

Knowing Your Neighbours

How Living Room Concert Festival 'Gluren bij de Buren' Affects the Sense of Community Throughout 23 Cities in the Netherlands

Student Name: Vera Eelkema
Student Number: 479872
Course Name: Master Thesis Class ACS
Course Code: CC4008
Supervisor: Michaël Berghman (& Julia Peters)
Date: 26-06-2020
Word Count: 15779 words

Abstract

The aim of this project is to find out whether artistic project by and for neighbourhoods have an impact on the sense of community, using the case of Dutch music festival ‘Gluren bij de Buren’. In order to measure whether social impact happens and/ or lasts, a survey was conducted during two moments in time: directly after the festival and two months later. After analyses of both questionnaires it turned out that people felt closer to their neighbours: connectedness, social cohesion and social in- and exclusion all increased and thus the perceived sense of community increased. During this study, an unforeseen worldwide pandemic occurred. Because it was unforeseen, this huge factor is not taken into account in the setup of the research. Even though, the COVID-19 virus might has impacted the results of this study, the conclusion can be drawn that socially engaged art project do stimulate community sense and social cohesion among its participants.

KEYWORDS: community sense, connectedness, social cohesion, social in- and exclusion, socially engaged art projects.

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 RESEARCH QUESTION(S)	5
1.2 OUTLINE THESIS	6
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	7
2.1 COMMUNITIES	7
2.1.1 <i>Connectedness</i>	8
2.1.2 <i>Social Cohesion</i>	9
2.1.3 <i>Social In- and Exclusion</i>	10
2.2 SOCIAL IMPACT	11
2.3 SOCIALLY ENGAGED (ART) PROJECTS	12
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	14
3.1 QUESTIONNAIRES	14
3.1.1 <i>Advantages and Disadvantages</i>	14
3.1.2 <i>Sampling Procedure & Sample</i>	15
3.2 DATA ANALYSIS	16
3.3 OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE VARIABLES	16
3.4 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY	20
3.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	20
3.6 METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS	21
4. RESULTS	22
5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	43
5.1 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	45
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	46
REFERENCES	48
APPENDICES	51
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES	51
APPENDIX B: INITIAL CODEBOOK	57
APPENDIX C: SYNTAX	63

1. Introduction

As we are in the midst of a global pandemic, the need for connectedness and human interaction grows. Every day new articles are appearing in the newspapers describing the mostly negative effects of the COVID-19 on society as a whole (macro-level) and on individuals (micro-level) (Kraak, 2020; Chaney, 2020; Holligan, 2020). In order to prevent COVID-19 from spreading, we are in a (intelligent) lockdown in the Netherlands: a self-imposed quarantine. The effects of such a lockdown are most noticeable in two fields: the economy and the human psyche. The economy is hit very hard: there is no (international) trade anymore, stores, factories and companies (temporarily) closed their doors, people are losing their jobs and thereby their spending power (Holligan, 2020). Another not to be underestimated aspect of such a lockdown is concerned with the human psyche. The self-imposed quarantine causes people to be socially isolated, which can lead to feelings of boredom, stress, loneliness, impotence and apathy (Kraak, 2020).

Especially, but not only, now during the pandemic enhancing the feeling of connectedness is important. The feeling of connectedness is known to be particularly strong among people that are part of the same community, which is why community forming is a good initiative to stimulate, especially during COVID-19 (Verharen, Heessels, Jansen & Wolf, 2019). A short definition of the term *community* is given by Schmeets and Coumans (2013, p. 3): “A group of people that either live together in the same place or have particular characteristics in common”.

This definition stresses that communities can either be geographical or psychographic. Although another name for a geographical community is neighbourhood, it is important to note that not every neighbourhood has to be a community (and vice versa). Sometimes people simply live together in a neighbourhood without bearing any connectedness towards one another, whereas it is also possible that people live on other sides of the world and still feel a strong sense of community (Bursik, 1999; Fei & Kuo, 2013).

Communities are thus a tool to promote, among other things, social cohesion. Some practical benefits of a strong sense of community are empowerment, sanity and lower crime rates (Person & Hughey, 2004; Bursik, 1999; Kraak, 2020; Holligan, 2020). Research shows that socially engaged (art) projects can enhance the feeling of connectedness and social cohesion among the participants of the event, and eventually even lead to community forming based on psychographics (Matarasso, 1997). In order to stimulate community forming and increase social cohesion among people, multiple events have been organized over the years.

One of those is annually recurring event ‘Gluren bij de Buren. Gluren bij de Buren is an (originally local) initiative that was founded for two reasons: to stimulate local performance art and to increase connectedness among neighbours. The event is organized by Stichting de Cultuurbrigade; a Dutch initiative for the promotion of (local) culture.

Multiple questions arise concerning Gluren bij de Buren and community sense: did the event indeed help increase community sense? If so, to what extent? Are different social groups affected differently by the event? All of these questions can be bundled into the main research question of this study: *“To what extent does the socially engaged music festival Gluren bij de Buren impact the sense of community among its participants?”*

The event is hosted in 23 cities in the Netherlands. Throughout these cities 1300 living rooms are transformed into a temporary stage for performance arts. Performance art is a very broad concept including, among other things rap, poetry, ballet and theatre (Gluren bij de Buren, 2020). The event has two main purposes. First of all, the organization wants to help develop talent. By participating in the event, the organization hopes that acts will grow and develop the maturity of their act. Secondly, it wants to make neighbourhoods cosier and lower the threshold for neighbours to interact with one another (not only during the event, but also afterwards). In other words: they want to improve the social cohesion in their participating neighbourhoods (Gluren bij de Buren, 2020).

Gluren bij de Buren is a socially engaged practice with a clear social aim. There are many cultural or artistic events that only want to convey ‘art for art’s sake’, however there are just as many events with an extra agenda: this can be for example political, social and/or economic (Pasanen, Taskinen & Mikkonen, 2009; Hacking, Secker, Spandler, Kent & Shenton, 2008; Saayman & Saayman, 2004). This research will focus on projects with a social agenda. Gluren bij de Buren is going to be the case study representative of that group. The people participating in Gluren bij de Buren are artists, homeowners and visitors. Even though these groups each have different characteristics, they will be analysed as one as they all come from the same geographical location and have similar goals and motivations to participate in the event.

Research into the benefits of community sense, the feeling of connectedness and social cohesion is more relevant than ever due to COVID-19. As stated earlier in this introduction, socially engaged (art) projects can enhance the feeling of connectedness among their participants, and eventually even lead to community forming based on psychographics. Furthermore, it is also relevant to conduct this study with Gluren bij de Buren as a case study, as it turns out they do not yet have annual reports stating the realization of their aims. The event

is an initiative from Stichting Cultuurbrigade. Stichting Cultuurbrigade also fails to discuss whether or not the aims of Gluren bij de Buren are realized in their annual reports. This raises questions: are these social aims actually met? Do socially engaged practices have a (lasting) impact on their environment? If so, what is this impact? In which areas does it affect the people attending these events? This study could provide insights and answer those questions.

When assessing literature many articles were found that describe the impact of (cultural) events in different fields. Important goals for this type of events are either social and/or economic or the maintenance of a public image (Richards & Wilson, 2004; Herrero, Sanz, Devesa, Bedate & Del Barrio, 2006). Many of these studies that focus on social benefits conduct their study via qualitative methods. This means that there are few studies out there that have conducted research into the benefits of socially engaged events, whereby the results are generalizable. There are some studies that aim at developing a social impact assessment tool, thereby basing this tool on the outcome of survey research (Pasanen, Taskinen & Mikkonen, 2009; Balduck, Maes & Buelens, 2011). This study will be an addition to those.

1.1 Research Question(s)

The main research question of this study is *“To what extent does the socially engaged music festival Gluren bij de Buren impact the sense of community among its participants?”* In order to answer the main research question, several sub questions have to be answered as well:

- To what extent does this impact differ according to different social groups, specifically between men and women and different age groups?
- Do the participants of Gluren bij de Buren perceive a sense of community in their direct environment?
- How does socially engaged (art) project ‘Gluren bij de Buren’ contribute to the sense of community of their participants?
- Does connectedness increase in the neighbourhoods after Gluren bij de Buren has taken place?
- Does social cohesion increase in the neighbourhoods after Gluren bij de Buren has taken place?
- Does social inclusion in the neighbourhoods increase, while social exclusion decreases, after Gluren bij de Buren has taken place?
- Does the community sense in a neighbourhood affect people’s feeling of safety and connectedness?

1.2 Outline Thesis

The following chapters will discuss several theoretical concepts and existing theories in relation to the topic of this study. This chapter is followed by a section on the research design. After that, an overview of the most important results is summed up, followed by a discussion and conclusion based on the results. This final chapter of this thesis discusses and interprets the results, as well as provide recommendations for further research.

In the appendices you can find an overview of the questions asked in the survey as well as the codebook used in SPSS. The final appendix shows the syntax used for the statistical test for this research.

2. Theoretical Framework

There are several concepts that need exploration in order to answer the main research question. The main theoretical concepts of this study are *communities* and *social impact*. Important elements of for every community are *connectedness*, *social cohesion* and *social in- and exclusion*. These concepts will therefore be discussed as well. After that *social impact* and *socially engaged (art) projects* in relation to the main research question will be discussed.

2.1 Communities

One of the most important concepts related to the main research question is the concept of community. Communities are demarcated and defined by both visible and nonvisible elements. Examples of visible elements are specific clothing, practices and/or languages only shared by one community. These are easily recognized traits that set one community apart from another (Simma & Paulus, 1998). Nonvisible elements of communities are concerned with the relations a group of people have to one another and the representation and prioritization of commonly shared interests weighing against individualistic interests (Simma & Paulus, 1998). Thus, a community can be defined as a network of people that share norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups. This process is also known as ‘social cohesion’ (Schmeets & Coumans, 2013, p. 3).

Historically, communities were mainly formed on the base of convenience: a geographical location. Communities in which people live nearby one another can be referred to as neighbourhoods. However, with the rise of globalization and digitalization communities are not necessarily restricted to a geographical location anymore. Nowadays, communities are increasingly often based on shared psychographic interests rather than shared demographics, which is especially true for communities of younger generations (Bursik, 1999; Fei & Kuo, 2013). This notion is interesting to take into account when analysing the results of this study for two reasons. The people participating in Gluren bij de Buren are, regardless of their role during the event (visitor/ host/ act), almost always from the same neighbourhood. This means that the people gathering at Gluren bij de Buren form a ‘community’ on the basis of geographical location, so community in the traditional sense. However, another and perhaps more important motivation for people to gather at Gluren bij de Buren is because of a shared interest in culture: a psychographic element. This is creating a ‘community’ in the more modern sense. Taking aside how communities are formed, the elements connectedness, social cohesion and social in- and exclusion apply to all communities. Both elements are of importance to

Gluren bij de Buren, as event focusses on gathering people based on a geographic location as well as a shared interest in culture.

2.1.1 Connectedness

The first element of communities exist of is the concept of connectedness. Connectedness can be defined as the feeling that people have when they are members of a certain group: they share particular qualities with other members of that group and therefore have the feeling that they belong together (Whitlock, 2007). As already stated in the introduction, connectedness, especially in recent times, is becoming more and more important to stimulate. This statement is true for all age groups, but mainly for elderly people (65 years and older).

As there is currently no cure to COVID-19 available, the Dutch government can only carry out a single type of measure in order to prevent the disease from spreading: a (intelligent) lockdown (Holligan, 2020). Due to this (self-imposed) quarantine however, many people are becoming isolated, especially if they live alone like many elderlies do. Being in social isolation can lead to feelings of boredom, stress, loneliness, impotence and apathy (Kraak, 2020). Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2014) conducted research into the prevention of these negative feelings. They found that stimulation of the brain (via social interaction) plays an important role in preventing and/ or reducing these feelings. It is therefore of great importance that people, especially those that live alone, seek contact with others. Being part of a (strong) community or neighbourhood makes it easier to be in touch with others. It is therefore highly likely that there are many elderly people participating in Gluren bij de Buren, in order to forge new relationships and/ or strengthen existing ones.

The findings of Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2014) are also reflected in the research of Miao, Wu and Sun (2019). Their research focusses solely on China, but it shows the importance of neighbourhood networks. Especially older people enjoy the benefits of strong neighbourhood networks, as more connectedness leads to more social cohesion, which in turn leads to more social engagement and less depression.

A study by Gallicchio, Siddiqi, Langenberg and Baumgarten (2002) reveals that within a community men and women unconsciously and automatically adapt traditional gender roles, in which the women tend to feel more responsible for the health and well-being of the elderly people in the community. This responsibility can feel as a burden though. The percentage of women that is depressed due of this burden is much higher than the percentage of men, who

suffer. Gallicchio, Siddiqi, Langenberg and Baumgarten (2002) stress the importance of regular interventions to prevent depression from happening.

2.1.2 Social Cohesion

Another element of community forming and the bonds that community members have with each other, can be described as social cohesion: “The network of people that share norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups” (Schmeets & Coumans, 2013, p. 3). Within communities, social cohesion is built up from three layers or dimensions: (1) participation, (2) trust and (3) integration (Schmeets & Coumans, 2013).

The first-dimension, participation, refers to social contacts people in a community have, including supporting and helping each other. Gardner (2011) states the importance of interaction between neighbours: people whom live in close proximity. One of the main advantages they mention is concerned with (older) adults in a neighbourhood. Interaction with other people, aside from family and friends, promotes engagement in life, facilitates social relationships and boosts their overall well-being. For this study it is therefore interesting to look at how age relates to feeling of community of the participants of Gluren bij de Buren.

Secondly, the dimension trust, which refers to the trust people in a community have in one another, as the word itself implies. The first and second dimension mainly look inwards: they are important *within* communities.

The final dimension, integration, is concerned with how people interact with each other. This dimension is however is not only concerned with the participation and trust people of one community share within a community but stretches *between* communities. Important here to take into account is that when integration within a community is strong, people feel less inclined to integrate with people in other communities. One does not exclude the other, however integration outside one’s community is less sought after when social inclusion within a community is strong.

Integration within and between communities serves one major advantage not only for individual members of a community, it also provides an advantage for society at large. Papachristos and Bastomski (2018) demonstrate in their article how the distribution of crime in a city is not linked to individuals, but to neighbourhoods. The social ties that an individual with criminal behaviour has in his/ her community or neighbourhood assure that others are more easily pursued to display the same type of behaviour. Usually these social ties do not end at the borders of one neighbourhood. It is highly likely that cross-fertilization takes place with

other neighbourhoods that are geographically close or contain a similar socioeconomic status. This effect seems to be threatening for the safety and wellbeing of members of those communities/ neighbourhoods that do not take part in this criminal behaviour.

However, Bursik (1999) explains that people who live in communities with strong(er) social ties tend to feel more constraint and are therefore less likely to display unconventional and illegal behaviour. Thus, having (strong) communities offers the benefit of lower crime rates for society as a whole. It would be interesting to see if the feeling of community increases for the participants of Gluren bij de Buren, and what that will do to their feeling of safety in the neighbourhood.

2.1.3 Social In- and Exclusion

A third element that is important for communities is social in- and exclusion. One cannot really talk about one without mentioning the other. Gidley, Hampson, Wheeler and Bereded-Samuel (2010) explain the origin of both concepts. During the 1970s in France many people were excluded from the social insurance system. This assured that certain groups of people were not able to fully participate economically, socially and politically in the society they lived in: they became socially excluded. The opposite of social exclusion is social inclusion. Social inclusion is the process of actively improving one's ability, opportunities and worth in a certain society (Gidley, Hampson, Wheeler & Bereded-Samuel, 2010). Social in- and exclusion are both important as they provide members of society or a community with a sense of belonging.

(Strong) communities do not only provide people with the sense of belonging. Being part of community offers other benefits as well. Peterson and Hughey (2004) conducted research into the notion of empowerment that can come from (strong) communities. Empowerment is defined as "a social action process by which individuals, communities and organizations gain mastery over their lives in the context of changing their social and political environment to improve equity and quality of life" (Person & Hughey, 2004, p. 533). Peterson and Hughey are specifically interested in the differences between men and women when it comes to using community ties as a tool to improve individual empowerment. They find that the difference lies in the feeling of connectedness. Having relational bonds with community members is the most important condition for women to feel empowered. This is in contrast with men, who tend to believe that individual action, rather than investment in community networks is of more importance to personal empowerment. In the end, Peterson and Hughey find that communities that are able to balance the diverse strength of men and women are most

likely to be empowered and therefore self-reliant in society as a whole. For this study it is interesting to look at how the notion of empowerment is differently perceived among genders.

2.2 Social Impact

Stemming from the introduction it becomes clear that *Gluren bij de Buren* is a socially engaged art project with (social) goals. In order to measure impact or effectiveness, it is important to be able to assess these goals. Although this research solely looks into the social impact of socially engaged art projects, impact can take place among others in social, economic and technological areas. The concept of social impact is defined by Becker as “the process of identifying the future consequences of current or proposed actions, which are related to individuals, organizations and social macro-systems” (2001, p. 312).

Vanclay (2003) adds to Becker’s definition of the social impact that it is not merely analysing and monitoring social consequences. It is also concerned with managing and reacting to those consequences. He conducted research on SIA (Social Impact Assessment), and while doing so eight areas were identified. These areas are people’s: (1) way of life, (2) culture, (3) community, (4) political systems, (5) environment, (6) health and wellbeing, (7) personal and property rights and (8) fears and aspirations. When a change occurs in any of these dimensions, either positive or negative, it is possible to speak from social impact. The participants of *Gluren bij de Bluren* will be asked about their neighbourhoods and the people who live in it. Therefore, mainly areas 3 (their community) and 5 (their environment) will be dealt with in detail.

Important to take into account is the fact that social, economic and biophysical elements all influence each other, and should therefore be assessed as intertwined elements. Vanclay’s research shows that increasing the sense of community solely via an event or festival, like *Gluren bij de Buren*, is hard due to the fact that such events merely focus on the social element, and not on the economic or biophysical elements that are of equal importance. Because of time and resource limitations it is not going to be possible to look at economic and biophysical elements for this study. Vanclay’s argument therefore provides a valid limitation and possible recommendation for follow-up research of this study.

Pasanen, Taskinen & Mikkonen (2009) also conducted research into social impact, however they focused their study on cultural events in the tourism sector Finland. The criteria on which they assess the success of a cultural event are revitalizing cultural and/ or social life of the local people, build community pride, increase community participation and enhance the image of the destination. Especially with the first and the last criteria you can see that they

focus on event in the tourism sector. That being said, the criteria's community pride and community participation are very relevant for this study. The participants of Gluren bij de Buren will be asked about their feelings of community pride and participation as well, as a form to measure social impact.

2.3 Socially Engaged (Art) Projects

Strong communities have many advantages both for individuals and society as a whole. Lower crime rates, individual empowerment and the reduction of negative feelings such as loneliness, depression and stress, are examples of these advantages. As already stated in the introduction of this study, especially now during the COVID-19 pandemic, both individuals and governments are searching for ways to improve connectedness among people. Creating new communities or strengthen existing ones is proven to be an effective method for building or increasing connectedness (Verharen, Heessels, Jansen & Wolf, 2019). One of the tools frequently used to increase community sense is via socially engaged (art) projects (Matarasso, 1997). Many socially engaged projects are art related, however not necessary which is why this term is put in between brackets.

In his work, Matarasso (1997) describes approximately fifty benefits of socially engaged projects for communities, of which a reduced feeling of social isolation, developing and strengthening community networks, addressing crime and helping transform the image of public bodies are the most important ones. Gluren bij de Buren is a modern-day example of the type of event that Matarasso describes. Although its core business is to provide a platform for (local) artists, the event also has a clear social aim focused on building and strengthening communities.

Bishop (2012) critiques Matarasso's statements by declaring that these advantages are merely political tools for creating "submissive citizens who respect authority and accept the risk and responsibility of looking after themselves in the face of diminished public services" (p. 14). In this part of her work she looked at social and political developments in the United Kingdom during the late 20th and early 21st century, and states that there is usually a hidden agenda behind socially engaged projects: participation in society is mainly concerned with making individuals responsible for what, in the past, was the collective concern of the state (idem). Even though this might be true for events that are organized or completely subsidized by (local) government, Gluren bij de Buren is largely self-sustaining, thereby limiting the influence of politics.

Ostrower (2005) conducted a large national survey in the United States among attendees of cultural events, asking about why, where and with whom they attended. She researched several types of cultural events: art museums or galleries, dance events, arts and crafts fairs or festivals, music festivals and plays. *Gluren bij de Buren* can be best compared with the category 'arts and crafts fair or festival'. She discovers that in this category the main motivation for people to attend is 'to socialize' (59%), which is much higher than any of the other possible answers, of which 'gaining knowledge', 'being emotionally rewarded' or 'celebrating heritage' are a few examples.

The findings of Ostrower (2005) show the importance of the social element associated with artistic projects/ events, as well as the main motivation for most people attending such events: to socialize. The previously discussed literature of for example Gardner (2011), Peterson and Hughey (2004) and Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2014) all stress the importance of relations between people and the benefits these relationships provide. Combining all of their works shows that socially engaged art projects are the ultimate tool for enhancing community sense.

3. Research Methodology

The nature of this study is quantitative, making the research approach deductive. Deductive reasoning refers to the facts that a theoretical proposition is tested (Saunders et al., 2012). This type of reasoning intends to develop from the general to the specific: general theory and a knowledge base lie at the foundation of the hypotheses, which are tested and afterwards either accepted or rejected (Saunders et al., 2012).

The design of this study is a quantitative mono method research design, meaning that only one instrument for data collection is used to gather all necessary data (Bryman, 2012). The applied method is a survey. When applying a survey strategy research a large body of quantitative or quantifiable data with at least two variables is collected, by means of a survey or questionnaire. The data is examined in order to detect patterns of association (Bryman, 2012). In this study an online self-completion questionnaire will be conducted. This type of questionnaire means that the respondent answers a set of questions without aid or interference of an interviewer (Bryman, 2012). In this study is chosen for an online questionnaire as it most convenient for the respondents, and therefore ensures a high(er) response rate.

The survey is conducted twice. Even though the two points of measurement come closely after one another (a two-month difference), the time horizon of this study can still be classified as longitudinal (Bryman, 2012). A longitudinal research allows for the measurement of progress of concepts like community sense and social impact over a longer period of time.

3.1 Questionnaires

3.1.1 Advantages and Disadvantages

Conducting a questionnaire knows many advantages and disadvantages. As not all advantages and disadvantages apply to this study, only those relevant for this study will be discussed. The main advantage of conducting a survey is that it is a quick and cheap way to collect large amounts of data at once (Bryman, 2012). Filling out a survey is also more convenient for the respondent than setting a time and a date for an interview (Bryman, 2012). Another benefit is concerned with the absence of an interviewer (Bryman, 2012), as some of the survey questions as some of the answers to the question in the survey are personal to the respondent. Such questions can be personal and- or embarrassing for respondents to cover, if people do not have social relationships to the extent that they wish for. Answering such questions anonymously via an online questionnaire rather than talking to an interviewer will lower the threshold for many, so that they can answer truthfully. Lastly, there is no interviewer variability, meaning

that all questions are presented in the exact same order to all respondents and there is no preliminary interpretation from the researcher whilst in the process of gathering the data (Bryman, 2012).

However, conducting a survey also knows limitations or disadvantages. The main disadvantage is concerned with the fact that there is no room for help probing or helping the respondents with questions that are unclear once the survey is send (Bryman, 2012). Even though questionnaires are a great way to collect a large amount of data at once, it is impossible to ask follow-up questions in the same questionnaire that derive upon the given answers (Bryman, 2012). Lastly, there is always a chance of a low response rate when sending out a survey (Bryman, 2012). A low response rate could damage the representativeness of the sample, and therefore the study.

3.1.2 Sampling Procedure & Sample

In order to measure whether Gluren bij de Buren has a (lasting) impact on its participants, the survey has to be conducted twice. The first questionnaire will serve as a ‘ground zero’, whereas the second survey provided knowledge into whether certain variables have changed or not. In both instances I retrieved the dataset from the organization.

In order to gather the data of the first survey each participant of Gluren bij de Buren was asked to scan a QR code or to go to a certain webpage and fill in the survey. The first survey was conducted right after the event had taken place, which resulted in a high willingness to fill in the questionnaire. A total of 1166 people responded to the first survey. The sample of 1166 people were selected without any sampling strategy, due to the fact that the outcome of the first questionnaire served as ‘ground zero’. It was therefore important that as many people as possible answered the questions, so that the standard deviation of the results is limited to a minimum. One of the final questions in the survey asked whether people were willing or not to fill in a second questionnaire, two months later.

Even though the willingness of people to fill in the second questionnaire was high, not every participant of the first survey left their email address behind. Conducting the second survey with the exact same sample of the first survey was therefore not possible. Therefore, a sampling strategy has been applied in order to select people for the sample for the second survey: systematic sampling. A systematic sample is also a form of probability sampling, in which each member of the population is listed with a number. Instead of choosing the numbers for the sample randomly, the numbers are chosen at a regular interval (Bryman, 2012). The

sample size chosen for this study was set at 15%. Every sample should at least be 10% of the population, without exceeding the “maximum” of 1000 participants, in order to provide a representative sample and prevent sample saturation (Privitera, 2011). 15% leads in this case to every sixth person of the total population being chosen for the sample, resulting in $n = 174$.

As stated in the introduction, the participants of Gluren bij de Buren can be divided into three groups: homeowners, artists and visitors. For two reasons they will be analysed as one group in this study. First of all, the groups all share similar characteristics and come from the same geographical location. The differences between the three groups are therefore negligible and not worth to look into as individual groups. Secondly, some of the cities are poorly (ten participants or less) or not all represented in the second sample, due to its size. Conducting the same study with two larger samples would be a recommendation for follow-up research.

3.2 Data Analysis

Gluren bij de Buren has taken place on February 9, 2020. Agreed with the organization was that after the event had taken place a survey was send out to all people involved to the 2020 edition: artists, homeowners and visitors. The survey was only available online, via Google Forms. The expectancy is that after a week all data is collected, which means that analysis can start to take place. The data will be analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics. The analysis of the data will consist of two parts: a comparison between the outcomes of questionnaire 1 and 2 with regards to several statements concerning community sense and several significance tests (ANOVA & Chi-Square Test of Independence) with a selection of variables.

The questionnaire, including questions and statements, are asked twice to each participant that is willing to answer both surveys. There will be two months in between these moments of measurement. The first questionnaire will serve as ground zero, which assures that after conducting of the second survey it will be possible to see changes in the variables. This means that each hypothesis test and the overview of the outcome of the statements will be drawn up twice in order to be able to draft the comparison.

3.3 Operationalization of the Variables

Below an overview of the hypotheses that are set up for this study, as well as an explanation of the literature that is used in order to come up with these hypotheses.

- **Hypothesis 1: The sense of community of people participating in Gluren bij de Buren has increased after the event has taken place.**

As described in the literature review the elements connectedness, social cohesion and social in- and exclusion are important for the sense of community. The works of Miao, Wu and Sun (2019), Whitlock (2007) and Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2014) all stress the importance of connectedness to other people. Connectedness to other people does not only increase the feeling of belonging, it also reduces loneliness, depression and other negative feelings. Schmeets and Coumans (2013) and Gardner (2011) emphasis in their work the importance of social cohesion, closely related to connectedness. Increased social cohesion is not only beneficial for people's overall well-being and engagement in life, it also reduces crime rates in neighbourhoods due to (informal) social control. Finally, social in- and exclusion being about being there for others and having the feeling others are there for your (Gidley, Hampson, Wheeler and Bereded-Samuel, 2010). These concepts are also concerned with empowerment, being proactive and taking matters in your own hand, as described by Peterson and Hughey (2004).

Connectedness, social cohesion and social in- and exclusion are all translated into statements that to some extent ask about either people's community or their environment, which are two of the eight areas that Vanclay (2003) identified as areas in which social impact can be measured. Next to that, each statement refers to some extent to community sense, pride and participation. Elements that are defined by Pasanen, Taskinen & Mikkonen (2009) as elements social impact can be measured on. The statements are subjective indicators, situations that people deal with on a day-to-day basis:

- I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren;
- I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren;
- I trust my neighbours;
- I feel safe in my neighbourhood;
- I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself;
- We greet each other in the neighbourhood;
- I feel part of the neighbourhood;
- I am there for my neighbours;
- My neighbours are there for me;
- I undertake activities with my neighbours.

The optimal result would be that the participants agree with each statement more than before, except for the statement 'I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself.' The percentage of people that agree with this statement should decline.

- **Hypothesis 2: People 65 years or older have met more new people during Gluren bij de Buren than people younger than 65 years old.**
- **Hypothesis 3: People 65 years or older have a stronger intent to stay in touch with people they met during Gluren bij de Buren than people younger than 65 years old.**

Hypotheses 2 and 3 are based on a combination of previous studies. Gardner's theory (2011) concerning strong community explains how being part of a strong community is most beneficial to elderly people, in comparison to any other age group, for multiple benefits. One is considered elderly if you are 65 years or older. A few of these benefits are the social security that people will look after you, engagement to others and overall boosts of well-being.

Research conducted by Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2014) and Miao, Wu and Sun (2019) also stress the benefits of strong communities for elderly people. Miao, Wu and Sun (2019) emphasize the social benefits of being part of a strong community at an older age. Their case study focusses on China, however, is transmissible to other parts of the world as well. Being more connected with neighbours leads to more social engagement and less depression among the participants of their study.

Similar results are revealed in the study of Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2014). They conducted research into prevention of boredom, stress, loneliness, impotence and apathy. It turned out that frequent stimulation of the brain, via social interaction with others, reduced or even prevented these feelings from happening.

Based on the theories of Gardner (2011), Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2014) and Miao, Wu and Sun (2019), it becomes clear that elderly people benefit more from a strong community. The theories however all seem to skip over the question whether or not elderly people are also aware of this benefit and if so, do they actively pursue it? Hypotheses 2 and 3 will test whether that is the case or not. The hypotheses will be tested using an ANOVA test, to see whether the means of people younger than 65 years old and people 65 years differ significantly from one another. The variables used for these tests are 'age', 'newpeople' and 'intent'.

- **Hypothesis 4: Women consider themselves to be there for their neighbours, more than men do.**
- **Hypothesis 5: Women have the feeling their neighbours are there for them, more than men do.**

Hypotheses 4 and 5 are concerned with gender differences when it comes to expectations and behaviours in communities. Peterson and Hughey (2004) found in their research that within communities, connectedness and social ties are of greater importance to women than men. This is due to the fact that women use these relationships as tools for individual empowerment. It is therefore hypothesized that women are more likely than men to be there for their neighbours, and also have the feeling that their neighbours are there for them.

The study of Gallicchio, Siddiqi, Langenberg and Baumgarten (2002) shows that women in communities tend to feel more responsible for elderly in that same community. They found that men and women unconsciously automatically shift towards traditional gender roles in which is the woman is a caregiver, thereby placing the burden of the health of the elderly more on the women than on the men in a community. When this burden is not properly strained, it leads to a (high) level of depression among the women in the community.

Based on the theories of Peterson and Hughey (2004) and Gallicchio, Siddiqi, Langenberg and Baumgarten (2002), it is likely that men and women differ in the extent to which they experience others to be there for them and to what extent they feel they are there for others. Both hypotheses will be tested using an ANOVA test, to see whether the means of women and men differ significantly from one another. The variables used for these tests are ‘gender’, ‘bethere’ and ‘thereforme’.

- **Hypothesis 6: There is a relation between how safe the participants feel in their neighbourhood and how self-involved a neighbourhood is perceived to be.**

Papachristos and Bastomski (2018) demonstrate how the distribution of crime in cities is not related to individuals, but mainly to neighbourhoods. People in the same neighbourhood or community tend to copy each other’s behaviour to some extent. Even if this behaviour is unconventional or illegal.

Bursik (1999) explains in his study that communities with strong social ties tend to have lower crime rates, due to the fact that members of that community feel more social constraint. This constraint assures that unconventional and illegal behaviour is reduced to an acceptable level for the entire neighbourhood or community.

The combined theories of Papachristos and Bastomski (2018) and Bursik (1999) show that it is likely that there is a relationship between the perceived safety of a neighbourhood and the perceived self-involvement of neighbours. In order to test this hypothesis a Chi-Square Test of Independence with variables ‘safety’ and ‘self-involvement’ will be conducted.

3.4 Reliability and Validity

The reliability of a study refers to the consistency to which a measure of a concept is stable and thus replicable (Bryman, 2012). The questions in the questionnaire are generalizable to such an extent that they are applicable to any socially engaged art project with a social aim. This makes this study reliable, and not only applicable to one specific case.

The validity of a research is concerned with the integrity of the conclusions generated (Bryman, 2012). There are only a few main concepts that the participants of this study are asked about: community sense, connectedness, social cohesion and social in- an exclusion. In order to assure validity, control questions will be asked in the questionnaire. This means multiple questions about the same concept, to prevent the respondents from misinterpreting the question and thereby the entire concept.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

There are four main issues when it comes to ethics that need to be avoided: (1) harm to participants, (2) lack of informed consent, (3) invasion of privacy and (4) deception (Bryman, 2012; Saunders et al., 2012). All the concepts in this study are concerned with how people relate to and connect with other people. People that do not feel this connection to their desired extent or even feel the opposite may feel relatively lonely and may experience feelings of shame and/ or embarrassment when answering the survey. This shame and embarrassment could lead to socially desirable answers in the case of interviews. However, the method of this study is an online, anonymous questionnaire. This generates a distance between the researcher and the respondents. This distance creates a ‘safe space’ that minimizes these barriers and increase the odds of participants answering truthfully.

Participating in the questionnaire is voluntary which solves the issue of informed consent. The questionnaire is anonymous, ensuring confidentiality. It is made specifically clear to the respondent that their names and/ or other data cannot be accessed, shared or revealed. The final issue is concerned with deception and will be limited to a minimum due the fact that at the start of the questionnaire the research purpose of the surveys will be explained to the

respondents. This way the participants will know to a great extent what their answers will be used for, without having to enclose the total aim of the research.

3.6 Methodological Limitations

As stated in the methodology there were two points of measurement. Ideally, one of these was supposed to be *before* the event had taken place. However, this was not doable due to time limitations. For that reason, the first survey was conducted the day after Gluren bij de Buren had taken place. Increasing the feeling of connectedness, community sense and social cohesion is a (slow) process. The effects of the event will not be fully visible after only one day, which is why the timing of the first questionnaire is still be considered a neutral moment for the determination of point zero.

Another major limitation of this study is concerned with the unforeseen event of COVID-19. Two months after Gluren bij de Buren had taken place, a worldwide pandemic occurred. Originally, Gluren bij de Buren would be the only (large) event that would take place in the neighbourhoods during the timespan of this study. Increased feelings of social cohesion and community sense could therefore likely be attributed to the event. However, COVID-19 is a major event that strikes all participating neighbourhoods/ cities in this study. The pandemic was unforeseen and is therefore unaccounted for in this research. Thus, changes in the variables can are no longer definitely attributable to Gluren bij de Buren.

4. Results

This study aimed to find out whether the event ‘Gluren bij de Buren’ impacted people’s sense of community. In order to do so several statements were formulated that asked people, among other, about their feelings of inclusiveness, connectedness and sense of safety in their neighbourhoods. The same questionnaire was conducted twice, one time right after the event had taken place and once two months later, in order to be able to draw up a comparison and identify possible growth in certain areas.

The first hypothesis is also the major hypothesis of this study: **“The sense of community among people participating in Gluren bij de Buren has increased after the event has taken place”**.

- H0: The sense of community among people participating in Gluren bij de Buren has not increased after the event has taken place.
- H1: The sense of community among people participating in Gluren bij de Buren has increased after the event has taken place.

The initial survey was conducted with 1166 people. In order to measure the concepts connectedness, social cohesion and social in- and exclusion, a set of subjective statements about everyday situations has been asked in the questionnaire. The respondents could answer on a scale from 1 to 5: 1 being ‘completely disagree’ and 5 ‘completely agree’. The statements that the respondents were presented with were the following:

- I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren;
- I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren;
- I trust my neighbours;
- I feel safe in my neighbourhood;
- I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself;
- We greet each other in the neighbourhood;
- I feel part of the neighbourhood;
- I am there for my neighbours;
- My neighbours are there for me;
- I undertake activities with my neighbours.

The first questionnaire was conducted only a few days after the event had taken place. Of these 1166 people, a sample of 15% (174 people) was drawn. Participation was voluntary in both surveys. Not all 1166 respondents from the first survey filled in the second one too. In order to prevent convenience sampling for the second sample, systematic sampling has been applied to assure that the people selected for the second survey were an equally representative group as the people that filled in the first survey. The 174 people that filled in the second survey were asked to rate the same statements as before, however this time two months after Gluren bij de Buren.

The ideal outcome would have been that after comparison between the two questionnaires, the percentage of people that (strongly) agree with the statements increased, with the exception of the statement ‘I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself’, of which this percentage should have decreased.

Firstly, an overview of the mean differences per statement per questionnaire will be presented in table 1. Table 2 displays the outcome the ANOVA test for each of the statements. The results of the ANOVA test show whether the mean differences between questionnaire 1 and 2 are significant or not. The alpha, or the level of significance, is set at 0,05 for the ANOVA test. After table 1 and 2 an in-depth analysis of each statement will be presented.

Table 1

Mean differences of each statement between questionnaire 1 and 2

Survey	I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren	I have touch with the people I met during Gluren bij de Buren	I trust my neighbour	I feel safe in my neighbourhood	I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself	We greet each other in part of the neighbourhood	I feel I am there for my neighbour	My neighbour are there for me	I undertake activities with my neighbour	
1	3,94	2,75	4,31	4,41	2,80	4,15	3,93	4,17	3,96	3,15
2	3,87	2,40	4,45	4,52	2,72	4,40	4,01	4,30	4,06	3,16
Total	3,93	2,70	4,33	4,42	2,79	4,18	3,94	4,19	3,97	3,15

Table 2

ANOVA table stating whether the mean difference between of the statements in questionnaire 1 and 2 is significant or not

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren. * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		,845	1	,845	,805	,370
	Within Groups		1438,986	1370	1,050		
	Total		1439,831	1371			
I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		17,886	1	17,886	12,559	,000
	Within Groups		1951,189	1370	1,424		
	Total		1969,075	1371			
I trust my neighbours * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		2,728	1	2,728	4,611	,032
	Within Groups		802,156	1356	,592		
	Total		804,884	1357			
I feel safe in my neighbourhood * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		2,073	1	2,073	4,552	,033
	Within Groups		616,484	1354	,455		
	Total		618,557	1355			
I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		,993	1	,993	,961	,327
	Within Groups		1398,641	1353	1,034		
	Total		1399,634	1354			
We greet each other in the neighbourhood * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		9,527	1	9,527	14,261	,000
	Within Groups		902,545	1351	,668		
	Total		912,072	1352			
I feel part of the neighbourhood * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		,901	1	,901	1,038	,308
	Within Groups		1170,999	1349	,868		
	Total		1171,901	1350			
I am there for my neighbours * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		2,571	1	2,571	4,515	,034
	Within Groups		769,900	1352	,569		
	Total		772,470	1353			
My neighbours are there for me * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		1,662	1	1,662	2,216	,137
	Within Groups		1015,273	1354	,750		
	Total		1016,935	1355			
I undertake activities with my neighbours * survey	Between Groups (Combined)		,005	1	,005	,004	,952
	Within Groups		2058,559	1352	1,523		
	Total		2058,565	1353			

- **I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren**

The mean of this statement was more or less similar in both questionnaires. Table 1 shows that questionnaire 1 scored an average of 3,94, whereas survey 2 scored an average of 3,87: only a 0,07 difference. It is logical that these means are similar, as the number of new people that respondents met during the event cannot increase or decrease two months after the event. Table 2 shows a significance score of 0,370. This is much higher than the set alpha of 0,05, which results in a non-significant difference between the means of questionnaire 1 and 2.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of statement: 'I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren'

Questionnaire 1 (n=1198)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	41	3.4	3.4	3.4	Completely disagree	8	4.2	4.6	4.6
Disagree	65	5.4	5.4	8.8	Disagree	9	4.7	5.2	9.8
Neutral	222	18.5	18.5	27.4	Neutral	31	16.2	17.8	27.6
Agree	464	38.7	38.7	66.1	Agree	76	39.8	43.7	71.3
Completely agree	406	99.8	33.9	100.0	Completely agree	50	26.2	28.7	100.0

A more in-depth analysis of the distribution of answers to this statement in both questionnaire 1 and 2 can be found in table 3. The differences between questionnaire 1 and 2 here is quite interesting. In survey 1 there are relatively few people that completely disagree (3,4%) or just disagree (5,4%) with this statement. 18,5% of the people is neutral in the matter. Whereas 38,7% agrees with meeting a lot of new people, and 33,9% state to completely agree with the statement.

In the second questionnaire the distribution of answers remained more or less similar. 4,6% of the people completely disagrees with having met many new people, 5,2% just disagrees and 17,8% is neutral. The largest group here is people agreeing with it (43,7%). Lastly, people completely agreeing with the statement is 28,7%.

- **I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren**

During the first questionnaire this statement scored a mean of 2,75. In the second questionnaire the average dropped to 2,40, which is a difference of 0,35. It is interesting to see that right after

the event has taken place, people are more inclined to stay in touch with the new people they met. This intention seems to decrease as time passes. The question ‘Is this change in mean difference significant?’ arises. Table 2 shows that that the significance score is 0,000, which is lower than alpha (0,05). Therefore, it can be stated that the mean difference for this statement is statistically significant: the difference between these two questionnaires is likely to be caused by something else than chance.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of statement: ‘I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren’

Questionnaire 1 (n=1198)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	240	20.0	20.0	20.0	Completely disagree	50	26.2	28.7	28.7
Disagree	247	20.6	20.6	40.7	Disagree	33	17.3	19.0	47.7
Neutral	385	32.1	32.1	72.8	Neutral	66	34.6	37.9	85.6
Agree	230	19.2	19.2	92.0	Agree	21	11.0	12.1	97.7
Completely agree	96	8.0	8.0	100.0	Completely agree	4	2.1	2.3	100.0

The outcome of the answers in both questionnaires towards statement ‘I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren’ can be found in table 4. 20,0% of the respondents completely disagrees and 20,6% just disagrees with this. The largest group is neutral (32,1%), and 19,2% actually agrees. 8,0% completely agrees with the statement.

In the second questionnaire, the answers are more skewed towards *not* staying in touch with newly met people. 28,7% of people state they completely disagree with the statement, 19,0% just disagrees. The largest proportion of people is neutral (37,9%), whereas 12,1% agrees and only a small group of 2,3% completely disagrees.

- **I trust my neighbours**

The difference between the averages in questionnaire 1 (4,31) and 2 (4,45) is 0,14. Even though it is a small difference, it is still an increase in the level of trust people have in their neighbours. Table 2 shows a significance score of 0,032 for this statement, which is also lower than the set

alpha of 0,05. That means that the results of this statement are statistically significant. The mean difference is unlikely to be caused by coincidence.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of statement: 'I trust my neighbours'

Questionnaire 1 (n=1168)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	8	.7	.7	.7	Completely disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	18	1.5	1.5	2.2	Disagree	1	0.5	0.6	0.6
Neutral	132	11.0	11.3	13.5	Neutral	14	7.3	8.0	8.6
Agree	451	37.6	38.6	52.1	Agree	65	34.0	37.4	46.0
Completely agree	559	46.7	47.9	100.0	Completely agree	94	49.2	54.0	100.0

Table 5 shows the distribution of answers to statement 'I trust my neighbours' in both questionnaire 1 and 2. It shows that in the first questionnaire most people tend to agree (38,6%) or totally agree (47,9%) with this statement. These two categories together are 86,5% of the total population. Less than 1% (0,7%) did not trust their neighbours at all, 1,5% did just not trust them and 11,3% of people remained neutral in the matter.

In the second questionnaire 37,4% of the population agrees with the statement 'I trust my neighbours' and 54,0% completely agree. 8,0% remains neutral towards trusting their neighbours and 0,6% disagrees with the statement. There are no people that completely disagree with this statement in the second questionnaire.

- **I feel safe in my neighbourhood**

Table 1 shows that there is a small mean difference (0,09) between questionnaire 1 and 2 when it comes to the statement 'I feel safe in my neighbourhood'. Survey 1 scored an average of 4,41, whereas survey 2 scored an average of 4,52. Even though it is only a slight increase, it is an increase in the right direction. Looking at the level of significance in table 2, it is also possible to conclude that the mean differences of this statement are statistically significant, as the significance score (0,33) is lower than the set alpha (0,05).

Table 6*Descriptive Statistics of statement: 'I feel safe in my neighbourhood'*

Questionnaire 1 (n=1166)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	3	.3	.3	.3	Completely disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	15	1.3	1.3	1.5	Disagree	0	0	0	0
Neutral	75	6.3	6.4	8.0	Neutral	6	3.1	3.4	3.4
Agree	487	40.7	41.8	49.7	Agree	71	37.2	40.8	44.3
Completely agree	586	48.9	50.3	100.0	Completely agree	97	50.8	55.7	100.0

Table 6 shows the respondents' answers towards the statement 'I feel safe in my neighbourhood'. More than half of the people (50,3%) who took the first survey completely agree with this statement, whereas 41,8% just agrees with is. Together this makes up 92,1% of the population that were confronted with this statement. 6,4% of the people remained neutral, whereas 1,3% disagrees and a 0,3% of the people completely disagree with feeling safe in their own neighbourhood.

The division of the answers of the second survey is even more skewed towards agreement with the hypothesis. 55,7% of the people completely agree. Combined with 40,8% of people that just agree makes the total percentage of people agreeing with feeling safe in their own neighbourhood 96,5%. 3,4% of people remains neutral towards the matter, whereas no one (completely) disagrees with this statement in the second survey.

- **I have the feeling everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/herself**

Questionnaire 1 scored an average of 2,80 with this statement, whereas questionnaire 2 scored an average of 2,72. Of all statements, this was the only statement where the ideal result would be for the mean to go down instead of up. The decrease in mean differences is only minor though, being 0,08. Looking at table 2, the significance score of this statement is 0,327, which is much higher than the set alpha (0,05). This means that the differences between the means in questionnaire 1 and 2 is not significant and could be caused by chance.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of statement: 'I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/herself'

Questionnaire 1 (n=1166)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	112	9.3	9.6	9.6	Completely disagree	17	8.9	9.8	9.8
Disagree	354	29.5	30.4	40.0	Disagree	59	30.9	33.9	43.7
Neutral	411	34.3	35.2	75.2	Neutral	59	30.9	33.9	77.6
Agree	233	19.4	20.0	95.2	Agree	34	17.8	19.5	97.1
Completely agree	56	4.7	4.8	100.0	Completely agree	5	2.6	2.9	100.0

Table 7 shows the distribution of answers towards the statement 'I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself'. The outcome of the first survey reveals a pretty evenly spread distribution. The largest group (35,2%) is neutral towards the matter. 30,4% of the people disagree and 20,0% of the people agree with the statement. The smallest two groups are the extremes: (9,6%) completely disagrees and the smallest group (4,8%) completely agrees.

The outcome of the second survey shows a similar distribution of answers, although the answers are slightly more skewed towards people disagreeing with the fact that their neighbours are being self-involved. The largest group of people (33,9%) remains neutral towards the matter, however a group equally large (33,9%) disagrees with the statement that everybody in their neighbourhood is being self-involved. 9,8% of people strongly disagrees with the statement, whereas 19,5% of the people agree and a small 2,9% completely disagrees.

- **We greet each other in the neighbourhood**

There is a relatively large difference between questionnaire 1 and 2 when it comes to this statement. Survey 1 scored an average of 4,15, in comparison with survey 2 which scored an average of 4,40. This is a 0,25 difference into the desired direction. People tend to greet each other more in the neighbourhoods. The results in table 2 display that the level of significance for this statement is 0,000, which is lower than the set alpha (0,05). The mean difference between questionnaire 1 and 2 for this group is therefore statistically significant, and not likely to be caused by coincidence.

Table 8*Descriptive Statistics of statement: 'We greet each other in the neighbourhood'*

Questionnaire 1 (n=1164)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	5	.4	.4	.4	Completely disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	40	3.3	3.4	3.9	Disagree	3	1.6	1.7	1.7
Neutral	181	15.1	15.5	19.4	Neutral	15	7.9	8.6	10.3
Agree	493	41.2	42.4	61.8	Agree	66	34.6	37.9	48.3
Completely agree	445	37.1	38.2	100.0	Completely agree	90	47.1	51.7	100.0

The distribution of answers towards the statement 'We greet each other in the neighbourhood' can be found in table 8. 42,4% of the people in the first survey agrees, as well as 38,2% of the people who are in completely agreement. 15,5% of the people is neutral. A small group of 3,4% disagrees, whereas an even smaller group (0,4%) of people completely disagrees.

The outcome of the second survey shows that two months after Gluren bij de Buren has taken place people are more inclined to greet their neighbours. Over half of the people (51,7%) completely agree, just as 37,9% agrees. These two numbers added together make 89,6% of the total outcome. 8,6% remains neutral towards the matter, and a 1,7% disagrees with the statement. There are no people that completely disagree with the hypothesis in the second questionnaire.

- **I feel part of the neighbourhood**

Questionnaire 1 scored a mean of 3,93 on this statement, whereas questionnaire 2 ended up with an average of 4,01. This is a 0,08 difference in the right direction. Table 2 shows a significance score of 0,308, which is much higher than the set alpha of 0,05. The mean differences between questionnaire 1 and 2 are not statistically significant and could be caused by chance.

Table 9*Descriptive Statistics of statement: 'I feel part of the neighbourhood'*

Questionnaire 1 (n=1162)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Completely disagree	16	1.3	1.4	1.4	Completely disagree	3	1.6	1.7	1.7
Disagree	61	5.1	5.2	6.6	Disagree	8	4.2	4.6	6.3
Neutral	270	22.5	23.2	29.9	Neutral	33	17.3	19.0	25.3
Agree	459	38.3	39.5	69.4	Agree	71	37.2	40.8	66.1
Completely agree	356	29.7	30.6	100.0	Completely agree	59	30.9	33.9	100.0

The outcome of both surveys concerning the statement 'I feel part of the neighbourhood' is presented in table 9. The distribution of answers in both surveys are almost equal, although the outcomes of the second survey hint a little bit more towards agreement with the statement. In the first questionnaire 30,6% of the people completely agreed with the statement, whereas 39,5% just agreed. 23,2% remained neutral, and only a small group of people disagreed (5,2%) or completely disagreed (1,4%) with the statement.

The outcome of the second survey is more or less similar to the outcome of the first survey, although answers in the agreeing (40,8%) and totally agreeing (33,9%) answering category slightly grew. This time 19,0% stood neutral towards the matter, whereas again only a small group of people disagreed (4,6%) and completely disagreed (1,7%) with the statement.

- **I am there for my neighbours**

Table 1 shows that the mean for this statement in questionnaire 1 was 4,17, in comparison to 4,30 in questionnaire 2. This is 0,13 difference, and a positive growth. Table 2 shows a significance score of 0,034, which is below the set alpha (0,05). The mean differences between questionnaire 1 and 2 concerning the statement 'I am there for my neighbours' are therefore statistically significant. The difference between the two means is unlikely to be caused by chance.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics of statement: 'I am there for my neighbours'

Questionnaire 1 (n=1165)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	2	.2	.2	.2	Completely disagree	0	0	0	0
Disagree	25	2.1	2.1	2.3	Disagree	2	1.0	1.1	1.1
Neutral	167	13.9	14.3	16.7	Neutral	24	12.6	13.8	14.9

Agree	556	46.4	47.7	64.4	Agree	68	35.6	39.1	54.0
Completely agree	415	34.6	35.6	100.0	Completely agree	80	41.9	46.0	100.0

Table 10 shows the answers to the statement ‘I am there for my neighbours’. In the first survey, this statement is agreed with by 47,7% of the people and completely agreed with by 35,6%. 14,3% of the people remained neutral, and only a relatively small portion of the population disagreed (2,1%). 0,2% of the people went one step further and indicated to completely disagree.

After the second survey was conducted, 46,0% of the population completely agreed with the statement whereas 39,1% just agreed with it. 13,8% of the people took a neutral stand towards this statement and only 1,1% disagreed with it. There were no people who completely disagreed with the statement in the second survey.

- **My neighbours are there for me**

There is only a 0,10 difference between the means of questionnaire 1 and 2 when it comes to the statement ‘my neighbours are there for me’. Questionnaire 1 scored an average of 3,96, whereas questionnaire 2 scored an average of 4,06. Once again, even though it is only a small difference, it is a difference in the right direction. Table 2 shows for this statement a significance score of 0,137. This score is below alpha (0,05), which leads to the conclusion that the mean differences of this statement are statistically insignificant.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics of statement: ‘My neighbours are there for me’

Questionnaire 1 (n=1167)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	6	.5	.5	.5	Completely disagree	3	1.6	1.7	1.7
Disagree	52	4.3	4.5	5.0	Disagree	6	3.1	3.4	5.2
Neutral	260	21.7	22.3	27.2	Neutral	35	18.3	20.1	25.3
Agree	517	43.2	44.3	71.6	Agree	63	33.0	36.2	61.5
Completely agree	332	27.7	28.4	100.0	Completely agree	67	35.1	38.5	100.0

Table 11 shows the distribution of answers towards the statement ‘My neighbours are there for me’. The outcome of the first survey showed that most people (44,3%) agreed with the statement. 28,4% completely agreed, 4,5% disagreed and 0,5% completely disagreed with the statement. 22,3% of the population remained neutral.

After the second survey the outcomes shifted a little bit more towards (complete) agreement with the statement. 36,2% of the people agreed with the hypothesis, which is somewhat less than before, however 38,5% completely agreed with the statement. This is a 10,0% increase in comparison with two months earlier. 20,1% of the people were neutral, whereas 3,4% of the population disagreed and 1,7% completely disagreed.

- **I undertake activities with my neighbours**

The mean differences between questionnaire 1 and 2 are minimal. Questionnaire 1 scored an average of 3,15 and questionnaire 2 scored 3,16. There is only a 0,01 difference between the points of measurement. Looking at table 2, the significance score of this test results in a score of 0,952, which is much higher than the set alpha (0,05). The mean difference for this statement is not significant.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics of statement: ‘I undertake activities with my neighbours’

Questionnaire 1 (n=1165)					Questionnaire 2 (n=174)				
	n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		n	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Completely disagree	136	11.4	11.7	11.7	Completely disagree	18	9.4	10.3	10.3
Disagree	234	19.5	20.1	31.8	Disagree	33	17.3	19.0	29.3
Neutral	298	24.9	25.6	57.3	Neutral	52	27.2	29.9	59.2
Agree	317	26.5	27.2	84.5	Agree	46	24.1	26.4	85.6
Completely agree	180	15.0	15.5	100.0	Completely agree	25	13.1	14.4	100.0

The final statement is ‘I undertake activities with my neighbours’. The distribution of answers towards this statement is presented in table 12. This is a statement where the answers to the questions are quite equally distributed. After conducting the first survey 11,7% of the people stated that they completely disagree with the statement. 20,1% just disagreed and 25,6% of the

people were neutral. 27,2% actually agreed with the statement and 15,5% completely agreed with the statement.

After the second survey was conducted, answers seemed to be equally spread in comparison to the outcome of the first survey. The outcome of this survey showed 10,3% of the people completely disagreeing and 19,0% just disagreeing. 29,9% remained neutral, whereas 26,4% agreed. The final group of people (14,4%) completely agreed with the statement.

The analysis of all statements shows that the percentage of people (completely) agreeing increases, with exception of the statement 'I feel that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself'. In that statement, as hoped for, the people (completely) agreeing decreased, as well as the people (completely) disagreeing increased. When looking at the significance of each the statements, it becomes clear that the following statements are significant in this study:

- I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren;
- I trust my neighbours;
- I feel safe in my neighbourhood;
- We greet each other in the neighbourhood;
- I am there for my neighbours

This means that the increase in the answers towards (total) (dis)agreement with these statements is unlikely due to chance. As 5 of the 10 statements are statistically significant, it is possible to conclude that H0 is neither rejected nor accepted. In some areas the sense of community among people participating in Gluren bij de Buren has increased, although in other areas improvements could still be booked.

Originally the thought was that these changes in community sense could be attributed to Gluren bij de Buren. However, as the first point of measurement did not take place before the event, a 'point zero' could not truly be established. The significant changes that have occurred during the time span of two months are therefore more likely to be attributed to COVID-19, than to Gluren bij de Buren.

Hypothesis 2: People 65 years or older have met more new people during Gluren bij de Buren than people younger than 65 years old.

Hypothesis 3: People 65 years or older have a stronger intent to stay in touch with people they met during Gluren bij de Buren than people younger than 65 years old.

The following hypotheses are focussed on specific groups: the different ages that have participated in Gluren bij de Buren. The level of significance was set at 0,05. These hypotheses were both tested using an ANOVA test with the following structure:

- H0: $\mu_{\text{elderly people}} \neq \mu_{\text{younger people}}$
- H1: $\mu_{\text{elderly people}} = \mu_{\text{younger people}}$

Table 13

Mean differences between men and women concerning variables ‘newpeople’ and ‘intent’ between questionnaire 1 and 2

survey	What is your age?	I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren	I have the intention to stay in touch with people I met during Gluren bij de Buren
1,00	0 – 64 years old	3,95	2,74
	65 years and older	3,89	2,77
	Total	3,94	2,74
2,00	0 – 64 years old	3,82	2,34
	65 years and older	4,02	2,60
	Total	3,87	2,40

The variable ‘newpeople’ measured to what extent people have the feeling that they met (many) new people during Gluren bij de Buren. Table 13 shows that people younger than 65 years old initially scored an average of 3,95 in the first questionnaire, whereas people older than 65 years old scored an average of 3,89. After the second survey has been conducted, people younger than 65 years old scored an average of 3,82, in comparison to people older that are 65 years or older who scored an average of 4,02. The fact that these means do not exactly align is due to the fact that the sample of both surveys is not identical. Questionnaire 2 is conducted with a mere 15% of the original sample, which may explain these gradual differences.

The variable ‘intent’ measured the intention people have of staying in touch with the people they have met during Gluren bij de Buren. After the first survey people younger than 65 years old scored an average of 2,74 whereas people older than 65 years old scored an average of 2,77. Both means dropped after the second questionnaire has been conducted. People younger than 65 years old scored an average of 2,34, whereas people 65 years and older

scored a 2,60. The fact that both means decreased could be explained by the fact that COVID-19 occurred during the time span that was in between the two questionnaires. Due to the self-imposed lockdown people stayed home more. Reaching out to (new) people was discouraged as it could lead to a possible increased health risk.

Table 14

Results of ANOVA test with variables 'age', 'newpeople' and 'intent'

survey		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1,00 I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren. * What is your age?	Between (Combined) Groups	,656	1	,656	,626	,429
	Within Groups	1249,002	1192	1,048		
	Total	1249,658	1193			
I have the intention to stay in touch with the people I met during Gluren bij de Buren * What is your age?	Between (Combined) Groups	,171	1	,171	,117	,732
	Within Groups	1737,407	1192	1,458		
	Total	1737,578	1193			
2,00 I met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren. * What is your age?	Between (Combined) Groups	1,380	1	1,380	1,286	,258
	Within Groups	184,580	172	1,073		
	Total	185,960	173			
I have the intention to stay in touch with the people I met during Gluren bij de Buren * What is your age?	Between (Combined) Groups	2,339	1	2,339	1,957	,164
	Within Groups	205,500	172	1,195		
	Total	207,839	173			

Table 14 shows whether the mean differences between the two age groups, concerning the variables 'newpeople' and 'intent' are statistically significant. The variable 'newpeople' scored in questionnaire 1 a significance score of 0,429 which is higher than the set alpha (0,05). This variable in the second survey also scored higher than the set alpha (0,05), namely 0,258. In both instances the outcomes of the tests were insignificant, we therefore accept the H0 hypotheses.

Concerning the variable 'intent', the level of significance in questionnaire 1 was initially 0,732: higher than the set alpha of 0,05. The same test with the outcome of the second

survey resulted in a significance score of 0,164, also higher than the set alpha. As with the variable ‘newpeople’, the variable ‘intent’ is in both cases nonsignificant.

In both questionnaires, both tests have a significance score that is higher than the set alpha. In both cases the H0 hypothesis is being accepted. This leads to the conclusion that in this population the means of people younger than 65 years old and people older than 65 years old do no significantly differ from one another.

Hypothesis 4: Women consider themselves to be there for their neighbours, more than men do.

Hypothesis 5: Women have the feeling their neighbours are there for them, more than men do.

The two following hypotheses look at differences in gender and how that relates to the relationships the participants of Gluren bij de Buren have with their neighbours/ other community members. These hypotheses were both tested with an ANOVA test. The level of significance, alpha, was set at 0,05. Like previous hypotheses, they therefore have the following structure:

- H0: $\mu_{\text{women}} \neq \mu_{\text{men}}$
- H1: $\mu_{\text{women}} = \mu_{\text{men}}$

In both surveys there were four answering categories when it came to gender: (1) man, (2) woman, (3) other, (4) I rather not say. As hypotheses 4 and 5 clearly look at differences between men and women, answering categories other and I rather not say are coded as missing values. In order to provide an answer for these hypotheses the respondents could answer on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being ‘completely disagree’ and 5 ‘completely agree’.

Table 15

Mean differences between men and women concerning variables ‘bethere’ and ‘thereforme’ between questionnaire 1 and 2

survey	What is your gender?	I am there for my neighbours	My neighbours are there for me
1,00	Men	4,17	4,03
	Women	4,18	3,94
	Total	4,17	3,97

2,00	Man	4,29	4,24
	Vrouw	4,32	3,95
	Total	4,31	4,07

The variable ‘bethere’ measured to what extent people perceive themselves to be there for their neighbours. Table 15 shows that in the first questionnaire men score an average of 4,17. This is similar to women, who scored an average of 4,18. Both means increased after the second questionnaire had been conducted. Men now scored an average of 4,29 and women 4,31.

The variable ‘thereforme’ looked at how people perceive their neighbours to be there for them. In questionnaire 1, men initially scored an average of 4,03 and women 3,94. As with variable ‘bethere’ both means have increased after the second questionnaire had been conducted. Men now score an average of 4,24 and women 3,95. The expectation was that women value stronger relationships with neighbours more than men to, however based on the results of table X the averages of men, more than women, have increased in how they perceive their neighbours to be there for them.

Table 16

Results of ANOVA test with variables ‘gender’, ‘bethere’ and ‘thereforme’

survey		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1,00 I am there for my neighbours * What is your gender?	Between Groups	(Combined) ,028	1	,028	,049	,826
	Within Groups	660,281	1164	,567		
	Total	660,309	1165			
My neighbours are there for me * What is your gender?	Between Groups	(Combined) 2,256	1	2,256	3,115	,078
	Within Groups	844,374	1166	,724		
	Total	846,630	1167			
2,00 I am there for my neighbours * What is your gender?	Between Groups	(Combined) ,034	1	,034	,063	,802
	Within Groups	90,635	170	,533		
	Total	90,669	171			
My neighbours are there for me * What is your gender?	Between Groups	(Combined) 3,427	1	3,427	4,053	,046
	Within Groups	143,736	170	,846		
	Total	147,163	171			

Table 16 shows whether the mean differences between men and women are statistically significant or not and utilize the variable 'bethere' and 'thereforme'. Starting with variable 'bethere', the significance score of in questionnaire 1 initially was 0,826. This is much higher than the set alpha (0,05), which leads to the conclusion that the results of this test are not statistically significant. The significance score of the variable 'bethere' and both genders after questionnaire 2 was 0,802. This score is also higher than the set level of significance (0,05), resulting again in a statistically nonsignificant score.

The variable 'thereforme' initially scored 0,078 in questionnaire 1. This score is higher than the set level of significance (0,05), leading to another insignificant outcome. However, after the second survey the significance score was 0,46. This is lower than the set alpha (0,05), leading to a statistically significant test. As previously stated, the expectation was that women would have the larger impact when it comes to how they perceive their neighbours to be there for them and the other way around. However, looking at table 15, it is possible to conclude that the increase in mean average of men causes the second test to be statistically significant, rather than the increased average of women.

Hypothesis 4 'Women consider themselves to be there for their neighbours, more than men do' is statistically not significant in both cases. During both tests the significance score is higher than the set alpha, leading to the conclusion that H0 is in both instances accepted. In this population the means between men and women do not significantly differ from one another when it comes to how people perceive themselves to be there for their neighbours.

Hypothesis 5 'Women have the feeling their neighbours are there for them, more than men do' is not statistically significant in questionnaire 1, however it is statistically significant in questionnaire 2. This means that initially H0 is accepted: the means of men and women in the population do not differ significantly from one another. However, in the second survey H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted: the means of men and women in this population do differ significantly from another. The expectation was that this mean difference was caused by women, however as table 15 points out, it is the mean increase of men that makes the second survey statistically significant.

Hypothesis 6: There is a relation between how safe the participants feel in their neighbourhood and how self-involved a neighbourhood is perceived to be.

The final hypothesis “There is a relation between how safe the participants feel in their neighbourhood and how self-involved a neighbourhood is perceived to be” is concerned with the feeling of safety people have, and how that relates to the perceived self-involvement of members of a neighbourhood. Based on the literature it is believed that there is a relationship between those two variables. This was tested using a Chi-Square Test of Independence. The level of significance once again was set at 0,05.

- H0: There is no relationship between the feeling of safety and the perceived level of self-involvement in a neighbourhood.
- H1: There is a relationship between the feeling of safety and the perceived level of self-involvement in a neighbourhood.

Table 17

Crosstab with variables safety and self-involvement

Questionnaire 1		I feel safe in my neighbourhood					Row
		Completely disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Completely agree	marginals
I have the feeling that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly occupied with himself/ herself	Completely disagree	0 0,0%	0 0,0%	0 0,0%	26 23,2%	86 76,8%	112 100,0%
	Disagree	0 0,0%	5 1,4%	10 2,8%	146 40,8%	197 55,0%	358 100,0%
	Neutral	1 0,2%	2 0,5%	33 8,0%	191 46,1%	187 45,2%	414 100,0%
	Agree	1 0,4%	5 2,1%	27 11,4%	102 43,2%	101 42,8%	236 100,0%
	Completely agree	1 1,8%	3 5,3%	5 8,8%	26 45,6%	22 38,6%	57 100,0%
	Columns	3	15	75	491	593	1177
	marginals	0,3%	1,3%	6,4%	41,7%	50,4%	100,0%
Questionnaire 2		I feel safe in my neighbourhood					Row
		Completely disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Completely agree	marginals
I have the feeling that everyone in the neighbourhood is mainly	Completely disagree			0 0,0%	2 11,8%	15 88,2%	17 100,0%
	Disagree			0 0,0%	19 32,2%	40 67,8%	59 100,0%

occupied with himself/ herself	Neutral	4 6,8%	27 45,8%	28 47,5%	59 100,0%
	Agree	1 2,9%	20 58,8%	13 38,2%	34 100,0%
	Completely agree	1 20,0%	3 60,0%	1 20,0%	5 100,0%
	Columns marginals	6 3,4%	71 40,8%	97 55,7%	174 100,0%

Table 18

Results Chi-Square Test of Independence with variables safety and self-involvement

survey		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2- sided)
1,00	Pearson Chi-Square	79,526 ^a	16	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	83,407	16	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	54,088	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	1177		
2,00	Pearson Chi-Square	25,112 ^b	8	,001
	Likelihood Ratio	26,332	8	,001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	19,571	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 10 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

b. 7 cells (46.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

Table 17 shows the crosstab of both questionnaires with variables ‘safety’ and ‘self-involvement’. The results of questionnaire 1 show that the majority of people feel safe in their neighbourhood: 40,8% and 50,4% (combined 91,2%) of people (completely) agree with this. Only 0,3% feels really unsafe and 1,3% feels just unsafe. 6,4% of the people is neutral in the matter. After conduction of the second questionnaire there are no people anymore who have responded that they feel a little bit or even very unsafe in their own neighbourhood. A combined

score of 40,8% and 55,7% leads to 96,5% of the people (completely) agreeing with the statement that they feel safe in their own neighbourhood.

Table 18 shows the results of the Chi-Square Test of Independence with those similar variables, both in questionnaire 1 and 2. The outcome of the Chi-Square Test of Independence with questionnaire 1 results in a significance score of 0,000. This is lower than the set alpha (0,05), which means that the outcome of this test is significant. The second survey leads to a significance score of 0,001, which is also below the set alpha. In both instances is the significance score lower than the set alpha, which means that H0 is being rejected in favour of H1: in this population there is a relationship between the feeling of safety and the perceived level of self-involvement in a neighbourhood. This means that the people participating in Gluren bij de Buren do not feel that their community sense is influenced by the level of self-involvement of their neighbours, nor that they have an unsafe feeling in in their neighbourhood.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

The initial survey was conducted with 1166 people, whereas the second questionnaire was conducted with a 15% sample of that group (174 people). The second sample was much smaller than the first sample because less people volunteered for the second questionnaire. In order to get an equally representative second sample compared to the first one, systematic sampling has been applied.

The first and main hypothesis of this study dealt with whether or not sense of community among people participating in Gluren bij de Buren has increased after the event had taken place. This hypothesis was tested using ten statements, which all in some extent dealt with elements of community sense: connectedness, social cohesion and social in- and exclusion.

After analysis of each individual statement in both questionnaires it is possible to conclude that the division of answers to each statement shifted more towards social cohesion and community sense among the participants. People completely disagreeing with the statements nearly vanished, whereas the percentage of people totally agreeing with the statements only kept growing. Due to only five of the ten statements being significant, it is not possible to give a definitive answer towards the question whether social cohesion in the neighbourhoods increased significantly. There is a 50% chance that the changes are based on chance.

Initially, Gluren bij de Buren was believed to be the only large event that happened in the involved cities during the time span of this study. However, the unforeseen event of COVID-19 took place during the same time period as well. Due to the pandemic people were more housebound and therefore more focused on their direct environment: the neighbourhoods they live in. This leads to the conclusion that it is highly likely that COVID-19 affected the participants of this study to a larger extent than Gluren bij de Buren did. The worldwide virus is also mainly responsible for the increased feeling of togetherness in people, as it stirs up an intrinsic need for connectedness (Verharen, Heessels, Jansen & Wolf, 2019; Kraak, 2020; Chaney, 2020; Holligan, 2020).

The other hypotheses of this study all dealt with subgroups of the participants of Gluren bij de Buren. The first set of ANOVA tests was conducted with variables 'age', 'newpeople' and 'intent'. All tests resulted in a nonsignificant outcome. H0 was accepted, meaning that in this population the means of people younger than 65 years old and people older than 65 years old do not differ significantly from one another.

This is in contrast with the literature provided by Gardner (2011). His findings show that elderly people more actively maintain their social relationship to neighbours/ other community members, as this provides them with many benefits: social security and stimulation of their brain activity, thereby reducing feelings such as boredom, stress and loneliness. There are two probable explanations for the discrepancy between the results of this study and previous studies.

It is likely that, even though the benefits of social interactions on a later age are scientifically proven to be beneficial, people are unaware of these benefits and thus do not actively pursue a strong(er) social network. Another explanation could be that people are in fact aware of these benefits and therefore strive to make their social networks as strong as possible earlier on in life. Building a strong social network early on in life provides a larger guarantee for the benefits when they have reached this elderly stage in life.

The second set of ANOVA tests was conducted with variables 'gender', 'bethere' and 'thereforme'. In both questionnaires, the tests with variables 'gender' and 'bethere' resulted in a nonsignificant outcome. H₀ was accepted, meaning that in this population both men and women do not differ significantly when it comes to the perceived feeling of being there for their neighbours.

The ANOVA tests with variables 'gender' and 'thereforme' was insignificant in questionnaire 1, whereas the results became significant in the second survey. At first men and women in this population did not seem to differ significantly from one another when it asked if their neighbours/ other community members are there for them. However, after conducting the ANOVA test with the results of the second questionnaire we were able to reject H₀ in favour of H₁: proofing that men and women *do* differ significantly from one another in this population. Two months after Gluren bij de Buren men and women seemed to differ when asked if their neighbours/ other community members are there for them.

Based on the literature of Peterson and Hughey (2004) it was believed that such a change would be due to women. They describe women to be more focussed on their social ties in communities/ neighbourhoods, as they see this as a tool to improve empowerment and thus their quality of life. Interestingly enough, the change from a nonsignificant result to a significant outcome is the result of an increase in the averages of how men perceive their neighbours to be there for them.

The final hypothesis was conducted with a Chi-Square Test of Independence with variables 'safety' and 'self-involvement'. The results were significant, leading to the

conclusion that H0 was accepted: there is a relation between the feeling of safety and the perceived level of self-involvement in a neighbourhood.

Taking a closer look at the number displayed in the crosstab with these variables, it shows that most people already felt safe in their neighbourhood, although there were some people whom (totally) disagreed with this statement. There were also some people that felt that most people in their neighbourhood were self-involved. However, after the second survey was conducted the percentages of people feeling safer increased, whereas the percentage of people feeling (totally) unsafe dropped to zero. A similar trend was visible for the perceived level of self-involvement of people's neighbours. People responded that they felt that their neighbours were less self-involved.

This is in line with the theories of Papachristos and Bastomski (2018) and Bursik (1999). The findings of this study can be aligned with those theories. Both theories stress the importance of strong social ties within communities in order to limit crime levels. Having met or renewed bonds with other neighbours increased the social ties between neighbours, the feeling of safety, and reduces crime levels. As Papachristos and Bastomski (2018) state, people tend to copy behaviour from those close to them. Again, having met/ or renewed bonds with other neighbours strengthens social ties and will assure that people display more socially desirable behaviour. Simply put having nothing to hide with regards to illegal or unwanted behaviour will decrease the level of self-involvement of people.

Thus, in conclusion, it is possible to state that the community sense has increased in the participating cities of Gluren bij de Buren: a positive outcome. However, the outcome of this study is more likely attributed to COVID-19, than to Gluren bij de Buren. Gluren bij de Buren served as the cause to look at social cohesion in the participating neighbourhoods, however due to the design of this study (the first measurement point was not before the actual event but right after) it is not possible to solely attribute the changes to Gluren bij de Buren.

5.1 Limitations of the Study

The first questionnaire is conducted right after the event had taken place, rather than before. Although this is due to time restrictions, this unfortunately means that there was no 'point zero' measured before the event. It is possible that some people were already affected by the event when filling out the first survey, thereby offering a distorted view.

Although it is great to witness the expected and hoped for results, there is another factor that has to be taken into account. During the timespan of two months, Gluren bij de Buren was

the only (large) event that had taken place and therefore was seen as the only possible factor being able to impact nearly all participants of the study. Increased feelings of solidarity and community sense thus could only be attributed to Gluren bij de Buren. There is however an unforeseen factor in play. As mentioned before, we are currently amidst a pandemic. The virus spread to the Netherlands at the end of March, and the second questionnaire was conducted halfway April. However, during that time the Netherlands was already a few weeks into its intelligent lockdown, forcing people into a new lifestyle and rhythm. The feeling of being all together duped into a situation that was unpleasant for so many increased the social cohesion among Dutch citizens (Verharen, Heessels, Jansen & Wolf, 2019). There was a lot of support for people in essential jobs and many initiatives were set up to see each other through the crisis, e.g. doing groceries for elderly, babysitting children from nurses, etc. (Verharen, Heessels, Jansen & Wolf, 2019). Thus, even though from the results it stems that there is an increase in community sense among the participants of Gluren bij de Buren, the worldwide virus COVID-19 was not taken into account in the set-up of this study, and therefore not considered as a variable.

The final limitation of this study is concerned with research conducted by Vanclay (2003). The eight areas of SIA (Social Impact Assessment) he identified are people's: (1) way of life, (2) culture, (3) community, (4) political systems, (5) environment, (6) health and wellbeing, (7) personal and property rights and (8) fears and aspirations. However, as a limitation to his own study he notes that social impact is not an isolated element. Other elements, economic or biophysical (DNA, upbringing, etc.) elements can also play a role and should be looked into when assessing impact. This limitation applies to this study as well.

5.2 Recommendations for further research

There are two major recommendations for further research. One of them would be to conduct the exact same study when, and if, the COVID-19 virus has passed, or a vaccine has been developed. This way it would become clear to which extent COVID-19 influenced the results, and to which extent some of the change could be attributed to Gluren bij de Buren.

The other recommendation would be to conduct the same study and look into individual differences between the cities. The social aim of Gluren bij de Buren is to make neighbourhoods cosier. This study looks at the overall picture to see whether the event increased general "cosiness" and social cohesion in the participating cities, without looking at individual differences between the cities. This is due to the fact that currently the sample of the second

survey is too small to draw any general conclusions, as some of the cities are not in the sample. A comparative study between individual differences could provide additional insights into the possible differences between cities/ neighbourhoods.

References

- Balduck, A. L., Maes, M., & Buelens, M. (2011). The social impact of the Tour de France: Comparisons of residents' pre-and post-event perceptions. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(2), 91-113. DOI: 10.1080/16184742.2011.559134
- Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial hells: Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*. London: Verso Books.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Bursik Jr, R. J. (1999). The informal control of crime through neighbourhood networks. *Sociological focus*, 32(1), 85-97. DOI: 10.1080/00380237.1999.10571125
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Cacioppo, S. (2014). Social relationships and health: The toxic effects of perceived social isolation. *Social and personality psychology compass*, 8(2), 58-72. DOI: 10.1111/spc3.12087
- Chaney, S. (2020). Consumer Prompts Record Drop in Consumer Spending. Retrieved from: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/personal-income-household-spending-COVID-19virus-march-2020-11588197997>
- Fei, J., & Kuo, H. (2013). Community media in China: Communication, digitalization, and relocation. *Journal of International Communication*, 19(1), 59-68. DOI: 10.1080/13216597.2012.753927
- Gallicchio, L., Siddiqi, N., Langenberg, P., & Baumgarten, M. (2002). Gender differences in burden and depression among informal caregivers of demented elders in the community. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, 17(2), 154-163. DOI: 10.1002/gps.538
- Gardner, P. J. (2011). Natural neighbourhood networks—Important social networks in the lives of older adults aging in place. *Journal of aging studies*, 25(3), 263-271. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaging.2011.03.007
- Gidley, J., Hampson, G., Wheeler, L., & Bereded-Samuel, E. (2010). Social inclusion: Context, theory and practice. *The Australasian Journal of University-Community Engagement*, 5(1), 6-36. Retrieved from: <https://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/view/rmit:4909/g2006019858.pdf>
- Gluren bij de Buren. (2020). *Informatie*. Retrieved from: <https://glurenbijdeburen.nl/informatie>
- Hacking, S., Secker, J., Spandler, H., Kent, L., & Shenton, J. (2008). Evaluating the impact of

- participatory art projects for people with mental health needs. *Health & social care in the community*, 16(6), 638-648. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2524.2008.00789.x
- Herrero, L. C., Sanz, J. Á., Devesa, M., Bedate, A., & Del Barrio, M. J. (2006). The economic impact of cultural events: a case-study of Salamanca 2002, European Capital of Culture. *European urban and regional studies*, 13(1), 41-57. DOI: 10.1177/0969776406058946
- Kraak, H. (2020, March 14). COVID-19 toont juist ons sociale weefsel. *De Volkskrant*. Retrieved from: https://blendle.com/i/vkn/COVID-19-toont-juist-ons-sociale-weefsel/bnl-vkn-20200314-11884967?utm_campaign=social-share&utm_source=blendle&utm_content=blendletrending-android&sharer=eyJ2ZXJzaW9uIjoiaMSIsInVpZCI6InZlcmFlZWxrZW1hMSIsIml0ZW1faWQiOiJibmwtbmtuLTIwMjAwMzE0LExODg0OTY3In0%3D&utm_medium=external
- Holligan, A. (2020). COVID-19virus: Why Dutch lockdown may be a high-risk strategy. Retrieved from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-52135814>
- Matarasso, F. (1997). *Use or ornament. The social impact of participation in the arts*, 4(2). London: Comedia
- Miao, J., Wu, X., & Sun, X. (2019). Neighbourhood, social cohesion, and the Elderly's depression in Shanghai. *Social Science & Medicine*, 229, 134-143. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.08.022
- Ostrower, F. (2005). *Motivations matter: Findings and practical implications of a national survey of cultural participation*. Retrieved from: http://webarchive.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311238_motivations_matter.pdf
- Papachristos, A. V., & Bastomski, S. (2018). Connected in crime: The enduring effect of neighbourhood networks on the spatial patterning of violence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 124(2), 517-568. DOI: 10.1086/699217
- Pasanen, K., Taskinen, H., & Mikkonen, J. (2009). Impacts of cultural events in Eastern Finland—development of a Finnish event evaluation tool. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 9(2-3), 112-129. DOI: 10.1080/15022250903119546
- Peterson, N. A., & Hughey, J. (2004). Social cohesion and intrapersonal empowerment: gender as moderator. *Health education research*, 19(5), 533-542. DOI: 10.1093/her/cyg057
- Privitera, G. J. (2011). *Statistics for the behavioural sciences*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, California
- Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2004). The impact of cultural events on city image: Rotterdam,

- cultural capital of Europe 2001. *Urban studies*, 41(10), 1931-1951. DOI: 10.1080/0042098042000256323
- Verharen, L., Heessels, M., Jansen, C. & Wolf, J. (2019). Sociale Kwaliteit voor een sterke Sociale Basis. Retrieved from <https://www.socialevraagstukken.nl/wp-content/uploads/Sociale-Kwaliteit-in-de-Sociale-Basis-.pdf>
- Saayman, A., & Saayman, M. (2004). Economic impact of cultural events. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 7(4), 629-641. Retrieved from: <https://www-ingentaconnect-com.eur.idm.oclc.org/content/sabinet/ecoman/2004/00000007/00000004/art00006#Refs>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students* (6th ed.). Pearson Education Limited: Harlow
- Schmeets, H., & Coumans, M. (2013). *The Assessment of Social Cohesion and Social Exclusion in the Netherlands*. UNESCO workshop on Measuring and Assessing Inclusive Social Policies. Retrieved from: http://www.unesco.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SHS/pdf/Workshop-Social-Inclusion_Schmeets-Coumans.pdf
- Simma, B., & Paulus, A. L. (1998). The 'International Community': Facing the challenge of globalization. *European Journal of International Law*, 9(2), 266-277. DOI: 10.1093/ejil/9.2.266
- Whitlock, J. (2007). The role of adults, public space, and power in adolescent community connectedness. *Journal of community psychology*, 35(4), 499-518. DOI: 10.1002/jcop.20161
- Vanclay, F. (2003). International Principles for Social Impact Assessment. *Impact assessment and project appraisal*, 21(1), 5-12. DOI: 10.3152/147154603781766491

Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaires

Both questionnaires will contain the same questions. The questions, as well as a short introduction to questionnaire 1 and 2 can be found below.

[Introduction questionnaire 1] Dank dat je mee wilt doe aan deze korte enquête. Het invullen zal ongeveer zal maximaal 5 minuten van je tijd in beslag nemen. Met jouw hulp kunnen we Gluren bij de Buren 2021 nog beter maken!

[Introduction questionnaire 2] Hoi Gluren-bezoeker, je hebt aangegeven nog wat extra vragen over Gluren bij de Buren 2020 in te willen vullen. Hartstikke fijn, dankjewel! Deze tweede enquête over Gluren bij de Buren, zal in tegenstelling tot de vorige enquête, maar maximaal 3 minuten duren: 7 vragen en 10 stellingen. We zijn benieuwd om te zijn of er laatste tijd wat veranderd is qua sfeer in de buurt.

1. Wat is je geslacht?

- ◆ Man
- ◆ Vrouw
- ◆ Anders [korte antwoord regel]

2. Wat is je leeftijd?

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| ◆ 0 – 18 jaar oud | ◆ 45 – 54 jaar oud |
| ◆ 18 – 24 jaar oud | ◆ 55 – 64 jaar oud |
| ◆ 25 – 34 jaar oud | ◆ 65 jaar en ouder |
| ◆ 35 – 44 jaar oud | |

3. In welke provincie woon je?

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------|
| ◆ Noord-Holland | ◆ Friesland |
| ◆ Zuid-Holland | ◆ Groningen |
| ◆ Zeeland | ◆ Drenthe |
| ◆ Noord-Brabant | ◆ Overijssel |
| ◆ Utrecht | ◆ Gelderland |
| ◆ Flevoland | ◆ Limburg |

4. Wat is je hoogst genoten opleiding?

- ◆ Voorgezet onderwijs
- ◆ MBO
- ◆ HBO
- ◆ Universiteit
- ◆ PHD

5. In welke stad heb je meegedaan aan Gluren bij de Buren in 2020?

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| ◆ Alphen aan den Rijn | ◆ Hilversum |
| ◆ Amersfoort | ◆ Leiden |
| ◆ Amstelveen | ◆ Nieuwegein |
| ◆ Assen | ◆ Nijkerk |
| ◆ Baarn | ◆ Nissewaard |
| ◆ Bloemendaal | ◆ Soest |
| ◆ Delft | ◆ Utrecht |
| ◆ Den Haag | ◆ Venlo |
| ◆ Emmen | ◆ Zeist |
| ◆ Haarlemmermeer | ◆ Zoetermeer |
| ◆ Helmond | ◆ Zutphen |

6. Als wat heb je meegedaan aan Gluren bij de Buren?

- ◆ Artiest
- ◆ Huiseigenaar
- ◆ Bezoeker

7. Hoeveelste editie is dit dat je aan Gluren bij de Buren meegedaan hebt?

- ◆ 1
- ◆ 2
- ◆ 3
- ◆ 4
- ◆ 5
- ◆ 6
- ◆ 7
- ◆ 8
- ◆ 9
- ◆ 10
- ◆ Meer dan 10

8. Hoe vaak neem je deel aan culturele activiteiten?

- ◆ 1x per week
- ◆ 1x per maand
- ◆ Een aantal keer per jaar
- ◆ 1x per jaar
- ◆ Nooit

9. Waarom heb je meegedaan aan Gluren bij de Buren?

- ◆ Ik was uitgenodigd door een huiseigenaar.
- ◆ Ik was uitgenodigd door een artiest.
- ◆ Om nieuwe mensen te ontmoeten.
- ◆ Om mijn burens te ontmoeten.
- ◆ Ik wilde één of meerdere acts zien.
- ◆ Ik wilde een specifieke artiest zien.
- ◆ Anders [korte antwoord regel]

10. Met wie heb je meegedaan aan Gluren bij de Buren?

- ◆ Alleen.
- ◆ Met een buur/ burens.
- ◆ Met een vriend/ vrienden.
- ◆ Met mijn partner.
- ◆ Met een familielid/ familieleden.
- ◆ Met een collega/ collega's.
- ◆ Anders [korte antwoord regel]

11. Ik had de meest sociale interactie met...

- ◆ Artiesten
- ◆ Huiseigenaren
- ◆ Bezoekers

12. Ik voel me sterk(er) verbonden met mijn burens na Gluren bij de Buren.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

13. Ik heb veel nieuwe mensen ontmoet tijdens Gluren bij de Buren.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

14. Ik heb de intentie contact te houden met de mensen die ik ontmoet heb tijdens Gluren bij de Buren.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

15. Ik heb het gevoel dat iedereen in de buurt met zichzelf bezig is.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

16. We groeten elkaar in de buurt.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

17. Ik voel me veilig in mijn buurt.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

18. Ik vertrouw mijn buren.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

19. Mijn buren zijn er voor mij.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

20. Ik ben er voor mijn buren.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens

- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

21. Ik voel me onderdeel van de buurt.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

22. Ik onderneem activiteiten met mijn burens.

- ◆ 1 = Helemaal oneens
- ◆ 2 = Oneens
- ◆ 3 = Neutraal
- ◆ 4 = Mee eens
- ◆ 5 = Helemaal eens

Appendix B: Initial Codebook

Variable	Definition	Answering categories	Measurement level
Gender	The gender of the respondent.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Male 2. Female 3. Other 999. Missing value	Nominal
Age	The age of the respondent.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 – 18 jaar oud 2. 18 – 24 jaar oud 3. 25 – 34 jaar oud 4. 35 – 44 jaar oud 5. 45 – 54 jaar oud 6. 55 – 64 jaar oud 7. 65 jaar en ouder 	Ordinal
Province	The province in the Netherlands the respondent lives in.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noord-Holland 2. Zuid-Holland 3. Zeeland 4. Noord-Brabant 5. Utrecht 6. Flevoland 7. Friesland 8. Groningen 9. Drenthe 10. Overijssel 11. Gelderland 12. Limburg 999. Missing value	Nominal
Education	The highest degree or level of education the respondent has finished.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voorgezet onderwijs 2. MBO 3. HBO 4. Universiteit 5. PHD 999. Missing value	Nominal

City	The city in which the respondent has attended Gluren bij de Buren in 2020.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alphen aan den Rijn 2. Amersfoort 3. Amstelveen 4. Assen 5. Baarn 6. Bloemendaal 7. Delft 8. Den Haag 9. Emmen 10. Haarlemmermeer 11. Helmond 12. Hilversum 13. Leiden 14. Nieuwegein 15. Nijkerk 16. Nissewaard 17. Soest 18. Utrecht 19. Venlo 20. Zeist 21. Zoetermeer 22. Zutphen <p>999. Missing value</p>	Nominal
Cluster	Refers to the cluster the respondent belongs to.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Artist 2. Homeowner 3. Visitor <p>999. Missing value</p>	Nominal
Edition	The number of editions the respondent has attended Gluren bij de Buren.	Korte antwoord regel	Ratio

Freqcult	The frequency with which the respondents participates in cultural events.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1x per week 2. 1x per maand 3. Een aantal keer per jaar 4. 1x per jaar 5. Nooit 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Motivation	The motivation of the respondent for attending Gluren bij de Buren.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ik was uitgenodigd door een huiseigenaar. 2. Ik was uitgenodigd door een artiest. 3. Om nieuwe mensen te ontmoeten. 4. Om mijn burens te ontmoeten. 5. Ik wilde één of meerdere acts zien. 6. Ik wilde een specifieke artiest zien. 7. Anders [korte antwoord regel] 999. Missing value	Nominal
Company	With whom the respondent attended Gluren bij de Buren	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alleen. 2. Met een buur/ burens. 3. Met een vriend/ vrienden. 4. Met mijn partner. 5. Met een familielid/ familieleden. 6. Met een collega/ collega's. 7. Anders [korte antwoord regel] 999. Missing value	Nominal
Interaction	Refers to the group of people the respondent had most interaction with	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Artiesten 2. Huiseigenaren 3. Bezoekers 999. Missing value	Nominal

	during Gluren bij de Buren.		
Connection	The level of connection the respondent feels to his/ her neighbours after Gluren bij de Buren.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Newpeople	The respondent has met many new people during Gluren bij de Buren.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal mee eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Intent	The intention the respondent has for staying in contact with people he/ she met during Gluren bij de Buren.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Selfinvolvement	Ik heb het gevoel dat iedereen in de buurt met zichzelf bezig is.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Greet	We groeten elkaar in de buurt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Helemaal oneens 7. Oneens 8. Neutraal 9. Mee eens 	Ordinal

		10. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	
Safety	Ik voel me veilig in mijn buurt.	1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Trust	Ik vertrouw mijn buren.	1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Thereforme	Mijn buren zijn er voor mij.	1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Bethere	Ik ben er voor mijn buren.	1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
Partof	Ik voel me onderdeel van de buurt.	1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal

Activities	Ik onderneem activiteiten met mijn burens	1. Helemaal oneens 2. Oneens 3. Neutraal 4. Mee eens 5. Helemaal eens 999. Missing value	Ordinal
------------	---	---	---------

Appendix C: Syntax

Syntax for both questionnaire 1 and 2

```
T-TEST GROUPS=age(1 2)
```

```
/MISSING=ANALYSIS
```

```
/VARIABLES=new_people intent
```

```
/CRITERIA=CI(.95).
```

```
T-TEST GROUPS=gender(1 2)
```

```
/MISSING=ANALYSIS
```

```
/VARIABLES=bethere thereforme
```

```
/CRITERIA=CI(.95).
```

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
/TABLES=selfinvolvement BY safety
```

```
/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
```

```
/STATISTICS=CHISQ
```

```
/CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL
```

```
/COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=trust safety selfinvolvement greet partof bethere thereforme  
activities
```

```
/ORDER=ANALYSIS.
```