

University of Groningen

Liveable Villages

Gieling, Joost; Haartsen, Tialda

Published in:
 Sociologia Ruralis

DOI:
[10.1111/soru.12151](https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12151)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
 Final author's version (accepted by publisher, after peer review)

Publication date:
 2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Gieling, J., & Haartsen, T. (2017). Liveable Villages: The Relationship between Volunteering and Liveability in the Perceptions of Rural Residents. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 57(S1), 576-597.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12151>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

1 **Liveable villages: the relationship between volunteering and liveability in the**
2 **perceptions of rural residents**

3 **Abstract**

4 *In the Dutch policy discourse it is increasingly thought that active citizenship will positively affect*
5 *satisfaction with the living environment. This paper challenges this assumption by examining whether*
6 *and how volunteering in village life and individual perceptions of liveability are interrelated. Through*
7 *a series of hierarchical regressions, we found that having the opportunity to volunteer in village life is*
8 *not a significant predictor of perceived liveability. Moreover, by classifying rural inhabitants as non-*
9 *participants, nominal participants and active participants in volunteering in village life, we*
10 *determined that active residents evaluate liveability less positively than the other two groups.*
11 *Accordingly, determinants other than volunteering and active citizenship are better able to predict*
12 *perceived liveability, although the specific variables differ for each group of rural inhabitants. This*
13 *suggest that governments overestimate both the willingness of rural residents to volunteer and the*
14 *benefits of becoming active in village life.*

15 **Keywords:** *Liveability; Volunteering; Citizen activity; Big society; Quantitative approach*

16 **1. Introduction**

17 Life in European villages is strongly influenced by the demographic processes of ageing, population
18 decline and the outmigration of the highly educated. These processes raise concerns among
19 residents and policymakers that a good quality of life in rural areas is not guaranteed. In Dutch policy
20 discourse the concept of liveability is frequently used to estimate how individuals value the quality of
21 their living environment and which determinants play a role therein (Veenhoven, 2000; Kaal, 2011;
22 Haartsen & Venhorst, 2010). Policymakers often assume that the liveability of a village is determined
23 to a great extent by active citizenship (Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, 2007/2011;
24 Leidelmeijer, 2012). It is thought that active citizenship generates possibilities for the accumulation
25 of social capital and leads to higher levels of social cohesion, which will in turn be beneficial to the
26 village in a myriad of ways. This line of reasoning is further motivated by the introduction of the ‘big
27 society’ (or the Dutch equivalent, ‘participation society’), which involves the reallocation of
28 responsibilities from the central state to local communities (Kisby, 2010; Patty & Johnston, 2011;
29 Putters, 2014). At the local level, this is translated into the promotion of a culture of volunteering,
30 self-reliance and community initiatives to replace the popular belief that the government should be
31 held responsible for the development and quality of local public space and local society. To achieve
32 this, policymakers increasingly expect that rural citizens are committed to their living environment
33 and would willingly participate in various aspects of village life on a voluntary basis to keep their
34 village liveable (Verhoeven & Tonkens, 2013; Mohan, 2012; Woolvin & Hardill, 2013; Jones & Heley,
35 2014).

36 Although no conclusive definition of liveability can be found in the literature, it is commonly
37 agreed to entail the degree to which the physical and the social living environments fit the individual
38 requirements and desires (Leidelmeijer et al., 2008; Pacione, 1990; Newman, 1999). In the urban
39 planning literature, liveability is often used as a proxy for citizen activity and focuses on place-making
40 processes (Kaal, 2011; Godschalk, 2004). It is believed that urban residents should collaborate within
41 local communities to be better able to direct place-making processes and hence to safeguard the
42 quality of the living environment against neoliberal and economic growth-related policies (Douglass,

2002; Wagner & Caves, 2012). Regarding rural areas, the idea remains persistent that villages consist of inhabitants living together in *Gemeinschaften* with high levels of mutual support and a strong sense of local society. Such close-knit communities are considered to be very suitable for dealing with the 'big society'-related redistribution of responsibilities from the central state to local communities. However, increasingly it is found that, due to processes of globalisation and increased mobility, rural residents perceive the local community as less important and attach greater value to other aspects of village life, such as the opportunity to live in a green and quiet environment (Steenbekkers & Vermeij, 2013). This implies that rural residents' commitment to the local community is waning (Groot, 1989; Wellman & Leighton, 1979) and that the default position in which community members work together to make change happen may have become outdated (Skerratt & Steiner, 2013).

Moreover, many scholars are sceptical about the added value of 'participation' as a buzz word in policymaking in general and as a driver of liveability in particular (Shortall, 2008; Jancovich, 2015; Tonts, 2005; Fiorina, 1999). In the voluntarism literature, the unproblematised assumption that volunteering is a 'good thing' has been challenged (Joseph & Skinner, 2012). Studies discussing the benefits of volunteering in rural areas are beginning to shed light on some of the less positive elements of voluntarism, such as 'volunteer burn-out', 'no-choice volunteering' and volunteering being exclusive or inaccessible to some groups in a community (Timbrell, 2007; Woolvin & Rutherford, 2013). If the critics are right, this could mean that governments are overestimating both the willingness of rural residents to volunteer and the benefits of becoming active in village life.

Against this background it is remarkable how little attention is paid to the question of whether and how liveability and active citizenship in terms of formal voluntary work are interrelated in rural residents' perceptions. This study therefore aims to explore whether high volunteerism rates do actually lead to higher levels of perceived liveability. We will also investigate whether rural residents perceive the availability of opportunities to volunteer in village social life as a determinant of liveability, and its importance relative to other liveability determinants such the availability of services and public transport. We do so by conducting a series of hierarchical regression analyses, based on data collected in rural areas in the province of Friesland, the Netherlands. This paper starts with a discussion of how the concept of liveability has been applied in geographical research and how it could relate to active citizenship. We then discuss the potential positive and negative effects of volunteering in rural societies, and we explore whether different groups of active rural residents can be identified. The quantitative method is further detailed in the methodology section, followed by our results and the discussion.

76

77 **2. Theory and previous research**

78 **2.1. Liveability and citizen activity**

79 Liveability is an emerging theme in the field of urban geography and planning (cf. Pacione, 2003; Howley et al., 2009; Ruth & Franklin, 2014; Abbott et al., 2008; Gough, 2015; Lowe et al., 2014) and a well-established concept in Dutch policymaking and rural planning (Kaal, 2011; Leidelmeijer & Van Kamp, 2004; Thissen & Loopmans, 2013). In a geographical context, liveability usually refers to the degree to which the physical and the social living environment fit individual requirements and desires (Leidelmeijer et al., 2008). The concept of liveability slightly differs from the concept of quality of life (Van Kamp et al., 2003). Quality of life usually refers to the subjective social wellbeing of individuals and is underpinned by several dimensions which relate to self-reported measurements such as happiness, life satisfaction and a sense of belonging (Shucksmith et al., 2009). In contrast to quality of

88 life, the concept of liveability is concerned with an individual's appraisal of the qualities of the
89 neighbourhood or the village community. This spatial dimension is normally not incorporated in
90 quality of life models, whilst geographers have argued that it should be considered as one of the
91 pillars of quality of life (Van Kamp et al., 2003; Wang & Wang, 2016; Ruth & Franklin, 2014). Scholars
92 report theoretical (Veenhoven, 2014; Marans, 2001; Fleuret & Atkinson, 2007) and empirical
93 (Schwanen & Wang, 2014; Morrison, 2011) support for the idea that social and physical aspects of
94 place play a pivotal role in enhancing the quality of life in a village. Therefore, we argue that
95 liveability provides a promising pathway to explore further how rural residents evaluate the quality
96 of their living environments.

97 For a long time, village liveability was associated with the maintenance of services and
98 facilities. More recently, research has indicated that the availability of various kinds of public services
99 has less impact on quality of life than commonly assumed (Egelund & Laustsen, 2006; Gardenier,
100 2010) and people's satisfaction with services is better understood in terms of accessibility rather than
101 availability (Langford & Higgs, 2010; Haartsen & Van Wissen, 2012; Elshof et al., 2015). Accordingly,
102 attention is now shifting to maintaining facilities where people can meet and interact with each
103 other, such as community centres, as the presence of such venues is believed to be vital to enhancing
104 communities' social cohesion. So far, there is limited empirical support for an individual's subjective
105 evaluation of liveability being affected by participation in community life. Bernard (2015) reports a
106 positive relationship between participation in events and a positive evaluation of the environment.
107 He assumes that community involvement fosters a positive attitude towards the community in
108 general. This could also lead to a positive evaluation of other community characteristics, not
109 necessarily directly related to participation in community life.

110 The arguments governments use to promote 'big society' are usually framed in terms of
111 'empowerment' or 'responsibility': active citizens are expected to take personal responsibility for the
112 liveability of their living environment and government policies aim to encourage this by emphasising
113 people's sense of citizenship (Verhoeven & Tonkens, 2013). The idea is that through societal, leisure
114 and political participation, 'big society' provides rural residents with ample opportunities to influence
115 local policymaking processes, collectively to reform local society in alignment with their own local
116 desires and to seek new and innovative ways to deliver better local services at lower costs. In turn,
117 such communal activities are believed to encourage processes of social cohesion and social capital
118 enhancement.

119

120 **2.2. The shadow side of volunteering**

121 Governments in many Western countries are cutting back on the work they do and participation in
122 this context can be identified as a communities' capacity to safeguard residents' needs and desires
123 (Joseph & Skinner, 2012). It is believed that individual rural communities are capable of successfully
124 filling the gaps left by former state-organised services based on the assumption that they have a
125 strong sense of self-sufficiency and social solidarity. It is assumed that 'big society' initiatives offer
126 rural communities possibilities to experiment with the reform of services which best fit their local
127 needs and desires (Williams, 2002; Williams et al., 2014). However, empirical studies show that
128 reliance on voluntary efforts has many limitations and shortcomings (Crisp, 2015), particularly with
129 geographically dispersed populations, for which providing an adequate level of voluntary-based
130 services is a continuous challenge (Hardill & Dwyer, 2011). Geographical and socioeconomic
131 limitations hinder the substitutional value of voluntary work in the reform of public services,

132 meaning that ‘some rural places will thrive through voluntarism while others wither away’ (Skinner,
133 2008; p. 201).

134 Due to the rapidly changing composition of rural populations, the distribution of voluntary
135 organisations in rural areas is uneven and dispersed (Mohan, 2012; Milligan, 2007). Some form of
136 attachment to local society is often regarded as a prerequisite for becoming active in village life
137 (Musick & Wilson, 2008), yet the commitment of most rural residents towards their community has
138 decreased over the years (Hunter & Suttles, 1972; Groot, 1989; Vermeij, 2015). Research indicates
139 for instance that in-migrants are less actively involved in a village’s social life compared to long-term
140 residents and that they are especially underrepresented in events and activities connected with
141 enhancing a village’s social qualities (Vermeij, 2015). This could be because community life has a local
142 character, with newcomers often being regionally orientated and involved in social networks far
143 beyond the village borders (Simon et al., 2007; Lammerts & Doğan, 2004). However, long-term
144 residents can also be involved in social networks beyond the village borders (Vermeij, 2015) and may
145 therefore be less motivated to become active in village life.

146 As a consequence, the assumption that volunteering is unequivocally positive has been
147 critically scrutinised (Timbrell, 2007). First, the willingness to participate in village social life is in
148 many cases a lifestyle decision (Nakano, 2000; Holmes, 2014), suggesting that residents who choose
149 to volunteer ‘are typically degree educated, middle aged and of higher social class’ (Morgan, 2013; p.
150 384). Voluntary organisations can therefore have a very exclusive character by only being accessible
151 to particular groups in a community. More affluent volunteers tend to use voluntary work as a tool to
152 strengthen their social networks. This suggests that higher-income groups benefit most from
153 opportunities to set up various community self-help groups (Williams, 2002; Shucksmith, 2000).
154 Second, in rural areas facing depopulation, the number of voluntary tasks which need to be
155 discharged by a reduced number of residents can be overwhelming (Tonts, 2005). In some cases,
156 volunteers are running services which would otherwise not exist. This is often referred to as ‘no-
157 choice’ volunteerism and is required when there are no alternative means of providing a specific
158 service important to the local community (Timbrell, 2007). Third, governments and market actors do
159 not always collaborate effectively with volunteers in running civic initiatives and can even delay or
160 frustrate a project’s progress. This can cause volunteers to feel that they are losing their voice in and
161 ownership of an activity, which can eventually result in volunteer ‘burnout’ (Salemink & Strijker,
162 2016; Allen & Mueller, 2013).

163

164 **2.3. Different types of active residents**

165 Aiming to gain a better grasp of the role of participation in the ways rural residents appreciate the
166 quality of their living environment, this study classifies rural residents according to their level of
167 participation in village life. Volunteering in formal organisations will be used as a proxy to measure
168 participation levels in village life. The motivations to volunteer in village life and the experiences
169 while volunteering ‘are numerous, hugely diverse and vary according to personal, cultural
170 environmental and structural circumstances’ (Brodie et al., 2009; p. 27). There are many different
171 forms of volunteering and the benefits that volunteers report tend to vary considerably (Wilson,
172 2012; Musick & Wilson, 2008). In particular, when the tasks assigned to a volunteer match the
173 volunteer’s initial reasons for starting to volunteer, high levels of satisfaction with the voluntary job
174 can be predicted (Wilson, 2012).

175 It goes beyond the scope of this paper to explore all the motives for starting to volunteer in
176 depth, but it is acknowledged that residents who choose to volunteer can roughly be divided into

177 two types: nominal and active participants (Stern & Dillmann, 2006), both pertaining to different
178 levels of local engagement. Nominal participation refers to a relatively uncommitted contribution to
179 a local community, such as attending local events or signing petitions. Active participation refers to
180 people who feel responsible for the overall success of the local community and invest a substantial
181 amount of their spare time and effort in achieving this. However, this dichotomous classification
182 implies that there is another group of rural residents, namely those who do not participate in village
183 life. Rural residents are not equally motivated to become involved in a village's social life and some of
184 them may have made a conscious decision not to participate in it as their attachment to their direct
185 living environment can be very limited (Barcus & Brunn, 2010). Their interest and involvement in the
186 village's social life may not go much deeper than having good relations with their immediate
187 neighbours. Other groups may even lack the ability to participate equally in village life due to
188 financial or physical constraints, suggesting that participation is socially patterned (Shortall, 2008;
189 Baum et al., 2000). We should therefore take into account that a considerable number of rural
190 residents choose not to participate in village life (Skerratt & Steiner, 2013). Based on our literature
191 review, we distinguish three types of voluntary participants in this paper: active, nominal and non-
192 participants.

193

194 **3. Methods**

195 **3.1. Sample**

196 We adopted a quantitative approach to clarifying the relationship between volunteering and
197 liveability in the perceptions of rural residents. By means of hierarchical regression analyses we will
198 first determine whether rural residents perceive the availability of opportunities to volunteer in
199 village life as a determinant of liveability and how important this is relative to other liveability
200 determinants. Second, we will examine whether different levels of volunteering lead to different
201 perceptions of liveability from the perspective of individual village dwellers. The quantitative data we
202 present in this paper were collected by means of an online survey conducted in rural areas in the
203 province of Friesland (see Figure 1). Friesland is situated in the north of the Netherlands and is
204 considered to be the most rural part of the country (Haartsen et al., 2003). Many ways of
205 distinguishing urban areas from rural ones can be found in the literature (cf. Cromartie, 2008; Flora
206 et al., 1992). However, in this study we chose to classify villages (including the surrounding area) with
207 a total population of less than 5000 as 'rural'. This cut-off point has been used and discussed in
208 previous studies (Phillimore & Reading, 1992; Perlín, 2010). In line with this definition, we calculated
209 that the province of Friesland has 293,801 inhabitants living in rural communities out of a total
210 population of 646,390 inhabitants (Statistics Netherlands, 2014). We administered an online survey
211 to the *Fries burgerpanel* (Frisian citizens' panel) to recruit respondents for this study (Van Selm &
212 Jankowski, 2006). This panel is hosted by the Frisian research institute Partoer and comprises people
213 living in Friesland who have agreed to complete surveys on societal topics on a regular basis. Only
214 panel members living in rural areas are included in the further data analysis for our study here.

215

216 *Figure 1 around here*

217

218 A convenience sampling approach yielded a total of 468 completed questionnaires of
219 members of the citizens' panel living in rural areas. The questionnaire was online for several weeks in
220 autumn 2014. Online survey research is believed to have significant benefits over other means of
221 collecting survey data (Evans & Mathur, 2005). However, one of its main drawbacks is that survey

222 data collected using a panel are difficult to generalise to a larger population, as the panel is
223 composed of self-selected respondents rather than being randomly selected from the general
224 population. Respondents who enjoy expressing their opinion on regional matters in Friesland could
225 therefore be overrepresented. We also found that respondents in our dataset were relatively old
226 (average age 55.5) and better educated than the provincial average (State of Friesland, 2015). The
227 underrepresentation of younger age cohorts and less well-educated residents suggests that the data
228 is not a perfect representation of the total rural population living in the province of Friesland. Bearing
229 these limitations in mind, non-probability samples are nevertheless well-suited to assessing how
230 certain variables are statistically related to each other and to subsequently accepting or rejecting an
231 associated null hypothesis (Steinmetz et al., 2014).

232

233 **3.2. Variables**

234 This study distinguishes four types of variable:

235

236 *Overall perceived liveability* – the dependent variable is the extent to which respondents perceive
237 their daily living environment as liveable. As argued previously, liveability (or its Dutch translation,
238 *leefbaarheid*) is a common term in Dutch everyday language and the inhabitants of Dutch rural areas
239 are particularly familiar with its meaning. We therefore assessed the perceived quality of the living
240 environment simply by asking respondents to grade the liveability of their living environment on a
241 scale from one (lowest) to ten (highest). The results show that respondents perceive the liveability of
242 their villages as very high, with an overall average score of 7.94 (see Table 2). This relatively high
243 score reflects other studies which also show that rural residents living on the Dutch countryside are
244 very satisfied with their living environment (Steenbekkers & Vermeij, 2013).

245

246 *Liveability determinants* – the measurement of several liveability determinants is derived from the
247 method as described by Namazi-Rad et al. (2012a, 2012b), who originally distinguished six relevant
248 liveability determinants: Transport, Services, Job, Housing, Neighbourhood and Leisure. Each
249 liveability determinant is composed of several items. The way some of the items are addressed was
250 slightly altered in our survey as not all of them seemed relevant in a rural context. The items have
251 also been translated into Dutch. The determinant ‘opportunities to volunteer’ has been added to the
252 original approach because this is the core of our research and we believe that this determinant has
253 not been stressed enough by Namazi-Rad et al. (2012b). The question ‘How satisfied are you with the
254 opportunities to do voluntary work in your living environment?’ was added to cover the liveability
255 determinant of volunteering. We asked respondents to state how satisfied they were with the
256 liveability determinants on a 5-point Likert scale (from *very unsatisfied* to *very satisfied*).
257 Respondents were then asked to rank the liveability determinants in their preferred order of
258 importance, enabling us to assess the relative importance of several liveability determinants in
259 general and of volunteering as a liveability determinant in particular.

260 The item ‘Home size’ was found to have the highest mean, while ‘costs of public transport’
261 has the lowest (Table 1). At the level of the liveability determinants, respondents were most satisfied
262 with ‘house’ and least satisfied with ‘job’. The Cronbach’s alpha, indicating the internal reliability of
263 the factors, shows acceptable reliabilities. Only the ‘transport’ factor scores below the conventional
264 standard of .65 (Vaske, 2008). However, as the alpha is only slightly below this number and deleting
265 any of the items from the transport determinant would not improve the overall alpha, we decided to
266 leave all the items in.

267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310

Table 1 around here

Volunteering in village life – respondents were asked how much time they normally spend volunteering in various forms of community life, such as clubs (sport, music, theatre and other hobby clubs), religious organisations, societal organisations (school, nature, elderly healthcare and civil rights), politically-oriented organisations, and neighbourhood, municipal or village councils. By active involvement we mean the weekly number of hours an individual rural resident spends volunteering for local organisations, which can include, for example, organisational work, coaching a youth team, maintaining a website, collecting money for charity, visiting the elderly or organising church events. In line with Stern and Dillmann’s typology, we classified respondents either as non-participants (not spending any time in village associational life), nominal participants (volunteering to a maximum of 5 hours a week in village associational life) or active participants (volunteering more than 5 hours a week in village associational life). We explicitly asked respondents about their level of ‘formal volunteering’ rather than ‘informal volunteering’ or any less formalised activities (Williams, 2002). This means that it is possible that respondents, including those referred to as non-participants, are actually involved in community life in other ways than those captured by this research.

The results show that the non-participant category (N = 77) accounts for only 16.5 percent of the total number of respondents. Almost half of the respondents can be classed as nominal participants (N = 242) and approximately a third of the respondents can be referred to as active participants (N = 149) (Table 2). The respondents spend considerably more hours volunteering in village social life than the average participation rate of the total Dutch rural population would suggest (Steenbekkers & Vermeij, 2013), although we must consider the overrepresentation of older age cohorts and more highly educated residents in the data. Furthermore, the three groups report different scores on overall perceived liveability: the active participants report the lowest perceived liveability scores while the non-participants report the highest perceived liveability scores.

Sociodemographic variables – a number of sociodemographic factors have been added to the survey as control variables that previous research has shown to be important to social participation. We included the variables education, length of residence, sex, home ownership and age. The association between this latter variable and any dependent variable is often assumed to be curvilinear. We therefore decided to use the squared form of age in the analysis. A number of interesting outcomes can be observed when these factors are combined with the residents’ activity categories (Table 2): active residents are more often male, better educated and reported a longer length of residence than the other two categories. Other studies of rural resident activity in village life report similar results, although there are differences depending on the type of social activity (cf. Brodie et al., 2009; Wandersman & Florin, 2000; Vermeij, 2015). We also included a classification of forms of activity to examine the kinds of activities different types of active citizens are involved in. The most notable observation is that nominal participants seem to be only marginally interested in becoming active in local politics and church events, while active participants can be found abundantly in each form of civic activity.

Table 2 around here

4. Results

311 4.1. Volunteering as a predictor of liveability

312 A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to examine the relative importance of the
313 opportunities for volunteering as a predictor of perceived liveability, with blocks of independent
314 measures introduced hierarchically into the model to assess the net increase in variance explained by
315 each set of variables. The main advantage of this statistical technique is its ability to identify which
316 liveability determinant contributes statistically significantly to explaining the dependent variable,
317 after the effect of several demographic variables is controlled for (Pallant, 2013). A significant and
318 positive standardised β -coefficient indicates that this specific determinant makes a unique positive
319 contribution to explaining overall liveability. An increased value on the liveability determinant by one
320 standard deviation would be likely to increase the overall perceived liveability score by the value of
321 the corresponding standardised β . If the sign of the β coefficient is negative, the opposite effect is
322 found. In that case, an increased value on the liveability determinant by one standard deviation
323 results in a decrease in the overall perceived liveability score by the value of the corresponding
324 standardised β . There were no indications that the assumption of multicollinearity has been violated,
325 indicating that the statistical inferences made about the data are reliable.

326 The seven liveability determinants were introduced into the model first, followed by the
327 sociodemographic variables (Table 3). The seven liveability determinants collectively account for 31
328 percent of the variance in the dependent variable (indicated by the R^2). The results show that
329 satisfaction with the neighbourhood in particular is a strong predictor of individually perceived
330 liveability, making the strongest unique contribution to the dependent variable. Satisfaction with
331 leisure was found to be another important predictor of perceived liveability. In contrast to these
332 significant predictors of perceived liveability, satisfaction with the opportunity to volunteer in a
333 village's social life is not significantly related to perceived liveability. The standardised effect size (β)
334 of this specific predictor is very small and highly insignificant.

335 Adding the second block of independent variables causes a very small increase in the R^2 to 33
336 percent ($p < .05$). In other words, only an additional two percent of the variance in overall liveability
337 is accounted for by the sociodemographic variables. The item 'active in village life' is the only variable
338 found to make a significant contribution to the dependent variable. This particular item indicates
339 that rural residents who participate for more than five hours a week in village social life are more
340 likely to grade the liveability in their villages somewhat lower than rural residents who do not spend
341 any time in village social life. Satisfaction with opportunities to volunteer in village social life is thus
342 not a significant predictor of perceived liveability, but the actual level of volunteering in village social
343 life does have a significant and negative effect on the way liveability is perceived.

344 The insignificant relationship between satisfaction with opportunities to volunteer and
345 perceived liveability concurs with the low importance respondents attribute to the opportunities to
346 volunteer when asked to rank the determinants of liveability in order of importance (Figure 2). The
347 availability of opportunities to volunteer is ranked here as the least important determinant. In
348 general, the respondent's own house is considered to be the most important determinant followed
349 by the neighbourhood and services. It is remarkable that house and services are ranked as two of the
350 most important determinants, but that satisfaction with neither makes a significant contribution to
351 overall perceived liveability. The opposite is true for neighbourhood: satisfaction with the
352 neighbourhood does contribute significantly to perceived liveability and is also the second most
353 important determinant of perceived liveability. What the two significant predictors of perceived
354 liveability (neighbourhood and leisure) have in common is that it is difficult for an individual
355 genuinely to influence their overall quality. The realisation of a safe and clean neighbourhood with a

356 sufficient number of leisure facilities can only be achieved if inhabitants act together. It is difficult for
357 individuals to affect the quality of the neighbourhood and its leisure amenities, and it appears that
358 exactly these determinants are positively related to perceived liveability. This is in contrast to a
359 determinant such as the respondent's own house, which is in principle privately owned and can
360 therefore be altered by its owners to best meet their desires and requirements.

361
362 Table 3 around here

363
364 Figure 2 around here

365 366 **4.2. Level of participation and perceived liveability**

367 The previous regression already revealed that the level of volunteering in village life correlates
368 significantly with perceived liveability, yet different groups of residents may value different aspects
369 of rural life differently. To explore this possibility we now present three hierarchical regression
370 models for non-participants, nominal participants and active participants, with which we intend to
371 answer the question whether active rural residents perceive liveability differently from less active
372 rural residents and which determinants play a role in that. We performed the regression in two
373 steps: first the seven determinants were added to the model, followed by the sociodemographic
374 variables, to explore how the three categories differ from each other in terms of perceived liveability.

375 Satisfaction with the neighbourhood is the best predictor of a positive perception of
376 liveability for all three groups (Table 4). In general, this is highly valued by all rural residents, but
377 most strongly by the non-participant group. Furthermore, one unique and positive predictor of
378 perceived liveability can be distinguished for the non-participant group, namely satisfaction with
379 transport. This suggests that this specific group appraises the quality of place in terms of a pleasant,
380 friendly and green environment complemented by affordable and well-organised modes of
381 transportation. This group is somewhat less well educated than the other two groups and also
382 reports the shortest period of residence. Unfortunately, the data does not allow us to differentiate
383 further between residents who purposely chose not to participate and those who were unable to
384 participate. Nevertheless, this group reports the highest level of perceived liveability, suggesting that
385 they are the most satisfied with liveability in their villages.

386 An interesting additional outcome is that the beta coefficient for services correlates
387 negatively with perceived liveability. This does not necessarily mean that the non-participant group is
388 less satisfied with the provision of services in their villages, rather it indicates that the level of
389 satisfaction does not make a positive contribution to their perceived level of liveability. The individual
390 correlation coefficient between satisfaction with services and perceived liveability is positive and not
391 significant ($r = .11, n = 77, p > .05$). The unique and negative correlation found in the regression
392 model therefore only occurs when the other determinants are controlled for. The opposite is true for
393 the other two groups: their individual correlation coefficients for the relationship between
394 satisfaction with services and perceived liveability are positive and significant while in the
395 hierarchical regression these positive relationships disappear when other determinants are
396 controlled for (nominal participants: $r = .26, n = 242, p < .01$, active participants: $r = .44, n = 149, p <$
397 $.01$). It makes sense that the active participants report the strongest correlation between satisfaction
398 with services and perceived liveability as they report the longest length of residence. Research
399 indicates that long-term residents have particularly positive and nostalgic sentiments towards the
400 social and economic aspects of place (Zwiers et al., 2016). They seem to believe that the provision of

401 services makes their living environment more attractive for both current and potential future
402 inhabitants, resulting in stability-orientated behaviour towards service provisions (Paddison &
403 Calderwood, 2007; Amcoff et al., 2011).

404 The nominal participants differ from the other two groups by scoring positively on the
405 liveability determinant 'leisure'. For them, being satisfied with an adequate supply of leisure facilities
406 predicts high levels of perceived liveability. In other words, this group seems to prefer a less
407 committed style of volunteering, as they do not spend many hours on formal volunteering. This
408 contrasts with the most active participants, whose job satisfaction predicts high levels of perceived
409 liveability. A possible explanation for this positive relationship could be that this group comprises
410 relatively highly educated people for whom work is generally an important condition for life
411 satisfaction and thus also for liveability (Andrews & Withney, 1976). Neighbourhood satisfaction is
412 also the best predictor of perceived liveability for these two groups.

413 Introducing the second block of sociodemographic variables into the model did not result in a
414 strong increase in the model's R^2 . The seven liveability determinants account for the largest
415 proportion of the variation in perceived liveability. The only significant contributor in the second
416 block is the homeownership variable in the active participant category. Active homeowners are more
417 satisfied with overall liveability than renters in this specific category, most likely because they have
418 better opportunities to actively maintain and modify their homes and because they are believed to
419 have stronger bonds with their living environment than home renters (Wilson, 2012).

420

421 Table 4 around here

422 **5. Discussion and concluding thoughts**

423 Our primary objective in this paper was to explore the relationship between perceived liveability and
424 participation in village life via volunteering. Based on data collected in rural areas in the province of
425 Friesland, the Netherlands, we provide two additional arguments which call into question the validity
426 of the prevailing policy assumption that higher rates of citizen activity lead to higher levels of
427 perceived liveability. First, we found that the most active citizens are the least satisfied with the
428 overall liveability of their villages and that non-participants report the highest value of liveability.
429 This finding indicates that the non-participants are most satisfied with their direct living environment
430 without being actively involved in any formal village organisation. At an individual level, active
431 citizenship could contribute to life satisfaction and possibly to perceived quality of life (Hyypä &
432 Mäki, 2003; Nummela et al., 2008; Perkins et al., 1996), however our results show that the
433 perception of the quality of the living environment is not greatly affected by increased levels of
434 participation. Second, the availability of opportunities to volunteer in village life does not correlate
435 with perceived liveability. Although the majority of the respondents are at some level active in village
436 life, having ample opportunities to do voluntary work does not appear to be an important indicator
437 for a liveable environment. Therefore, this paper's results suggest that the availability of
438 opportunities to volunteer in village social life is not an important determinant of perceived
439 liveability and that satisfaction with opportunities to volunteer is not a significant predictor of
440 perceived liveability.

441 Consequently, determinants other than the availability of options to do voluntary work
442 predict high levels of liveability. After distinguishing three groups of rural residents based on their
443 level of volunteering in village life, we found that satisfaction with the neighbourhood turned out to
444 be the best predictor for each group of perceived liveability. However, differences between the

445 groups indicated transport to be an important predictor of liveability for non-participants, whereas
446 leisure was more important for nominal participants and jobs for active participants. It is important
447 that policymakers become aware that villages comprise diverse groups of residents and that the
448 voices of residents who are less visible in village social life are also heard. Non-participants' ideas of
449 what comprises a liveable village may differ considerably from active residents who are more likely
450 to set up civic initiatives and to attend public consultation meetings. In reality, the non-participant
451 group can even be expected to be larger than indicated by the results of this study. Active residents
452 are normally more inclined to join online panels and to share their opinion about various societal
453 topics than non-participants would do.

454 The active rural resident group is remarkable in that they are very involved in village social
455 life and invest a significant amount of their spare time in furthering the overall success of their
456 village. This group of active citizens could therefore experience feelings of disappointment when they
457 realise that other residents are not as motivated to participate in the village's social life as they are.
458 They may also become more aware of the need to improve local deficiencies and slowly turn from
459 being active participants into critical participants (Timbrell, 2007). Some active citizens may perhaps
460 only be participating out of necessity as 'if I don't do it, nobody else will' (Oliver, 1984; p. 602).
461 Bearing in mind that the group of active participants are least satisfied with the quality of their living
462 environment, it would be interesting to inquire further into what motivates this specific group to
463 volunteer: idealism, dissatisfaction or because they feel they have no choice? Through qualitative
464 research, more insight into the motives and the lived experiences of doing actual voluntary work can
465 be collected. A clearer picture can thus be obtained of the position of volunteering in rural life in an
466 era of state rollback. Critical engagement with voluntary work in rural areas is necessary, as it seems
467 difficult to reconcile the renewed policy focus on localism and community participation with a rural
468 population which becomes increasingly diverse, outwardly orientated and less committed to local
469 society.

470 All in all, scholars are drawing increasing attention to the negative side effects of promoting
471 voluntarism as a key driver for sustainable rural communities (cf. Jones & Heley, 2014; Woolvin &
472 Hardill, 2013; Shucksmith, 2000). Taking the spatial dimensions of welfare into account, the capacity
473 to self-organise is unevenly distributed across areas (Hamnett, 2009; Uitermark, 2015). Rural
474 communities which are rich either in social or cultural capital are able to reform local society in such
475 a way that it aligns with their requirements and demands, yet communities with less social and
476 cultural capital may increasingly face difficulties establishing citizen initiatives to respond to state
477 reforms. Such inequalities could translate into increased marginalisation of those rural communities
478 less well equipped to successfully implement civic initiatives (Uitermark, 2015). The unilateral
479 promotion of endogenous development through self-organisation and voluntarism may therefore
480 not be the best way to create more sustainable rural communities: policies aiming to stimulate
481 innovation and development seem to ignore the structural problems, such as poor access to
482 resources, markets and networks, confronting some rural communities (Bock, 2016). This suggests
483 that the promotion of greater citizen activity only has minimal impact as a tool to ensure the quality
484 of the living environment in rural areas.

485

486 **Acknowledgements**

487 We are grateful to Partoer Friesland for their collaboration in the data collection. Also, we would to
488 thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this
489 paper.

490 **References**

- 491 • Abbott, C., J. Lyons & T.M. Sell (2008) In search of urban livability. *Journal of Urban History*,
492 34 (3), pp. 552-561
- 493 • Allen, J. & S. Mueller (2013) The revolving door: A closer look at major factors in 589
494 volunteers' intention to quit. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41 (2), pp. 139-155
- 495 • Amcoff, J., P. Möller & E. Westholm (2011) The (un)importance of the closure of village shops
496 to rural migration patterns. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer
497 Research*, 21 (2), pp. 129-143
- 498 • Andrews, F. & S. Withney (1976) *Social indicators of well-being. Americans' perceptions of life
499 quality* (New York: Springer US)
- 500 • Barcus, H.R. & S.D. Brunn (2010) Place elasticity: Exploring a new conceptualization of
501 mobility and place attachment in rural America. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human
502 Geography*, 92 (4), pp. 281-295
- 503 • Baum, F., R. Bush, C. Modra, C. Murray, E. Cox K. Alexander & R. Potter (2000) Epidemiology
504 of participation: An Australian community study. *Journal of Epidemiology of Community
505 Health*, 54, pp. 414-423
- 506 • Bernard, J. (2015) Community satisfaction in Czech rural communities: A multilevel model.
507 *Sociologia Ruralis*, 55 (2), pp. 205-266
- 508 • Bock, B. (2016) Rural marginalisation and the role of social innovation: A turn towards
509 nexogenous development and rural reconnection. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 0 (0), pp. 1-22
- 510 • Brodie, E., E. Cowling & N. Nissen (2009) *Understanding participation: A literature review*.
511 (London: Involve)
- 512 • Crisp, R. (2015) Work clubs and the Big Society: Reflections on the potential for 'progressive
513 localism' in the 'cracks and fissures' of neoliberalism. *People, Place & Policy*, 9 (1), pp. 1-16
- 514 • Cromartie, J. (2008) Defining the "rural" in rural America. *Economic Research Service/USDA*, 6
515 (3), pp. 28-34
- 516 • Douglass, M. (2002) From global intercity competition to cooperation for livable cities and
517 economic resilience in Pacific Asia. *Environment & Urbanization*, 14 (1), pp. 53-68
- 518 • Egelund, N. & H. Laustsen (2006) School closure: What are the consequences for the local
519 society?. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50 (4), pp. 429-439
- 520 • Elshof, H., T. Haartsen & C. Mulder (2015) The effect of primary school absence and closure
521 on inward and outward flows of families. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*,
522 106 (5), pp. 625-635
- 523 • Evans, J. & A. Mathur (2005) The value of online surveys. *Internet Research*, 15 (2), pp. 195-
524 219
- 525 • Fiorina, M. (1999) Dark voices: A dark side of civic engagement. Pp. 395-425 in T. Skocpol &
526 M. Fiorina eds, *Civic Engagement in American Democracy* (Washington DC: Brookings
527 Institute Press)
- 528 • Fleuret, S. & S. Atkinson (2007) Wellbeing, health and geography: A critical review and
529 research agenda. *New Zealand Geographer*, 63, pp. 106-118
- 530 • Flora, C. et al. (1992) *Rural communities. Legacy and change* (Boulder, San Francisco &
531 Oxford: Westview Press)
- 532 • Gardenier, J.D. (2010) *Rijk met kleine dorpen. Een sociologische studie naar het platteland
533 van Noord-Groningen* (Assen: Van Gorcum)

- 534 • Godschalk D.R. (2004) Land use planning challenges: Coping with conflicts in visions of
535 sustainable development and livable communities. *Journal of the American Planning*
536 *Association*, 70 (1), pp. 5-13
- 537 • Gough, M.Z. (2015) Reconciling livability and sustainability. Conceptual and practical
538 implications for planning. *Journal of planning education and research*, 0 (0), pp. 1-16
- 539 • Groot, J.P. (1989) Dorpsbinding en lokaal bewustzijn. In: P. Huigen & M. van der Velde (eds.)
540 *De achterkant van verstedelijkt Nederland. De positie en functie van landelijke gebieden in de*
541 *Nederlandse samenleving* (Amsterdam/Utrecht: KNAG/GIRU) pp. 109-118
- 542 • Haartsen, T., P. Huigen & P. Groote (2003) Rural areas in the Netherlands. *Tijdschrift Voor*
543 *Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 94, pp. 129-136
- 544 • Haartsen, T. & V. Venhorst (2010) Planning for decline: Anticipating on population decline in
545 the Netherlands. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 101 (2), pp. 218-227
- 546 • Haartsen, T., & L. Van Wissen (2012) Causes and consequences of regional population decline
547 for primary schools. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 103 (4), pp. 487-496
- 548 • Hamnett, C. (2009) Spatial divisions of welfare: The geography of welfare benefit expenditure
549 and of housing benefit in Britain. *Regional Studies*, 43 (8), pp. 1015-1033
- 550 • Hardill, I. & P. Dwyer (2011) Delivering public services in the mixed economy of welfare:
551 Perspectives from the voluntary and community sector in rural England. *Journal of Social*
552 *Policy*, 40 (1), pp. 157-172
- 553 • Holmes, K. (2014) 'It fitted in with our lifestyle': An investigation into episodic volunteering in
554 the tourism sector. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 17 (4), pp. 443-459
- 555 • Howley, P., M. Scott & D. Redmond (2009) Sustainability versus liveability: An investigation of
556 neighbourhood satisfaction. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 52 (6), pp.
557 847-864
- 558 • Hunter, A.J. & G.D. Suttles (1972) The expanding community of limited liability. In: G.D.
559 Suttles (ed.) *The Social Construction of Communities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
560 pp. 44-80
- 561 • Hyyppä, M. & J. Mäki (2003) Social participation and health in a community rich in stock of
562 social capital. *Health Education Research*, 18 (6), pp. 770-779
- 563 • Jancovich, L. (2015) The participation myth. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. DOI:
564 10.1080/10286632.2015.1027698
- 565 • Jones, L. & J. Heley (2014) Practices of participation and voluntarism among older people in
566 rural Wales: Choice, obligation and constraints to active ageing. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56 (2), pp.
567 176-196
- 568 • Joseph, A.E. & M.W. Skinner (2012) Voluntarism as a mediator of the experience of growing
569 old in evolving rural spaces and changing rural places. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28, pp. 380-
570 388
- 571 • Kaal, H. (2011) A conceptual history of liveability. *City: Analysis for Urban Trends, Culture,*
572 *Theory, Policy, Action*, 15, pp. 532-547
- 573 • Kamp, I. van, *et al.* (2003) Urban environmental quality and human well-being. Towards a
574 conceptual framework and demarcation of concepts; a literature study. *Landscape and*
575 *Urban Planning*, 65, pp. 5-18
- 576 • Kisby, B. (2010) The big society: Power to the people?. *The Political Quarterly*, 81 (4), pp. 1-8

- 577 • Lammerts, R. & G. Doğan (2004) *Werkelijk waar. Onderzoek naar economische en sociale*
578 *participatie en het voorzieningengebruik van bewoners van kleine dorpen in Midden-Drenthe*
579 (Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker Institute)
- 580 • Langford, M. & G. Higgs (2010) Accessibility and public service provision: evaluating the
581 impacts of the Post Office Network Change Programme in the UK. *Transactions of the*
582 *Institute of British Geographers*, 35 (4), pp. 585-601
- 583 • Leidelmeijer, K. et al. (2008) *De Leefbaarometer; Leefbaarheid in Nederlandse Wijken en*
584 *Buurtten Gemeten en Vergeleken; Rapportage Instrumentontwikkeling* (Amsterdam &
585 Utrecht: RIGO Report 95640)
- 586 • Leidelmeijer, K. (2012) *Buurtparticipatie en leefbaarheid* (Amsterdam & Utrecht: RIGO Report
587 P21540)
- 588 • Lowe, M., C. Whitzman, H. Badland, M. Davern, L. Aye, D. Hes, I. Butterworth & B. Giles-Corti
589 (2014) Planning healthy, liveable and sustainable cities: How can indicators inform policy?
590 *Urban Policy and Research*, 33 (2), pp. 131-144
- 591 • Marans, R.W. (2003) Understanding environmental quality through quality of life studies: the
592 2001 DAS and its use of subjective and objective indicators. *Landscape and Urban Planning*,
593 65, pp. 73-83
- 594 • Milligan, C. (2007) Geographies of voluntarism: Mapping the terrain. *Geography Compass*, 1
595 (2), pp. 183-199
- 596 • Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2004–05) *Wetsvoorstel Wet*
597 *maatschappelijke ondersteuning, vergaderjaar 2004–2005, 30131, nr. 4*; The Hague
- 598 • Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2011) *Integratie, binding, burgerschap*; The
599 Hague
- 600 • Mohan, J. (2012) Geographical foundations of the Big Society. *Environment and Planning A*,
601 44, pp. 1121-1129
- 602 • Morgan, H. (2013) Sport volunteering, active citizenship and social capital enhancement:
603 What role in the 'Big Society'? *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 5 (3), pp. 381-
604 395
- 605 • Morrison, P.A. (2011) Local expressions of subjective well-being: The New Zealand
606 experience. *Regional Studies*, 45 (8), pp. 1039-1058
- 607 • Musick, M. & J. Wilson (2008) *Volunteers: A social profile* (Bloomington: Indiana University
608 Press)
- 609 • Nakano, L.Y. (2000) Volunteering as a lifestyle choice: Negotiating self-identities in Japan.
610 *Ethnology*, 39 (2), pp. 93-107
- 611 • Namazi-Rad, M., et al. (2012a) An heuristic analytical technique for location-based liveability
612 measurement. *Conference paper, Proceedings of the Fifth Annual ASEARC Conference -*
613 *Looking to the future - Programme and Proceedings, University of Wollongong*, pp. 1-6
- 614 • Namazi-Rad, M., et al. (2012b) An experimental determination of perceived liveability in
615 Sydney. *Conference paper, ACSPRI Conferences, RC33 Eighth International Conference on*
616 *Social Science Methodology*, pp. 1-13
- 617 • Newman, P.W.G. (1999) Sustainability and cities: extending the metabolism model.
618 *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 44, pp. 219-226
- 619 • Nummela, O., et al. (2008) Social participation, trust and self-rated health: A study among
620 ageing people in urban, semi-urban and rural settings. *Health & Place*, 14, pp. 243-253

- 621 • Oliver, P. (1984) 'If you don't do it, nobody else will': Active and token contributors to local
622 collective action. *American Sociological Review*, 49 (5), pp. 601-610
- 623 • Pacione, M. (1990) Urban livability; A review. *Urban Geography*, 11 (1), pp. 1-30,
624 • Pacione, M. (2003) Urban environmental quality and human wellbeing – a social geographical
625 perspective. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 65, pp. 19-30
- 626 • Paddison, A., & E. Calderwood (2007) Rural retailing: A sector in decline? *International
627 Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 35 (2), pp. 136–155
- 628 • Pallant, J. (2013) *SPSS survival manual. A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*
629 (London: Open University Press)
- 630 • Patty, C. & R. Johnston (2011) How big is the big society? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 64, pp. 403-
631 424
- 632 • Perkins, D., B. Brown & R. Taylor (1996) The ecology of empowerment: Predicting
633 participation in community organizations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52, pp. 85-110
- 634 • Perlín, R. (2010) Theoretical approaches of methods to delimitate rural and urban areas.
635 *European Countryside*, 4, pp. 182-200
- 636 • Phillimore, P., & R. Reading (1992) A rural advantage? Urban-rural health differences in
637 Northern England. *Journal of Public Health*, 14 (3), pp. 290-299
- 638 • Putters, K. (2014) *Rijk geschakeerd. Op weg naar de participatiesamenleving* (The Hague: The
639 Netherlands Institute for Social Research)
- 640 • Ruth, M., & R. Franklin (2014) Liveability for all? Conceptual limits and practical implications.
641 *Applied Geography*, 49, pp. 18-23
- 642 • Salemink, K. & D. Strijker (2016) The community reclaims control? Learning experiences from
643 rural broadband initiatives in the Netherlands. *Sociologia Ruralis*, (Forthcoming)
- 644 • Schwanen, T. & D. Wang (2014) Well-Being, context, and everyday activities in space and
645 time. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104 (4), pp. 833-851
- 646 • Selm, M. van, & N. Jankowski (2006) Conducting online surveys. *Quality & Quantity*, 40, pp.
647 435-456
- 648 • Shortall, S. (2008) Are rural development programmes socially inclusive? Social inclusion,
649 civic engagement, participation, and social capital: Exploring the differences. *Journal of Rural
650 Studies*, 24, pp. 450-457
- 651 • Shucksmith, M. (2000) Endogenous development, social capital and social inclusion:
652 Perspectives from LEADER in the UK. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40 (2), pp.208-218
- 653 • Shucksmith, M., S. Cameron, T. Merridew & F. Pichler (2009) Urban–rural differences in
654 quality of life across the European Union. *Regional Studies*, 43 (10), pp. 1275-1289
- 655 • Simon, C., L. Vermeij & M. Steenbekkers (2007) *Het beste van twee werelden* (The Hague:
656 The Netherlands Institute for Social Research)
- 657 • Skinner, J. (2008) Voluntarism and long-term care in the countryside: The paradox of a
658 threadbare sector. *The Canadian Geographer*, 52 (2), pp. 188-203
- 659 • Skerratt & Steiner (2013) Working with communities-of-place: Complexities of
660 empowerment. *Local Economy*, (0), pp. 1-19
- 661 • State of Friesland (2015) *Online database*. Retrieved from <http://fryslan.databank.nl>
- 662 • Statistics Netherlands (2014) *Statline*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl>
- 663 • Steenbekkers, A. et al. (2008) *A countryside for all Dutch people* (The Hague: The Netherlands
664 Institute for Social Research)

- 665 • Steenbekkers, A., & L. Vermeij (2013) *De dorpenmonitor. Ontwikkelingen in de leefsituatie*
666 *van dorpingen* (The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research)
- 667 • Steinmetz, S. *et al.*, (2014) Improving web survey quality. Potentials and constraints of
668 propensity score adjustments. Pp. 273-298, in M. Callegaro *et al.* eds, *Online panel research.*
669 *A data quality perspective* (West Sussex: Wiley & Sons Ltd)
- 670 • Stern, M. & D. Dillman (2006) Community participation, social ties, and use of the internet.
671 *City & Community*, 5 (4), pp. 409-424
- 672 • Timbrell, H. (2007) *Volunteering and active citizenship in Scotland: Exploring the complex*
673 *relationship* (Stirling; Volunteer Development Scotland – Centre for Excellence)
- 674 • Thissen, F. & M. Loopmans (2013) Dorpen in verandering. *Rooilijn*, 46 (2), pp. 80-89
- 675 • Tonts, M. (2005) Competitive sport and social capital in rural Australia. *Journal of Rural*
676 *Studies*, 21, pp. 137-149
- 677 • Uitermark, J. (2015) Longing for Wikitopia: The study and politics of self-organisation. *Urban*
678 *Studies*, 52 (13), pp. 2301-2312
- 679 • Vaske, J. (2008) *Survey research and analysis. Applications in parks, recreation and human*
680 *dimensions* (State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing, Inc)
- 681 • Veenhoven, R. (2000) *Leefbaarheid. Betekenis en modellen* (Rotterdam; Erasmus University
682 Rotterdam)
- 683 • Veenhoven, R. (2014) Quality of life: An overview. In: A. C. Michalos (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of*
684 *Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (Dordrecht; Springer) pp. 5265-5269
- 685 • Verhoeven, I. & E. Tonkens (2013) Talking active citizenship: Framing welfare state reform in
686 England and the Netherland. *Social Policy and Society*, 12 (3), pp. 415-426
- 687 • Vermeij, L. (2015) *Dichtbij huis. Lokale binding en inzet van dorpsbewoners* (The Hague: The
688 Netherlands Institute for Social Research)
- 689 • Wagner, F. & Caves, R. (2012) *Community livability: Issues and approaches to sustaining the*
690 *well-being of people and communities* (London; Routledge)
- 691 • Wandersman, A. & P. Florin (2000) Citizen participation and community organizations. Pp.
692 247-272 in J. Rappaport & E. Seidman eds, *Handbook of Community Psychology* (New York:
693 Kluwer Academics/Plenum Publishers)
- 694 • Wang, F. & D. Wang (2015) Place, geographical context and subjective wellbeing: State of art
695 and future directions. In: D. Wang & S. Hu (eds.) *Mobility, Sociability and Well-being of Urban*
696 *Living* (Berlin; Springer) pp. 1-42
- 697 • Wellman, B. & B. Leighton (1979) Networks, neighborhoods and communities. *Urban Affairs*
698 *Quarterly*, 14, 363-390
- 699 • Williams, A., M. Goodwin & P. Cloke (2014) Neoliberalism, Big Society, and progressive
700 localism. *Environment and Planning A*, 46, pp. 2798-2815
- 701 • Williams, C.C. (2002) Harnessing community self-help: Some lessons from rural England.
702 *Local Economy*, 17 (2), pp. 136-146
- 703 • Wilson, J. (2012) Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*
704 *Quarterly*, 0 (0), 1-37
- 705 • Woolvin, M. & I. Hardill (2013) Localism, voluntarism and devolution: Experiences,
706 opportunities and challenges in a changing policy context. *Local Economy*, 0 (0), pp. 1-16
- 707 • Woolvin, M. & A. Rutherford (2013) *Volunteering and public service reform in rural Scotland*
708 (SRUC; Research Report Rural Policy Centre)

- 709 • Zwiers, S., M. Markantoni & D. Strijker (2016) The role of change- and stability-oriented place
710 attachment in rural community resilience: a case study in south-west Scotland. *Community*
711 *Development* , (0), pp. 1-20

712 **Figure legend:**

- 713 • Figure 1: Map of the Netherlands, with the province of Friesland in red
714 • Table 1: Descriptive overview and reliability analysis for liveability factors
715 • Table 2: Social characteristics of the respondents
716 • Table 3: Hierarchical regression analysis with total liveability score (dependent variable),
717 satisfaction with liveability determinants and socio demographics as block variables
718 (independent variable)
719 • Figure 2: Mean scores of the ranking of the seven liveability determinants for different
720 groups of participants
721 • Table 4: Hierarchical regression analysis with total liveability score (dependent variable) and
722 satisfaction with several liveability determinants and socio demographics as block variables
723 (independent variable)