



Combating Inequalities through Innovative Social Practices of and for
Young People in Cities across Europe

WP7 Report

Case Studies: Framing Document

Authors: *Tomáš Sirovátka, Ondřej Hora, Jana Válková*

Date: June 2015

Contents

Position of Work Package 7 in Citispyce project.....	2
The case studies: what do we have in our hands?	2
The selection.....	2
Clustering the innovative practices	3
Theoretical underpinning of the case studies	6
Evaluation methodology.....	8
Assessment of the case studies: first reflections.....	10
Addressing the key dimensions of inequalities	11
Success factors	11
Next steps	20
References	21

Position of Work Package 7 in Citispyce project

The objective of Work Package 7 is to provide a repository of the innovative practices. Such an objective may be understood as one of the final outcomes of the Citispyce project.

WP 7 builds on the previous work packages: in WP2 the causes and symptoms of inequalities affecting the youth in 10 cities at the national and city level were investigated, while in WP 3 examined the dimensions of the inequalities and the social infrastructure which are responding to these dimensions in the excluded neighbourhoods. In WP 4 the perceptions of the inequalities by young people themselves and their strategies to respond them were explored, with the emphasis on the innovative strategies. In the WP5 the menu of innovative practices and descriptions of the selected social innovations (30 cases in total) in 10 European cities were provided. In WP 6 the pilot projects have been implemented, in which either the suitable practices were transferred from one city into another city, or some new practices or new elements of practices were implemented in one city.

WP 7 provides case studies of these pilot projects as well of the other innovative practices which were identified in WP5. The objective of the WP7 is to provide the evidence on the design, implementation and outcomes of these innovative practices, while paying attention to their innovative elements as well as to their transferability. In this respect Citispyce enabled some kind of ‘experiment in vivo’. The practices from one city were transferred into other societal and implementation contexts. This way, their positive potentials were examined in a creative way. The stakeholders who were involved in their transfer deliberately selected the practices when having to consider their potential positive effects, as well as necessary adaptations to the local conditions.

The next objective of WP 7 is, after completing the case studies and presenting them, to discuss these case studies and emerging policy implications (recommendations) with the stakeholders (during an evaluation workshop) and to formulate the list of recommendations.

The purpose of this document is to frame the individual case studies within the context of Citispyce project, to explain the selection of the innovative practices and the methodology and content of the case studies. Finally, reflections on the success factors of the innovative practices are provided.

The case studies: what do we have in our hands?

The selection

The selection of case studies has followed two tracks: the first was the pilots. In this case, the stakeholders (municipalities, NGOs, and universities involved) discussed the menu of the innovative practices at the workshop in Krakow (September 2014) and after they implemented the selected pilots. Their selection has been underpinned with several criteria, the three most important, in combination are:

- Expected positive impacts on the inequalities the young people are facing
- Transferability considering the local contexts
- The costs (the project provided only very limited resources for implementation of the pilots).

Some partners implemented the practices seen in the other cities, while other partners like Malmö or Hamburg decided to implement some new practices which were developed by themselves.

The other track of the case study selection was the cases/practices already existing in the cities. In such a case, the three following criteria dominated:

- Expected, or the already envisaged, positive impacts of the practices
- Other positive devices like innovativeness, perceived transferability and reasonable costs
- Possibilities to carry the case study effectively.

In both cases the expected positive impacts, as well as innovativeness, were the most important perspectives. The partners were guided by the experience gained in the previous work packages which have identified the failures of existing policies and the needs of young people.

Clustering the innovative practices

The case studies which are presented can be clustered from several perspectives. First, the possible logic of the clustering will be explained and then the classification of the case studies will be provided. In the final step a discussion on the success factors of the innovative practices follows.

During work on the Work Packages the following key perspectives which have been used in the evaluation of the practices/projects (see section on evaluation methodology) were distinguished:

- The logic of intervention: corresponding to/influenced by Integrative, Redistributive and Moral underclass discourses, this is to identify what causes of inequalities/exclusion seem to be addressed
- The dimensions of inequality identified with the help of the perceptions of young people: neglect, distance, lack of trust
- Area of intervention: employment (entrepreneurship as a part of it), education, recognition/empowerment, communing/sociability, participation and neighbourhood development
- Implementation mode/approach: Top-down, Bottom-up
- Target group in terms of typology of social innovation (which applies to both target groups and logics of intervention) based on two dimensions: ambition and ability
- Objectives of the intervention: increasing human and social capital (employability), supporting self-esteem, providing resources/opportunities, supporting processes, communing, sociability, engagement, trust. These can be linked to the typology of target groups.

The innovative practices which have been evaluated, however, have made these distinctions difficult to sustain. The logics of intervention often overlapped, as did the dimensions of inequalities addressed or the areas of the intervention. Consequently, the top-down and bottom-up approaches were mostly difficult to disentangle, the target groups difficult to

distinguish properly or different target groups were addressed. Finally, it was typical that there were several objectives of the interventions identified in one practice/project.

To sum up, the conclusion may be accepted that within the innovative practices that we are introducing here, the above distinctions are blurred: this is a key feature of the social innovations, reflecting the complexity of the inequalities, as well as the complexity of the innovative practices which are addressing them.

Second, thanks to this complexity, the innovative practices did pay attention to the aspects often neglected in the mainstream policies. They also contrast with the currently widespread MUD discourse¹. Instead they are aiming to bridge distance, to provide recognition, build trust, offer engagement and empowerment to the neglected target groups like those who lose aspirations and aim at alternative solutions or they may even resign solutions. Processes and approaches to young people play a key role, enabling the actors involved to facilitate/boost their individual and collective potential through active cooperation in addressing social inequalities in excluded neighbourhoods.

From the above reasons the overview/clustering of the innovative practices adopts two criteria: this is the area of the intervention as the first, and the origin of the practice/project (based on the domestic experience/field work or the practices transferred from the other city/country) as the second.

Although this seems to be quite a simple distinction, this leads us to the key lesson. Originally it was assumed that mainly employment and education oriented innovations would be in focus. It turned out that these practices or innovations proved to overlap with other more general aspects like recognition, empowerment, participation, self-esteem, trust and engagement. The latter aspects create the necessary preconditions for more specific employment and education oriented effects. This is because very often the young people who are living in the deprived neighbourhoods are very often marginalised or excluded in several dimensions: economic, social, civic/political and spatial. In consequence they are losing trust, self-confidence, aspirations and motivation. Mainstream policies fail to recognise the above crucial aspects of social inclusion or assume that employment will be the solution to these problems. Consequently, mainstream policies are perceived by young people as oppressive and not very helpful, or insufficient.

Although there are typically several intervention areas addressed by each of the practices under study, it is possible with some simplification to cluster the case studies according the 'main' area addressed (see table below).

¹ The various discourses on social exclusion our studies have covered are discussed in the next section.

Table1: map of the innovative practices

Area/ general aim	Employment	Entrepreneurship	Education, development	Recognition, empowerment, trust, engagement, neighbourhood development
Pilots	Integrated approach (Sofia, from Brno)	The Loft (Athens, from Birmingham)	Recording studio (Brno, from Barcelona)	Hidden Wings (Krakow, from Birmingham) Beatfreeks (space to expression) (Venice, from Birmingham) Moin Moin Hamburg - Welcome Tours for Refugees Multisectoral cooperation (Malmö)
Case studies	Learning by working (Brno) Youth Employment Agency (Hamburg)	The Loft (Birmingham) Buzzinezzclub (Rotterdam) Topeko (Athens)	Educational Demos (Barcelona) Free Remedial Tutoring (Krakow) Challenge Sports (Rotterdam) Health and Social Centre (Sofia) The New Opportunity (Rotterdam)	Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom (Barcelona) Beatfreeks (Birmingham) Cricket Club (Venice) Brightful (Malmö)

The distinction of the areas of innovative practices is not sharp: these areas often overlap since they are mutually interlinked and supportive. This is clearly the case, for example the practices like Multisectoral cooperation in Malmö, which follows both the aim of networking, engagement, democracy, as well as the aim of producing individual abilities, self-confidence and collective knowledge. Similarly, Welcome Tours for Refugees in Hamburg follow not only ‘bridging distance’ or ‘socialising’ objectives, but also the aim of providing knowledge about the city and society to refugees. Similarly The New Opportunity in Rotterdam aims to change ‘unhealthy thinking and unhealthy behaviour’ through motivation, empowerment and support as a pre-condition for individual development, education and employment, or the Loft in Athens which is not only concerned with entrepreneurship but also with empowerment,

engagement, development and education – similar to other practices in employment, entrepreneurship and education areas, etc. etc. Some projects like The New Opportunity (Rotterdam) and others are dealing with fairly marginalised young people due to (self)-exclusion and problematic family/neighbourhood influences-conditions. This implies the need for quite complex approaches, concerned with the essential individual motivations, abilities and social relationships.

Theoretical underpinning of the case studies

The case studies are built on the results of the previous work packages. Work packages 2-4 focused on social inequalities and their causes on macro-, meso- and micro-levels. They have also analysed; the national and local policy frameworks and social infrastructure in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, the experiences of young people concerning social inequalities and social infrastructures, their strategies within the role of the innovative practices.

The comparative WP2 report has distinguished several areas of inequalities which we have kept as the key areas of practices/pilots/projects. It also distinguished different ways of looking at (causes of) problems and solutions: RED discourse - redistribution perspective that focuses on have-nots; INT discourse - social integration perspective that focuses on do-nots; MUD discourse - a moral underclass perspective that deals with feel-nots who do not express the 'right' morals; and a fourth perspective that focuses on self-exclusion of want-nots (Stigendal, 2013).

In terms of causes of inequalities beyond the RED/INT/MUD approaches, it was distinguished what kind of causes the practices/projects address as they were identified throughout several WPs from different perspectives individual causes (lack of ambition (motivation), resignation/retreat, lack of self-efficacy, lack of abilities/skills/, lack of social capital, trust, disengagement) and objective causes such as labour market structures and the lack of employment opportunities, educational opportunities, communing opportunities, discrimination, including institutional discrimination, social isolation and concentration effect, cycle of disadvantage, intergenerational transmission of disadvantage, retrenchment of welfare service (neoliberal convergence) and financialisation/indebtedness and lack of resources (Stigendal, 2013, Hussain and Higson, 2014).

BOX 1: Three discourses on social exclusion

According to Levitas (1998, 2005) three discourses or “ideal types” of social exclusion may be distinguished which explain the causes of poverty and imply different solutions/policies.

The redistributive discourse (RED) recognises poverty and inequality as the major impediments of social inclusion. The policy implications include the necessity to provide adequate levels of income to those unable to work. Moreover, RED also addresses social, cultural and political participation as well as economic participation assuming that people, if provided with adequate resources, will use those resources towards social inclusion.

The moral underclass discourse (MUD) attributes social exclusion to the moral or behavioural deficiencies of the excluded. This viewpoint ignores structural factors in order to blame the excluded. The major policy implication is that the existence of welfare state benefits has caused a deviant behavioural response of choosing a life of dependency rather than the independence that paid employment provides. The major policy implication is that income support should be kept at low levels and conditional assuming that financial incentives will lead people in the “right” direction and that the “right morals” are a sufficient condition for inclusion.

The social integrationist discourse (SID) narrows the definition of social inclusion to participation in paid work. This approach which defines included (excluded) as in paid work (not in paid work) prevents consideration of inequality within the “included”. Both individual and society have a role in social exclusion/inclusion. Emphasis is put on active labour market policies and activation. There is no need for policies to address wages and working conditions or to inequalities between classes, genders or ethnic groups.

Levitas, R. (1998, 2005) The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

WP3 emphasised three local perspectives on combating social exclusion: Bridging social and physical distances (solution) to address social isolation (problem); ‘Communing’, developing new forms of togetherness (solutions) to tackle decay (problem); developing trust, responsive communication, connectivity, interdependencies and diversity (solutions) to tackle exclusionary forms of servicing, ad-hoc and piecemeal policies (problem), (Güntner et al., 2014).

In WP 5 social innovation was defined as practices that: i) meet new social needs or better meet the already existing ones of specific vulnerable groups like young people; ii) find new ways of meeting social needs which are more effective, efficient and/or sustainable than the alternatives; iii) empower people, allowing them to participate and increase their capabilities; iv) promote the awareness of rights and active citizenship; v) turn social challenges to opportunities; and vi) increase social capital, social trust and enhance society’s capacity to undertake actions at the local level (Jubany, , Güell, 2014).

Finally, WP 6 has brought a new typology of social innovations which was also incorporated into guidelines for WP 7 (Spies, 2015). If we consider this typology, we can recognise several options on how the practices/projects contribute to overcoming social inequalities: breaking fatalism, empowerment and developing ambition, learning (building capacity/ability), building social capital, offering opportunities for collective activities, better environment,

education, work, housing, health care and services, stimulating, enabling co-creation, neighbourhood development.

Figure 1: Typology of logics of intervention and ideal-types of participants

Italic: analytical dimensions

Bold: policies and interventions

Standard: type of person

Ambition: integration into mainstream society through school/job

Learning counselling; social matching	and capital;	Motivated to integrate into mainstream society, but lacking competences and/or social network	Offering opportunities
<i>Low ability and support</i>		Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change	<i>High ability and support</i>
Empowerment: developing ambition, competences and social network		Aiming for 'alternative' ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support	Stimulating and enabling entrepreneurship; co-creation; 'communing'

Resignation or aiming for 'alternative' integration

law enforcement

Source: Spies, 2015

These above theoretical perspectives have been used in the case studies as analytical categories.

Evaluation methodology

The case studies in fact represent ex-post evaluation studies which are focusing on the design of the practices/projects, their implementation and their outcomes/effects. The purpose is to provide a complex picture on; what were the objectives and key activities (modus operandi), what were the implementation conditions like resources needed and the actors involved, the implementation processes, and finally, the outcomes. The links between the design, implementation and outcomes are in focus. Lastly, the context in which the practices/projects were implemented is also analysed.

The methodology combines two approaches: theory driven evaluation and, as much as possible, alternative/practice driven evaluation.

BOX 2: Two approaches to policy evaluation

Theory driven evaluation

Program theory: stakeholders' implicit and explicit assumptions on what actions are required to solve the problem and why the problem will respond to the actions (Chen, 2005).

Evaluation strategy: Facilitating stakeholders to clarify contextual factors and mechanisms essential for their program's success.

Program theory serves as a conceptual framework for evaluating effectiveness.

The conceptual framework asks two general questions:

Why question: Why does the intervention affect the outcomes? (change model)

How question: How are the contextual factors and program activities organized for implementing the intervention and supporting the change process? (action model)

An Alternative: Integrative Validity Model and "Bottom-Up" Approach

Viability Evaluation: Assess the extent to which an intervention program is viable in the real world (e.g. practical, suitable, affordable, evaluable, helpful)

Methodology: Mixed methods (e.g. pretest-posttest, interviews, focus groups, survey)

Chen, H.T. 1990. *Theory-Driven Evaluations*. Sage.

Chen, H.T. 2005. *Practical Program Evaluation: assessing and improving program planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Sage.

In the case of the pilots (practices transferred from one city to another city, or, in some cases new practices implemented thanks to Citispyce) it was the combination of the implementation/formative studies and, in some cases when the implementation has been almost fully accomplished, impact evaluation. When doing the evaluation, the emphasis was put on some key aspects like: innovativeness of the practice, the success factors and transferability.

In both cases, however, the time span provided for evaluation was quite short. In the case of pilots, they started in October 2014. The preparation stage took 3 months, then implementation phase followed, which means that the evaluation was possible during a period of at most 6 months if the implementation phase is included. This means that concerning outcomes/effects, the evidence is limited due to the short time horizon to follow them, considering that most of the effects expected like employability, educational and personal development, empowerment, sociability, trust and engagement are rather long-term/gradual effects.

Regarding the case studies of the already existing practices/projects, the time period provided for evaluation was even shorter, it did not include the implementation phase of the practices. In fact the evaluation period lasted from April to June 2015. This means that ex-post evaluation studies that were carried out very much depended on the existing evidence on the practices/projects. In some rare cases, the partners selected the practices/projects which have been implemented earlier with their direct participation or supervision (like Multisectoral

cooperation project in Malmö) or they have had longer-term experience with it. In such cases the case studies are also partly based on longer-term observation.

The analysis was based on the combination of various sources of data: existing documents and statistics provided by the stakeholders, direct observations (especially important in the case of the pilots when the partners were often the implementing body/the principal), interviews with the stakeholders and participants, or focus groups in some cases. The results of the field work carried out in other work packages were also intensively exhausted: WP2 which addressed social inequalities and policies at the national and local level, WP 3 which addressed inequalities and social infrastructures in neighbourhoods, WP 4 which addressed the perception of inequalities and policies by young people in neighbourhoods, WP 5 which has identified the innovative practices in neighbourhoods, and WP 6 which evaluated the implementation of the pilots.

The structure of the evaluation report was provided to the project partners which enables them to capture the key features of the practices/pilots. This has included:

1. Evaluation methodology
2. Project Design
 - 2.1 Social Issue(s) addressed
 - 2.2. Project goals and plans
 - 2.3 Competences and resources required
 - 2.4 Degree of organization (bottom-up/top-down practice)
 - 2.5 The logic of intervention
3. Organisational context of implementation
4. Project implementation and outputs
 - 4.1 Targeting of the program
 - 4.2 Addressing needs
 - 4.3 Empowerment, engagement and choice
 - 4.4 Stakeholders involved
 - 4.5 Competences and resources involved
 - 4.6 Process evaluation criteria
 - 4.7 Innovativeness
 - 4.8 Success factors and conditions, critical implementation barriers
5. Project results/outcomes (effects)
6. Final reflections
 - 6.1 The role of the pilot/project/practice
 - 6.2 Innovation
 - 6.3 Success factors
 - 6.4 Policy recommendations, transferability

Assessment of the case studies: first reflections

The case studies could not be designed to provide the solid ‘contra-factual’ assessment of the innovative practices. Rather they aim to put the practices into the national contexts, to

identify their innovative features in terms of addressing; the needs of young people, the approaches to young people, the outcomes/effects to the extent these are available, the success factors regarding their implementation and outcomes, and finally considering transferability. By doing this, the *blackbox* is open and the links between the design, implementation and outcomes are possible to understand.

Addressing the key dimensions of inequalities

The case studies document that the important device of the innovative practices is that they address the dimensions of social exclusion which are rather neglected in mainstream policies. Their approach reflects the dimensions as distinguished by Percy-Smith (2000:9): typically, the practices are unique in that they address neighbourhood, individual, spatial and group dimensions, often in a combination with political/civic and social dimensions.

Self-confidence, creativity, empowerment, sociability, trust and engagement are strongly supported through innovative approaches. The practices take into account the widespread feeling of the 'heteronomy of life' (Berger, 1965) on the site of young people living in the excluded neighbourhoods, leading to low aspirations and disengagement, and a lack of trust.

The other related characteristic is a highly individualised approach and emphasis on the process to balance relationship, recognition, mutual trust, empowerment and co-determination. Typically individual or group/community work based on partnership principle is the norm/quality standard.

The findings of the outcomes of the practices/projects confirm that the above concerns of the practices help to appropriately address the needs of young people.

Their characteristics contrast with the approach of the mainstream policies which are more and more focusing just on the economic dimension of social inclusion, based on 'activation approach'. In this approach currently work-first approach prevails or in the worst case workfare (Loedemel and Moreira, 2014). Such an approach represents an obstacle to built preconditions for the effective social inclusion in most of the dimensions, like the individual, neighbourhood, group, social and civic/political dimensions.

Success factors

The case studies identify the success factors of the implementation of the innovative practices. We summarise them in brief below (as they are presented in the case studies). We admit that the assessment is provided at different levels of abstraction. The aim is to get rather a wide picture (i.e. diversity of practices, diversity of analyses) than a focused analytical grid.

Table 2: Aims and success factors of the innovative practices

Area: Employment

	Goals/objectives	Success factors
Integrated approach – Sofia (from Brno)	<p>Main goal: to increase the capacity of young Roma to find and retain employment.</p> <p>The objectives: Understand the needs of young unemployed Roma and the needs of employers; Build and strengthen the job orientation, job search and job retention skills (soft skills) of young Roma; Decrease negative attitudes of employers towards hiring Roma and build a network of employers open to hiring them.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Successful adaptation of social innovative practices from Brno to the context and needs of Roma youth in Sofia.</p> <p>Development of relevant design and effective implementation of a pilot counselling program, which can be successfully expanded and replicated.</p> <p>Development of trust between Roma youth and the HESED team based on mutual respect and helpful support.</p> <p>Building of a trustful relationship between a network of employers and HESED, which will act as a bridge between employers and Roma workers.</p>
Learning by working (Brno)	<p>Main goal: to raise the chances of a socially excluded group of Roma to get employed in the open labour market.</p> <p>The objectives: Teach the target group to independently orientate in the labour market, apply for jobs and dispose of basic knowledge of the legal framework in labour law. Increase chances for employment of the target group through cooperation with employers and improve the target group's image in the media through raising awareness of good practice examples Set up a long-term functioning system of cooperation among relevant institutions for Roma inclusion in the labour market.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Design of the project should reflect the needs of the target groups.</p> <p>Trustful and experienced NGO as principal implementing the project.</p> <p>Careful monitoring of the project progress during implementation.</p> <p>Flexibility within implementation of the project to react to the needs of the clients.</p> <p>External:</p> <p>Sufficient financial and personnel resources.</p>
Youth Employment Agency (Hamburg)	<p>Assist young people with a seamless transition into education, independency and employment.</p> <p>Fight youth unemployment and reduce the number of training scheme careers</p> <p>Lead to shorter paths to secure independence</p> <p>Secure a labour force for future</p> <p>Bundle the services for young</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>One-stop-shop approach</p> <p>Cooperation between providers is improved and communication is faster and easier.</p> <p>Understanding of each other's tasks and hand-in-hand approach</p> <p>Easier to access by clients and surrounding social workers etc.</p>

	people more effectively and efficiently.	<p>Clear and transparent approach</p> <p>External/contextual:</p> <p>Reach of clients during schooling</p>
--	--	--

Area: Entrepreneurship

	Goals/objectives	Success factors
The Loft (Birmingham)	<p>Offering opportunities to showcase work, to build networks and to generate business.</p> <p>Empowerment: developing ambition, self-belief, competences and social networks; social capital.</p> <p>Improving employability;</p> <p>Building relationships with cultural, educational and other organisations.</p> <p>Bridging gaps between disadvantaged young people and local government (City Council).</p> <p>Brokering between the arts and the community.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>The sense of community, being able to ‘dip’ into other projects and be part of collaborative projects with likeminded people - empowering and exciting working environment.</p> <p>Independence, feeling more confident in ‘doing it alone.’</p> <p>Developing networks to sustain dreams of young people in the creative industry.</p> <p>External:</p> <p>Immediacy, accessibility, quality and affordability of the space.</p>
The Loft-Athens (from Birmingham)	<p>A place where young artists can meet, exchange ideas, identify their needs, network and display their art work.</p> <p>Additional aims: enhancing social entrepreneurship through counselling and business coaching and/or liaising young participants with the Municipality for the implementation of consultation sessions regarding artistic and cultural activities organised by the Municipality targeting young people.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>The commitment of staff members, and the fact that they all share the same philosophy which motivates them to work efficiently, empower and support beneficiaries and provide the best possible outcome.</p> <p>The profile of the target group, their genuine interest and willingness.</p> <p>The initial design and the successful adjustment of the practice in order to meet the needs of the local people.</p> <p>External:</p> <p>Provision of space by local authorities and their willingness to accept the implementation of this practice and host it in their premises.</p>
Buzinezzclub (Rotterdam)	<p>Main goal: Fight inequality in chances/ deprivation and promote socioeconomic mobility.</p> <p>Objectives: to foster an entrepreneurial spirit among young jobless people in Rotterdam (aged 18-27); to activate young people, stimulate a different mind set; reduce the duration of dependence on social assistance or help young people to remain out of social assistance; to create a financial</p>	<p>Connection with the motivation and character traits/personality of young people is key to success. Positive, individualised support, aiming at fostering an entrepreneurial attitude and related changes in behaviour.</p> <p>Creating a safe environment, allowing people to make mistakes, helping people to explore and reconsider their dreams are essential elements of this approach.</p> <p>Connections with the regional business community are crucial: durable multi-annual coaching can be offered through collaboration between permanent staff, voluntary professionals and entrepreneurs.</p> <p>Long-term orientation: investing in long lasting</p>

	return on investment.	relationships and networks, volunteers who work for some years on the goals that the members formulated during the group coaching trajectory in the first half year.
Topeko (Athens)	The project aims at the multifaceted support of the unemployed (through training and counselling), who will be supported in an integrative manner before the founding of their enterprises (Social Cooperative Enterprise) by placing them in jobs in dynamic sectors of the local economy (such as the social economy and the green economy) on the basis of identified development needs in the area of Elefsina.	Internal + external: Careful design prior to the implementation and the good collaboration between private sector, cooperatives with extensive expertise and public bodies who played an important role in the intervention area (such as the Municipality of Elefsina, the Municipal Public Benefit Enterprise and PASEPPE). Good coordination of actions and an effective cooperation between all actors. Special attention given to the planning and organization of Meetings, Forum activities and ad hoc meetings in order to make the most of the participation of the Municipality of Elefsina, Municipal Public Benefit Enterprise (KEDE) and PASEPPE during the implementation of the actions for networking.

Area: Education, personal development

	Goals/objectives	Success factors
Recording studio- Brno (from Barcelona)	Providing opportunities for young Roma (e.g. to record music, get publicity etc.) Raising human capital (skills) of young Roma musicians Raising social capital (contacts) of young Roma musicians Empowering young Roma musicians	Internal + external During implementation the barriers appeared: demands of various Czech offices to allow the recording studio in the space provided by the municipality (e.g. soundproof system requires more demanding building changes). Due to closer inspection of the building unexpected conditions were found (e.g. the floor of the studio was in much worse condition than expected). Collision of the project timetable with term time of various Czech offices. Czech offices usually use maximum period allowed (one month) before they answer to applications. Collision of the project timetable with university rules. The success factors to overcome the barriers: Commitment of the pro-Roma NGO to invest additional finance and human resources into the project Interested young Roma Cooperation and assistance by university and municipality.
Educational Demos (Barcelona)	To identify individual and social needs faced by young people and address them through the project. Raising awareness of duties as citizens and of values like equality of opportunities, inter-culturality, non-discrimination and the promotion of active citizenship.	Internal: Overall philosophy (internal) → implemented through the performance of youth workers Motivation and commitment of personnel (internal) → implemented through the attitude and performance of youth workers Methods of operation based on trust and self-confidence (internal) → implemented through the performance of youth workers

	<p>Redirecting the activities to the most appropriate actors (e.g. social services, centre of information and assistance for youth).</p>	<p>Attitude of youngsters and motivation to commit to the project (internal) → implemented through the attitude and performance of youngsters Interest of youngsters in the culture of hip hop (contextual/external)</p> <p>External: Counting on infrastructures: recording studio (internal) → existing infrastructure</p>
<p>Free Remedial Tutoring (Krakow)</p>	<p>To develop a sense of satisfaction from helping others, and being responsible for them, in young people in the role of tutors;</p> <p>To fill gaps in the knowledge and possibly the social skills needed by beneficiaries in order to continue to make effective use of the educational system;</p> <p>To a certain extent: to strengthen the positive image of the school and to familiarize the children of local residents with the high admission requirements.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Key success factors include the human factor, temporal and spatial factors.</p> <p>The organisers play down the financial requirements and point to the need to evoke in the people involved in the practice the belief that they are doing something important and useful. What is crucial in this respect, therefore, is the presence of a specific motivating factor. Charisma and the ability to persuade people on the part of the practice organiser.</p> <p>An appeal to the internal motivation of young tutors leads to a great commitment and positive effects due to the fact that they have chosen to devote their time to people from their neighbourhood who have limited access to quality schools.</p>
<p>Health and Social Centre (Sofia)</p>	<p>To provide an integrated approach for addressing numerous interconnected problems of the Roma community: Suitable infrastructure based in a Roma neighbourhood Provision of complementary community-based services; Human resources development of Roma community.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Changing the established practice of focusing on a particular area or problem, the HSC addresses the multifaceted and complex question of Roma inequality in its entirety. What matters is the process, not short-term isolated results.</p> <p>The main drivers of the successful development were the high expertise and qualifications of its staff, and its tireless commitment to work with the people from the target groups, the seemingly limitless flexibility of the staff.</p> <p>After years of downward trends in Fakulteta, with each new generation born into deeper poverty, hopelessness and pessimism, the HSC has effectively demonstrated that a reversal of direction was possible. Parents of children who participate in Centre's programmes have visibly changed their behaviour, becoming more responsible and concerned parents. The school performance of children has improved. Young people participating in social skills development groups tend to marry later than their peers and have children later. They are also more motivated to complete education and find employment.</p> <p>External limitations:</p> <p>The main limitation of the HSC model remains its relatively small capacity. The successful past record increases interest, and in recent years the number of</p>

		people who want to participate in its programmes considerably exceeds the available space.
Challenge Sports (Rotterdam)	<p>Helping young people to develop the necessary attitude and skills to obtain and keep in education or employment.</p> <p>To direct them towards school or work within a short period of time (3-6 months).</p> <p>Building social capital and mainstream social values. Sports are an essential part of the training.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Thorough knowledge of the target group Challenge Sports works with; Quality and characteristics of the team, Attitude towards young clients.</p> <p>A clear vision of what they have to do with their clients.</p> <p>Well-organised primary process (intake, start up of pathway); precise management, business-like character.</p> <p>Being able to deliver all requested data on results quickly (transparency);</p> <p>Lacking qualities:</p> <p>Flexibility towards customer-demands (Youth Counter): ability to handle a large number of people, organised on the constant inflow of new clients</p> <p>Cost effectiveness and being cheaper than other suppliers of re-integration services: “A <i>light programme</i>”, or, according to Challenge Sports, “<i>not heavier and more expensive than necessary.</i>”</p>
The New Opportunity (Rotterdam)	<p>The practice focuses changing ‘unhealthy thinking and unhealthy behaviour’. Working in a both holistic/systematic and pragmatic way it addresses various needs: practical problems, social and psychological problems, addictions, lack of education, lack of ‘labour-identity’ (specific and general (communication and relation) skills to function in a job), lack of motivation, meaning giving, lack of identity.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>The connection with neighbourhood and youth workers.</p> <p>Specialised care offered at the TNO-centre on mental health and addiction problems.</p> <p>TNO is using a realistic, systematic and grounded approach to reach its goals.</p> <p>The amount of time and energy that is and can be devoted to direct people towards jobs and schools or specialised care and to ‘keep in touch’ with them over a long period of time (2 years).</p> <p>External :</p> <p>Additional funding and knowledge from the private sector in the outflow-phase: charities, individual employers, churches.</p>

Area: Recognition, empowerment, trust, sociability, engagement

	Goals/objectives	Success factors
Hidden Wings/ Beatfrecks - Krakow (from Birmingham)	<p>To provide local Krakow youth with the possibility of building niche competences and utilizing them in order to achieve success in a broader social context.</p> <p>Individual related aims: enhancing sense of agency and internal locus of control; increasing self-esteem; supporting social involvement and team-work competences.</p> <p>Group related aims: building networks and collective spaces, empowering,</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Well prepared trainers</p> <p>Engagement of the participants</p> <p>Building a feeling of participation in an extraordinary undertaking.</p> <p>External:</p> <p>Broad stakeholder participation</p>

	<p>integrating into wider society (convincing the public that there exists potential in excluded youth), and improving visibility.</p> <p>Motto: change through personal development.</p>	<p>Securing financial and infrastructural resources</p>
<p>Beatfrees - Venice (from Birmingham)</p>	<p>To strengthen the communication and the connection among young people, the public services and the various associations engaged in youth issues/policies/interventions.</p> <p>Networking youth realities and associations in Mestre in order to reduce physical distances between them and to offer opportunities;</p> <p>Building a virtual and actual space where young people could express themselves, their skills and abilities; organizing (together with young people) an event where they can perform their skills, such as art, music, sport, theatre, photo.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>The wider overall philosophy of the project that fits with the neighbourhood background and with the target group needs and skills</p> <p>Social capital-networks of the founder that facilitated the implementation of the practice;</p> <p>The founder of the project has been able to identify some specific social needs of a part of the resident young people;</p> <p>External:</p> <p>The strong sense of community and the tradition of strong engagement of the citizens towards the common good of Mestre and Marghera.</p> <p>Involving various social actors (both at informal and institutional level) in the neighborhoods, thus contributing to increasing social networks, collaborations</p>
<p>Moin Moin Hamburg - Welcome Tours for Refugees (Hamburg)</p>	<p>Main goal: social and cultural integration of young refugees.</p> <p>Objectives: aiming at the gap between informal qualifications plus abilities at the time of arrival and a long-term formal integration process</p> <p>Better knowledge about the city to move around more easily outside the shelter and through that get involved in (social) activities.</p> <p>Better knowledge about possibilities</p> <p>Empowerment to make better use of own abilities</p> <p>Avoidance of Infantilization</p> <p>Improvement of language skills.</p> <p>In this <i>resource oriented approach</i> spoken languages serve as a support.</p> <p>Cultural organizations and businesses given the opportunity to get engaged in innovative social practice.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Winning young refugees in the shelters to: be willing to come to a first meeting, to talk about their own wishes/experiences, to identify with the project and take part in tours.</p> <p>Finding tour guides with different languages</p> <p>External barriers:</p> <p>The implementation succeeded only partially: during the Pilot phase we met 39 young people who were willing to come to a first meeting and talk about their wishes and experiences. Although at the beginning we had the feeling that nearly all of them were interested in the project in the first place, only a few attended because they were occupied with other issues or we did not meet their real interests.</p>
<p>Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom (Barcelona)</p>	<p>Learning and defence of human rights, as well as raising awareness of duties as citizens and of values such as equal opportunity, interculturality, non-discrimination and the promotion of an active citizenship.</p> <p>To promote theatre as an educational tool for young people, as a channel of social transformation and as a space for</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Overall philosophy implemented through the attitude and performance of the organisation's personnel</p> <p>Personnel's motivation and commitment implemented through the attitude and performance of stakeholders and apprentices</p> <p>Methods of operation based on trust and self-confidence implemented through the performance of stakeholders and apprentices</p>

	<p>alternative leisure. To identify individual and social needs faced by young people and address them through this educational project, further activities of the organisation and/or redirect them to the most appropriate actors (e.g. social services, centre of information and assistance for youth).</p>	<p>Young people's motivation and commitment to the project implemented youngsters' attitude and performances Youngster's interest in theatre and Theatre of the Oppressed thanks to the organisation's reputation and word of mouth (contextual)</p> <p>External: Counting with infrastructure: rehearsal/ staging premises</p>
<p>Beatfrees (Birmingham)</p>	<p>To give a voice to young people, develop life and transferable employability skills and create community leaders. Beatfrees' stated mission is to develop people and spaces through creativity and create a better world through more equipped, engaged, empowered young people able to apply their creativity to affect personal and social change. To help young people develop skills, resources, networks and confidence which will improve their employability and readiness for self-employment.</p>	<p>Internal: Overall philosophical approach to young people, building trust Social capital/networks which tackle the isolation and distance of some young people and enable them to connect with those in authority as well as with like-minded others through virtual and physical networks Methods of operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the way in which it connects young people and institutions - its focus on the individual's development of skills and/or social competences as a direct contribution to tackling wider societal causes of inequality e.g. unemployment, inadequate qualifications and low levels of 'soft skills' <p>The use of arts-based practice in a sustainable business model requiring relatively modest resources to engage with hard to reach young people in order to offer them alternative routes into training or employment Support for young people seeking to earn a living through self-employment as freelance practitioners notably, but not exclusively, in the creative industries.</p>
<p>Cricket Club (Venezia)</p>	<p>Networking youth realities and associations in Mestre in order to reduce physical distances between them and to offer opportunities; Building a virtual and actual space where young people could express themselves, their skills and abilities; Organizing (together with young people) an event where they can performing their skills, such as art, music, sport, theatre, photography.</p>	<p>Internal: Wider overall philosophy of the project that fits with the neighbourhood background and with the target group needs and skills Social capital-networks of the founder that facilitated the implementation of the practice; Ability of the founder of the project to identify some specific social needs of a part of the resident young people; Skills and social capital of the project implementing association (individual and collective social capital), involving various social actors (both at informal and institutional level) in the neighborhoods, thus contributing to increasing social networks, collaborations.</p> <p>External: Strong sense of community and the tradition of strong engagement of the citizens towards the</p>

		common good of Mestre and Marghera.
Multisectoral cooperation (Malmö)	<p>The original aim: identifying and creating cross-sector collaboration to address the underlying structural causes of individual unemployment.</p> <p>An overlying aim: to plan and prepare the full-scale action project proposal to the ESF.</p> <p>To create a common understanding of problems and solutions connected to social exclusion by discussions between actors from different sectors, but also by involving young people.</p> <p>To built the knowledge alliance, by including young people in order to create a potential contribution of a multitude of perspectives regarding causes and solutions to the societal problem of social exclusion.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>The design of the project: it is connected to two of the prospects for social innovation in WP2:</p> <p>Giving young people a voice (their rights could be strengthened)</p> <p>Having a potential-orientated approach, paying attention to underlying causes and young people's positive potential</p> <p>Providing voices to young people that have real influence</p> <p>Creating relations characterized by mutual trust, which has been gradually established in the Youth involvement process.</p>
Brightful (Malmö)	<p>Main aim: by providing different activities, help and motivate young women and men in believing in themselves and their ability to set (and reach) their own individual goals.</p> <p>To encourage young people to set goals for the future, providing a forum for them where support and encouragement is provided.</p>	<p>Internal:</p> <p>Focus on 'group mentorship' and, focus on its participants acquiring long-term, generic capabilities such as a growing capacity to set up goals for the future and identifying with and learning from other people.</p> <p>Potential-orientation that we, in CITISPYCE, identify with a capacity for innovation.</p> <p>As the most significant success factors for the project we see the degree of participation, self-governing and engagement of young people.</p> <p>"The secret", says Elin Dagerbo, who has written a piece about the starting of Brightful, "lies in honest intentions, feeling passionately about the issue and being well established within the target group".</p>

Summing up the above insights into the success factors of the innovative practices, the following conclusions may be adopted.

In all areas, the importance of the internal success factors clearly prevail over the external factors. The internal success factors include both practice/project design and practice/project implementation which are of similarly equal significance. Regarding project design two aspects which lay in the core of the philosophy (programme theory) underpinning these practices/project seem to be the most important. The first one being the strong focus not only on the needs of the participants, but also on their potentials. A highly individualised approach is consequently a norm, based on the mutual recognition, involvement, cooperation and empowerment as the principles of action. Social work becomes crucial at the levels of individual, group and community work. The second aspect (closely associated with the first) is that the method, process and approach, matters the most. The method of operation consists of cooperation, co-determination, empowerment and partnership. With some exaggeration, one may say that "the helpless are turning to those who are helping the others". This means

that the design of the practice/project and the implementation process are merging. This is typical feature for bottom-up practices.

Nevertheless, regarding implementation as such, the following success factors are important: the abilities of principal (implementing body, mostly NGO) like human and social capital, networks, experiences, highly committed and competent staff or volunteers. Associated devices are good management of the implementation process and competence in situational leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 2007).

The principals have to be, for example, adaptive and flexible in several respects. Concerning the transfer of the pilots, the partners in the roles of principals were able, and creative, to adapt the practices born in a different national context into their own national/city contexts. When doing that they have respected the ideas behind the practice as the most important like the overall philosophy and approach, while the concrete methods or processes may be different and adapted to the local conditions. Similarly, the principals were flexible in their reaction to the needs of young people as well as to the implementation conditions, hence they were able to overcome the emerging obstacles during the process of pilot implementation.

The external success factors appear to be less decisive. Nevertheless, three factors were identified as important. The first one was the network mode of governance, or the existing cooperation networks like cooperative relationships between NGOs, municipalities, business sectors, universities, etc. However, this was very much influenced by the already established social capital and networks of the principal (internal success factor) and/or by the ability of the principal to find the partners and to establish networks.

The other facilitating factor was the community/neighbourhood social capital and social potential. The third facilitating factor were the financial resources provided (for example, financing through European funds was very helpful) or some infrastructures provided (for example space for the activities provided free of charge by a municipality). The financial and personnel resources were more important in the case of larger projects which have combined several time consuming (professionalised) activities necessary to achieve the outcomes. Typically, it is the case of employment oriented practices/projects like TOPEKO in Athens, Buzzinezzclub in Rotterdam, Youth Employment Agency in Hamburg or Learning by Working in Brno.

One may conclude that the success factors are very closely associated with the aims of the practices/projects. The practices are striving to bridge social distance, increase trust and built community by recognition, potential oriented approach, empowerment, partnership and co-determination. Thus their aims are overlapping with their operational principles and methods.²

Next steps

As the next step of WP 7, the workshop with the stakeholders will be organised in September 2015 where the case studies and the lessons from them will be discussed and Policy recommendations will be formulated.

² We, however admit, that do not have clear evidence that these success factors also apply to target groups characterised by strong mechanisms of self-exclusion or those who lack resources.

This action will feed the Final report which will further elaborate policy recommendations, based on the case studies carried in WP 7 and on the results of the other work packages.

Case studies will be also included into the 'Repository of case studies' on the web pages of Citispyce. They can serve this way as an inspiration for the innovative policy initiatives.

References

Berger, P. 1963. *Invitation into sociology: A humanistic perspective*. Bantam: Doubleday Dell Publishing group Inc.

Güntner, S., Gehrke, A.-M., Seukwa, L.-H. 2014. *Local matters? Neighbourhoods and social infrastructure as spaces of reproducing, producing, mitigating or counteracting social inequalities in 10 European cities*. Citispyce Work Package 3 Fieldwork I: Final Comparative Report.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H. and Johnson, D.E. 2007. 9th Ed. *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources*. Prentice Hall.

Hussain, A., Higson, H. 2014. *WP4 Comparative Report of "Fieldwork II"*. Citispyce.

Jubany, O., Güell, B. 2014. *Menu of Social Innovation Practices & Interim Workshop Report*. Citispyce.

Loedemel and Moreira. 2014. *Activation or Workfare? Governance and the Neo-Liberal Convergence*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Percy-Smith, J. (ed.). 2000. *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion: Towards Inclusion?* Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia.

Spies, H. 2015. *Work Package 6 Comparative report. Social innovation in action*. Citispyce project.

Stigendal, M. 2013. *CAUSES OF INEQUALITY AFFECTING YOUNG PEOPLE IN 10 EUROPEAN CITIES*. Citispyce Baseline and comparative report.

Annex: the case studies

Athens

1 The Loft

2 Topeco

Barcelona

3 Educational Demos

4 Forn Teatre Pa´ Tothom

Birmingham

5 Beatfreeks

6 The Loft

Brno

7 Learning by Working

8 Recording Studio

Hamburg

9 Moin, moin Hamburg

10 Youth Employment Agency

Krakow

11 Free Remedial Tutoring

12 Hidden Wings

Malmö

13 Brightful

14 Multisectoral cooperation

Rotterdam

15 Buzinezzclub

16 Challenge Sports

17 The New Opportunity

Sofia

18 Health and Social Centre

19 Integrated Approach

Venice

20 Beatfreaks

21 Cricket Club