

mobil.TUM 2024

Inclusive methods to involve disadvantaged groups in the development of sustainable mobility



Lluís Martínez & Imre Keserü
Mobilise, Vrije Universiteit Brussel

Research question

How can **disadvantaged people** be **involved** in developing sustainable mobility solutions through **inclusive methods**?

Participation, disadvantaged groups and inclusivity

Procedural fairness	Stages of involvement	Tools and methods	Decision-making power	Context-sensitivity
Involvement of disadvantaged group	Allocation of tasks	Required skills and competences	Influence of participants	Cultural and historical awareness
Representativeness	Moment(s) of involvement	Knowledge learning and exchange	Implementation of the results	Recruitment and participation channels
Transparency	Collaboration	Motivation and engagement	Ownership of the process	Facilitation of the activities
Open communication	Long-term community engagement	Empowerment	Sources: Amann & Sleight, 2021; Mahmoud et al., 2021; Petts, 2000; Shasky, 2013; Webler, 1995.	

Research approach: The (urban) living lab

Urban living labs are forums for innovation, applied to the **development of new products and services**, integrating people into the entire development process as **users and co-creators**, to experiment, test and evaluate new solutions **in complex and real contexts** (Mahmoud et al., 2021).

The Brussels living lab

	Kuregem	Brussels Capital Region
Population density (inhabitants/km ²)	20 679	7 501
Median taxable yearly income	€ 15 518	€ 19 723
Share of inhabitants with non-Belgian nationality (European Union, Turkey, North Africa, Sub-Saharan)	34,8 %	29,1 %
+25-year-olds with a higher education degree (Anderlecht)	16.3 %	28.1 %

Disadvantaged groups in the living lab



Migrants and/or ethnic minorities



Older people



Women



Digitally excluded people



Lower income citizens

Source: INDIMO project, 2022

Brussels living lab: co-creation process



Brussels living lab: Experiment

Duration: 10 min

Languages: English, Dutch,
French

Sample

50: 40 F – 10 M

6 older people

19 migration background

12 no secondary education

13 digitally excluded

Recruitment

On-street (50)

Method

Introduction

Assignments

Short interview

Location

Public space

Indoors



Brussels living lab: Focus groups

Duration: 60min

Languages: English, French

Sample

19 (6+8+5): 13 F – 6 M

4 older people

8 migration background

6 no secondary education

Recruitment

On-street

Posters

Flyers in mailboxes

Social media (1)

Previous participants (1)

Partners (6)

Civic organisations (11)

Method

Detailed explanation

Visual elicitation

Co-design game

Individual sheet

Location

Public space

Indoors



Brussels living lab: Survey

Duration 15min

Languages: English, Dutch,
French and Arabic

Sample

52: 28 F – 24 M
5 older people

Recruitment

On-street (47)

Posters

Flyers on mailboxes

Social media

Previous participants (5)

Method

Introduction
Visual elicitation
Short interview

Location

Public space



Assessment

Procedural fairness	Stages of involvement	Tools and methods	Decision-making power	Context-sensitivity
Involvement of disadvantaged group	Allocation of tasks	Required skills and competences	Implementation of the results	Cultural and historical awareness
Representativeness	Moment(s) of involvement	Knowledge learning and exchange	Influence of participants	Recruitment and participation channels
Transparency	Collaboration	Motivation and engagement	Ownership of the process	Facilitation of the activities
Open communication	Long-term community engagement	Empowerment		

Achieved

Unclear

Not achieved

Conclusions

How can **disadvantaged people** be **involved** in developing sustainable mobility solutions through **inclusive methods**?

1. Studying the context: demographics, culture and recent history
 2. Identifying the most effective forms of recruitment
 3. Going where people are, making sure everyone is there. < **Public space and visibility**
 4. Adapting to the context: language, knowledge, skills. < **Language supporter(s)**
 5. Making it simple and engaging. < **Duration, games, visuals, learning and facilitation**
 6. Make participation meaningful and relevant. < **Key topics, events, compensation**
- } **Local partners**
Civic org., Gov.

THANK YOU

www.smartmobilityhubs.eu

lluis.martinez.ramirez@vub.be



- Amann, J., & Sleight, J. (2021). Too vulnerable to involve? Challenges of engaging vulnerable groups in the co-production of public services through research. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 44(9), 715-727.
- Mahmoud, I. H., Morello, E., Ludlow, D., & Salvia, G. (2021). Co-creation pathways to inform shared governance of urban living labs in practice: Lessons from three European projects. *Frontiers in sustainable cities*, 3, 690458.
- Petts, J., & Leach, B. (2000). *Evaluating methods for public participation: Literature review*. Bristol: Environment Agency.
- Shasky, A. (2013). *Implementing inclusive public involvement practices: a case study*. [Master's thesis, University of Oregon]
- Webler, T., Kastenholtz, H., & Renn, O. (1995). Public participation in impact assessment: a social learning perspective. *Environmental impact assessment review*, 15(5), 443-463.