role</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 : Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 : Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Table | 725 | 100% | 29% |
| Total       | 2534 |      |     |

4.4.3 Data Analysis

In this chapter, the results of the interviews are presented. Some of the combinations overlap and therefore there are four theme created:  
1. Ambition and Interest;  
2. Provincial Role, Participant – Stakeholder and the Network;  
3. Laws and Regulations;  
After the main combinations are discussed, there is room for smaller findings that are worth mentioning. This chapter ends with a summary of all the findings. That answers the sub research questions 5, 6 & 7.
Ambition and Interest

Interests versus Ambition

Interests and ambition are closely linked together. Someone with an ambition is very likely to have an interest in realising that ambition. The ambition start often by the initiator who has an idea, but it also manifests itself in the form of a vision, motivation, energy, and commitment to realise that idea. One of the key success factors is keeping that ambition, the driving force in a process, high. That ambition is easily tempered by interest differences, for instance a governmental body has the responsibility, and therefore an interest in, checking the initiatives compliance with laws and regulations. The body is thus not directly interested in the success of the initiative itself. Therefore, it is important to know the ambitions and clarify the interests of the stakeholders in an initiative. Finally, the opinion is that the province should be more critical about what their ambition is and if they have an interest in an initiative that fits that ambition.

Participant – Stakeholder versus Ambition

The connection between participant – stakeholder and ambition is easy. At least one of the participants needs the ambition to start the initiative at all. As mentioned before that ambition is crucial for the process. To maximise the effect of the ambition it is recommended to clarify what that ambition is. When this is done the search for participants that share that ambition is crucial to enable the ambition to become reality. Besides that, the participants and stakeholders can enlarge that ambition and similar initiatives with similar ambitions can be linked. The difficult and important part is creating that shared ambition among all stakeholders and keeping it throughout the process. When this succeeds, there is a will to progress in the process and stakeholders and participants will help each other. Even when interests differ, stakeholders and participants will find a satisfying compromise.

Provincial Role versus Ambition

The provincial role in combination with ambition is believed to be two sided. First of all the province should have clear what there ambition is and select initiatives on that ambition. The second provincial role is the enhancing of the ambition of the initiatives. This is mentioned as one of the most useful actions taken and roles played by the province. They brought the initiative to a higher level, raised the ambition, and kept that ambition high throughout the process. This is done by organizing sessions with experts in the beginning of the process and visualising the ambitions in value maps. One problem with that role is that that high ambition can be too ambitious for the, by the province given, timespan.

Participant – Stakeholder versus Interests

Most of the lessons are already mentioned in the paragraphs above, which are closely linked to the participant – stakeholder versus interests combination. One lesson is not mentioned yet, and that is that the different interests of participants sometime where not understood or clearly communicated. For instance, the province needs moments to show results and other stakeholders need to provide room for that interest to be fulfilled and maybe even benefit from it. In addition, the province needs to be clear about their particular interests.

Provincial Role, Participants and the Network

Provincial Role versus Knowledge Impulse

Various interviewees see the input of knowledge in initiatives as very useful and a role played well by the province in the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme. First, there is a lot of knowledge within the province that can be used. Secondly, the province used various experts to help overcome different hurdles that initiatives struggled with if the province itself did not have
that expertise themselves. This could be a financial expert but also students doing an assignment for that initiative. Finally, there is the network of the province that helped initiatives find other parties that could help them without direct involvement of the province. This role is believed to become more important in the future.

**Participant – Stakeholder versus Network**
The interviewees see a great benefit of being part of a network. Especially the connecting element and the knowledge that is available in the network are perceived positive. They think that the network has and still can enhance their initiative. For the network, some of the initiatives directly point to the province, mainly because their own network is not that substantial, and see the vast network of the province. However, there are examples of initiatives used their own vast local network with enthusiastic volunteers.

**Provincial Role versus Network**
The provincial role in combination with the network seems to be to have the network and use it in the best way. Interviewees see this as one of the best features of the province, connecting initiatives, companies, schools, experts, and people. The key is to have a diverse network and the right partners. The education part of the network is well developed but other provinces have more focus on, for instance, financial partners. This can be an interesting goal for the future. Another challenge is the use of the network, there is the need to connect to issues beyond the local level, more than is done before. Finally, the connection of the network should be more through the provincial organisation, making it more than the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme.

**Provincial Role versus Participant – Stakeholder**
The province wants to be more participant in the initiatives. In addition, the province need participants more than ever to realise its goals. The province can play different roles as a participant or stakeholder, such as initiator, realisator, or facilitator. Clarity about those roles makes the process easier. In those roles, the province can have several added values. These added values can be: subsidy or other forms of financial support, knowledge inputs from both internal and external sources, enhancing ambition in the initiative and connecting it to a more regional level, making a network available for the initiative, and finally give the initiative status due to the fact that a authority is involved. Every initiative needs a customization of those roles and added values used and will often be a combination of all. The focus is shifting from initiator and realisator to facilitator, and the added value subsidy is used less and less. In addition to this, the province also has a role as permit providing authority, which can complicate the position of the province.

**Project Delay versus Participant – Stakeholder**
Stakeholders and participants are very determinative for the process progress. One of the important factors mentioned in the interviews is stability, the change in key partners caused serious delays. Another factor that was considered important was the need for a driving force. Someone in the initiative needs to push the process forward, to keep the pace. Further, the lack of professionalism in the stakeholders and participants caused delays. Finally, the government is considered a slow partner and causing delays, in two ways. First, the permit procedures are slow and are underestimated. The opportunity for objections is often overlooked. Objections made by stakeholder of the process, some even by participants. Secondly the time it takes in governmental organisations to get something done, in short the bureaucracy, where important factors of delay.
Laws and Regulations

Organisational Structure versus Government
This paragraph is more about the organisational structure of governments and the problems people experience with this. The first problem is the fragmented way in which, especially local and regional, government bodies are organized. These large bodies have various departments that operate in their own interest. Therefore, it regularly happened that, one department is supporting or even initiating an initiative and another department is blocking that initiative. Which is frustrating for everybody and very confusing for external parties, for which a province is a province. One reason for these problems is the double function a governmental body has. The first is participant in an initiative and the second a controlling administrative body. This can lead to the conflicting interests. Another problem is the lag of authority that a representative of a government body has. Caused by the ground principles on which the Dutch democracy is based, decisions have to follow a long path in a governmental body to reach approval. This denies a governmental body to work fast and use the energy that is available in a particular moment, a possibility they would like to have.

Project Delay versus Laws and Regulations
Laws and regulations are one of main reasons for delay in the process. First, there are all the permits and the associated timeframes. These permits have to come from different governmental bodies, and many initiators underestimate the time needed for these permits, especially when there are objections made. The second reason is the timeframe of the province, four years, and the time it takes the province to come up with a subsidy programme. In this programme, this took almost two years, with only two years left for the realisation. Many initiatives where started already but needed the money make good progress. Further, the subsidy programme decided after some time to work together with Erfgoed & Erfgenamen and some initiatives were transferred to that programme, leading to delays.

Subsidy versus Laws and Regulations
In addition to the previous paragraph, the interviews show some interesting insights into the relation between laws and regulations and subsidies. To start with a positive note, most liked the concise way to apply for the subsidy. This was done by the value maps, only four A4 sheets of paper. Less positive is the accountability systematics, especially for initiatives that use multiple subsidies. They struggle with the fragmented subsidy programmes and their different accountability systematics, even within the province itself. Due to the time it takes it is noticed that initiatives find the subsidies not worth the effort, and do not involve the province for that reason anymore.

Subsidy and Tools
Subsidy versus Provincial Involvement
The most important reason to involve the province is still the opportunity to get a subsidy. Some did not even looked for the conditions of the subsidy and found during the process that it took more time than expected. On the other hand, there is an upcoming interest to involve the province without subsidy. This because it takes time and people lose a bid of their ownership.
Subsidy versus Provincial Role
As described in the precious paragraph, initiatives involve the province mainly because of the subsidy opportunities. Therefore, many interviewees see that as the most important role of the province. However, the interviewees from the province see the need for change, because funds are limited. There are suggestions that there should be looked for other subsidy forms, such as funds, loans or other unknown ways. It is believed that the role of the province needs a mix of instruments, thus also subsidy but that the focus needs to shift to network and knowledge. This change will take time, on one hand for the initiatives to see the added value of a province with limited resources and on the other hand for the province to find and clarify their future role.

Tools versus Provincial Role
The province used a variety of tools to enhance the quality of the initiatives. Most of them were based on the network the province has. For instance, before the subsidy application the initiatives had several sessions with the province and some expert to clarify the goal and enhance the ambition of the initiative. In these sessions they made a value map, this infographic summarised the initiative. The added value of these value maps is perceived differently by the interviewees. Some are enthusiastic and some could not understand them and are already forgotten what they are about. Other tools used by the province where workshops and academies about a theme that connects to one or more initiatives. These tools where not mentioned very often. However, the few who did where positive. They expanded the network of the initiatives, provided an opportunity to brainstorm about the initiative and exchange knowledge.

Other findings
Because it is not possible to include all the information gathered from the interviews in this report it is unavertable that some interesting remarks are not included. To minimalize that, this paragraph contains a few remarks that were made during the interview that are thought to be interesting but not referred to as much.

The first remark made is about planning. It is perceived contradictory for a province to want to work bottom-up and use the energy from the society, but at the same time force their own agenda upon the initiatives. The province determents the completion date, connected to the election agenda to ensure publicity for the deputy. Further, that political agenda was not always clear, and should be better aligned with the initiatives. The second remark is the role that Martin Bakker played in this programme. His use, enthusiasm and commitment is clearly visible, but he is the face of Mijn Mooi Brabant, which can be a risk, for instance if Martin Bakker leaves. Better spreading though the provincial organisation can minimise this risk. Further, interviewees referred to the uniqueness of the initiatives and the fact that they lay outside of their normal routines. Making the process more difficult, resulting in overlooking needed permits for instance. Finally, the added value of the province seemed to be higher in the initiatives that, in my view, are public participation initiatives. This is possibly caused by the unexperienced public in this line of work. In addition, they might not be so used to look beyond their initiative.
Interview Data Summery

These summaries answers the sub research questions 5, 6 & 7, based on the interviewees’ responses.

Sub Research Questions 5

What are the, by the participants determined, positive aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?

The financial support is the main reason for the participants to involve the province in their initiative. This support helped initiatives to get started, and was especially needed for the higher ambition level created by the province. That ambition is the most important positive process aspect. The initiatives starts with an ambition or vision. A goal that the initiator wants to realise. This ambition is the driver of the process. A, for the interviewees unexpected, strength of the province is the way they enhanced that ambition, pushing the initiative to a higher level. The province used several tools to accomplish this. These tools are seen as useful and positive, starting with the roundtable conversations resulting in value maps of the initiatives. These tools seemed to be more useful in the public participation initiatives, possibly because of the limited experience. For a continuation of the process stakeholders and participators are needed, and found through the network of the initiatives themselves, and the provincial network. The province organised workshops and academies to bring parties together, and to provide a knowledge impulse to the initiatives. Experts from inside the provincial organisation or external through the network helped the initiatives overcoming problems. In addition, the large network of schools and students provided a fresh view on problems resulting in surprising solutions. These meeting also created a shared ambition and vision by all the participants, making it easier to overcome problems during the process. A smaller positive aspect in the process is the status the province brings to an initiative. Finally, the way the province used the value maps to do the subsidy application, was perceived easy.

Sub Research Questions 6

What are the, by the participants determined, negative aspects of the public participation spatial (re)development process, of Mijn Mooi Brabant?

Time is the major problem in process, and this manifests itself in different ways. Firstly, the time needed to gather and select initiatives, taking up half of the four years. Parallel to that the subsidy scheme design needed that same period. This leaded to a two-year period between the subsidy granting and the realisation deadline, a planning only realistic with no setbacks of any kind. The political four-year agenda forced that deadline upon the initiatives, and it had to be postponed by a year because none of the initiatives is finished jet. Secondly, the permits and their process time needed are underestimated. They proved to be slow and with more obstacles than expected. Thirdly, the organisational structure of governmental bodies slows the process down. This is cause by the lag of authority given to the governmental representatives. These representatives have to justify their actions in the organisation and cannot make decisions on their own, regarding helping an initiative financially. This is just the way the Dutch democracy is arranged, protecting democracy. Another negative aspect of the process is the unclear double role the province has, as a participant in a process, and as a permitting authority. Two roles with not necessarily the same goal. This also manifests itself within the fragmented way the province is organised. Different departments have different interests and those differences where not clear for participants, that see the province as one
organisation. Those interest differences have the risk to lower the so important ambition and energy of the initiatives. This fragmentation was also experienced in the subsidy accountability systematics. Different departments had different systematics leading to time-consuming paperwork. This can be partially explained by the lag of the provincial network integration within the province itself. Finally, the ambition enhancing is perceived as positive but also made the initiatives larger and more complicated, making it even harder to comply with the deadline and the financial struggle already there. Other smaller negative aspects are; the instability of key partners, no clarity about the final subsidy programme, no clear driving force, unprofessional participants, and the uniqueness of the initiatives for the participants. All these aspects made the process more difficult and/or leaded to delays. Finally, the tools used are experiences vague and a waste of time by some of the participants, needing to more practical.

Sub Research Questions 7

What should, according to the participants, the role of a regional government be in public participation spatial (re)development processes?

According to the participants of the initiatives, the role of the province is clear. They involve the province for the subsidy and see that as their most important role. However, after experiencing the programme they acknowledged that the added value for the province was more extensive. Further, the external provincial interviewees see the need for the change because of the limiting of resources over the years. All the interviewee agreed that the province should become more facilitator than initiator or realisator. That facilitating can take different form; one is again the subsidy, possibly in different forms. The second is the knowledge input, enhancing ambition and providing experts, students, etcetera to the initiatives to solve problems. Also, keeping ambition high throughout the process. Thirdly the network, where all the experts, companies, school, students, etcetera are part of. Organizing meetings to bring them together and search for ambition shearing participants, trying to connect initiatives regionally. Further the province should be more clear about their double role they play, and communicate better internally in the organisation. The last remark is that the province should have a clear ambition and vision of their own to be able to pick the initiatives that fit into those goals of the province.

4.4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, sub research question 8 is answered by combining the answers of sub question 5, 6 and 7 together and link this back to the literature. The sub question 8 is:

How are the positive and negative aspects related to the role of the regional government in public participation spatial (re)development processes?

In the spatial (re)development processes, the role of the regional government is two-sided. First, there is the role of democratic governmental body that regulates and assess changes to their fields of justices. This role is responsible for the granting of subsidies, permits, and etcetera. This provincial role proved to be slow, caused by the slow moving processes. These slow processes are partly the result of the way governments are organized to ensure democratic decision-making, and have to apply to the principles of good governance. These structures, laws and regulations are very important for the Dutch democracy and improvements on that part go way beyond the scope of this research. Further, the connection between the first and second role of the provinces shows similar problems. First, due to the
organisation structures, governmental representative have very limited authority. This leads to difficult positions in process negotiations, as a participating actor. As de Bruijn et al., (2008) state, it is important to have a high power staff in the process to ensure progress. More authority for governmental representative can solve this problem but is hard to realise due to the reasons mentioned above. Further, the politics are not ready for public participation. This appears through their agenda. That four-year agenda is forces upon the initiatives with, especially close to the elections, completely different interests than the initiative. If the province wants to be close to society, society’s agenda should be leading. Another problem with that agenda is the relative small timeframe in which initiatives can join. This small timeframe excludes all other, possible better, initiatives. In addition, the fact that a budget has to be used within the administrative period, can lead to the selection of initiatives that are not of the highest quality or with no good prospect for success. Further, subsidy arrangements take a very long time leaving very little for the realisation of the initiative and on that realisation, the initiatives is judged. Finally, the selection process is potentially biased and not transparent, because the way of working is not suitable for subsidy procedures.

The second role of the regional government in the spatial (re)development process is as participant in the process. This is where the added value of the province lies. These added values are divided into four categories; subsidy, network, knowledge, and status. Subsidy is the main reason for initiatives to involve the province and some interviewees belief, the only one. This is changing simply due to the limitation of funds in the province, but also because public participation in the policy implementation process is believed to improved efficiency. Subsidy is also accountable for most of the problems with the province and used for the realisation of the initiatives. The second category is the network. The network is one of the major assets of the government. Especially the education part of the network is well developed. In the network, initiatives, experts, governmental bodies, companies, schools, and students can find connections, ambition, examples, expertise, and knowledge that can help them improve and move forward. Different tools are used to get actors in the network together, such as workshops and academies. Tools used to maintain and make use of the network need funding. The same for the hiring of experts, to enhance initiatives. The Mijn Mooi Brabant programme provided those funds with a lot less hassle than a subsidy, which allowed the team to respond quickly to upcoming opportunities. This is possible because those expenses are seen as a purchase and not a subsidy, with much milder rules. In addition, the amount of money spend in these cases is a lot lower than for the subsidies. Finally, that money is used for the added value of the province, while in the case of the subsidy, the subsidy is the added value of the province. The second added value of the province is its network. This network is predicted to be more and more important in the future. The province is believed to be a good guardian and host of the network, because they do not have a financial expectation of actors in the network (van der Heijden, 2015). The one point of criticism is the connection of the network internally in the province. The Mijn Mooi Brabant network is more or less standalone. This can be improved by including more existing networks of the province. The network is especially useful in the exploration and planning phase of the spatial (re)development process. The third added value is knowledge and this is two-sided. On one hand the knowledge internal in the province and on the other hand the knowledge external in the network. Both sources of knowledge can and are used in the same way. This is to enhance the ambition of the initiatives and to overcome hurdles along the process. It is mainly applicable to the exploration and planning phase of the spatial (re)development
process. This knowledge input is mainly interesting for public initiatives because their lag of experience or lag of funds to include experts. Tools used by the province where perceived useful but for some vague and to abstract, but provide a good basis for their development. As mentioned, the knowledge can be used fast and the province can respond to the needed knowledge of every individual initiative. The last category is a small added value of the province. A province brings status to initiatives with their involvement. This status can open doors and attract other parties to the initiative. Status can influence all stages of the spatial (re)development process.

When the added value of the province is projected on the spatial (re)development process timeline, it is noticeable that it is concentrated in the exploration and planning phase, except for the subsidy, which is focused on the realisation phase. It is remarkable that the subsidies are granted for a phase in the process that the province is hardly involved in, and the provincial effort is judged on the product while the province only influences the process to design the product.

4.5 Recommendation

How can the province improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society?

A good provincial approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society starts with the basics. The province should clarify in which themes they would like to participate, and facilitate spatial (re)development processes. This clarity is needed for their own organisation, setting the boundaries for provincial work. Besides that, this should be clear for initiators of spatial (re)development processes, so they know when the province can be involved and if the province wants to be involved. This is not described in the future vision of the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme, thus should be added. Further, the province should be very critical about which initiatives they will support. If the provinces wants to be close to the public and use the energy of the public, they need to select only initiatives that are initiated by, have support from, and work for, the public. This means rejecting initiatives that come from, other governmental bodies, companies, and etcetera. The public, often united in foundations, should be the ones that are supported. They even benefits the most from the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach, mainly because the public do not have the knowledge and/or expertise for this kind of processes. That professionalization in, for instance process architecture, sustainability of economics, it the strength of the province and their other experts. However as mentioned in the literature, an interdependency should be present, the initiator must need the province and vice versa. If there is an initiative, initiated by and for the public, and if fits the goals of the province, the work can start.

When the process is started, the provincial support for the initiatives should be focused on the exploration and planning phase of the spatial (re)development process. In those phases, the initiatives can be prepared to start the realisation phase with a positive prospect that the initiative will reach the goals of all the participants, including the province. The province can help in the Mijn Mooi Brabant way, structuring the process, enhancing ambition, bringing in experts to overcome hurdles in the process, and make the network available to connect, enhance, and involve other parties in the initiatives. This focuses the effort of the province to
their strengths. An additional support should be the clarification of boundary condition within their own organisation and the law. Inform initiatives about provincial permits needed, and act more like one organisation. Make sure to involve the administrative and political bodies within the province, and provide the room for publicity focused on the process instead of the product. The evaluation criteria should be changed accordingly. The process should be evaluated on the process and not its physical result. Therefore, the province needs to be satisfied when the process is moving to the next phase of the spatial (re)development process with the prospect of mutual gain for the actors involved. A political publicity moment can be the starting, instead of the finishing of the realisation phase. Another big advantage of focussing on the exploration and planning phase of the spatial (re)development process is the shortening of the lead-time of initiatives. This will reduce the influence of the four-year agenda of the province, without the need for major organisational changes within the province. This also means that the province can facilitate and take on initiatives throughout the administration period, instead of just a few months. This will spread the workload, makes the province able to use upcoming opportunities, and be more in line with the public. In this way, the province is flexible and can work in line with the agenda of the initiative, being able to adapt to the dynamics of governance networks.

The biggest threat to the flexibility of a province are the traditional subsidies. Therefore, subsidies should not be used anymore in the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach. This will also bypass a lot of time-consuming bureaucracy. The one drawback is the fact that the initiatives see the province as a place to get financial support, and it might keep initiative away from the province. The lag of this financial stimulant might be absorbed by expanding the network with financial players, such as banks, funds, crowdfunding experts, and etcetera. The province of Overijssel shows that this is possible. If the province wants to support initiatives financially, this should be done after the initiative is gone through the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme. Therefore, is not a plea to the province to abandon all subsidies. However, they must be separated from this programme. This involvement of other provincial departments and programmes is one way to better interconnect the network to and within the province. Further, it is strongly recommended that the subsidy application documents of Mijn Mooi Brabant finds a way into, or set an example for, other provincial programmes. This will reduce the paperwork and make it easier to apply for a subsidy. The possibility is already shown in the Mijn Mooi Brabant programme. A further recommendation is a network scan. The network is very important for the provincial future and should be diversified. Scanning the network will find holes in useful and needed expertises in the network, one of those possible holes can be the financial sector. When the hole are found, a plan must be made to fill them up.

A few final recommendations/comments can be made, that are located a bit further in the future or in another step in the processes. First, it might be useful to involve the public already in the agenda setting stage of policymaking. In this way the formulation of this goals and themes of programmes are much closer to the public and the province will be more aware of the will of the public. This will make it easier to do the right thing. Secondly, search for ways to get more authority and trust for the civil servants to ensure fast reactions. Finally, prevent programmes to be too much based on one person. This will make programmes less vulnerable for changes of staff.
5. Conclusion
5.1 Conclusion

This research presents recommendations to the provinces of Noord-Brabant how improve the Mijn Mooi Brabant approach to the spatial (re)development process in the participation society. For these recommendations, the positive and negative aspects of the spatial (re)development process are made clear. The recommendations contribute in the first place to the work of the province of Noord-Brabant. However, the results can be useful to all the provinces of the Netherlands, because it is shown that, at least a few of them, struggle with this subject. Further societal relevance is found by the public initiator. Through this research, they can understand the province better and act on the problems. Taking into account the positive and negative aspects of the spatial (re)development process. This research hopefully creates some awareness about other added values of provinces in the Netherlands and helps the Dutch government to catch up with the societal changes.

The scientific relevance of this research is the contribution to a slightly underdeveloped field of research. Scientific research about the involvement of provincial bodies in the spatial (re)development process is scares. This research provides a small contribution to the development of this field, and helps regional governmental bodies to authenticate knowledge, which partly exists between civil servants internally. It opens the doors to scientific methodologies and give an example of their use.

5.2 Discussion

The limitations of this research start with the choice of the case. This case is selected because of its different approach to spatial (re)development in the participation society. This single case approach research limits the generalisation possibility of this research. Different sources make clear that other Dutch provinces and even municipalities struggle with similar problems, but the recommendations cannot be used directly in the other cases. Undoubtedly, the research can be useful and provides learning points for those other governmental bodies. The next limitation of this research is found in the selection of the embedded units, the four initiatives. The selection of four initiative is relatively small en does not cover the whole programme, this might lead to recommendations that are not supported by the other initiatives. Further, the embedded units are selected to be divers with specific sampling methods. This made the research broadly oriented, but possibly less profound and other sampling methods might result in other findings. The next step in the research is the interviewee selection. This selection focused on triangulation. However, it possible that other choices in the selection, could have let to different results. In addition, the fact that only one interview per interviewee is conducted without the possibility for the interviewee to prepare, allows the answer to be a snapshot of reality, and emotions could have influenced those answers. This is done deliberately to prevent overthought and politically correct answers, but every method has its pros and cons. This effect could possibly be reduces by using more different types of data, such as media feed, and etcetera. Other limitations are based in the analysis of the data. In this research, the data is coded by a single person, this allows for a biased coding process, leading to biased information. This is the case due to the time limitation for this research. However, the data gathering reached saturation, which allows the conclusion that the major themes of the programme are captured. Finally, the selection of combinations to focus on was done by the number of references, this was done to ensure the
use of the major themes within the boundaries of time. However, this makes it possible to overlook brilliant ideas or important results. This is partly absorbed by a small section to accommodate other findings. Nevertheless, these were not selected out of small numbering combinations do not cover the risk fully.

5.3 Further Research

There are two way further research is possible. First, further research can improve this research. This is possible if different ways, for instance by analysing the data differently and/or compare it to the similar types of research done in different provinces or different public participation programmes. Another possibility is extending this research by a quantitative analysis of the results by a questionnaire throughout the province their partners and the initiatives. In addition, a qualitative approach can have a useful contribution, asking what stakeholder think of the results and what they expect when the recommendations are implemented. Finally, the recommendations can be implemented and the result can be evaluated. The second way further research is possible, is by solution research for problems, which were brought to light through this research. For instance, there is research required to the way governmental bodies can be made better suitable for public participation. Part of this research must comprehend new ways of subsidies and the problem related to the lag of authority in the province. Finally, a research, to find hole in the diversity of the provincial network is recommended. This makes it possible for the province to act directly on a possible risk.
References
References


**Interviewees**

Appendices
Appendix A Partners of the province of Noord-Brabant

- ANWB
- Brabant Particulier Grondbezit
- Brabantse Milieu Federatie (BMF)
- Brabants Kenniscentrum voor Kunst en Cultuur (BKKC)
- Brabants Landschap
- European Centre for Nature Conservation (ECNC)
- Gemeente Eersel
- Gemeente Helmond
- Gemeente 's-Hertogenbosch
- Gemeente Roosendaal
- Gemeente Werkendam
- Gemeente Woudrichem
- Innovatienetwerk Groene ruimte en Agrocluster
- Landbouw Innovatie Noord-Brabant (LIB)
- Natuurmonumenten
- Parkschap De Biesbosch
- Rijkswaterstaat
- Staatsbosbeheer
- Stichting Viba-Expo
- TOP Brabant
- Waterschap Aa en Maas
- Waterschap Brabantse Delta
- Waterschap De Dommel
- ZLTO
Appendix B Time Path of the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 March 2011</td>
<td>Coalition Formating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 April 2011</td>
<td>Defining details of the programme By provincial representative Yves de Boer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 2011</td>
<td>- Energetic society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Spacial activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visible administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - 2011</td>
<td>Defining details of the programme By programme leader Martin Bakker + Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 2011</td>
<td>- 15 Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 March 2012</td>
<td>- Plan “Mijn Mooi Brabant” in an Infographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- States Announcement 2876956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 2012</td>
<td>Proposed Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roundtable Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picture Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - 2012</td>
<td>Subsidy Scheme Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 2012</td>
<td>Proposed Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March- 2013</td>
<td>Roundtable Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picture Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Decision Point 1 By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cluster Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Approved Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - 2013</td>
<td>Decision Point 2 By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>- Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2013</td>
<td>- Cluster Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Approved Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Point 3 By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provincial Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cluster Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Approved Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start 13/13 initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Time Path of the Mijn Mooi Brabant Programme
## Appendix C Mijn Mooi Brabant Initiatives

### Table 9: The Initiatives of Mijn Mooi Brabant and Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Grant Applicant</th>
<th>Initiated by and for the Public</th>
<th>Programme³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakhuys De Heen</td>
<td>Stichting 400 Jaar De Heen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beek dal initiatief De Gender</td>
<td>Municipality of Eersel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breukelen Beleven</td>
<td>Stichting Peelnetwerk</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biesbosch Museum</td>
<td>Stichting Biesboschmuseum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijkdenken</td>
<td>Waterschap Aa en Maas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groen En Zorg</td>
<td>Stichting Nature Assisted Health Foundation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historisch Bedrijfsvaartuig</td>
<td>Talsma Shipyards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leer- En Buurttuin</td>
<td>ROC Da Vinci College Roosendaal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liniepad Woudrichem</td>
<td>Municipality of Woudrichem</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slag Om De Schelde</td>
<td>Municipality of Woensdrecht</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snelwegbadhuis</td>
<td>Atelier Tussenruimte</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoorzone Den Bosch</td>
<td>Stichting Viba Expo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Achelse Kluis</td>
<td>Staatsbosbeheer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Borders</td>
<td>Stichting Forum Kunst en Cultuur Tilburg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coöperatie Vertrouwen</td>
<td>Coöperatie Vertrouwen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Pekhoeve</td>
<td>Stichting de Pekhoeve</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Soete Moeder</td>
<td>Stichting Soete Moeder</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Gogh Experience</td>
<td>Stichting Vincent van Gogh Etten- Leur</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weervisserij</td>
<td>Stichting Behoud Weervisserij</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E&amp;E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Mijn Mooi Brabant (MMB) Erfgoed en Erfgenamen (E&E)
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Appendix D Interview scripts

D1 Interview Jan van Pul | 11 mei 2015

Collectieve Leer- en Buurttuin, Roosendaal

Introductie

Algemeen

Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

*How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?*

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

– Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
– De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
– De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

Geïnterviewde

– Kunt u kort vertellen hoe uw bij het programma Mijn Mooi Brabant betrokken bent geraakt?
– Wat uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?
– In welke fase zit het initiatief op dit moment?

Het Realisatie Proces

Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkeling proces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?

– Welke partijen zijn betrokken bij het initiatief?
  – Op welke moment zijn deze partijen betrokken bij het initiatief?
  – Welke partijen zou u achteraf op een ander moment betrokken hebben?
  – Welke partijen zou u achteraf erbij, of juist niet erbij betrokken hebben?
– Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hadden op het proces?
  – Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  – Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?
– Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hadden op het proces?
  – Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  – Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
  – Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?

Wat is uw ervaring met bouwprocessen, heeft u dit soort initiatieven vaker gedaan?

De rol van de provincie

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingproces?

– Hoe is de provincie betrokken geraakt bij het initiatief?
  – Vanuit welke partij kwam het initiatief om samen te werken?
  – Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)

– Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?
  – Welke meerwaarde had u verwacht aan het begin van de samenwerking?
  – Hoe kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  – Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor een meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?

– Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
  – Welke rol had u verwacht van de provincie in het proces?
  – Hunt u het verschil verklaren?
  – Wat denkt u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?
  – Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie op de goede en minder goede aspecten van het proces?
Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen.

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

_How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?_

**Huishoudelijke Mededelingen**

- Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
- De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
- De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

**Geïnterviewde**

- Kunt u kort vertellen hoe uw bij het programma Mijn Mooi Brabant betrokken bent geraakt?
- Wat uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?
- In welke fase zit het initiatief op dit moment?

**Het Realisatie Proces**

Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkeling proces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?

- Welke partijen zijn betrokken bij het initiatief?
  - Op welke moment zijn deze partijen betrokken bij het initiatief?
  - Welke partijen zou u achteraf op een ander moment betrokken hebben?
  - Welke partijen zou u achteraf erbij, of juist niet erbij betrokken hebben?
- Kunst u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hadden op het proces?
  - Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  - Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?
- Kunst u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hadden op het proces?
  - Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  - Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
  - Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden vermindert?
- Wat is uw ervaring met bouwprocessen, heeft u dit soort initiatieven vaker gedaan?

**De rol van de provincie**

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?

- Hoe is de provincie betrokken geraakt bij het initiatief?
  - Vanuit welke partij kwam het initiatief om samen te werken?
  - Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)

- Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?
  - Welke meerwaarde had u verwacht aan het begin van de samenwerking?
  - Hoe kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  - Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor een meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?

- Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
  - Welke rol had u verwacht van de provincie in het proces?
  - Hunt u het verschil verklaren?
  - Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?
  - Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie op de goede en minder goede aspecten van het proces?
Dijkdenken Blauwe Sluis, Gewande

Introductie

Algemeen

Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen.

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

_How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?_

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

− Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
− De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
− De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

Geïnterviewde

− Kun u kort vertellen hoe uw bij het programma Mijn Mooi Brabant betrokken bent geraakt?
− Wat uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?
− In welke fase zit het initiatief op dit moment?

Het Realisatie Proces

Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkeling proces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?

− Welke partijen zijn betrokken bij het initiatief?
  o Op welke moment zijn deze partijen betrokken bij het initiatief?
  o Welke partijen zou u achteraf op een ander moment betrokken hebben?
  o Welke partijen zou u achteraf erbij, of juist niet erbij betrokken hebben?
− Kun u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hadden op het proces?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?
− Kun u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hadden op het proces?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
  o Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?
  o Wat is uw ervaring met bouwprocessen, heeft u dit soort initiatieven vaker gedaan?

− De rol van de provincie

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?

− Hoe is de provincie betrokken geraakt bij het initiatief?
  o Vanuit welke partij kwam het initiatief om samen te werken?
  o Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)

− Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?
  o Welke meerwaarde had u verwacht aan het begin van de samenwerking?
  o Hoe kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  o Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?

− Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
  o Welke rol had u verwacht van de provincie in het proces?
  o Hunt u het verschil verklaren?
  o Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?
  o Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de goede en minder goede aspecten van het proces?
Introductie

Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

- Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
- De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
- De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

Geïnterviewde

- Kunt u kort vertellen hoe uw bij het programma Erfgoed & Erfgenamen betrokken bent geraakt?
- Wat uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?
- In welke fase zit het initiatief op dit moment?

Het Realisatie Proces

- Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkeling proces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?
- Welke partijen zijn betrokken bij het initiatief?
  - Op welke moment zijn deze partijen betrokken bij het initiatief?
  - Welke partijen zou u achteraf op een ander moment betrokken hebben?
  - Welke partijen zou u achteraf erbij, of juist niet erbij betrokken hebben?
- Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hadden op het proces?
  - Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  - Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?
- Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hadden op het proces?
  - Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  - Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
  - Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?
- Wat is uw ervaring met bouwprocessen, heeft u dit soort initiatieven vaker gedaan?

De rol van de provincie

- Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?
  - Hoe is de provincie betrokken geraakt bij het initiatief?
  - Vanuit welke partij kwam het initiatief om samen te werken?
  - Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)
- Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?
  - Welke meerwaarde had u verwacht aan het begin van de samenwerking?
  - Hoe kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  - Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?
- Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
  - Welke rol had u verwacht van de provincie in het proces?
  - Hunt u het verschil verklaren?
  - Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?
  - Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de goede en minder goede aspecten van het proces?
D5 Interview Har Kuijpers | 13 mei 2015

Introductie

Gezien

Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

Geïnterviewde

Wat uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?

Het Realisatie Proces

Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkeling proces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?
Op welk moment zijn welke partijen betrokken bij het programma?
Welke partijen zou u achteraf op een ander moment betrokken hebben?
Welke partijen zou u achteraf erbij, of juist niet erbij betrokken hebben?
Welke aspecten hebben een positief effect gehad op het proces?
Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?
Welke aspecten hebben een negatief effect gehad op het proces?
Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?

De rol van de provincie

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?
Waarom wil de provincie betrokken worden bij een initiatief?
(wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)
Vanuit welke partij kwam het initiatief om samen te werken?
Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in de initiatieven?
Welke meerwaarde zien de initiatief nemers in de provincie?
Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?
Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?
Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de goede aspecten van het proces?
Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de minder goede aspecten van het proces?
Wat vind u van de subsidieregeling die is toegepast op het initiatief?
Hoe zou uw ideale subsidieregeling eruit zien?
D6 Interview Pieter Saris | 13 mei 2015

Bedrijfsvaartuig Helmond

Introductie
Algemeen
Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:
How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen
– Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
– De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
– De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

Geïnterviewde
– Wat uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?
– In welke fase zit het initiatief op dit moment?
– Wat is uw ervaring met bouwprocessen, heeft u dit soort initiatieven vaker gedaan?

Het Realisatie Proces
Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelings proces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?
– Welke partijen zijn betrokken bij het initiatief?
  o Op welke moment zijn deze partijen betrokken bij het initiatief?
  o Welke partijen zou u achteraf op een ander moment betrokken hebben?
  o Welke partijen zou u achteraf erbij, of juist niet erbij betrokken hebben?
– Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hadden op het proces?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?
– Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hadden op het proces?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
  o Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?

De rol van de provincie
Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?
– Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)
  o Hoe is de provincie betrokken geraakt bij het initiatief?
  o Vanuit welke partij kwam het initiatief om samen te werken?
– Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?
  o Welke meerwaarde had u verwacht aan het begin van de samenwerking?
  o Welke meerwaarde heeft de provincie gehad in de samenwerking?
  o Hoe kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  o Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?
– Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
  o Welke rol had u verwacht van de provincie in het proces?
  o Kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  o Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?
– Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de goede aspecten van het proces?
– Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de minder goede aspecten van het proces?
– Wat vind u van de subsidieregeling die is toegepast op het initiatief?
– Hoe zou uw ideale subsidieregeling eruit zien?
D7 Interview Dries Onclin | 15-05-2015

Bedrijfsvaartuig Helmond

Introductie

Algemeen

Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

− Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
− De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
− De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

Geïnterviewde

− Wat is kort uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?
− Wat is uw ervaring met bouwprocessen, heeft u dit soort initiatieven vaker gedaan?

Het Realisatie Proces

− Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkeling proces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?

− Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hadden op het proces?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?

− Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hadden op het proces?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
  o Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?

De rol van de provincie

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?

− Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)
  o Hoe is de provincie betrokken geraakt bij het initiatief?
  o Vanuit welke partij kwam het initiatief om samen te werken?

− Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?
  o Welke meerwaarde had u verwacht aan het begin van de samenwerking?
  o Welke meerwaarde heeft de provincie gehad in de samenwerking?
  o Hoe kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  o Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?

− Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
  o Welke rol had u verwacht van de provincie in het proces?
  o Kunt u het verschil verklaren?
  o Wat denkt u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?

− Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de goede aspecten van het proces?

− Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de minder goede aspecten van het proces?

− Wat vind u van de subsidieregeling die is toegepast op het initiatief?

− Hoe zou uw ideale subsidieregeling eruit zien?
Introductie
Algemeen
Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

- Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
- De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
- De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 60 minuten

Geïnterviewde

- Wat is kort uw rol is binnen het programma en de initiatieven?

De rol van de provincie

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?

- Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief? En zien de initiatiefnemers deze meerwaarde ook? (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)

- Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?

- Wat zou u, naar uw mening, meerwaarde moeten zijn van een provincie?

- Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?

- Welke problemen verwacht of ziet u bij deze rol?

- Wat vind u van het subsidie instrument in dit soort processen/initiatieven?

- Hoe zou uw ideale subsidieregeling eruit zien?
Initiatief Dijkdenken Blauwe Sluis Gewande

Introductie

Algemeen

Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

*How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?*

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

- Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
- De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
- De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 30 minuten

Geïnterviewde

Wat is kort uw rol is binnen het programma en het initiatief?

Het Realisatie Proces

Wat zijn de, door de actoren gedefinieerde, problemen met het burger participaties ruimtelijke (her)ontwikkelingsproces van Mijn Mooi Brabant?

- Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hadden op het proces?
  - Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  - Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?

- Kunt u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hadden op het proces?
  - Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  - Hoe bent u hier mee omgegaan?
  - Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?

De rol van de provincie

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?

- Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  - (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)
  - Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in het initiatief?
  - Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?

- Welke rol nam de provincie aan in het proces?
  - Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?
  - Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de goede aspecten van het proces?
  - Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de minder goede aspecten van het proces?

- Wat vind u van de subsidieregeling die is toegepast op het initiatief?
D10 Interview Anja Niewind | 21 mei 2015

Provincie Overijssel

Introductie

Algemeen

Mijn naam is Remco Mulder ik ben bezig met mijn afstudeer onderzoek aan de TU/e voor de master Construction Management and engineering. Hiervoor doe ik een onderzoek in opdracht van de provincie Noord Brabant met als casestudy Mijn Mooi Brabant en Erfgoed & Erfgenamen

Het doel van het onderzoek is het verbeteren van het proces van burger participatie in een ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsprogramma van regionale overheid.

De hoofdvraag is:

How should Dutch regional governments organize the process of public participation urban (re)development programs that enhance spatial quality?

Huishoudelijke Mededelingen

– Dit interview wordt opgenomen en vertrouwelijk behandeld
– De uitwerking van dit interview wordt naar u opgestuurd voor validatie en staat open voor feedback
– De geschatte tijdsduur van dit interview is 45 minuten

Geïnterviewde

– Kun u kort vertellen wat uw rol is binnen de provincie Overijssel?

De Werkwijze van Overijssel

– Kun u uitleggen op welke manier de provincie Overijssel burger initiatieven steunt in uw programma?
  o Waarom is er voor deze aanpak gekozen?
  o Wat zijn de sterke punten van deze aanpak?
  o Wat zijn de zwakke punten van deze aanpak?

Het Realisatie Proces

– Kun u vertellen welke aspecten een positief effect hebben op de realisatie processen?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe zou dit positieve aspect kunnen worden versterkt?

– Kun u vertellen welke aspecten een negatief effect hebben op de realisatie processen?
  o Welke factoren hebben de meeste invloed gehad op deze aspecten?
  o Hoe zou dit negatieve aspect kunnen worden verminderd?

De Rol van de Provincie

Wat zou, volgens de betrokken actoren, de rol van een regionale overheid moeten zijn in het burger participatie ruimtelijk (her)ontwikkelingsproces?

– Waarom is de provincie betrokken bij het initiatief?
  (wat is belangrijker geld of kennis, netwerk, enz.)

– Welke meerwaarde ziet u in de betrokkenheid van de provincie in initiatieven?

– Wat zou u, naar uw mening, voor meerwaarde mogen verwachten van een provincie?

– Welke rol neemt de provincie Overijssel aan in het proces?

– Wat denk u dat de rol van de provincie moet zijn in het proces?

– Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de goede aspecten van het proces?

– Hoe ziet u de invloed van de rol van de provincie of de minder goede aspecten van het proces?

Het Subsidie Instrument

– Wat vind u van de subsidieregeling die is toegepast op het initiatief?

– Hoe zou uw ideale subsidieregeling eruit zien?

– Hoe manoeuvreert u zich in de spagaat van de overheid tussen rechtmatig en doelmatig handelen, maar je wil ook snel tot uitvoering kunnen komen, praktisch kunnen zijn.
### Appendix E Open Coding Results

Table 10: Open Coding Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Influence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Involved Later</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Keeping Overview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Knowing Limits of Authority</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Knowledge Lack of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Aligning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Martin Bakker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mijn Mooi Brabant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition Enhancing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition Not Achieved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Notorety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Opportunity Seeking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ownership Loss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participating Citizen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partners Combining</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Permits and Procedures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Project Selection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Planning Unrealistically</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Political Agenda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political Results</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Setting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Lack of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise Impulse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Problem Solver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise Lack of</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Process Acceleration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Process Delay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Impulse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Process Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Lack of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy Conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy Opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Protecting Own Interests</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Seeking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Risk Possibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Role Distribution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Rules and Regulations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province Involvement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Scoop Broadening</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province Role</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Solution Oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Creation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stakeholder Relationships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infroming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Start Over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infroming Late</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Idea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support Creation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Driving Force</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time Available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Common</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Creating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Underestimation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Lack of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unusual Project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests Difference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergraal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F Open Coding Results Grouped

Table 11: Open Coding Results Grouped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Project Selection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Limited</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Struggle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests Difference</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Impulse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Limited</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and Regulations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Structure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant - Stakeholder</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Role</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E Theoretical Coding Results

#### Table 12: Nodes versus Nodes Information Complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01: Ambition</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02: Critical Project Selection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03: Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04: Financial Struggle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05: Government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06: Interests</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07: Interests Difference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08: Knowledge Impulse</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09: Knowledge Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Laws and Regulations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Experience Limited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Network</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Organisational Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Organisational Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: Organisational Justification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Participant - Stakeholder</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: Politics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Poor Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: Professionalisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Project Delay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: Provincial Involvement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: Provincial Role</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23: Publicity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24: Risks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: Subsidy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Tools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2534 100%