Explaining local citizen participation:

Interest, internet use, resources and urbanization as explaining variables

Babette Aubri

S1741802

Supervisor 1: Pieter-Jan Klok

Supervisor 2: Shawn Donnelly

Date: 01-07-2019

Version: 1

Word count: 13.943

<u>Abstract</u>

In this paper, the topic ''citizen participation'' is studied. In this paper two types of citizen participation are distinguished namely local political participation and local civic participation. Local political participation relates to local voting behavior for instance, while local civic participation relates to a citizen initiative for instance.

In this paper, several factors are tested on whether they have a relationship with citizen participation or not. Therefore, the research question that is posed in this paper is: *``which factors influence local political participation and local civic participation and what are the differences between the two types of participation?''*

There are four influencing factors that are tested in this case. The first influencing factor relates to the interest that people have in for instance local politics, local news and local discussions. The second influencing factor is about the education and income people have, in other words the resources. The third influencing factor is about to what extent people use the internet in order to communicate with others about local issues. The final influencing factor relates to the environment people live in, this can be rural or urban. In other words, it describes the relation between the level of urbanization and local citizen participation. In this paper it is expected that these four influencing factors both have an effect on local political participation and on local civic participation.

This paper uses a large data set from 2018 that is about local engagements in the Netherlands. The research design in this study is a cross-sectional research design. This paper seeks to explain more about local engagements in The Netherlands and is therefore especially relevant for (Dutch) policy-makers.

Keywords: Local citizen participation, local political participation, local civic participation, interest, internet use, resources, level of urbanization.

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	
1.1	Research question	6
2.0	Theory section	7
3.0 Me	ethods	
3.1	Research design	
3.2	Case selection	15
3.3	Operationalization & data methods	
3.4	data analysis	
4.0 An	nalysis	
4.1	Descriptive analysis	
4.2	explanatory analysis	
5.0 Co	onclusion	
Biblio	graphy	

1.0 Introduction

In this chapter the current dialogue of the topic ''local citizen participation'' is studied. Since the topic of local citizen participation is studied, it is very important to first define that concept. Local citizen participation can be defined into two different concepts namely, local civic participation and local political participation. Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) explain a lot on what local civic participation means. The clearest distinction between the two concepts is that local political participation is related to the decision-making process and thus relates to the political sphere while local civic participation is not. In the article, it is mentioned that citizen initiatives are seen as a form of civic participation in which citizens themselves lead the action instead of the government. This is often the case when citizens want to improve their neighborhood or strengthen the social cohesion in their neighborhood. Thus, it could be argued that local civic participation takes place when people themselves try to enhance their own neighborhoods.

Local political participation on the other hand has another meaning. The term local political participation can be explained in many different ways. Conge (1988) mentions that political participation has different features. The features they mention are for instance that it can be individual or collective, national or local, against current structures of authorities or in favor of current structures of authorities. Besides this, the author emphasizes that political participation can be expressed in a verbal and/or a non-verbal way, it can be illegal and unconventional but it can also be nonviolent and finally the intensity can also differ. Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) explain under which circumstances political participation takes place. The authors argue that the internal political efficacy and the external efficacy matter regarding local political participation. In others words, citizens must have the feeling that they can make a difference and that the government is responsive to their concerns.

Moreover, this paper tries to seek several factors that influence local citizen participation. In some articles it is argued that in some cases, people's interest in local issues is an important factor whether someone is willing to participate or not. In the article by Davidson and Cotte (1989) this concept is translated into ''the sense of community'' in which it is explained that people must somehow care for their community in order to be willing to do something for their community and participate. Other factors that are extensively discussed in many articles are: money, education and skills, in other words, the resources someone has. In the article by Wilkes (2004) it is extensively explained that resources are a vital element in political

participation. However, another very important factor nowadays is "the internet". The internet is used a lot and is perhaps also an important factor regarding local citizen participation. In many articles it is discussed that the internet has an effect on citizen participation. In for example the article by Tolbert and McNeal (2003), it is explained that the internet is a vital element in explaining citizen participation. Finally, the last factor that is discussed is the level of urbanization. James (2001) argued that people who live in rural places, have less education compared to people who live in urban areas, thus, they have less resources. However, it could be argued that people who live in rural areas have more "sense of community" compared to people who live in urban areas.

In short, many studies on local citizen participation have already been done. However, there are still some elements that are missing and this will lead us to the next part of this introduction in which the relevance of this research is being explained. In this study, the focus will be specifically on the inhabitants of The Netherlands. In most research on local citizen participation, a broader approach is taken. The study by Michels and De Graaf (2010) also studied local citizen participation as a topic and already takes Dutch municipalities as a case but only limits itself to Groningen and Eindhoven and does not make any general statements about Dutch citizens.

Another element that is missing in the current literature is that the aspect of citizen participation is often not separated into civic participation and political participation and then being compared. Often, the term ''local citizen participation'' is used. In this study, the separation is already made clear from the beginning because they are seen as two different concepts.

This makes, that this study is filling a scientific gap by 1) explaining more on Dutch citizens in specific and 2) separating civic and political participation from each other and see if there are any differences regarding the factors explaining it.

1.1 Research question

In 2018 a large survey has been held to gather information about local engagements in The Netherlands. In this paper, a certain topic of this survey is being studied. The research question that is being studied is: *``which factors influence local political participation and local civic participation and what are the differences between the two types of participation?'*

The sub questions that derive from this research questions are:

- To what extent are Dutch citizens politically active and civically active?
- To what extent are the factors: interest, resources, internet use and urbanization different compared to each other?
- To what extent are the influencing factors different regarding local political and local civic participation?

As already mentioned, it is very important to be clear about the differences regarding local political participation and local civic participation. It should be mentioned that in this study, different factors that might influence local citizen participation are measured both for local political participation and for local civic participation. Then, the relations are tested, somewhat compared and a conclusion can be made on which relation is significant and which relation is not significant. Perhaps it might be possible to mention which relation is stronger. Note that in this study, when ''local citizen participation'' is mentioned, it both includes local civic participation and local political participation. In answering the research question a contribution is made to the knowledge especially relevant for (Dutch) local policy-makers.

In this chapter the topic of this study was introduced. Besides this, in this chapter it was also mentioned why this study is relevant and why it is fulfilling a scientific gap. In addition, in this chapter the research question and the sub questions are set out. In chapter two, the theoretical framework is set out and the expectations derived from the current theories are mentioned. Besides this, chapter two also consists of the conceptualization of the key words. In chapter three it is explained how the variables are constructed and how the data is analyzed. To continue, chapter four consists of a descriptive analysis in which the descriptive data is showed and an explanatory analysis in which the research question is answered. Finally, chapter five emphasizes the results and some limitations of this study are mentioned.

2.0 Theory section

In this section, the existing theories about local citizen participation will be set out. First, the main concepts used in the research question will be conceptualized. In the second part, the existing literature will be used to set a theoretical framework. This theoretical framework is necessary to set expectations.

There are several concepts that might need some explanation in order to understand them better. The main concepts in the research question are: local political participation, local civic participation. According to Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006), the concept local political participation relates to facets such as voting in local elections, working on campaigns, getting formal and informal engaged in local issues and attending protests. However, Conge (1988) takes a broader perspective on what political participation entails. The author explains that there are six issues in the discussion of the conceptualization of political participation. The first issue is about the idea that political participation can be active or passive. With this, it goes against the conceptualization made by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) because they only highlight the active forms of political participation. Conge (1988) questions whether awareness and feelings about politics also must be seen as a form of political participation. Moreover, the second issue is that political participation can be violent and non-violent. With this, it is meant that political participation can be expressed in a protest for instance as mentioned in the article by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) but it can also be expressed in a less conventional way such as in strikes for instance. The third issue mentioned in the article is that political participation can be seen in forms where citizen try to maintain how the state operates, or where citizens try to change how the state operates. The next issue in the conceptualization is that political participation should not only be called political participation when it is directed to the government but also when it is not directed directly to the government, but more to the area where the government operates in. The fifth issue is whether political participation should be called political participation when the action is sponsored and mobilized by the government, or when citizens themselves should guide the action. The final issue mentioned in the article is about the distinction between intended and unintended actions. With that, it questions whether it should be called political participation when there is an unintended action with an unintended outcome. Thus, the author of the article mentions that the conceptualization of political participation is very comprehensive and it is therefore very important for the analysis to be clear about what the concept entails.

The database by LKO2018 has several items that relate to some of these conceptualizations. The items about "local political participation" in de database mainly overlap with the conceptualization made by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) which means that items that relate to voting behavior and local political involvement are selected in this study.

The fifth issue mentioned in the article is important to keep in mind since it is about the distinction between local political participation and local civic participation. This is the case because Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) argue that this issue in specific, is important in defining the two types of citizen participation. Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) argue that local civic participation does not relate to the decision-making process and thus, is not guided or mobilized by the government or any other authorities. It is mobilized and guided by the people themselves. This can be an important feature for the outcome because when actions are guided by the citizens themselves, they are often guided in the interest of the people. Contrary, when actions are guided by the government, they are often guided in the interest of the government (Conge 1988). Furthermore, Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) elaborate on the conceptualization of local civic participation by mentioning that citizen initiatives are a facet of local civic participation. However, critics argue that citizen initiatives are seen as a hybrid form rather than a pure form of citizen activism. In the article it is also mentioned that citizen initiatives are only involved with collaboration with local authorities when professionals take over the initiative but this does not necessarily have to be the case. Usually, citizen initiatives are seen as a collective action that stimulates self-governance. Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) name several features of community initiatives, which could be seen as local civic participation. The features mentioned in the article are for instance that citizen initiatives usually are collective, self-organized and is independent from government or other organizations. The LKO2018 database has one item that clearly fits this conceptualization made by Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) which is about participation in citizen's initiative.

Now that the conceptualization of the main concepts is made clear, the next part of the theory section is about the factors that lead to local citizen participation. In the article by Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) it is mentioned that citizen initiatives require a certain amount of interest from the citizens. In other words, in order to have civic participation, a certain amount of interest is required. In this article, a conceptualization of the concept '' interest'' is made. A distinction is made between the interest in the process or in the results. Thus, in defining the concept, a distinction must be made between interest in the process or interest in the results. Besides this,

Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) argue that one of the features of citizen's initiatives is, that it is a collective action. Since this article defines 'interest'' as an interest in the result rather than an interest in the process, it might not be useful for determining the theoretical framework since the 'interest'' items in this study, relate to an interest in the process instead of an interest in the result. Since there are many ways in which 'interest'' can be defined according to the current literature, the conceptualization must be made clear. As already mentioned, the items in the LKO2018 database are more related to the interest and involvement in the process instead of the results. This is the case because the items are for instance about involvement and discussions about local concerns. However, this article by Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) might still be useful to mention in order to indicate that there is a clear difference in the meaning of the concept 'interest''.

Furthermore, Davidson and Cotte (1989) mention the term ''sense of community'' a lot. The study showed that the relation between sense of community and political participation is significant. In this study, facets that fall under the concept of political participation are for instance voting behavior, working on local issues and contacting officials. The sense of community can somehow also count for the ''interest'' factor because as the authors explain, the sense of community consists of four different elements namely: feelings of membership, feelings of influence, feelings of shared needs and feelings of a shared emotional connection. It can be argued that when citizens have a feeling of shared needs and a shared emotional connection, they care more for their community and thus have more interest in local engagements. This article strongly emphasizes first of all the feeling of togetherness, in other words, the collective interest. Besides this, the article also emphasizes the feeling of influence, and with that, emphasizes interest in the process more than the interest in the results.

The authors thus argue that there is a significant relation between the sense of community and political participation. However, it can also be argued that the sense of community might be relevant in relation with local civic participation. This is the case because Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) mention that local civic participation often relates to citizens enhancing their own neighborhoods by for instance strengthen the social cohesion among neighbors. This argument is in line with ''feelings of shared needs and feelings of an emotional connection'' (Davidson and Cotte 1989). Thus, the theoretical framework already assumes that there is a relationship between local political participation and ''interest'' since the sense of community can somehow count for the ''interest' 'factor as argued above. However, it might also be the case that there is also a relation between local civic participation and ''interest'' because the ''sense of community'' might also be relevant regarding local civic participation. To be clear, the aspect

of 'interest' is studied for local civic participation and for local political participation. Then, it is studied which relation is significant and which relation is perhaps stronger than the other if there are any clear differences regarding the strengths of the relations.

Furthermore, Denters and governance (2016) argue that the term resources is a key element in explaining local civic participation. In the article it is stated that in the Civic Voluntarism Model, the question whether or not a person will become actively involved in a particular civic activity is dependent on three key factors: motivations, resources and mobilization. However, Fledderus and Honingh (2016) argue that resources is not a vital element in explaining nonparticipation. Moreover, in the article by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) the authors set out three main elements that explain why people politically participate on a local level. One of these three elements refer to 'resources''. On this concept a theoretical framework is set out. Theorists argue that one of the most determining factors in explaining why people participate is 'resources''. The term resources in this case refers to money, education and civic skills. With the socio-economic status model (SES) it can be explained that citizens with a higher economic status, are more likely to involve themselves in local politics. This argument is also in line with what the study by Wilkes (2004) showed. In this study, they have found that a higher level of education and better language skills have positive relation on the participation level in collective action. In this article, collective action is related to political participation and not to civic participation. It is however questionable if collective action is also or maybe even a more related concept to the term civic participation.

Thus, the concept ''resources'' reflects money, skills and education. Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) argue that for local political participation, money is a very important factor. However, in this study, the term ''local political participation'' refers to voting behavior and the involvement into local political activities. One could argue that for voting behavior, the resource ''money'' might not be an explaining factor. Contrary, the item that is related to local political activities might be more related to the resource ''money'' because this item for instance poses the question whether someone is active in a protest group. Wilkes (2004) however, shows that language skills and the level of education are more important in relation to local political participation. This might be more relevant when explaining local political participation in terms of voting behavior and local political activities. This is the case because one could argue that if someone is involved in a public hearing in the municipality, which is one of the items, having good language skills might be more important than having much

money.

Denters and governance (2016) argue that "resources" are vital with regard to civic participation. It must however be made clear which type of "resources" the author refers to. In this article the author refers to time, human capital and financial capital to explain the concept "resources". In addition, Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) explain that local civic participation relates to citizens improving their neighborhoods and strengthening the social cohesion among neighbors. As the authors of the article also explain, the type of resources necessary, differ among different types of local civic participation. When citizens for instance want to organize a barbecue to strengthen the social cohesion, human capital might not be such an important factor while time and financial capital are. The concept of local civic participation is translated into the item that refers to the involvement in citizens' initiatives. In the article by Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) it is explained that time and skills are one of the most important resources with regard to citizens initiatives. This is the case because studies show that many citizens' initiatives never take place because of a lack of time. Besides this, skills are extremely important because when setting up a citizens initiative, one needs operational, verbal and social skills in order to make the initiative work (Bakker, Denters et al. 2012).

Thus, there is a bit of inconsistency regarding the term "resources" in local civic participation, while Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) and Wilkes (2004) are both very strict about the effect of "resources" in local political participation. Besides this, the items that are selected to measure "resources" are related to money and education. Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) emphasize the importance of skills and education but do not neglect the importance of money with regard to civic participation. Contrary, as argued before, for local voting behavior and being able to present yourself in a public hearing, money might not be such an important factor while education is. Thus, when taking the current literature into account it does not become very clear whether the term "resources" is more relevant in explaining local political participation or in local civic participation. For that reason it is decided that the aspect "resources" is studied for both civic participation and political participation. Then, both relations will be described on whether they are significant or not and if there are perhaps any clear differences in the strengths of the relations.

Moreover, when describing the ''factors influencing local citizen participation'' in the 21st century, one element that should not be neglected is the internet. In many studies it has been found that the internet has an influence on the levels of participation. The article by Tolbert and McNeal (2003) is specifically related to political participation. The authors of the article show that because of the internet, people are more informed about politics, and this has an influence on electoral behavior. The authors of the article mention that due to the internet, people are more likely to vote and thus internet has a positive influence on political participation. However, the authors also argue that on the long-term, the internet could have a negative impact on political participation. This is the case because of unequal access to the internet.

Furthermore, another article in the current literature about internet use and citizen participation is the article by Shah, Cho et al. (2005). This article models the effect of internet on civic participation. The argument made by the authors is in line with what Tolbert and McNeal (2003) argue, namely, that the internet provides citizens with more information about politics. In this way, more political discussions occur on the internet and people can communicate more with each other about civic problems. Thus, political discussions and civic communications are seen as facets of civic participation. The authors of the article conclude that in this way, the internet has a positive influence on civic participation. The items selected that relate to the internet factor are especially related to making contact with local authorities or with neighbors while using the internet. This means that the political information might not be as important as the communication element in this case.

Thus, both of the authors of the two different articles mention that the internet has a positive influence on civic participation and political participation. However, both authors also really emphasize the importance of the internet on political information and with that, emphasize the relation between the internet and political participation. Since the level of providing political information is not measured in this study, but only the communication between citizens and between citizens and local officials is measured, it might also be the case that a relation between internet use and local civic participation. Thus, to be clear, the internet factor is tested both for political and civic participation. Then, both relations are checked on whether they are significant or not, and perhaps if there any clear differences regarding the strengths of the relations.

Finally, Kakumba (2010) mentions that they find a higher response rate in their surveys regarding local engagements in rural areas then in urban areas. This means that the geographical place people live in could also be a factor in explain local citizen participation Besides this, it can also be argued that the "sense of community", as mentioned in the article by Davidson and Cotte (1989), is higher in rural areas because often in these places people know each other personally and thus feel more connected compared to people who live in urban areas. Thus, it could be argued that collective action is more likely to occur in rural areas than in urban areas because people have more sense of community. As argued before, the sense of community might be important in the explanation of whether people participate or not because when citizens for instance want to enhance their neighborhood without involving any local officials, they have to arrange something themselves, and for that, a certain level of social cohesion is necessary. Following this argumentation, it could be argued that there might be a relation between local civic participation and the level of urbanization. However, in this study it is also checked whether there is a relation between the level of urbanization and local political participation. For that reason, the factor "level of urbanization" is measured both in relation with local civic and local political participation. When looking at the results, it is checked whether the relations are significant or not and if there are perhaps any clear differences regarding the strengths of the relations.

Thus, in this chapter the conceptualization of the key words is made clear. Besides this, the current literature about the topic ''citizen participation'' is set out in order to set out a theoretical framework. This theoretical framework results into setting different expectations regarding the four influencing factors in relation with citizen participation.

3.0 Methods

3.1 Research design

The type of research in this study is a hypothesis testing type of research. However, the expectations are formulated openly and this makes it that the study is more explorative. That is the reason why the term ''hypothesis'' is replaced with ''expectations''. This means that there are several assumptions and expectations derived from observations and knowledge. These assumptions and expectations are translated into a set of expectations and afterwards it is tested whether these expectations derived from the theories are in line with the theoretical framework or not.

To be more specific, the research design in this study is related to a cross-sectional research design. This means that there are a set of units and there are variables measured that one moment in time.

In this specific case the units are Dutch citizens and the variables are 'factors influencing local political participation", "factors influencing local civic participation" and the "level of participation". When performing a cross-sectional research design there are several limitations, namely, only the association can be tested. This is the case because only the effect at one time only can be measured. Sometimes by logically thinking, a prediction can be made on whether x precedes y but this is certainly one of the limitations when performing a crosssectional research design. Another limitation this type of research design is that the nonspuriousness can also not be fully tested for. This is the case because for this, the effect with the possible third variable needs to be measured and the effect without the possible third variable needs to be measured in order the state a conclusion. However, the existing theory and considering alternative explanations can help in order to give answers referring to causality. This is done in the form of control variables. When the control variables are taken into account in doing a regression analysis, the possible effect of a third variable is controlled for. Thus, there are several limitations to this type of research design. However, these limitations can be reduced by using control variables. The only thing that matters is that I have to be very careful when making causal statements while doing cross-sectional research. However, cross-sectional research is very suitable when you have a database with many cases. In this study, the database that is used has more than 1000 cases so therefore, it can be justified that in this case a cross-sectional research design is used.

3.2 Case selection

In this study, several citizens of different Dutch cities are asked to give their opinion about local engagements. The survey items derive from ''lokaal kiezersonderzoek 2018'' (LKO2018) (Denters & Jansen, 2018). The LKO2018 has derived its data collection method from LKO2016 in which a nationwide sampling method is used. So this is also the case in the LKO2018. This is done with the aspect of efficiency in mind.

The LKO2018 uses an internet panel derived from CentERdata. The internet panel consists of approximately 5000 households with different backgrounds. What is important to mention is that the households that participate in the panel are selected by CentERdata & CBS. This, means that participants cannot sign up themselves. This is also an important condition to maintain diversity within the panel because in this case, there are no obstacles in participating in the panel. In addition, the response rate, which is 80% is relatively high. However, it can be questioned whether it is a representative sample even though there is a high response rate. This is the case because not everyone that is invited actually participates. So even though the people that are invited to participate are a representative sample, it does not necessarily have to be the case that the response is also representative. However, CentERdata and CBS select new participants when people that are invited do not participate. Thus, by monitoring whether the data given from the panel is in line with the data that the population gives, CentERdata checks for the representativeness of the sample. Besides this, another important element that needs to be discussed is the validity. The internal validity relates to the time-order and nonspuriousness. As already mentioned, we can only test the association so the internal validity can partially be guaranteed. Moreover, the external validity is refers to whether the conclusions that are drawn in this study can be generally stated. This is certainly the case because the sample is representative for all Dutch citizens so they are a good representation of the whole population.

To conclude, the people participating in the panel are a good representation of the Dutch society and the outcomes that derive from the internet panel can be more generally stated and in this dataset, it is explicitly mentioned that every data that is collected is strictly anonymized and cannot be traced back to people.

3.3 Operationalization & data methods

As already mentioned in the previous section, in this study I will not collect the data myself but I use a database from LKO2018. In this part I will justify more why that database is suitable in my research by selecting several items from the LKO2018 to measure my variables. The survey items that are used in my research are found in table 1 and table 2. The exact meaning of the items can be found in the appendix in table 1 and table 2. In this section, first the theoretical part of the operationalization is set out and then the operationalization continues with how the variables are measured.

Table 1: meaning of the items

Influencing factors				
•	v32b: Interest in local politics.			
٠	v34a: Interest in local newspapers.			
•	v34b: Interest in local TV.			
•	v35: Interest in local radio.			
•	v37: Interest/involvement in local			
	news.			
•	V12: Internet use			
•	sted: level of urbanization.			

- netcat: Category of netto-income.
- oplmet: Highest diploma.

Table 2: meaning of the items

Local political participation:	Local civic participation:
• v1: Did you vote.	• v13_1: participation in
• v11: Local political involvement.	citizens' initiative.

The independent variables: "influencing factors"

The factors influencing local political participation and the factors influencing civic participation are the same (table 1). This is the case because they are tested for both political participation and civic participation. Then, the results will show for which type of participation the influencing factors are significant and perhaps are which relation are most strong. However, this can only be stated if there are any clear differences.

Interest

The factors influencing local political participation relate to items that have been mentioned as a possible influencing factor in the current literature. The first variable that is discussed is the variable ''interest''. As already mentioned in the theory section, this variable is related to personal interest and interest in the process instead of the results. Davidson and Cotte (1989) mention that the interest aspect often relates to people who have shared needs and an emotional connection, thus, this fits with the interest in the involvement in the process instead of the direct results. However, Davidson and Cotte (1989) emphasize the collective interest instead of the individual interest. The LKO2018 does not have much data about the collective interest so for that reason, in this study, the items that relate to the individual interest are selected. For that reason, the items selected are about the interest in local politics, local issues, local TV, local radio and the local news.

The ''interest'' aspect is measured by the following items: v32b, v34a, v34b, v35 & v37. V32b is about the interest in local politics. The answering categories range from 1-3 in which 1 means '' not interested'' and 3 means ''very interested''. Since the interest variable consist of 5 different items, an index must be made. V32b consist of 3 answering categories while the other variables consist of 5 answering categories. For that reason, v32b is recoded and instead of three answering categories, it now has five answering categories in order to even all the items in weight. In addition, the variable is computed as an ordinal measure. V34a refers to the question whether someone reads the local newspaper. The answering categories range from 1-5 in which 1 means ''never'' and 5 means ''almost always''. The item is computed as an ordinal variable. Moreover, the item 34b refers to the question whether someone watches local television. Since it is part of the same question as the previous one, it also has a five point Likert-scale and has an ordinal measure. Furthermore, the item v35 is about the whether someone listens to the local radio in which again, the same 5 point Likert-scale is used and the item is again ordinal. Finally, v37 is about whether someone is listens to, and is involved in

discussions about local news. The item has an answering category which ranges from 1-5 in which 1 means "I often participate in these discussions" and 5 means " this never happens". The item is computed as an ordinal variable. Since the answering categories related to item v37 are reversed compared to the other answering categories from other items, v37 is recoded into v37_N in which 1 means "this never happens" and 5 means "I often participate in these discussions."

In addition, the 'interest' scale consist of five items. However, one of the items, item 34a, has many missing cases namely 815. For that reason, this scale is constructed via a MEAN.4 option which means that for the missing cases in one item, the average of the other four items is computed.

Internet

The next variable that is discussed is the variable ''internet use''. Many articles mention the importance of the internet on citizen participation. The authors of the article by Shah, Cho et al. (2005) and the authors of the article by Tolbert and McNeal (2003) both argue that the internet is an important influencing factor in citizen participation because it the internet provides citizens with more information about politics for instance. In this way, the internet could influence voting behavior of people. Besides this, another reason why the internet might be important in explaining the relation with citizen participation, is because due to the internet, people communicate more. The item v12 covers this aspect since it consist 5 sub questions v12_1 until v12_5 in which it is asked of someone used the internet to contact the mayor, civil servants, other inhabitants and organizations about local issues during the last five years. Besides this, it also questioned if someone used the internet to sign an initiative or a petition (v12_4). V12_5 means ''none of the above''. V12 has two answering categories in which 0 means ''no" and 1 means ''yes''.

Resources

Another variable that is discussed is the variable "resources". In the article by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) the concept "resources" refers to money, education and skills. The LKO2018 database has two items that overlap with this conceptualization made by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) namely money and education.

For that reason, the two items selected out of the LKO2018 database are "category of nettoincome" and "highest diploma". These two variables are seen as background variables. The category of the netto-income ranges from 0-14 options in which option 13 and 14 are labelled

as ''missing''. The others options are the categories defined by the income in which 0 is the lowest category and 12 is the highest category. This item is measured by an ordinal variable. The item referring to ''highest diploma'' ranges from 1-9 in which 1 is the lowest diploma possible and 6 is the highest diploma possible. The option 7 means ''other'', the option 8 means ''not (yet) completed any education'' and the option 9 means ''having no education at all'''. There are no missing variables labelled and the item is computed as an ordinal variable. Thus, the variable consists of two different items. However, it may also be possible that in this case, income for instance, has a stronger relation with the dependent variable than education. For that reason, they are also tested separately from each other.

Level of urbanization

The final influencing factor is ''level of urbanization''. Several authors such as (Kakumba 2010) and (Davidson and Cotte 1989) may predict that this also has an influence on citizen participation so that is why this item is also selected. The ''level of urbanization'' is also a background variable. The answer categories are based on a 5point Likert-scale in which 1 means ''very urban'' and 5 means ''not urban''. In addition, the item is computed as an ordinal variable. Furthermore, this item is recoded in which 1 means ''very urban'' in order to put all the items into the same direction.

The dependent variables: "local political participation" & "local civic participation" Local political participation

The first dependent variable that is discussed is ''local political participation''. As explained in the theory section, the conceptualization of ''local political participation'' is very broad. The conceptualization made by Conge (1988) is very comprehensive. The conceptualization made by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) is only one part of the conceptualization made by Conge (1988) and it relates to for instance attending protests or whether someone votes or not. Since I do not collect the data myself, I must fit my conceptualization of the concept with the data I have. In the database there are many items about whether someone votes or is politically active. Since those conceptualization fits with the conceptualization made by Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006), these items will fit the conceptualization and I have decided to select those items.

The items selected for measuring local political participation (table 2) cover questions on whether someone has voted in the municipal elections or whether someone has been locally active in a certain way for the last five years. These items were picked because they both relate to the decision-making process in the political sphere. Thus, local political participation is measured by the following items: v1 & v11. The item v1 questions whether someone has voted or not during the last municipal elections. V1 has five answering categories ranging from 1-3 and -8 & -9 the negative numbers are labelled as "missing". Moreover, v1 is computed as a nominal variable. Besides this, in order to make v1 comparable with v11, a recode was necessary. A new variable v1_N2 is computed in which 0 means "no" and 1 means "yes", the third option which means "was not permitted to vote" is now labelled under the option "missing".

The item v11 questions whether someone has been politically active in a certain way during the last five years. This item has 9 sub questions ranging from v11_1 until v11_9. The answering categories range from 0-1 in which 0 means "no" and 1 means "yes". Besides this. V11 is computed as a binary measure.

Local civic participation

With local civic participation, the idea of self-organization and not involving any local authorities is more present as explained in the theory section in the article by Bakker, Denters et al. (2012). The item selected for measuring local civic participation (table 2) covers the question whether someone has participate in a citizen initiative. This relates to the idea of self-government mentioned by Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) so that is way I think this item will fit the conceptualization and is therefore useful. V13_1 has two answer categories namely 1, which means ''yes'' and 2, which means ''no'' and is computed as a binary variable. Besides this, in order to put this item in the same direction as all the other items, a recode was necessary. Thus, v13_1 is recoded into v13_N1 in which 0 means ''no'' and 1 means ''yes''.

The next section of the operationalization is about how the variables are constructed. The concepts use, sometimes exists of different dimensions, in this case for instance, the different aspects of participation. In some cases, it is expected that these different aspects measure the same thing. In other words, they measure one dimension. If this is the case, it can be decided to make one variable out of it. However, it can also be the case that there are for instance two or maybe three ''types'' of participation. If this is the case, a variable that exists of different dimensions can be made which result into making sub dimensions or maybe delete certain items that do not contribute to the scale.

To see whether there is one factor explained by the items, or whether there are more, factor

analysis and reliability analysis must be performed. The factor analysis also explains whether the items used are coherent or not. The reliability analysis is being performed when the items are measured on one dimension. If this is done, it must be checked whether all the items used score high and are suitable for measuring the variable. However, this might not be relevant for all the items because doing factor analysis and checking for reliability is only necessary when you have a Likert-scale. Thus, that is why it is justified that in this case, the factor analysis is only performed for some items because for the other items it does not have any added value. After that, when the scales are set, the quality of the scales must be assessed. This can be done via Cronbach's Alpha. When there is a strong correlation between the items, the alpha is high and when there is no strong correlation between the times, the alpha is low. It can be assumed that an items with a Cronbach's Alpha higher than 0.7 are accepted in this case.

Thus, for the variable 'interest' which relate to the items: v32b, v34a, v34b, v35 and v37 factor analysis and a reliability check is performed.

A factor analysis is performed to first of all see whether the item is explained by one or more factors. As shown in table 3 only the first component one has an eigenvalue greater than 1. This means that all the items can be explained by one factor only. Besides this, the factor analysis also showed that rotation is not possible and this also indicates that the items are explained by one factor only. In other words, all the items measure the same dimension and thus one variable can be made out. Besides this, the correlation matrix that is included in the appendix as table 3 shows that the correlations between the items range between 0,197 and 0,500. This means that the correlations are not very high, but are also not very low. When interpreting this, it could be argued that the scale is coherent.

Table 3: factor analysis

		Initial Eigenvalu	ies	Extraction	n Sums of Square	ed Loadings	
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	
1	2,267	45,342	45,342	2,267	45,342	45,342	
2	,868,	17,362	62,704				
3	,782	15,646	78,351				
4	,633	12,660	91,010				
5	,449	8,990	100,000				

Total Variance Explained

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4: Cronbach's Alpha

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,670	,695	5

Table 5: Item-Total Statistics

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in de lokale politiek?	13,6257	8,153	,475	,248	,626
Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan?	11,6088	6,613	,550	,352	,564
Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan?	12,1223	6,182	,460	,288	,604
Hoe vaak gaat u op het internet gericht op zoek naar lokaal nieuws, bijvoorbeeld over problemen in uw gemeente?	12,8629	7,007	,379	,165	,640
Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstelling, luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstelling?	11,3388	6,783	,355	,167	,657

In table 4 the Cronbach's alpha between the five items is computed. The alpha level is 0, 67 which is relatively high (table 4). In the previous section I argued that that an alpha level of 0, 7 should be acceptable. However, the right alpha level is still a matter of debate and since 0, 67 is very close to 0, 7, I accept 0, 67 to be a reliable alpha level. Moreover, the item total correlation row (table 5) shows that the correlations between the items range from 0,355 and 0,555 which could be interpreted as relatively normal correlations. Besides that, table 5 also shows that for all the items, the Cronbach alpha would be lower than it is now if one of the items is deleted. To sum up, when the factor analysis and reliability check, it could be argued that the scale is reliable, coherent and explained by one factor only.

3.4 data analysis

In the first section of the analysis, the frequencies of all the variables are shown, starting with the two dependent variables and continuing with all the independent variables. In addition, the main point in chapter 4.1 is that the sub questions posed in chapter two are being answered. Before doing regression analysis, several conditions have to be met. These assumptions are checked before performing the regression analysis. Since the regression analysis is performed in chapter 4.2, it is decided that the assumptions are checked in this chapter.

In this chapter, several assumptions have to be checked in order to perform a regression analysis. These conditions are: checking whether the variables are continuous, the linearity assumption, independence of errors, constant error variance (homoscedasticity), normally distributed errors, no multicollinearity and no significant outliers.

With the linearity assumption, it must be checked whether the independent and dependent variable are linear, in other words, whether there is a relation between the variables or not. The independence of errors assumption checks whether the errors are independent from each other. In addition, homoscedasticity refers to the idea that the variance of errors should not change across the values of X. Furthermore, the normally distributed error assumption checks whether the errors of the regression are normally distributed. The ''no multicollinearity'' assumption is checked via the VIF option on SPSS and the ''no significant outliers'' checks whether there are any extreme cases.

After that, the regression analysis is set out in chapter 4.2. While using the constructed scales, a regression analysis is being performed and the expectations derived from the theoretical framework are tested. The data will be analyzed on the basis of a linear regression analysis and via a logistic binary regression analysis. This means that several expectations are set out and then it is tested whether these relations are significant or not and if there are any differences regarding the strengths of the relations. In this paper, it is decided that the relationship is significant when the significance level is smaller than 0, 05. When a relationship is seen as significant, it can be assumed that there is a relationship between the independent and dependent variable. Other key figures are the standardized b coefficient in which it can be checked how strong the relationship is and the standard error which indicates the length between the data points and the regression line. This of course, should be as small as possible. Besides this, key figures in doing a logistic binary regression analysis are the Exp (B) and the significance values. It should be mentioned that there is a somewhat comparative aspect in this study. This is the case because the influencing factors are checked

both for local political participation and local civic participation. Then, it is checked on which type of participation the influencing factor has a significant relation with and if there are any differences regarding the strength of the relations. Besides this, it is aimed to have the highest R-square value possible so that the model is able to fit the data used. Moreover, the goal is to have as many valid cases possible but this would probably not be a danger since the database that is used consists of more than 1000 cases.

Assumptions regression analysis

The first assumption that needs to be checked is whether the variables are continuous. This means that they have to be measured at an interval or ratio level. The dependent variables need to be measured at an interval or ratio level while the independent variables need to be measured at the interval, ratio, binary level or when dummy variables are created. All the independent variables are treated as continuous. However, the dependent variable ''local political participation'' is computed into a scale while the dependent variable ''local civic participation'' is computed as nominal. This means that for the dependent variable ''local civic participation'' no linear regression analysis can be performed. Thus, for this reason, it is decided to perform a logistic binary regression analysis for the dependent variable ''local civic participation''.

The second assumption that is checked is the linearity assumption. The linearity assumption checks whether there is a relationship between X and Y. This is checked via SPSS by computing scatterplots. The scatterplots can be found in the appendix. In order to interpret the scatterplots it should be mentioned that the closer that the adjusted regression curve is to the line, the more likely it is that the assumption is not violated. The different tables in the appendix show a strange pattern. The reason why the dots in the different scatterplots are overlapping might be a result of the variable construction because some of the variables are not continuous. Thus, the reason why the dots are overlapping is a results of the fact that one dependent variable is not continuous and some independent variables are not continuous. The scatterplots accertain pattern but it is difficult to assess whether it is linear or not.

Furthermore, the third assumption is the independence of errors assumption. This can be checked via the Durbin Watson test via SPSS. The model summary (chapter 4.2, table 18) shows that the Durbin Watson test has a score of 1,504. Overall, a score ranging from 1, 5 and 2, 5 can be considered as normal which means that the errors are independent from each

other.

In addition, the next assumption is about the homoscedasticity. This test argues that the variance of errors should not change across X. This means that in the scatterplots, the data should not follow a certain pattern. See the appendix for the separate scatterplots.

The next assumption is about the normal distributed errors, checked in chapter 4.1 where the different histograms are displayed.

Besides this, another assumption that also needs to be met is the "no multicollinearity" assumption which means that there must be no correlation between the independent variables within a regression model. This is checked via the VIF option in SPSS. In the appendix as table 16 it is shown that the VIF is 1 which means that there is no multicollinearity in this model.

The final assumption is about having no significant outliers. An outlier indicates that there is an observation that is extreme in relation to all the other data. This is important to take into account as it might influence the interpretation of the data. However, since the data set that is used is so large, a few outliers might not change the results so for that reason this assumption is not checked.

Assumptions logistic binary regression analysis

The first assumption when performing a logistic binary regression analysis is that the dependent variable must be measured at a dichotomous scale. In this case, the dependent variable refers to ''local civic participation'' which is measured via the question whether someone has been active in a citizen initiative in which people can either state ''yes'' or ''no''. This means that the first assumption is fulfilled.

The second assumption is that there must be at least one or more independent variables. This assumption is also met since there are four independent variables that are tested in this study. The third assumption states that the dependent variable must consist of mutually exclusive answering categories. In this study the answering categories are "yes" or "no" which means that this assumption is also fulfilled.

The final assumption is the linearity assumption, this assumption checks whether there is a linear relationship between de dependent variable and the independent variables. This can be tested via a box-Tidwell test. In the appendix as table 17 it is shown that three of the four relations are significant. This means that there might be an issue regarding linearity. However, the sample size also plays a role here and since the data set that is used is so large, this will not be seen as an issue.

Thus, as already mentioned, only for the dependent variable ''local political participation'' a multiple regression analysis is performed. For the other dependent variable ''local civic participation'', a logistic binary regression analysis is performed.

In this chapter, first the type of research was discussed. Besides this, the limitations that derive from this type of research was also mentioned. After that, it was explained where the data derived from. It was mentioned that the data that is used derived from the LKO2018 database. Furthermore, in the operationalization section, first the operationalization of the items were set out, and with that, it was justified why those items were selected. Then, the operationalization of the data was set out and factor analysis and reliability analysis was performed. Finally, in the last section of this chapter, the assumptions when doing a linear regression analysis and when doing a logistic binary regression analysis were set out. To give an overview of chapter 4, first the descriptive data is showed, then the regression analysis is performed and then the test for the dependent variable ''local civic participation'', the logistic binary regression analysis is performed. On the basis of that, the results are being interpreted and perhaps compared.

4.0 Analysis

4.1 Descriptive analysis

The first sub question states *'to what extent are Dutch citizens politically active and civically active?* So the frequencies of the local political participation and local civic participation are first analyzed.

Table 6: dependent variable ''local political participation''

localpoliticalpart1							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	,10	521	19,3	21,5	21,5		
	,20	1747	64,6	72,0	93,5		
	,30	90	3,3	3,7	97,2		
	,40	42	1,6	1,7	98,9		
	,50	12	,4	,5	99,4		
	,60	9	,3	,4	99,8		
	,70	2	,1	,1	99,9		
	,90	3	,1	,1	100,0		
	Total	2426	89,7	100,0			
Missing	System	278	10,3				
Total		2704	100,0				

Table 6 refers to the frequencies of local political participation. The variable local political participation has a mean of 0, 19. The variable is normally distributed but it is skewed to the right. Besides this, table 6 shows that the number of cases is 2426 which means that the sample is large enough. In addition, table 6 shows that the percentages are higher in the first columns of the table and become lower at the end of the columns. It can be concluded that regarding local political participation, most people in the sample are not very active. Thus table 6 shows that in this sample, people are not very active with regarding local political participation.

Furthermore, this scale consist of ten items in which all the items are added up and then divided by ten. The values range from 0-1 in which 0 means doing nothing, so not being active and 1 means being very active.

Table 7: the dependent variable ''local civic participation''

act	actief geweest tijdens een burgerinitiatief bij u in de gemeente							
Frequency Percent Valid Percent Cumulative								
Valid	nee	2424	89,6	89,7	89,7			
	ja	279	10,3	10,3	100,0			
	Total	2703	100,0	100,0				
Missing	System	1	,0					
Total		2704	100,0					

Bent u de afgelopen vijf jaar samen met anderen wel eens

To continue, table 7 displays the frequency table related to local civic participation. The variable is measured by one item only. Table 7 also shows that the number of valid cases is 2703 which is a large sample. Besides this, the table shows that 89, 6 percent of the sample has not been active regarding local civic participation and 10, 3 percent has been active regarding local civic participation. Thus, table 7 shows that regarding local civic participation, the people in this sample are not really active.

Thus, when only looking at the descriptive data of the two dependent variables, one could argue that in this sample, people are not really active in both types of participation. This is the case because as showed above, the data is highly skewed to the right and the frequencies show that most people in this sample are not active. Thus, to give an answer to the first sub question which states: states "to what extent are Dutch citizens politically active and civically active? It could be argued that Dutch citizens are politically and civically not really active.

The second sub question states: "*To what extent are the factors: interest, resources, internet use and urbanization different compared to each other*?" So the frequencies of all the influencing factors are analyzed. The first influencing factor that is analyzed is the variable "interest"





In table 18 in the appendix and figure 8 the frequencies of the ''interest'' variables are shown. Figure 8 shows that the data is normally distributed and has a mean of 2, 98. Besides this, table 18 in the appendix shows that the sample has 51 missing cases but still has a sample of 2653. The frequency table also shows that the data is normally distributed since the frequencies are higher in the center of the table and lower at the edges of the table. The fact that the data is normally distributed and peaks in the center of the table tells us that in this sample, most people are quit interested in local politics, local newspapers, local television, local radio and the local news.

Furthermore, the next influencing factor that is analyzed is the variable "resources". As already mentioned, this variable consist of two different items. One of the items is about the income and the other item indicates to the education someone has. The variable resources is tested but the two items are also tested separately. For that reason, the frequencies of the variable "resources" is analyzed, but also the frequencies of the items "income" and "education" are analyzed. The resources scale thus consist of two items in which both items are added up and then divided by two.

Table 9: frequencies ''resources''

resources						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	,00,	10	,4	.4	.4	
	,50	12	,4	,5	,9	
	1,00	55	2,0	2,2	3,1	
	1,50	106	3,9	4,3	7,4	
	2,00	236	8,7	9,5	16,9	
	2,50	223	8,2	9,0	25,8	
	3,00	279	10,3	11,2	37,0	
	3,50	289	10,7	11,6	48,7	
	4,00	300	11,1	12,1	60,7	
	4,50	342	12,6	13,8	74,5	
	5,00	231	8,5	9,3	83,8	
	5,50	176	6,5	7,1	90,9	
	6,00	102	3,8	4,1	95,0	
	6,50	52	1,9	2,1	97,1	
	7,00	41	1,5	1,6	98,7	
	7,50	12	,4	,5	99,2	
	8,00	9	,3	.4	99,6	
	8,50	8	,3	,3	99,9	
	9,00	3	,1	,1	100,0	
	Total	2486	91,9	100,0		
Missing	System	218	8,1			
Total		2704	100,0			

Figure 10: histogram ''resources''



Table 9 and figure 10 display the frequencies of the variable ''resources''. The histogram shows that the data is normally distributed but a little bit skewed to the right with a mean of 3, 80. Table 9 shows that there is a sample of 2486 and that there are 218 missing cases. To interpret these frequencies, it could be argued that in this sample, people score quit average on education and income which means that this sample does not represent for instance only highly educated rich people or low educated poor people. In the appendix, table 19 and

table 20 show the frequencies of education and income in The Netherlands as a whole. In table 19 in the appendix it is shown that most people in the Netherlands in 2018 fall in the category, HAVO/VWO/MBO. However, category HBO, which is the highest in the LKO2018 sample (see table 11), also scores relatively high. Besides this, table 20 in the appendix displays the incomes in the Netherlands. The last two columns represent the monthly wages. The last column is the month wage without any extras. The wages range from 1012-5437. As table 13 shows, in the LKO2018 sample, the categories 1001-2500 score highest. Taking table 19 and table 20 from the appendix into account, it could be argued that the sample from the LKO2018 survey score quit well with regard to income and education when comparing it to the rest of the population of the Netherlands.

	opimet_N						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	(Nog) geen onderwijs afgerond	22	,8	8,	8,		
	basisonderwijs	82	3,0	3,1	3,9		
	vmbo	551	20,4	20,9	24,8		
	havo/vwo	302	11,2	11,4	36,2		
	mbo	616	22,8	23,3	59,6		
	hbo	709	26,2	26,8	86,4		
	WO	359	13,3	13,6	100,0		
	Total	2641	97,7	100,0			
Missing	System	63	2,3				
Total		2704	100,0				

|--|

Figure 12: histogram "education"



Table 11 and figure 12 show the frequencies related to the variable ''education''. The two tables show that the data is normally distributed with a mean of 3, 88. Table 11 shows that people having a ''HBO'' degree score highest and people having no education yet scores lowest. However, the people who have ''MBO'' score as second highest. This means that in this sample, there are people with a high education, but also people with a lower education which is good for the representativeness of the sample.

Table 13: frequencies 'income''

Persoonlijk netto maandinkomen in categorieën						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	geen inkomen	208	7,7	8,2	8,2	
	EUR 500 of minder	115	4,3	4,5	12,7	
	EUR 501 t/m EUR 1000	379	14,0	14,9	27,6	
	EUR 1001 t/m EUR 1500	468	17,3	18,4	46,0	
	EUR 1501 t/m EUR 2000	553	20,5	21,7	67,7	
	EUR 2001 t/m EUR 2500	407	15,1	16,0	83,7	
	EUR 2501 t/m EUR 3000	207	7,7	8,1	91,8	
	EUR 3001 t/m EUR 3500	107	4,0	4,2	96,0	
	EUR 3501 t/m EUR 4000	53	2,0	2,1	98,1	
	EUR 4001 t/m EUR 4500	26	1,0	1,0	99,1	
	EUR 4501 t/m EUR 5000	5	,2	,2	99,3	
	EUR 5001 t/m EUR 7500	13	,5	,5	99,8	
	Meer dan EUR 7500	5	,2	,2	100,0	
	Total	2546	94,2	100,0		
Missing	Dat weet ik echt niet	49	1,8			
	Dat wil ik niet zeggen	98	3,6			
	System	11	,4			
	Total	158	5,8			
Total		2704	100,0			

Figure 14: histogram ''income''



Table 13 and figure 14 show the frequencies of the variable ''income''. As shown in table 13, the incomes are categorized into different categories. The data is normally distributed but somewhat skewed to the right with a mean of 3, 7. As the frequency table shows, the category with people having an income of 1501-2000 score highest. The table also shows that the categories with people earning 4501 or more are poorly represented compared to the Dutch population as a whole. This is also visible in table 20 in the appendix since only one category has a monthly wage more than 4501. When interpreting these two tables, it could be argued that the big earners are not really represented in this sample.

Table 15: frequencies internet use

Internetuse						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	,20	2598	96,1	96,1	96,1	
	,40	74	2,7	2,7	98,9	
	,60	22	8,	8,	99,7	
	,80	9	,3	,3	100,0	
	Total	2703	100,0	100,0		
Missing	System	1	0,			
Total		2704	100,0			

To continue, the next variable that is analyzed is the variable ''internet use''. Table 15 displays the frequencies of this variable. The frequency table shows that most people score on the value 0, 2 which means that most people do not use the internet that much in order to contact public officials or other citizens. This scale consists of five items which are added up and then divided by five in which 0 means minimum internet use and 1 means maximal internet use.

Finally, the last variable that needs to be discussed is the variable ''level of urbanization''. This variable consist of an item that ranges from the option ''not urban'' to ''very urban''. In table 16 and figure 17 the frequencies of this variable are computed.

	stedelijke woonplaats						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	niet stedelijk	415	15,3	15,5	15,5		
	weining stedelijk	529	19,6	19,7	35,2		
	matig stedelijk	583	21,6	21,7	56,9		
	sterk stedelijk	730	27,0	27,2	84,1		
	zeer sterk stedelijk	428	15,8	15,9	100,0		
	Total	2685	99,3	100,0			
Missing	System	19	,7				
Total		2704	100,0				

Table 16: frequencies ''level of urbanization''

Figure 17: histogram ''level of urbanization''



The histogram shows that this variable has a mean score of 3, 08. Besides this, the frequency table shows that people living in a "strongly urban" environment are most represented in this sample and people living in a "not urban" environment score the lowest frequencies. However, since all the frequencies are very close to each other, it could be argued that people of urban and rural places are all represented in this sample.

To conclude, the second sub question was about "to what extent are the factors: interest, resources, internet use and urbanization different compared to each other?"

In providing an answer to this question a short summary of the descriptive data about the influencing factors is set out. In this sample, people have quit some interest in for example the local news and local discussions. Besides this, the frequencies of the tables related to the resources also showed that in this sample, people with lower education are included, but also people with higher education are present. In addition, the tables referring to the income of people showed that people with an average income are represented most in this sample. The big earners are not represented that much. Furthermore, the frequencies also showed that the people in this sample do not really make use of the internet in order to contact other people or public officials. Finally, regarding the level of urbanization, the sample consist of both people who live in urban areas and people living in rural areas.

4.2 explanatory analysis

T 11	10	1 1		•	1 •
Table	18.	model	cummary	roarossion	analysis
IUDIC	10.	mouei	Summer y	regression	unui ysis
			~	0	~

Model Summary ^b						
Model	Adjusted R Std. Error of Durbin- Model R Square Square the Estimate Watson					
1	,544ª	,296	,295	,05538	1,504	

 a. Predictors: (Constant), resources, Internetuse, stedelijke woonplaats, Interest_N1

b. Dependent Variable: localpoliticalpart

The results of the regression analysis show that the explained variance of the model, the r square value is not that high, namely 29, 6 percent. To interpret this 29, 6 percent, it means the independent variables all together explain 29, 6 percent of the variance in the dependent variable ''local political participation''. However, a relatively low r square does not necessarily mean that there is no relation or a weak relation as it might also be the case that the relation is not linear. Moreover, table 18 also displays the standard error of the estimate (SEE). A low SEE means that there is a good model fit. In this case the SEE has a value of 0, 06 which could be interpreted as relatively low.

Table 19: coefficients regression analysis

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	,006	,007		,836	,403
	Interest_N1	,022	,001	,281	15,311	,000,
	Internetuse	,489	,022	,396	21,765	,000
	stedelijke woonplaats	-,001	,001	-,023	-1,273	,203
	resources	,005	,001	,108	5,908	,000

Coefficients^a

a. Dependent Variable: localpoliticalpart

Internet use & local political participation

The coefficient matrix (table 19) show the main results of the regression model. The ''internet use'' variable has a standardized B coefficient of 0, 396 and has a significance value of 0,001. This means that the relationship is significant because 0,001 < 0, 05. Besides this, the standardized B coefficient is about how strong the relationship is. A value 0f 0, 396 can be interpreted as quit a strong relation.

Thus the relationship between "internet use" and "local political participation" can be interpreted with a value of 0, 396.

Resources & local political participation

The variable 'resources' has a standardized B coefficient of 0,108 and has a significant value of 0,001. This means that the relationship is significant because 0,001<0, 05. However, as already mentioned in chapter 5.1, this variable consist of two different variables and is therefore also checked separately.

Table 20: coefficient regression analysis: education & income

Coefficients^a

		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	,003	,007		,395	,693
	Interest_N1	,023	,001	,285	15,498	,000
	Internetuse	,485	,022	,393	21,605	,000
	stedelijke woonplaats	-,001	,001	-,027	-1,472	,141
	Hoogste opleiding met diploma	,005	,001	,102	5,162	,000
	Persoonlijk netto maandinkomen in categorieën	,001	,001	,034	1,705	,088

a. Dependent Variable: localpoliticalpart

This table shows the separate variables that both fall under the variable "resources". In the table it is shown that only the variable "education" is significant since 0,001 < 0,05. The variable "income" however is not significant since 0,088 > 0,05.

To compare the relationships, the standardized B coefficients are taken into account. The standardized B coefficient for the relation between "education" and "local political participation" is 0,102. Moreover, the standardized B coefficient that explains the relation between "income" and "local political participation" is 0,034 but since this relation is not significant it could be argued that the variable "education" has a stronger relation with "local political participation" than the variable "income".

Interest & local political participation

Table 19 shows that the variable ''interest'' has a standardized B coefficient of 0,281 and has a significant value of 0,001 which again means that the relationship is significant since it is smaller than 0, 05. Besides this, the relationship can be interpreted as a moderate to weak relation.

Level of urbanization & local political participation

For the variable ''level of urbanization'' table 19 shows that it has a significant level of 0,203 which is still greater than 0, 05 and thus is not significant. The standardized B coefficient is -0,023. A negative coefficient in this case means that when x (level of urbanization) increases, Y (local political participation) decreases.

Now that the relations between the independent variables and local political participation are analyzed, the relations between the independent variables and local civic participation need to be analyzed. Since the dependent variable ''local civic participation'' does not fit into the same regression model. A logistic binary regression analysis is performed in order to assess the relation between the independent variables and '' local civic participation''. First of all, it needs to be checked whether the relationship is significant or not and then the effect of the relation is taken into account.

Table 21: model summary logistic binary regression



When performing a binary logistic regression analysis, the Nagelkerke R Square is an important factor. This factor calculates the explained variance. To interpret this number, it means that the independent variables together explain 11, 8 percent of the variance in the dependent variable ''local civic participation''. However, the Cox & Snell R Square also has an important meaning. When interpreting the Cox & Snell R Square and the Nagelkerke R Square together, it means that the explained variance ranges between 5, 9 percent and 11,8 percent.

Table 22: variables in the equation

Variables in the Equation 95% C.I.for EXP(B) В S.E. Wald df Exp(B) Lower Upper Sig. Step 1^a Interest_N1 ,744 ,094 62,858 1 ,000, 2,105 1,751 2,530 Internetuse 5,094 .868 34,446 1 ,000, 163,064 29,754 893,657 8,476 1 .004 1.144 1.045 1,252 resources ,134 .046 stedelijke woonplaats -.059 ,052 1,309 ,253 943 ,852 1,043 1 -5,951 207,970 003 Constant ,413 1 .000

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Interest_N1, Internetuse, resources, stedelijke woonplaats.

Internet use & local civic participation

The 'variables in the equation'' matrix (table 22) shows the main results of the logistic regression analysis. The variable ''internet use'' has a significant value of 0,001 meaning that the relation between internet use and local civic participation is significant because 0,001 is smaller than 0, 05. Moreover, the variable has an Exp (B) value of 163,064. When interpreting this number it should be noted that a value of 1 means that there is almost no effect between the independent and dependent variable. Besides this, a value higher than 1 means there is greater effect between the independent and dependent and dependent variable. This means that a value of 163,064 means that there is quit a large effect between internet use and local civic participation. Thus, internet users are more likely to be civically active than non-internet users.

Resources & local civic participation

The 'variables in the equation'' matrix (table 22) shows that the variable ''resources'' has a significant value of 0,004. This means that the relation between resources and local civic participation is significant because 0,004 is smaller than 0,005. Besides this, the Exp (B) value of the variable resources is 1,144. Since this number is greater than 1, it could be argued that there is an effect between resources and local civic participation, but the effect is not that big.

However, as already mentioned in chapter 4.1, this variable consists of two different variables and is therefore also checked separately.

Table 23: variables in the equation: education & income

	variables in the Equation								
								95% C.I.f	or EXP(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step 1 ª	Interest_N1	,754	,094	63,749	1	,000	2,125	1,766	2,557
	Internetuse	5,015	,866	33,506	1	,000	150,618	27,571	822,828
	stedelijke woonplaats	-,064	,052	1,521	1	,217	,938	,847	1,038
	Hoogste opleiding met diploma	,123	,053	5,303	1	,021	1,130	1,018	1,255
	Persoonlijk netto maandinkomen in categorieën	,036	,035	1,069	1	,301	1,037	,968	1,111
	Constant	-6,052	,423	204,320	1	,000	,002		

Venielele e in de e Foundieu

 a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Interest_N1, Internetuse, stedelijke woonplaats, Hoogste opleiding met diploma, Persoonlijk netto maandinkomen in categorieën.

In table 23 the variable ''resources'' is separated into ''education'' and '' income''. The table shows that the relation between ''education'' and ''local civic participation'' has a significant value of 0,021. This means that the relation is significant because 0,021 is smaller than 0, 05. However, the table also shows that the relation between ''income'' and ''local civic participation'' is not significant because this relation has a significant value of 0,301 which is larger than 0, 05 and thus not significant. To compare the relationships, the Exp (B) is taken into account. The Exp (B) of the variable ''education'' has a value of 1,130 meaning that there is an effect, but the effect is not very large. Moreover, the Exp (B) of the variable ''income'' is 1,037 but since this relation is not significant it could be argued that there is no significant effect between ''income'' and '' local civic participation''.

Interest & local civic participation

The "variable in the equation" matrix (table 22) shows that the relation between "interest" and "local civic participation" is significant because the significant value is 0,001. This is smaller than 0, 05 and thus the relation is significant. Moreover, the Exp (B) has a value of 2,105 When interpreting this value, it could be argued that there is quit a strong effect between "interest" and "local civic participation".

Level of urbanization & local civic participation

Table 22 shows that the relationship between ''level of urbanization'' and ''local civic participation'' has a significant value of 0,253. This means that this relationship is not significant since 0,253 is greater than 0, 05. Moreover, the Exp (B) has a value of 0,943 which is smaller than 1 so no significant effect between the ''level of urbanization'' and ''local civic participation'' is found.

In the next part of the analysis, the relationships are somewhat being compared. The variable that was tested both for local political participation and for local civic participation is the variable ''internet use''. In chapter two it was indicated that there was a relationship between internet use and local political participation, but perhaps there was also relation between internet use and local civic participation. The results show the relationship between local political participation and internet use is significant. Besides this, the relationship between local civic participation and internet use is also significant. So, both relations are significant and perhaps there are differences in terms of the effect of the relations. The relationship between local political participation and internet use can be interpreted as quit a strong relation. However, the relation between internet use and local civic participation can also be interpreted as quit a strong relation. To be clear, since there are two different test a detailed comparison of the B coefficient and the Exp (B) is not meaningful. However, as argued above, both relations are quite strong so for that reason it could be argued that for both local political participation and local civic participation, a quite strong and significant effect with ''internet use'' is found.

The second variable that was tested for both of the dependent variables is the variable ''resources''. In chapter two it was mentioned that it was not very clear whether the variable ''resources'' had an effect on both local political and local civic participation. However, the results of the linear regression analysis shows that there is a significant relation between local political participation and resources. Besides this, the results of the logistic binary

regression analysis shows that there is also a significant relation between resources and local civic participation. Thus, both relations are significant. Furthermore, the relationship between resources and local political participation can be interpreted as very weak. In addition, the relationship between resources and local civic participation is also very weak. Thus, it could be argued that the variable resources has a significant relation with local political participation and local civic participation but for both of the relationships the effect is very weak.

However, the variable ''resources'' was also tested separately. As a result, the relationship between ''local political participation'' and ''education'' is significant but not that strong and the relation between ''local political participation'' and ''income'' is not significant. Moreover, the relationship between ''local civic participation'' and ''education'' is also significant but not that strong and the relationship between ''local civic participation'' and ''income'' is not significant. To conclude, since ''income'' is not significant for both types of participation while ''education'' is, it could be argued that a person's education is more important regarding citizen participation than a person's income.

The third variable was tested is the variable "interest". The theoretical framework in chapter two already assumed that there was a relationship between local political participation and "interest" but perhaps, a relationship between local civic participation and "interest" can also be found. The results show that the relationship between "local political participation" and "interest" is significant. Besides his, the relationship between "local civic participation" and " interest" is also significant. Thus, both relations are significant. Furthermore, the results show that the relationship between local political participation and interest is moderate to weak and the relationship between local civic participation and interest is quite strong. Since the two tests used are two different tests, a comparison between the relationships is often not very meaningful. However, it could be argued that the relationship between "local political participation" and "interest" is moderate to weak, while the relationship between 'local civic participation' and ' interest' is quite strong. The final relations that are analyzed are the relations between 'local political participation' and "the level of urbanization" & the relation between "local civic participation" and "the level of urbanization". The results of both analysis show that for both dependent variables, the relation with the level of urbanization is not significant.

In this chapter, the first two sub questions were answered by showing the descriptive data of the dependent variables and the independent variables. The descriptive data showed that people in this sample, are not very active in both types of citizen participation. Besides this, the descriptive data also showed that people in this sample have quite some interest in local topics but do not really make use of the internet in order to communicate with each other or with local officials. In chapter 4.2 the results of the linear regression analysis and the results of the logistic binary regression analysis were set out and the relations between the independent variables and dependent variables were analyzed.

5.0 Conclusion

This study tried to explain which factors influence local citizen participation in The Netherlands. The research question that is posed in chapter 1 was: *``which factors influence local political participation and local civic participation and what are the differences between the two types of participation?''* Via several expectations an answer to this question is developed. In this study, there were four *``influencing factors''* that were tested for both local political participation and local civic participation. These influencing factors were: interest, resources, internet use and level of urbanization. In chapter 2, a theoretical framework was set out and several expectations developed.

The first variable that was discussed was the ''interest'' variable. The theoretical framework indicated that there was a relationship between local political participation and ''interest''. However, it was questionable whether there was also a relationship between local civic participation and ''interest' '.When looking at the results, both relationships are significant. Besides this, it was found that the relationship between local political participation and ''interest'' was moderately weak while the relationship between local civic participation was quite strong.

The second variable that was discussed was the variable ''resources''. The results show that again, both relations are statistically significant. When interpreting both effects, it could be argued that ''resources'' has a very weak significant effect on both local political participation and local civic participation.

However, the influencing factor 'resources' consist of two different variables namely

"education" and "income" and is also tested separately. The results show that for the variable "local political participation" there is only a statistical significant relation with the variable "education". In addition, for the variable "local civic participation", also only a statistical significant relation was found with "education". Thus, the education someone has is more important regarding both types of citizen participation compared to the income someone has.

Furthermore, the next variable was about to what extent people use the internet to contact local officials or their fellow citizens with regard to local issues. For both relations a statistical significant relation was found. However, when interpreting the results, it could be argued that both relations are statistically significant and quite strong. Thus, the effect of internet use is quite strong for both types of citizen participation.

The final variable that was discussed is the variable ''level of urbanization''. The results show that for both types of citizen participation, no statistical significant relation was found. Thus, for both local political and local civic participation, no statistical significant relation was found with the level of urbanization. This means that in this study, the level of urbanization people live in does not affect the willingness to participate civically or politically.

To formulate an answer to the research question it could be argued that almost all the influencing factors that were tested in this study all had an influence on both types of participation because they were almost all significant. The only relationships that were not significant are the relationship between local civic participation & local political participation and the level of urbanization and the relation between 'income' and both types of participation

Besides this, there were also three sub questions posed in chapter 1. The first two sub question were already answered in chapter 4.1 but the third sub question could not be answered then. The third sub question was about "*to what extent are the influencing factors different regarding local political and local civic participation*?"

As argued before, a meaningful comparison between the relations is very difficult since there are two different tests used for each dependent variable. Therefore, in answering this question, no hard answers and conclusions can be made. However, in answering this sub question it could be argued that for the influencing factor ''interest'' it was found that there was a quite weak relation with local political

participation and a quite strong relation with local civic participation. Moreover, for all the other influencing factors, it was found that the influencing factors do not differ that much in significance and strength regarding local political participation and local civic participation.

When looking back at the theory chapter, it could be argued that the theoretical framework was partly in line with this study. As already mentioned, the influencing factor ''interest'' has a quite strong relation with local civic participation and a quite weak relation with local political participation.

Looking back at the theory, this on the one hand a bit surprising since in the theoretical framework a relationship between local political participation and "interest" was already assumed while it was questionable whether there was also a relation between "interest" and local civic participation. Therefore, it might be reasonable to assume that the relation between local political participation and "interest" might be stronger. However, this was not found when interpreting the results. On the other hand however, the "interest" aspect was mentioned both in relation with local civic participation by Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) and in relation with local political participation by Davidson and Cotte (1989). Since the authors both emphasized the importance of "interest" regarding both types of participation, the fact that both relations are significant might on the other hand not be very surprising.

Furthermore, when taking the theoretical framework into account, Denters and governance (2016) mentioned the importance of resources in local civic participation while Lowndes, Pratchett et al. (2006) mentioned the importance of resources in local political participation. This is in line with what the results show since both a significant relation for resources and local political and local civic participation is found. Besides this, Wilkes (2004) mentioned the importance of education in local political participation. This argument is in line with the outcomes of this study since it was found that local political participation has a stronger relation with education than with income since the relation with income is not significant and the relation with education is.

In addition, in this study also a stronger relation between local civic participation and "education" was found than with "income" since the latter is not statistically significant while "education" is. Looking back at the theoretical framework, Bakker, Denters et al. (2012) already emphasized the importance of skills and education

regarding local civic participation.

The third influencing that was discussed is the ''internet use'' variable. The results show that regarding internet use, a statistical significant relation was found for both types of citizen participation. Besides this, both relations are also quite strong. Tolbert and McNeal (2003) already mentioned the importance of internet use in local political participation and Shah, Cho et al. (2005) mention the importance of internet use in local civic participation Thus, the result of this study is in line with the argument made by Tolbert and McNeal (2003) and Shah, Cho et al. (2005) and is thus in line with what the theoretical framework assumed.

The final influencing factors that was discussed is the variable ''level of urbanization''. The results show that for both types of citizen participation, no statistical significant relation was found.

Thus, the idea that the level of urbanization has any influence on whether people participate or not cannot be confirmed by the results.

To end this chapter, the limitations of this research are shortly set out in order to give future research some input. As explained in chapter 3, this study works with data that was already gathered beforehand and not by the author of this paper. For that reason, it should be mentioned that the author had to work with the data that was available in order to test the expectations. That is also one of the reasons why the variable "local civic participation" consists of one item only. Unfortunately, this item was a binary item and could therefore not be used to perform a linear regression analysis. However, another test was performed in order to formulate an answer to the research question. It could be argued though that since there is a somewhat comparative element in this study, it would be better to use only a linear regression analysis because it would be more specific. Besides this, another limitation of this study is that because of the interpretation of two different tests, close results are very hard to interpret so that is why the comparative element is a bit neglected in this study. If only linear regression analysis was used, this was not an issue. Besides this, chapter 4.1 showed that in this sample, people are not very active in both types of citizen participation but maybe if people were more active, the results would have been different. Thus, there are some limitations in this study that may be taken into account for future research.

Bibliography

Denters, B., & Jansen, G. (2018). *Democratie dichter bij elkaar: lokaal kiezersonderzoek* 2018.

Bakker, J., et al. (2012). Citizens' initiatives: How local governments fill their facilitative role. *Local Government Studies*, 38(4), 395-414. doi: 10.1080/03003930.2012.698240

Conge, P. J. (1988). The concept of political participation: Toward a definition.

Davidson, W. B., & Cotte, P.R. (1989). Sense of community and political participation. *Journal of community psychology*, 17(2),119-125. doi: 10.1002/1520-6629(198904)17:2

Denters, B. (2016). 11. Community self-organization: potentials and pitfalls. *Critical reflections on interactive governance: Self-organization and participation in public governance*, 230.

Fledderus, J., & Honingh, M (2016). Why people co-produce within activation services: the necessity of motivation and trust–an investigation of selection biases in a municipal activation programme in the Netherlands. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82(1), 69-87.

doi: 10.1177/0020852314566006

James, R. (2001). Participation disadvantage in Australian higher education: An analysis of some effects of geographical location and socioeconomic status. *Higher education*, 42(4), 455-472. doi: 10.1023/A:1012264010667

Kakumba, U. (2010). Local government citizen participation and rural development: reflections on Uganda's decentralization system. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 76(1), 171-186. doi: .1177/0020852309359049

Lowndes, V., et al. (2006). Local Political Participation: The Impact of Rules-in-Use. *Public administration*, 84(3), 539-561. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2006.00601.x

Michels, A., & De Graaf, L. (2010). Examining citizen participation: Local participatory policy making and democracy. *Local Government Studies*, 36(4), 477-491. doi: 10.1080/03003930.2010.494101

Shah, D. V., et al. (2005). Information and expression in a digital age: Modeling Internet effects on civic participation. *Communication research*, 32(5), 531-565.

doi: 10.1177/0093650205279209

Tolbert, C. J., & McNeal, R.S. (2003). Unraveling the effects of the Internet on political participation?. *Political research quarterly*, 56(2), 175-185. doi: 10.1177/106591290305600206

Wilkes, R.(2004). First nation politics: deprivation, resources, and participation in collective action. *Sociological Inquiry*, 74(4), 570-589. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682X.2004.00105.x

Appendix 1

Table 1: meaning of the items

Factors influencing local political participation:

Post-test:

- v32b (In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in de lokale politiek)
- v34a (Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan)
- v34b (Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan)
- v35 (Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan)
- v37 (Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstelling, luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstelling)
- <u>v12: (Hebt u de afgelopen vijf jaar wel</u> <u>eens gebruik gemaakt van het internet,</u> <u>e-mails, apps of sociale media (Twitter,</u> <u>Facebook, Whatsapp) om...)</u>
- sted (stedelijke woonplaats)
- netcat (persoonlijk netto maandinkomen in categorieën)
- oplmet (hoogste opleiding met diploma)

Table 2: meaning of the items

Local political participation:	Local civic participation:
Post-test:	Post-test:
 v1 (Hebt u gestemd tijdens de gemeenteraadsverkiezingen) v11(Nu stellen we u een aantal vragen over uw betrokkenheid bij lokale politieke activiteiten. Er zijn verschillende manieren om iets politiek aan de orde te stellen of invloed uit te oefenen op lokale politici of de gemeente. Van welke van de volgende manieren hebt u in de afgelopen 5 jaar gebruik gemaakt) 	 v13_1 (Bent u de afgelopen vijf jaar samen met anderen wel eens actief betrokken geweest bij een burgerinitiatief in uw gemeente)

Factor analysis & reliability

Table 3: correlation matrix factor analysis Correlation Matrix^a

		In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseer d in de lokale politiek?	Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uww gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan?	Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan?	Hoe vaak gaat u op het internet gericht op zoek naar lokaal nieuws, bijvoorbeeld over problemen in uw gemeente?	Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstellin g. luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstellin g?
Correlation	In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in de lokale politiek?	1,000	,400	,262	,314	,345
	Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan?	,400	1,000	,500	,261	,328
	Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan?	,262	,500	1,000	,318	,197
	Hoe vaak gaat u op het internet gericht op zoek naar lokaal nieuws, bijvoorbeeld over problemen in uw gemeente?	,314	,261	,318	1,000	,206
	Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstelling, luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstelling?	,345	,328	,197	,206	1,000
Sig. (1-tailed)	In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in de lokale politiek?		,000	,000	000,	,000
	Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan?	,000		,000	,000,	.000
	Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan?	,000	,000		,000	,000
	Hoe vaak gaat u op het internet gericht op zoek naar lokaal nieuws, bijvoorbeeld over problemen in uw gemeente?	,000	,000	,000		,000
	Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstelling, luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstelling?	,000	,000	,000	.000	

a. Determinant = ,438

Table 4: communalities factor analysis

Communalities	
Initial	

	Initial	Extraction
In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in de lokale politiek?	1,000	,485
Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan?	1,000	,592
Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan?	1,000	,477
Hoe vaak gaat u op het internet gericht op zoek naar lokaal nieuws, bijvoorbeeld over problemen in uw gemeente?	1,000	,360
Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstelling, luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstelling?	1,000	,352

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 5: scree plot factor analysis



Table 6: component matrix Component Matrix^a

	Component
	1
In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in de lokale politiek?	,696
Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan?	,769
Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan?	,691
Hoe vaak gaat u op het internet gericht op zoek naar lokaal nieuws, bijvoorbeeld over problemen in uw gemeente?	,600
Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstelling, luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstelling?	,594
Extraction Method: Principal	Component

a. 1 components extracted.

Table 7: reliability analysis

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	1889	69,9
	Excluded ^a	815	30,1
	Total	2704	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 8: items statistics

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ν
In hoeverre bent u geïnteresseerd in de lokale politiek?	1,7639	,57152	1889
Als er in de krant lokaal nieuws staat, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak leest u dat dan?	3,7808	,91285	1889
Als er op de lokale of regionale radio of televisie nieuws is, bijvoorbeeld nieuws over problemen in uw gemeente, hoe vaak luistert/kijkt u dat dan?	3,2673	1,12747	1889
Hoe vaak gaat u op het internet gericht op zoek naar lokaal nieuws, bijvoorbeeld over problemen in uw gemeente?	2,5267	1,00447	1889
Als er in gezelschap over nieuws uit uw gemeente wordt gesproken, doet u dan meestal mee met het gesprek, luistert u met belangstelling, luistert u niet, of hebt u geen belangstelling?	4,0508	1,10015	1889

Table 9: scale statistics

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
15,3896	10,029	3,16690	5

Assumptions regression analysis



Table 11: regression plot 'internet use''



Table 12: regression plot 'interest''



Table 13: regression plot 'level of urbanization''



Table 14: regression plot 'education''



Table 15: regression plot 'income''



Table 16: VIF

Co	effic	ier	าts ^a

Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			c	orrelations		Collinearity	Statistics		
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	,006	,007		,836	,403					
	Interest_N1	,022	,001	,281	15,311	,000	,359	,312	,275	,958	1,044
	Internetuse	,489	,022	,396	21,765	,000	,446	,422	,391	,974	1,027
	stedelijke woonplaats	-,001	,001	-,023	-1,273	,203	-,025	-,027	-,023	,990	1,010
	resources	,005	,001	,108	5,908	,000	,165	,126	,106	,971	1,030

a. Dependent Variable: localpoliticalpart

Table 17: box tidwell test

Variables in the Equation

								95% C.I.fc	or EXP(B)
		В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a	Interest_LN	,375	,042	78,539	1	,000,	1,455	1,339	1,581
	Internetuse_LN	-15,395	6,071	6,430	1	,011	,000,	,000	,030
	Sted_LN	-,034	,025	1,772	1	,183	,967	,920	1,016
	Resources_LN	,060	,019	10,162	1	,001	1,062	1,023	1,102
	Constant	-8,746	1,965	19,813	1	,000	,000,		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Interest_LN, Internetuse_LN, Sted_LN, Resources_LN.

4.1 descriptive data

Table 18: frequencies ''interest'' Interest_N1

			_		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1,00	56	2,1	2,1	2,1
	1,20	5	,2	,2	2,3
	1,25	59	2,2	2,2	4,5
	1,40	13	,5	,5	5,0
	1,50	57	2,1	2,1	7,2
	1,60	22	,8	8,	8,0
	1,75	69	2,6	2,6	10,6
	1,80	41	1,5	1,5	12,1
	2,00	123	4,5	4,6	16,8
	2,20	69	2,6	2,6	19,4
	2,25	83	3,1	3,1	22,5
	2,40	102	3,8	3,8	26,3
	2,50	76	2,8	2,9	29,2
	2,60	120	4,4	4,5	33,7
	2,75	85	3,1	3,2	36,9
	2,80	140	5,2	5,3	42,2
	3,00	245	9,1	9,2	51,5
	3,20	204	7,5	7,7	59,1
	3,25	59	2,2	2,2	61,4
	3,40	226	8,4	8,5	69,9
	3,50	42	1,6	1,6	71,5
	3,60	215	8,0	8,1	79,6
	3,75	29	1,1	1,1	80,7
	3,80	176	6,5	6,6	87,3
	4,00	135	5,0	5,1	92,4
	4,20	92	3,4	3,5	95,9
	4,25	3	,1	,1	96,0
	4,40	47	1,7	1,8	97,7
	4,50	5	,2	,2	97,9
	4,60	31	1,1	1,2	99,1
	4,75	1	,0	0,	99,1
	4,80	14	,5	,5	99,7
	5,00	9	,3	,3	100,0
	Total	2653	98,1	100,0	
Missing	System	51	1,9		
Total		2704	100,0		

Table 19: education in the Netherlands

	Onderwerp	т		Totaal ı	mannen	en vrouw	/en		
Hoogst b	ehaald onderwijsniveau 🏾	T		2005	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018
Bevolking	Totaal		x 1000	13 119	13 457	13 874	13 990	14 126	14 232
	1 Laag onderwijsniveau	x 1000	4 983	4 781	<mark>4 5</mark> 39	4 522	4 4 4 2	4 438	
	11 Basisonderwijs	x 1000	1 542	1414	<mark>1 508</mark>	1 488	1 451	1 4 5 1	
	12 Vmbo, havo-, vwo-ond	x 1000	3 441	3 367	3 032	3 0 3 5	2 991	2 987	
	121 Vmbo-b/k, mbo1	x 1000	2 305	2 207	1840	1821	1794	1 753	
	122 Vmbo-g/t, havo-, vwo	x 1000	1 1 3 6	1 160	<mark>1 191</mark>	1 213	1 197	1 235	
	2 Middelbaar onderwijsni	iveau	x 1000	5 047	5 1 2 5	5 359	5 371	5 4 3 3	5 4 2 3
	21 Havo, vwo, mbo2-4		x 1000	5 0 4 7	5 125	5 359	5 371	5 4 3 3	5 4 2 3
	211 Mbo2 en mbo3		x 1000	<mark>1 79</mark> 7	1826	2 3 17	2 3 2 4	2 315	2 194
	212 Mbo4		x 1000	2 007	2 114	1 802	1 796	1848	1 906
	213 Havo, vwo		x 1000	1 244	1 186	<mark>1</mark> 240	1 250	1 269	1 324
	3 Hoog onderwijsniveau		x 1000	2 965	3 446	<mark>3 81</mark> 4	3 898	4 0 4 4	4 165
	31 Hbo-, wo-bachelor		x 1000	1 894	2 249	2 439	2 482	2 564	2 645
	32 Hbo-, wo-master, doct	or	x 1000	1071	1 197	<mark>1 3</mark> 75	1 4 1 6	1 481	1 520
	Weet niet of onbekend		x 1000	124	104	162	199	207	205

Bron: CBS

Table 20:	incomes	in the	Netherlands
-----------	---------	--------	-------------

		Beloning per	Maandloon	
	Werkgelegenheid	baan	Maandloon	Maandloon
Bedrijfstakken / branches (SBI2008)	Banen	Uurloon	inclusief overwerk	exclusief overwerk
	x1000	euro		
A-U Alle economische activiteiten	8 096	22,23	2 460	2 427
A Landbouw, bosbouw en visserij	106	16,18	1 769	1 712
B Delfstoffenwinning	9	35,03	5 511	5 437
C Industrie	743	23,23	3 142	3 071
D Energievoorziening	27	29,50	4 249	4 214
E Waterbedrijven en afvalbeheer	34	22,52	3 268	3 108
F Bouwnijverheid	307	23,10	3 305	3 235
G Handel	1 3 5 1	18,69	1 896	1 870
H Vervoer en opslag	371	21,24	2 769	2 590
I Horeca	407	13,08	1 017	1 012
J Informatie en communicatie	261	27,15	3 657	3 642
K Financiële dienstverlening	270	33,32	4 285	4 275
L Verhuur en handel van onroerend goed	66	25,57	2 991	2 986
M Specialistische zakelijke diensten	491	28,37	3 591	3 575
N Verhuur en overige zakelijke diensten	1 053	15,52	1 615	1 573
0 Openbaar bestuur en overheidsdiensten	505	25,69	3 300	3 288
P Onderwijs	519	25,86	2 653	2 650
Q Gezondheids- en welzijnszorg	1 3 1 1	22,90	2 122	2 116
R Cultuur, sport en recreatie	135	20,04	1 706	1 700
S Overige dienstverlening	131	20,92	2 114	2 104

Bron: CBS