



# Co-producing safety in the local community: A Q-methodology study on the incentives of Belgian and Dutch members of neighbourhood watch schemes

Carola van Eijk, Trui Steen & Bram Verschuere

To cite this article: Carola van Eijk, Trui Steen & Bram Verschuere (2017) Co-producing safety in the local community: A Q-methodology study on the incentives of Belgian and Dutch members of neighbourhood watch schemes, *Local Government Studies*, 43:3, 323-343, DOI: [10.1080/03003930.2017.1281803](https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2017.1281803)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2017.1281803>



© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 02 Feb 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 870



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)

# Co-producing safety in the local community: A Q-methodology study on the incentives of Belgian and Dutch members of neighbourhood watch schemes

Carola van Eijk<sup>a</sup>, Trui Steen<sup>a,b</sup> and Bram Verschuere<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institute of Public Administration, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>Public Governance Institute, KULeuven, Leuven, Belgium; <sup>c</sup>Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to explain citizens' engagement in co-production activities in the domain of community safety. We use a multiple case study design by looking at neighbourhood watch schemes in Belgium and the Netherlands. We applied Q-methodology to map the opinions of citizens about their co-productive efforts, and to cluster these opinions into co-producers' profiles. Discussing differences and similarities in profiles enables a more generalised understanding of the reasons why people co-produce. We conclude with some policy-relevant points about incentivisation when local governments want to achieve an increase in citizen co-production.

**KEYWORDS** Co-production; local neighbourhood watch; community policing; motivations; Q-methodology

## Introduction

Numerous examples can be found of citizens being involved in the production of public services, especially in the local community. Informal care, poverty associations and neighbourhood watch are just a few examples. In all these, citizens cooperate with regular producers in professional (semi-)public organisations. This cooperation can take different forms, from co-planning through co-assessment to actual co-delivery of public services (Bovaird and Löffler 2012, 39). Notwithstanding these differences, the key feature is that both citizens and professional agents contribute to the provision of public services, and that their collaboration is aimed at enhancing the quality of the services produced. In the literature, this is referred to as co-production of public services (Parks et al. 1981; Brandsen and Honingh 2015).

**CONTACT** Carola van Eijk  [c.j.a.van.eijk@fgga.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:c.j.a.van.eijk@fgga.leidenuniv.nl)  Institute of Public Administration, Leiden University, P.O. Box 13228, The Hague 2501 EE, The Netherlands

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group  
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

Acknowledging the societal need to increase the potential benefits of co-production, one important research question concerns the motivations and incentives of citizens to co-produce public services. Gaining more insight into motivations of co-producers holds practical relevance since it can inform governments on incentivisation strategies aimed at increasing citizen involvement. Yet, despite this relevance, the current co-production literature has no clear-cut answer as the issue only recently came to the fore. The first, scarce studies discussed the issue from a theoretical perspective (Alford 2002; Verschuere, Brandsen, and Pestoff 2012). Later studies started to collect empirical insights, for example in the field of health care (Van Eijk and Steen 2014). This article focuses on safety co-produced through local neighbourhood watch schemes and analyses what drives people to participate. Although being a classical example of co-production, to date, the literature is mainly dominated by research in the Anglo-Saxon (specifically US) context. More recently, however, the idea of neighbourhood watch also set foot ashore several European countries; this in line with a changing role of citizens in safety policies more generally (Veldheer et al. 2012, 189–194).

The contribution of this article is twofold: by investigating citizens' motivations for being involved in the co-production of safety in their communities in a specific European context (i.e., Germanic administrative tradition, Painter & Peters 2010), and by applying a comparative design since the studies that do exist are mostly carried out in one single case. More specifically, we answer the following research question: *Why do citizens co-produce in the policy domain of safety, and what differences and similarities exist between the Netherlands and Belgium?* In the next section, we combine theoretical insights on police–citizen collaboration with co-production literature. Next, we explain the use of Q-methodology to map opinions of members of neighbourhood watches in the Netherlands and Belgium, and to cluster these opinions into co-producers' profiles. After presenting the results, we outline the research's contribution for theory as well as practice.

### **Literature review: co-producing safety in the local community**

'Living in a safe environment' is a basic need. It is therefore not surprising that citizens have engaged in safety issues for many decades, performing different tasks, and thereby collaborating with police organisations to different extents. Percy (1978) presented a list of activities in which citizens are involved in the context of safety. New technologies provide even more opportunities for citizen–police collaboration, for example via online discussion groups (Brainard and McNutt 2010) and citizen networks (Meijer 2014). Contrasting these activities with the above-mentioned definition of co-production, some activities can more easily be perceived as co-production (e.g., citizen mobile patrols, police–citizen councils) than others (e.g., locking

properties when leaving, installing alarm tools). Within the example of neighbourhood watch, the co-production element is prominent: citizens are actively patrolling streets and share information with police officers directly. However, before citizens' motivations are considered from the perspective of co-production, specifically, we first focus on community policing in more general terms.

### ***Co-producing safety***

The idea of volunteer policing is certainly not new. In the US context, important studies can be found dating back to the 1970s. The work by Ostrom and colleagues (e.g., Ostrom, Parks, and Whitaker 1978; Ostrom 1978), which is also considered as starting point of the co-production literature, includes community–police collaboration. Early studies provide insight with regard to why, and under which circumstances, citizens collaborate with police units. Sundeen and Siegel (1987, 43), for example, hint at the role of socio–economic variables when concluding that 'larger, lower income, heterogeneous communities have been less able to draw upon residents to participate in police auxiliary co-production arrangements.' Sharp (1978) points at the importance of solidary incentives over material ones and contrasts this with American governmental initiatives to stimulate citizen participation based primarily on the provision of material incentives. In the context of 'collective, crime prevention effort[s]', however, 'a sense of caring about one's neighbours, and a strong social network, which solidary organisations help sustain, is most important' (Sharp 1978, 55).

As such, 'community feeling' and 'safety' are seen as strongly connected. Community feeling potentially results in more willingness to put efforts in safety increasing activities (cf. Sharp 1978; Van Eijk and Steen 2013), while similarly, it can be argued that security potentially leads to a more healthy community (cf. Lichterman 2000). Other authors find a strong link between 'community feeling' and 'safety' as incentives to volunteer with the police as well. Kelling and Wilson (1982) argue that volunteers in policing typically are driven by a desire to improve the quality of life in their community, being concerned about social disorder and fearing crime. Zhao et al. (2002) show that police volunteers have more fear for crime and property victimisation compared to non-volunteers. Social disorder and a will to take action are found to drive volunteers (Guclu 2010). Scheider and Chapman (2009, 700) refer to trust as crucial for building citizen–police partnerships:

Citizens who do not trust the police are less likely to report crime and to participate in developing solutions to problems. They are also more likely to place blame and sole responsibility for increases in crime on the shoulders of police.

Yet, vice-versa, a fundamental aim of police–citizen partnerships is to enhance public trust in the police (Scheider and Chapman 2009, 700; Kappeler and Gaines 2015, 171).

The main focus of the above-mentioned studies, often starting from a political or criminological perspective, has been on the US context. However, more recently, also in several European countries, a more prominent and explicit desire to actively engage citizens in safety issues is observed. A Dutch governmental advisory body, for example, outlines how citizens' role in safety policies has changed throughout the last decades. To an increasing degree, Dutch government expects citizens to take up responsibilities. The emphasis on values/concepts like 'good citizenship', 'citizen courage', 'participation', 'responsibility' and 'self-management' is growing (Veldheer et al. 2012, 189–194). This development is in line with a more general trend in which citizens are encouraged to take up own responsibilities in collaboration with governmental actors.

Against this background, the number of neighbourhood watch schemes outside the US is growing (cf. Van der Land 2014), as well as the number of initiatives engaging citizens using ICT-tools to co-produce safety (cf. Meijer 2014). Coming back to the Netherlands, to an increasing extent, neighbourhood watch becomes the 'responsibility' of local governments (e.g., in terms of specific policies and financial support) (Veldheer et al. 2012, 193).

### ***Incentives for co-production***

Within the current co-production literature, citizens'/users' incentives to co-produce are one of the core themes (cf. Verschuere, Brandsen, and Pestoff 2012). Yet, scholars are still searching answers on the question *what motivates* co-producers. That this is still a puzzle might be the result of most studies theorising on motivations instead of empirically investigating these, thereby replicating existing arguments (cf. Meijer 2014). Empirical studies on co-producers' motivations are scarce and show that it is very hard to explain who will and who will not take part in co-production activities (Bovaird et al. 2015). Because the empirical studies that do exist are mostly carried out in other domains than safety (e.g., Fledderus and Honingh 2016; Van Eijk and Trui 2014), the insights on what motivates citizens to co-produce safety through neighbourhood watch schemes remain limited furthermore (Van der Land 2014, 10–11).

Implementing a more grounded approach, this article aims to increase our insights. However, before describing the methods we applied, it is useful to present some recent (theoretical) contributions to the scholarly debate on motivations for co-production. In their theoretical model, Van Eijk and Steen (2016) develop a theoretical model to explain citizens' engagement in co-production processes. They identify three sets of factors that are expected to

influence one's willingness to engage in co-production: (1) citizens' perceptions of the tasks they have to perform as a co-producer and the competencies needed to contribute to the public service delivery process, (2) citizens' individual characteristics, and (3) citizens' self-interest and community focus.

According to this model, in order to decide to engage in co-production processes, first, the issue at hand needs to be of salience to the person concerned. Also, it needs to be of relative ease to engage in the activity concerned (Pestoff 2012). The latter links with the extent to which citizens feel personally competent to participate (internal efficacy) as well as believe that government, as regular producer of public services, provides room for citizen involvement (external efficacy) (cf. Craig, Niemi and Silver 1990). Closely related to this is citizens' trust in government, or the extent to which one feels government to be responsive.

These perceptions are – at least to some extent – fed by individual characteristics of citizens (Van Eijk and Steen 2016). Socio-economic variables like income, education and professional position are expected to play a role. In addition, social connectedness – the environment in which one lives and the networks in which one engages – is expected to influence (opportunities for) participation in co-production (Thijssen and Van Dooren 2016; Steen 2006).

Willingness to contribute to the well-being of other people and towards society at large is an important element of the concepts of co-production (Alford 2002), active citizenship (Hermes 2009) and volunteerism (Reed and Selbee 2003). However, while doing good for others through co-production, citizens also gain personal rewards, such as developing new competencies, making social contacts and gaining a feeling of personal fulfilment (cf. Alford 2002). Moreover, as users of public services, often citizen co-producers directly benefit from an increased access to and quality of public services (Verschuere, Brandsen, and Pestoff 2012).

Although the theoretical model offers useful insights into factors expected to help explain citizen co-production, the model still provides little input for developing hypotheses on what factors are of importance in specific cultural settings or specific policy domains. Our research aims to provide a more systematic and empirical basis for those considerations, gathering insights that can add to the current literature. We do so by comparing two similar cases in two countries. In the section below, we elaborate our research design.

## Methodology

In line with our central research aim to gather additional insight that can add to the current literature, this study makes use of Q-methodology. After discussing the case selection, this research method is described in more detail.

## **Case selection: neighbourhood watch schemes in the Netherlands and Belgium**

In this study, we aim to investigate motivations to engage in the co-production of safety in the European context instead of the American (because most literature today is focused on the US context). Since we expect that the politico-administrative regime of for example the UK is quite similar to that of the US, we selected countries from another politico-administrative regime, namely the 'Germanic' administrative tradition. More specifically, we focus on the Netherlands and Belgium (Flanders), which are both clustered in the Germanic group of countries (Painter and Peters 2010), sharing a consensual political culture (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011) and being labelled as so-called neo-corporatist countries (Esping-Andersen 1990). By addressing the question what incentives citizens have to participate in two countries that are comparable in terms of politico-administrative regimes, we empirically isolate one policy domain in one particular politico-administrative context with the aim to provide a step forwards in theory building on incentives for co-production.

In both countries, local neighbourhood watch is performed as a specific form of community policing. In Belgium, this is called *BuurtInformatieNetwerken* (neighbourhood information networks), abbreviated to BIN; in the Netherlands, it is called *Buurtpreventieteams* (neighbourhood prevention teams), abbreviated to BPT. Although the actual implementation differs slightly (see Figure 1), in general, it can be argued that within neighbourhood watch schemes, citizens are expected to keep an eye on their neighbourhood. Information is gathered through monitoring and signalling, often via citizen patrols on the streets. If something suspicious happens, members of the neighbourhood watch (i.e., the co-producers) contact the police. As a result, municipalities, police and citizens collaborate in order to increase safety, improve social control and stimulate prevention (cf. CCV 2010).

## **Research method**

Studying neighbourhood watch schemes can help us to increase our insights in what drives citizens to engage in co-production of local safety specifically. As mentioned before, current co-production literature mainly focused on co-producers' motivations in other domains (e.g., Fledderus and Honingh 2016; Van Eijk and Steen 2014). Moreover, after conducting a large-*N* study, Bovaird, Van Ryzin, Loeffler and Parrado (2015, 18–19) conclude that citizens' behaviour and motivation to engage are so complex that 'many individual and contextual factors ... are bound to go unmeasured in a social survey', as such exposing a need for further in-depth and contextualised research.

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Belgium</i>	<i>The Netherlands</i>
<i>Case</i>	<i>Buurtinformatienetwerken</i> , BIN in Flanders	<i>Buurtpreventieteams</i> , BPT
<i>Background</i>	About 747 BIN's in Flanders in 2016; 913 in Belgium (De Redactie 2016)	About 700 BPT's in 2016 (Lub 2016)
<i>Product</i>	Neighborhood safety	Neighborhood safety Livable area
<i>Regular producers</i>	Local police Municipal civil servants	Local police Municipal civil servants
<i>Co-producers</i>	Neighborhood inhabitants	Neighborhood inhabitants
<i>Beneficiaries</i>	Neighborhood inhabitants	Neighborhood inhabitants
<i>Co-producers' tasks</i>	Monitoring, signaling, information exchange	Monitoring, signaling, information exchange

**Figure 1.** Characteristics of local neighbourhood watch schemes in Belgium and the Netherlands.

In order to gather more in-depth insights in the dynamics behind citizens' engagement, this study takes a more grounded approach. Using Q-methodology, different groups of co-producers can be identified, each sharing a specific viewpoint or 'discourse' on the topic studied. These different groups are identified by asking respondents to rank statements and then conducting factor analysis to identify groups of respondents who rank statements in a similar way. Q-methodology is thus concerned with seeking patterns across individuals rather than across variables (Dryzek and Berejikian 1993; Van Exel and De Graaf 2005). The method has proven its value in several studies, also within the field of public administration, for example, studying motivations associated with public service (Brewer, Selden, and Facer 2000), managers' viewpoints about democracy (Jeffares and Skelcher 2011) or citizens' perceptions of engagement in specific services or partnerships (cf. Van Exel, De Graaf, and Brouwer 2007; Willis and Jeffares 2012; Van Eijk and Steen 2014).

### **Data collection and analysis**

When a Q-methodology study aims to compare across countries, a 'bottom-up approach' is preferred (Dryzek and Holmes 2002: 21), implying that the specific context needs to be taken into account to ensure that no country specific factors are lost. This is achieved by using statements that are as close as possible to respondents' perceptions. Using one set of statements across the countries would require statements at a more abstract level and therefore implies an important loss of information. As an implication, two Q-methodology studies were designed (cf. Brown, Durning, and Selden 2008: 725): one concerning Belgian (Flemish) BIN and one concerning Dutch BPT. Initially, the existence of different discourses per country was investigated, followed by a comparison on the level of the results (i.e., the set of discourses per country). That two different sets of statements are still comparable differentiates Q-methodology from survey research, where similar questionnaires are needed in order to make comparisons based on statistics; within Q-methodology, comparisons are made at the level of words or 'discourses' (Dryzek and Holmes 2002: 21).

For both Q-methodology studies, first a broad set of statements (the Q-set) about citizens' perceptions to engage in co-production was developed. In order to integrate as many diverse possible viewpoints on the topic at hand in our set of statements, we made use of different sources to inform us on the practice of co-produced community safety. The Dutch set of statements (consisting of 193 statements in total) was developed with information from focus group discussions with active citizens both participating in different neighbourhood watch schemes and performing different tasks (i.e., 'regular' members patrolling on streets, a chairman and an organiser of telephone circles). The collected statements were compared with insights from academic literature. For the Belgian case, we initially made a list of approximately 100 statements, using popular literature (magazine articles on citizen engagement) and academic literature. As such, we attempted at taking into account the principle of 'universe of viewpoints' (Brown 1980). Although the co-production literature specifically does not provide a clear-cut framework on citizens' motives, related streams of literature (e.g., on citizen participation and volunteering) provide some insights that helped us to further increase the diversity of viewpoints. We believe that this diversity of sources increases the chance that as much as possible viewpoints are integrated in the set of statements, we eventually have presented to the respondents.

After data collection in both countries was independently initiated, the two studies were merged. From the two Q-sets, subsets of statements – labelled the Q-sample – were derived to use for further research. To give guidance in the selection process, both studies applied the 'discourse

analysis matrix' presented in [Figure 2](#). By doing so, we attempted at a comparable set of statements between the two cases, still allowing for some case specificity between the Belgian and Dutch cases. Inspired by Dryzek and Berejikian (1993), we distinguished statements as to types of argument (i.e., designative, evaluative, advocative), and discourse elements concerned. These discourse elements refer to motivations and incentives to join the neighbourhood watch team, concrete behaviour/acts of respondents or others (including emotions triggering these acts) and tasks, responsibilities and competences needed to perform these tasks. Based on this discourse matrix, we developed a contextualised Q-sample including 36 statements for the Belgian (Flemish) case, and a contextualised Q-sample including 45 statements for the Dutch case (see [Figures 3](#) and [4](#)).

Third, within both countries, a group of citizen co-producers (the P-set) was presented with the corresponding Q-sample. Since a Q-methodology study does not intend to be generalisable to the larger population, respondents do not need to be representative for the population or randomly assigned (Van Exel and Gjalte 2005). In the Netherlands, co-producers were selected being active in smaller/larger neighbourhood watch teams and smaller/larger cities. In Belgium, co-producers were selected from two local communities in which five officially recognised neighbourhood watch initiatives are active. In Q-methodology studies, a common number of respondents lies between 30 and 40 (cf. Brown 2002; Dryzek and Berejikian 1993). Within the Belgian study, 30 respondents took part, within the Netherlands 34. All respondents were individually asked to rank the statements according to a suggested quasi-normal distribution on an 11-point scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' (-5) to 'strongly agree' (+5). Their filled paper forms are labelled Q-sorts. After the respondents sorted the statements, they were invited to provide additional comments about their choices.

Next, the analysis was performed per country, using PQMethod. Correlations were calculated among the Q-sorts to get a first insight into the similarities and dissimilarities in viewpoints between the respondents. A Brown QCENT factor analysis with varimax rotation allowed to identify the number of different Q-sorts or factors (cf. Van Exel and Gjalte 2005). The number of factors that can be identified statistically is often higher than is

		<i>Discourse element</i>		
		Motivations	Behaviour	Tasks, responsibilities & competences
<i>Type of argument</i>	Designative	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
	Evaluative	<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>f</i>
	Advocative	<i>g</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>i</i>

**Figure 2.** Discourse analysis matrix.

	Statement	Factors		
		Task-bounded altruist	Protective rationalist	Normative rationalist
1	People who have a lot of spare time do not have a reason not to become a member.	-1	-4	1
2	Everyone has to contribute to preserving the safety of the neighbourhood, that's how it should be.	1	-1	0
3	I became a member because social control contributes to my personal safety.	4	-2	-1
4	There have been a couple of burglaries in my house.	-5	4	-5
5	I became a member in order to contribute to the community.	2	-1	1
6	Many people in the neighbourhood also became members.	-1	1	-2
7	Thieves and burglars are scared away by the safety network, which gives you enough reason to become a member.	2	1	2
8	The appreciation I get from others for my efforts pleases me.	0	-2	-3
9	I learn from it.	1	3	-2
10	What also motivates me (to become a member) is that I have little trust in the local police services.	-2	0	-4
11	I am a member because there have been several burglaries in the neighbourhood and I fear that I will be next.	-2	4	4
12	I have a lot of spare time, so it does not cost me any trouble to become a member and watch over the neighbourhood.	0	-2	-4
13	The local police services don't do enough nowadays, that's why I have become a member.	-3	0	0
14	I see a lot of suspicious people in my neighbourhood and I do not trust them, so I'm a member.	-4	3	-1
15	It is also the responsibility of my neighbours to preserve the safety in the neighbourhood, so they should become members.	-2	-3	3
16	It is obvious to become a member since many people in the neighbourhood have already signed up.	-1	0	2
17	If you are almost never home, it is pointless to become a member.	-3	-3	-2
18	Preventing future burglaries at home seems like a good reason to become a member.	1	5	3
19	I know that my efforts are not useless.	0	-1	4
20	I think that people should become a member in order to improve the safety in the neighbourhood.	3	2	-1
21	You can also influence the safety policies in the neighbourhood by becoming a member.	1	-1	-2
22	Because of my actions (calling when I see something suspicious at my or my neighbours' home), I also encourage other people to become members.	-1	0	5
23	If you want to feel safer, you should become a member.	2	0	0
24	I benefit from a safer neighbourhood, which is a critical condition to sign up and stay a member.	3	2	2
25	People who think that signing up will improve the safety in the neighbourhood have no reason not to become a member.	0	-1	0
26	I would feel guilty if I did not become a member.	-3	-5	-1
27	I simply want to contribute to improving the safety of my neighbourhood.	4	2	2
28	I am afraid of the reactions of my neighbours if I would decide not to become a member.	-4	-4	-3
29	The safety network clearly delivers (since I became a member).	-1	1	0
30	It does not cost me any effort at all to become a member.	2	2	-1
31	You have to be at home a lot, otherwise there is no point in becoming a member.	-2	-3	-3
32	I am a member because neighbourhood safety improves.	0	1	0
33	I find it easy to become a member, which is important.	0	0	1
34	I am a social person and I like to keep an eye on the neighbourhood for others.	3	-2	1
35	Membership means you have a voice in local safety policies, which gives you enough reason to sign up.	1	1	1
36	A good collaboration between the local police services and the neighbourhood safety network is crucial.	5	3	3

**Figure 3.** Ideal factor scores: Belgium.

theoretically satisfying. That is, when too many factors are distinguished, the differences between these factors are so small that they hardly can be explained as distinct discourses. A next step, therefore, was to consider the Eigenvalues and to eliminate these factors of which the Eigenvalue was lower than 1. The additional comments provided by the respondents and the so-called flags presented by PQMethod were considered to determine the final number of factors. Within the 'flagging procedure', per factor, the respondents are signed belonging to that particular factor. Since a factor needs to have a substantial number of associated respondents in order to be recognised as a distinctive factor, this procedure helps to eliminate factors without sufficient explanatory capacity. In the final step, the ideal-

Statement	Factors		
	<i>Normative partners</i>	<i>Pragmatic collaborators</i>	<i>Rationalisers</i>
1 You do not do this for society, you do this for yourself.	-4	-4	0
2 It's instructive, you learn from doing it yourself.	0	1	3
3 What we do is about upbringing.	-1	-1	-4
4 Otherwise, in the evening, all you do is watch television anyhow...	-3	-2	-5
5 I'm very happy with the feedback from the police.	3	-3	2
6 If you are afraid to do it, you should not join.	-2	1	1
7 You need to have the confidence to confront people.	0	3	0
8 Of course, you always have to do it together.	3	2	2
9 You need to have certain communication skills.	1	0	3
10 I think it needs to link to your personality.	0	0	1
11 You get to follow different courses. Well... that's added value!	0	1	-1
12 Above all, it's about social control.	4	2	-2
13 You can serve the public servants, making them able to be at the right place more easily and faster.	1	-1	-1
14 All that small vandalism. If you can prevent it, it saves a lot of money.	1	2	1
15 That was my driving force: my children being able to walk in the streets safely.	-1	0	0
16 You share part of the responsibility for the security of your own neighbourhood.	5	5	0
17 I do like a little bit of excitement.	-1	-1	3
18 It's boring: nothing happens.	-4	-4	-4
19 We're social of course with these boys.	-1	0	-1
20 I do believe this is a task of the neighbourhood watch scheme: if you walk along the street in your free time and you see that something is broken, you make a phone call.	1	0	-2
21 You need to have trouble in order to get movement, because in general people only move when there is too much trouble.	-3	-1	-2
22 I think more young persons should join the neighbourhood watch scheme.	2	2	1
23 It has to be your own neighbourhood alone.	0	-1	1
24 You need to know yourself well.	0	0	-1
25 Professional feedback, explaining what will happen with the information received, is important.	2	3	0
26 You notice that it gets results.	2	1	4
27 There's appreciation for what you do.	1	1	1
28 In fact, it's the common interest that you help to protect.	3	4	-1
29 I would do volunteering work anyhow.	-1	-2	5
30 Simply walking around brings many results.	2	2	4
31 The courses are quite substantive; after all I'm only doing this as a volunteer!	-2	-3	-1
32 The collaboration between one another is important.	2	3	0
33 If you feel unsafe on the street yourself, I think you should stop doing it.	-2	0	0
34 You should not be scared.	-2	4	0
35 As neighbourhood watch scheme, we should not try to take over the tasks of the police.	4	0	2
36 Something has to happen, in order for it to stay exciting.	-5	-2	-2
37 In fact, you keep in mind the whole local community and look everywhere.	-1	-1	2
38 I'm afraid that they know where I live and that they will look me up personally.	-3	-5	-3
39 The reason behind it is to do something for society.	1	-1	0
40 The contact with the young, that's what I really enjoy.	-1	0	-2
41 If there's a group of youngsters, you should not think 'oh no'.	0	1	1
42 I want to do something for the local community.	0	-2	-1
43 Oh yeah, those nice jackets of the neighbourhood watch scheme have a lot of effect; the clothing is very crucial.	0	-2	-3
44 It's about surveillance.	-2	-3	-3
45 You need some knowledge of people to do this.	1	1	2

**Figure 4.** Ideal factor scores: the Netherlands.

model Q-sort for each factor was calculated, visualising how an 'ideal' respondent with a 100% score on that factor would have sorted all the statements (Van Exel and Gjalte 2005; Brown 1993). The ideal-model Q-sorts (see Figures 3 and 4) are an important basis to identify what statements are

characteristic for the different viewpoints. For each factor, the weight given to the separate statements is listed (ranging from  $-5$  to  $+5$ ). For example, in [Figure 3](#), the first statement is weighted  $-4$  by the ideal-type 'protective rationalist', while an ideal-type 'normative rationalist' considers this as almost neutral (weighted  $+1$ ).

## Results

In this section, the different groups of co-producers identified in both Belgium and the Netherlands are described, thereby referring to [Figures 3](#) and [4](#), respectively.

### *Neighbourhood watches in Belgium*

The analysis of citizens' engagement in Belgian neighbourhood safety networks results in three groups of co-producers: the task-bounded altruist, the protective rationalist and the normative rationalist.

For the *task-bounded altruist*, the typical statements related to this profile stress different elements. Statement 36 shows that the good relationship and cooperation between police and citizens is very important for these co-producers. The 'task' – helping to produce safety – is important for these respondents, as it is considered as their valuable contribution to society: optimising safety in the neighbourhood, through social control (statement 3). In statements 20 ('I think people should join to improve the neighbourhood safety'), 27 ('I simply want to contribute to improving the safety of my neighbourhood') and 34 ('I am a social person and I look to keep an eye for others'), the importance of the societal value and the social aspect of co-production is further reflected: volunteering because of societal-altruistic reasons, with a focus on improving safety for the neighbourhood as a whole. This profile becomes even more clear when looking at negatively loaded statements. Personal interest per se is not important to the task-bounded altruist. Also, respondents holding this profile have no (objective or subjective) feelings of unsafety in their neighbourhood (statement 4). They tend to trust the good intentions of their fellow inhabitants (statement 14).

The second group of co-producers are the *protective rationalists*, who engage because co-production can increase one's own personal safety, or the safety of the neighbourhood they live in (*protective*). These respondents calculate costs (their time and effort) and rewards (safety), and only when rewards outweigh costs, they will co-produce (*rational*). This one-dimensional focus on improving safety in the own neighbourhood can stem from recent experiences of unsafety (statements 4 and 11), which has led to joining the neighbourhood safety initiative to prevent future calamities (statement 18). *Ceteris paribus*, these persons will not join, and not feel guilty

for not joining, when there are no personal experiences of unsafety (statement 26 and 28). On top of that, respondents belonging to this profile claim that everyone has a reason to co-produce, especially people with enough time (statement 1). In other words, everyone has an interest in a safer neighbourhood.

Third, the *normative rationalists* want to engage in co-production from the normative belief that it 'should be like that' (*normative*) and combine this with the belief that efforts of joining will also lead to a reward (*rationalist*). Previous own experiences with unsafety are not determining for commitment (statement 4), in contrast to the protective rationalist, but there is a fear for possible future crime (statement 11). Thus, the rationality is in preventing future crime. And according to normative rationalists, this prevention can best be achieved through co-production with the police (which are highly trusted, statement 10). The rationality is further shown by the belief of these respondents that their efforts will have an impact ('I know that my commitment will not be in vain', statement 19). The normative point is shown by the high loading on the statement that their actions can make other inhabitants to join the initiative (statement 22): co-production is something good, and as many people as possible should take their responsibility, even if this costs valuable spare time (statement 12). Only the collective effort will lead to high levels of safety. In other words, according to these co-producers, only a strong collaboration between police and inhabitants (normative belief in the value of co-production) can lead to a safer neighbourhood (rational incentive).

### **Neighbourhood watches in the Netherlands**

The analysis of citizens' engagement in Dutch neighbourhood watches specifies three groups of citizen co-producers, which we label the normative partners, the pragmatic collaborators and the rationalisers.

*Normative partners* are convinced that their investments are in the interest of society at large: 'you do not do this for yourself' (statement 1). Persons share part of the responsibility for security of their own living environment (statement 16), and through their engagement in BPTs, they help protect the common interest (statement 28). Normative partners do not overestimate their efforts; it is just about social control and simply walking around brings many results (statement 30). Excitement is also valued less compared to the other groups of co-production. Partnerships with the police are important since you cannot do it alone (statement 8) and are positively evaluated (statement 5). Yet, normative partners also emphasise that they should not try to take over police's tasks (statement 35).

*Pragmatic collaborators* share many viewpoints with normative partners, for example, their concern for the common interest and feelings of moral

obligation to share responsibility rather than self-interest. Pragmatic collaborators, however, create less of an idealised picture. The necessity of collaboration is somewhat less stressed, and their view on the relation with policemen is more critical. They find professional feedback of higher importance (statement 25) yet are much more critical of the feedback they actually receive from the police (statement 5). Pragmatic collaborators' focus is more on collaboration *within* the BPT (statement 32), thereby emphasising a separate position from the police. That one might fear for one's own security because of taking part in the neighbourhood watch scheme is highly criticised (statement 38); although compared to normative partners, the pragmatic collaborators are more convinced that if you are afraid to take part, you should better not join the local neighbourhood watch (statement 6).

*Rationalisers* are less driven by a normative civic duty and more by the results of their engagement in the BPT: they notice that their activities – however basic, such as simply walking around – lead to positive results (statements 26 and 30). Nevertheless, the rationalisers stay humble about the actual impact; what they do is not as extensive as upbringing the local youth (statement 3) and contrarily to the former groups, social control is not perceived as a central task (statement 12). Also, rationalisers seem less committed with safety. They are convinced that if they would not engage in the neighbourhood watch scheme, they would be doing some kind of volunteering work anyhow and, even more than in both other perspectives, they don't feel that otherwise they would not find much better to do in the evenings (statements 29 and 4). Finally, rationalisers find that having skills (e.g., communication and social skills) is important and feel that they learn from taking part in the BPT (statements 2, 9 and 45). Actually, personal development is valued more than the collaboration in itself.

## Discussion and conclusion

In the previous section, we presented the different groups of co-producers that could be identified in the two cases. Here, we discuss these findings: Why do citizens co-produce? How do our findings relate to existing knowledge, and what differences and similarities exist among both cases? We finish by considering the policy implications and providing suggestions for further research.

### *Comparison to existing knowledge*

Previous literature (e.g., Van Eijk and Steen 2016) identified several incentives and motivations to co-produce. Our research results are summarised in [Figure 5](#). The classification 0/1 should be understood as a crude assessment

Theoretical factors Co-producers' profile	Task-related factors (salience, ease, trust, efficacy)	Individual characteristics	Motivations	
			Self-interested	Community-focused
<i>Belgium</i>				
Task-bounded altruist	0	0	0	1
Protective rationalist	1	0	1	0
Normative rationalist	1	0	1	1
<i>The Netherlands</i>				
Normative partner	1	0	0	1
Pragmatic collaborator	1	0	0	1
Rationalizer	1	1	1	0

**Figure 5.** Indication of the presence of theoretical explanations for citizens' engagement within the two cases.

of these incentives and motivations of co-producers found in previous literature, as recently summarised by Van Eijk & Steen (2016), showing which theoretical argument can be found in the empirically observed group of co-producers (1), or not (0). Based on the Figure 5, four general observations can be made.

First, profiles are not unidimensional. Within many of the identified profiles, different rationales for co-production are combined. Self-interest and community focus coincide sometimes, for example. This suggests that in many cases, the engagement of people to co-produce is triggered by a combination of factors. For example, the profile of rationalisers in the Dutch safety case shows that co-production is triggered by personal attributes, individual characteristics (in terms of mastered skills) and self-interest simultaneously. Similar observations of motivations for co-production that may be more-dimensional were made in earlier studies. Jakobsen (2013) showed, via a field experiment on language support for immigrant children in Denmark, that the combination of having sufficient resources, being in need of the service in case, and having time to co-produce is determining the level of co-production. Meijer (2014, p. 19), in contrasts, argues that individual or collective interests might be a reason for *different* groups of people to collaborate with the police.

Second, considering the different profiles observed over the two cases, and depending on the case and profile, co-production may be explained by task-related factors, self-interest and community focus, while individual characteristics are less observable. In both countries, in almost all profiles, identified 'task-related factors' are considered to be (very) important for co-production. For example, the rationalisers in Dutch neighbourhood prevention are driven by the results that they expect from co-production, which is ultimately increased neighbourhood safety. This consideration of external efficacy seems part of the consideration to co-produce. Within the co-producer's perception, the required efforts will be effective and worthwhile

to invest. We also discovered different profiles in which co-production engagement is explained by a concern for community-related benefits. Task-bounded altruists in Belgian neighbourhood safety initiatives and normative partners in Dutch neighbourhood safety are driven by societal values, namely improving safety beyond self-interest.

Third, we observed profiles in which co-production is seen as a way to acquire own (material or immaterial) personal rewards. A profile that (partly) stresses personal rewards is, for example, the protective rationalist in neighbourhood safety in Belgium. These respondents aim for personal rewards defined as personal safety in their direct environment. However, we need to be careful with seeing this as purely self-centred and rational approaches to co-production. As a profile like the rationaliser in the Netherlands shows, explaining why people co-produce, even when driven by self-interest, is often more nuanced and complex. Learning processes are personal rewards, but the benefits expand to the community as well.

Fourth, the comparison between countries allows for comparing cases with similar tasks, in the same policy field, but in a different country. In the field of neighbourhood watch, we see that almost no differences exist regarding community focus as an explanation for co-production, but that in the profiles discovered for the Dutch case, the explanations based on self-centredness are less prominent. Personal attributes (e.g., salience, ease, efficacy) are somewhat more often and explicitly mentioned in the Dutch case than in the Belgian case. Still, it is very difficult, as we mentioned above, to discover the typical profile of volunteers in neighbourhood watches that is valid in a country, let alone in both countries. Hence, a European profile of co-producers' motivations is hard to find. Compared to the (mainly) American literature of volunteering in producing safety which points at the interplay between community feeling and safety concerns, we can find some similar European 'profiles' like the Belgian protective rationalist and the Dutch rationalisers. Our study, however, shows that there is no such thing as one profile, but that different people may be driven differently to co-produce safety.

Our (inductive) findings show that explanations for co-production may benefit from frameworks that combine insights from different perspectives. Since neighbourhood watch schemes are a classical example of co-production, general insights from the co-production literature can be applied. We are limited, however, in the extent to which we may generalise our insight derived from the study of co-producing local safety to other types and forms of co-production. Future research should focus at unravelling what kind of explanations are valid in what kind of context, with a specific attention for micro-level individual attributes, controlled for the kind of task at the meso-level and the institutional context of policy field and perhaps country at the macro-level. Furthermore, Q-methodology is sensitive to the issues being addressed (or not) in the very first phase of collecting statements. Although

we have tried to integrate a wide variety of insights collected from different sources, there is always the potential of a bias. This adds to the need for future research to test the conclusions in other contexts. Due to the methodology we use, we cannot make valid statements about how individual characteristics may explain the co-productive effort. We discovered some ideas about the (potential) effect of individual attributes on the profiles, for example, the level of capacities needed for co-producers to be able to engage in the co-production process in the way they want. Future research should take these shortcomings into account, for example, by collecting quantitative data in a large population in order to study the relationship between individual characteristics (age, gender, socio-economic status, social connectedness of people etc.) and people's willingness to co-produce; or by using qualitative methods to collect data and evidence about how citizens who differ in terms of individual characteristics perceive co-production to be easy/accessible, trustworthy or effective (from which their willingness to co-produce may stem).

### ***Conclusion and policy relevance***

This study increases our understanding of why citizens are triggered to co-produce. These are important insights for governments, especially at the local level, that want to encourage citizens to co-produce. Given the internationally observed trend of increased citizen participation, the growing emphasis on citizens' own responsibilities and the simultaneously expressed concerns about citizens' willingness to participate (cf. WRR 2012), gaining insight in these matters is important. (Local) governments that expect citizens to do part of the job previously done by professional organisations alone (e.g., as a result of deliberate governmental retreat from public service delivery) must be aware of the incentives people have to co-produce public services. Taking into account that citizens may have different incentives, one should for example be careful with introducing the 'compulsory' element. When co-producers do not feel well-understood, this can create negative views against the co-producing organisation and so be a threat to the interaction between co-producer and professional (Williams et al. 2016). People who co-produce from a normative perspective (like the Dutch normative partners or the Belgian task-bounded altruists) do not need to be obliged to take up societal responsibilities they consider as 'normal' and may be offended by such compulsory policies. Rather, these co-producers desire a policy framework that is supportive and facilitating for taking up co-producing tasks. These groups of co-producers may also expect feedback, while a framework making co-production 'compulsory' may be perceived as a framework that wants to 'sanction'. In sum, careful design of co-production policies – including communication – that takes diversity in incentives among citizens into account is

necessary, if co-production is to be an effective supplement to professional public service delivery.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Wouter Steeg, master's student at Leiden University, and Lara Devos, master's students at Ghent University, for valuable research assistance in collecting the data used in this study. The article is embedded in a research talent programme called 'The dynamics of co-production at the street-level', financed by NWO (The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research), and a research project conducted at Ghent University (Belgium).

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Funding

The article is embedded in a research talent programme called 'The dynamics of co-production at the street-level', financed by NWO (The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research), and a research project conducted at Ghent University (Belgium).

## Notes on contributors

*Carola van Eijk* is PhD candidate in the Institute of Public Administration at Leiden University, the Netherlands. In her PhD research, she focuses on the question of why both individual citizens and professionals are engaged to co-produce public services, and how individual characteristics like willingness and capacity impact on the interaction. This research is financed by NWO.

*Trui Steen* is Professor of Public Governance and Coproduction of Public Services in the Public Governance Institute at KU Leuven, Belgium. Her research includes topics such as professionalism, public service motivation, professional-citizen co-production of public services, central-local government relations and collaborative innovation in the public sector. She chairs the IIAS Study Group on Co-production of Public Services.

*Bram Verschuere* is an associate professor of public management in the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration at Ghent University, Belgium. In his research, he focuses on co-production of public services, management of public and nonprofit organisations, state-civil society relations and welfare policy.

## References

Alford, J. 2002. "Why Do Public-Sector Clients Coproduce?: Toward a Contingency Theory." *Administration & Society* 34 (1): 32-56. doi:10.1177/0095399702034001004.

- Bovaird, T., and E. Löffler. 2012. "From Engagement to Co-Production. How Users and Communities Contribute to Public Services." In *New Public Governance, the Third Sector and Co-Production*, edited by V. Pestoff, T. Brandsen, and B. Verschuere, 35–60. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bovaird, T., G. G. van Ryzin, E. Loeffler, and S. Parrado. 2015. "Activating Citizens to Participate in Collective Co-Production of Public Services." *Journal of Social Policy* 44 (1): 1–23. doi:10.1017/S0047279414000567.
- Brainard, L. A., and J. G. McNutt. 2010. "Virtual Government-Citizen Relations: Informational, Transactional, or Collaborative?" *Administration & Society* 42 (7): 836–858. doi:10.1177/0095399710386308.
- Brandsen, T., and M. Honingh. 2015. "Distinguishing Different Types of Co-Production: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions." *Public Administration Review*, Published electronically on October 8 doi:10.1111/puar.12465.
- Brewer, G. A., S. C. Selden, and R. L. Facer II. 2000. "Individual Conceptions of Public Service Motivation." *Public Administration Review* 60 (3): 254–264. doi:10.1111/puar.2000.60.issue-3.
- Brown, S. R. 1980. *Political Subjectivity: Application of Q Methodology in Political Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Brown, S. R. 1993. "A Primer on Q Methodology." *Operant Subjectivity* 16 (3/4): 91–138.
- Brown, S. R. 2002. "Structural and Functional Information." *Policy Sciences* 35: 285–304. doi:10.1023/A:1021358313052.
- Brown, S. R., D. W. Durning, and S. C. Selden. 2008. "Q Methodology." In *Handbook of Research Methods in Public Administration*, edited by G. J. Miller and K. Yang, 721–763. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- CCV [Centrum voor Criminaliteitspreventie en Veiligheid]. 2010. Buurtpreventie. <<http://www.hetccv.nl/dossiers/wijkinterventies/buurtpreventie>>.
- Craig, S. C., R. G. Niemi, and G. E. Silver. 1990. "Political Efficacy and Trust: A Report on the NES Pilot Study Items." *Political Behavior* 12 (3): 289–314. doi:10.1007/BF00992337.
- De Redactie. 2016. *Steeds meer buurtinformatienetwerken in ons land*. Monday August 1.
- Dryzek, J. S., and J. Berejikian. 1993. "Reconstructive Democratic Theory." *American Political Science Review* 87 (1): 48–60. doi:10.2307/2938955.
- Dryzek, J. S., and L. T. Holmes. 2002. *Post-Communist Democratization: Political Discourses across Thirteen Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. 1990. *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fledderus, J., and M. Honingh. 2016. "Why People Co-Produce within Activation Services: The Necessity of Motivation and Trust – an Investigation of Selection Biases in a Municipal Activation Programme in the Netherlands." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 82 (1): 69–87. doi:10.1177/0020852314566006.
- Guclu, T. 2010. "Use of Volunteers in Policing." *Telemasp Bulletin* 17 (1): 1–6.
- Hermes, J. 2009. "To catch a thief... Burgerschap in het leven van alledag." *Bestuurskunde* 1: 68–72.
- Jakobsen, M. 2013. "Can Government Initiatives Increase Citizen Coproduction? Results of a Randomized Field Experiment." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23 (1): 27–54. doi:10.1093/jopart/mus036.

- Jeffares, S., and C. Skelcher. 2011. "Democratic Subjectivities in Network Governance: A Q-Methodology Study of English and Dutch Public Managers." *Public Administration* 89 (4): 1253–1273. doi:10.1111/padm.2011.89.issue-4.
- Kappeler, V. E., and L. K. Gaines. 2015 [2011]. *Community Policing. A Contemporary Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Kelling, G. L., and J. Q. Wilson. 1982. "The Police and Neighbourhood Safety: Broken Windows." *The Atlantic Monthly* 249 (3): 29–38.
- Lichterman, J. D. 2000. "Partnerships. A 'Community as Resource' Strategy for Disaster Response." *Public Health Reports* 115: 262–265. doi:10.1093/phr/115.2.262.
- Lub, V. 2016. *De burger op wacht. Het fenomeen 'buurtpreventie' onderzocht*. Rotterdam: Kenniswerkplaats Leefbare Wijken.
- Meijer, A. J. 2014. "New Media and the Coproduction of Safety: An Empirical Analysis of Dutch Practices." *The American Review of Public Administration* 44 (1): 17–34. doi:10.1177/0275074012455843.
- Ostrom, E. 1978. "Citizen Participation and Policing: What Do We Know?" *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 7 (1–2): 102–108.
- Ostrom, E., R. B. Parks, and G. P. Whitaker. 1978. *Patterns of Metropolitan Policing*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Painter, M., and B. Guy Peters, edited by 2010. *Tradition and Public Administration*. Houndsmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Parks, R. B., P. C. Baker, L. Kiser, R. Oakerson, E. Ostrom, V. Ostrom, S. L. Percy, M. B. Vandivort, G. P. Whitaker, and R. Wilson. 1981. "Consumers as Coproducers of Public Services: Some Economic and Institutional Considerations." *Policy Studies Journal* 9 (7): 1001–1011. doi:10.1111/psj.1981.9.issue-7.
- Percy, S. L. 1978. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Citizen Co-Production of Community Safety." *Policy Studies Journal* 7 (s1): 486–493. doi:10.1111/psj.1978.7.issue-s1.
- Pestoff, V. 2012. "Co-Production and Third Sector Social Services in Europe." In *New Public Governance, the Third Sector and Co-Production*, edited by V. Pestoff, T. Brandsen, and B. Verschuere, 13–34. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pollitt, C., and G. Bouckaert. 2011. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reed, P., and L. K. Selbee. 2003. "Do People Who Volunteer Have A Dinstinctive Ethos? A Canadian Study." In *The Values of Volunteering. Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, edited by P. Dekker and L. Halman, 91–109. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic.
- Scheider, M. C., R. Chapman, and A. Schapiro. 2009. "Towards the Unification of Policing Innovations under Community Policing." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 32 (4): 694–718. doi:10.1108/13639510911000777.
- Sharp, E. B. 1978. "Citizen Organizations In Policing Issues and Crime Prevention: Incentives for Participation." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 7 (1–2): 45–58. doi:10.1177/089976407800700106.
- Steen, T. 2006. "Public Sector Motivation: Is There Something to Learn from the Study of Volunteerism?" *Public Policy and Administration* 21 (1): 49–62. doi:10.1177/095207670602100104.
- Sundeen, R. A., and G. B. Siegel. 1987. "The Community and Departmental Contexts of Volunteer Use by Police." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 16 (3): 43–53.
- Thijssen, P., and W. Van Dooren. 2016. "Who You Are/Where You Live: Do Neighbourhood Characteristics Explain Co-Production?" *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 82 (1): 88–109. doi:10.1177/0020852315570554.

- Van der Land, M. 2014. *De buurtwacht. Naar een balans tussen instrumentalisering en autonomie van burgers in veiligheid*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Van Eijk, C. J. A., and T. P. S. Steen. 2013. "Waarom burgers coproductent willen zijn. Een theoretisch model om de motivaties van coproducerende burgers te verklaren." *Bestuurskunde* 22 (4): 72–81.
- Van Eijk, C. J. A., and T. P. S. Steen. 2016. "Why Engage in Co-Production of Public Services? Mixing Theory and Empirical Evidence." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 82 (1): 28–46. doi:10.1177/0020852314566007.
- Van Eijk, C. J. A., and T. P. S. Steen. 2014. "Why People Co-Produce: Analysing Citizens' Perceptions on Co-Planning Engagement in Health Care Services." *Public Management Review* 16 (3): 358–382. doi:10.1080/14719037.2013.841458.
- Van Exel, J., G. De Graaf, and W. Brouwer. 2007. "Care for a Break? An Investigation of Informal Caregivers' Attitudes toward Respite Care Using Q-Methodology." *Health Policy* 83: 332–342. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2007.02.002.
- Van Exel, J., and G. De Graaf. 2005. "Q Methodology: A Sneak Preview." Electronic article published at <<http://www.qmethodology.net/index.php?page=1&year=2005>>.
- Veldheer, V., J.-J. Jonker, L. van Noije, and C. Vrooman. 2012. *Een beroep op de burger. Minder verzorgingsstaat, meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid? Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2012*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Verschuere, B., T. Brandsen, and V. Pestoff. 2012. "Co-Production: The State of the Art in Research and the Future Agenda." *Voluntas* 23 (4): 1083–1101. doi:10.1007/s11266-012-9307-8.
- Williams, B. N., M. LePere-Schloop, P. D. Silk, and A. Hebdon. 2016. "The Co-Production of Campus Safety and Security: A Case Study at the University of Georgia." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 82 (1): 110-130. doi:10.1177/0020852315573157.
- Willis, M., and S. Jeffares. 2012. "Four Viewpoints of Whole Area Public Partnerships." *Local Government Studies* 38 (5): 539–556. doi:10.1080/03003930.2011.615836.
- WRR (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid [Scientific Council for Government Policy]). 2012. *Vertrouwen in Burgers*. Den Haag: WRR /Amsterdam University Press.
- Zhao, J. S., C. Gibson, N. Lovrich, and M. Gaffney. 2002. "Participation in Community Crime Prevention: Are Volunteers More or Less Fearful of Crime than Other Citizens?" *Journal of Crime & Justice* 25 (1): 41–61. doi:10.1080/0735648X.2002.9721144.