WP2: STRATEGY REPORT

Version: 11 April 2013

Mikael Stigendal

Malmö University

This is the report that will guide the work in workpackage 2 (WP2) of the Citispyce project. It builds on previous versions as well as comments and suggestions from partners. I've tried to make clear how I have dealt with the comments and suggestions, for example by quotes. Regarding design, this is how I want your reports to look like. I want you to use the template of this report. That will make the reports much easier to compare. So please, make a copy of this report, erase my text in the copy, keep the formats and then use it as a template for your own report.

1. Why do we need WP2?

The easiest way to answer that question is to derive the answer from the title of the project, "combating Inequalities through Innovative Social Practices of and for Young People in Cities across Europe". As I understand the title, it contains two sides. Let's call the one side the problem-side as it deals with the inequalities, while the other side deals with the innovative social practices and thus, it can be called the solution-side. The title makes clear that these two sides should be perceived in their relationship.

That enables me to present a provisional rationale for WP2. We need WP2 in order to know about the inequalities that are supposed to be combatted through innovative social practices of and for young people in cities across Europe. Furthermore, we have agreed not just to focus on the symptoms but incorporate the causes of inequality as well. Accordingly, two sets of questions will become central to WP2:

1. Symptoms: How are young people affected by inequality? How does the inequality affecting young people manifest itself?
2. Causes: What are the causes of this manifested inequality? How should we understand it?

We need to know about not only the manifestations of inequality, the number of young people affected etc. Also, we need to know about the causes of inequality. Why? Because in my view, a practice should be regarded as particularly innovative if it targets and manages to change the causes of inequality. In line with the distinction between symptoms and causes of inequality, I want to suggest a distinction between two types of social innovations:

1. Symptom-oriented social innovations, compensating for the symptoms and effects of inequalities.
2. Cause-oriented social innovations, challenging the causes of inequality.

A typology of social innovations would certainly include more types than that, but I want to emphasise the distinction between these two, when it concerns combating inequalities through innovative social practices. In particular, we should look for practices which are innovative in the sense that they change the structures that causes inequality.

Thus, we need to know about both the symptoms and the causes of inequality, affecting young people. Without knowing that, we won't be able to assess a practice as socially innovative. Furthermore, without knowing that, we won't be able to assess a practice as more socially innovative in one city and less in another. What is regarded socially innovative in one city may perhaps be mainstreamed in another city, depending on the different contexts.

Some of the partners have commented on the distinction between symptoms and causes. As the Brno partners says, "although we accept the idea to distinguish the causes and symptoms, we have to be aware that very often it would be difficult to do so since the symptoms finally become causes (the spiral of precariousness)." The Hamburg team makes a similar point:

> *The report makes a very strong distinction between "symptoms" and "causes" and later between "problems" and "solutions" related to inequalities (p6). We would like to remind ourselves of the famous comment of Esping-Andersen that "the welfare state is (…) an active force in the ordering of social relations" (1990: 165). With this in mind, it is very often very hard to distinguish between the two sides and important to underline that "solutions" can be or turn into "problems". With regard to our target group(s), this is very evident: Nationality and age open and close doors to services, and the reason for this is no other than the very make-up of the welfare system itself that draws clear boundaries around citizenship (citizen vs alien) or age (child vs adult). Secondly, the institutions of inclusion may in practice provoke exclusion through mechanisms of institutional discrimination, just think about the last riots an France which were clearly directed against discriminatory state practices in schools etc., or think about the conditionalities built into the workfare approach of employment policies - not handing out benefits to people because they fail to apply for jobs means in reality that they will face deeper hardship than before rather than anything else. We say this to advocate a less dualistic or dichotomised view in the reports and rather concentrate on these relations which you describe as "generative mechanisms".*

These are important points to bear in my mind. However, my intention was not make strong distinctions but rather to encourage the partners to reflect on this distinction and in particular highlight the causes. Too often, the focus remains restricted to the symptoms. Thus, make sure that you don't forget the causes.

2. Analytical and comparative areas

So how do we acquire knowledge on the symptoms and causes of inequality? Usually in research, areas of symptoms and causes are identified and analysed separately. In a previous draft I wrote, preparing myself for the Barcelona conference, I picked up a few such areas from the "Overall strategy of the work plan" where it's stated that the baseline study is supposed to include "a survey of employment, housing, education policy frameworks, post-recession changes and income inequalities".

The Call Fiche calls them policy areas. As I see it, we should interpret it as contextual areas. This is also in line with one of the four objectives in the proposal, "To improve our understanding of the policy context across Europe within which public sector policy-makers and their social partners currently act." It is the understanding of the policy context that has to be improved. Hence, we need to identify contextual areas containing symptoms and causes of inequality. What about the ones enumerated above from the "Overall strategy of the work plan"? Will they do?

Quite well, as I see it. The first three (employment, housing, education policy frameworks) are well recognised as analytical areas and also, they accord with areas identified in the project Social Polis that I participated in some years ago.[1] An overall objective of Social Polis was to produce a focused, critical state of the art in research on cities and social cohesion. For that reason, the results may be particularly valid to use in Citispyce.

[1] Available at: http://www.socialpolis.eu/ (accessed 11 of March 2013)

The fifth (income inequalities), I interpret as part of a wider analytical "area" called welfare regimes, also an area identified by Social Polis. Regarding the fourth one mentioned (post-recession changes), I can't see it as a particular area but more as an aspect of the other four. In order to become sufficiently comprehensive, we need to supplement the four areas with another one, dealing with power. That means five areas, listed below and with references to the corresponding "existential field" in Social Polis. By linking it to these fields, we may get the advantage to use the results from Social Polis as a basis for our work:

- Employment (EF2 Urban Labour Markets & Economic Development)
- Housing (EF3 Housing, Neighbourhood and Health)
- Education policy frameworks (EF 7 Education and Training)
- Power, government/governance (EF6 Governance)
- Income inequalities (EF1 Welfare and Social Services)

We will of course not be interested in every aspect of these areas, but more particularly how they cause inequality. What we should be looking for is in other words the structural or social determinants, an expression used by the WHO-commission on Social Determinants of Health (World Health Organization, 2008), led by Michael Marmot, but in our case then the structural determinants of inequality, in particular the ones affecting young people. In one of the articles resulting from Social Polis, Pratschke and Morlicchio (2012: 1895) refer to it as generative mechanisms that "combine to produce differing outcomes in a context-dependent way". Other recent publications and sources of information which may be useful are included in the reference list.

So far, I have derived the need of WP2 from the title of the project and made a first suggestion of how to conceive of symptoms and causes of inequality. How does this fit with the objectives and specific tasks for WP2 stated in the proposal? This is the issue that I will turn to now.

3. Analysing the proposal

The proposal contains four objectives (O) for WP2 and I've underlined what I perceive as the key words in each one of them:

- O1: To examine the <u>current state of play</u> of policy, practice and language used at EU, national and city levels with regard to tackling <u>inequalities</u> and fostering and supporting <u>social innovation</u>
- O2: To improve our understanding of the policy <u>context</u> across Europe within which public sector policy-makers and their social partners currently act.
- O3: To uncover the public sectors' <u>policies and support</u> directed at encouraging young people's economic activity and civic engagement at EU, national and city levels.

- O4: To identify the extent to which these policies register the changing demographic landscape of inequalities as manifested in large urban centres of EU cities today and show evidence of a changing structural response involving social innovation, particularly towards young people

Let me make two observations. The first one deals with scale. Both EU, national and city levels are included. Secondly, the objectives can be understood on the basis of the distinction between the two sides that I derived initially from the title. Thus, the objectives concern both the problems and the solutions, as most clearly stated in O1, “tackling inequalities and fostering and supporting social innovation.” From such a point of view, O2 seems to deal with the problem-side and O3 with the solution-side while O4 relates the two sides to each other. It seems clear to me that WP2 has to deal with both these sides, the relationship between them and on the three levels. As I understand it, that means dealing with, on the one hand the contexts of inequality and on the other the policies and social innovations. However, the proposal includes a list of specific tasks (ST) of WP2 as well:

- ST1: Provide a macro-contextual picture of the study’s 10 partner countries
- ST2: Inform the qualitative case study evidence as part of a mixed-method research strategy;
- ST3: Compare this picture with the EU as a whole
- ST4: Compare characteristics and patterns of Spain, UK, Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, Czech Republic, Poland, Bulgaria, Italy and Greece.
- ST5: Provide an in-depth examination of current policy, legislation and initiatives with regard to social innovation, inequalities and young people and their impacts on national and international instruments in relation to engaging community actions and promoting social cohesion
- ST6: Analyse data to reveal the effects that recent political, economic, cultural and social shifts have had on social policies in Europe
- ST7: Ensure focus on interpretations of inequalities and young people (16 – 24) and innovation in the social field

My attempt to structure the four objectives with regard to the two sides seems applicable here as well. As I see it, ST1-ST4 concerns the problem-side and ST5 the solution-side while ST6 relates the two sides to each other. ST7 is a reminder on the focus.

This enables me to elaborate the provisional rationale for WP2 that I presented in the first chapter. There I stated that we need WP2 in order to know about the inequalities that are supposed to be combatted through innovative social practices of and for young people in cities across Europe. This concerns the problem-side. However, it becomes clear from the analysis of the proposal that the solution-side has to be added. That makes it important to impose clear limits on WP2. One such limit is methodological, as WP2 has to be based on ‘desk based’ research. No field work should be carried out. Another limit is set by the scale. WP2 should involve EU, national and city levels, but not neighbourhood level.

WP2 is expected to result in three deliverables which I will list below. I will also include my understanding of them:

- D2.1 Methodology Plan (M3): This is the deliverable that I'm writing on right now, but we have renamed it to "Strategy Report".
- D2.2 Ten reports on the current 'state of play' in the different countries of the partners (M7): These reports should be written by the partners and on the basis of the "Strategy Report". As I understand it, they must deal with both the problem- and the solution-side (see above) and focus on the cities but in their national contexts.
- D2.3 Final Base-line study on national and EU state of play to inform the fieldwork at local level (M8): This will be a comparative report based on the findings of the ten city reports, including both national and city-level comparisons. Furthermore, it will add the EU dimension to the WP2.

4. The five guiding themes …

At the Barcelona conference, I presented the five contextual areas mentioned above. In the subsequent discussion they were merged with the suggestion from the Barcelona team. After the conference, partners have sent comments to the Barcelona team who has been responsible for putting it all together in the document "Citispyce guiding themes". The document provides us with a "landscape" of potential aspects and also with a view of the point of departure which we later on can look back at. At the same time the need of making definitions and demarcations becomes very obvious. Moreover, the document gives us hints of where we need to develop a common understanding.

However, a rationale to the five guiding themes has not yet been written and explicitly elaborated. The need for such a rationale is recognised by the scientific coordinator. It is needed to explain the conceptual inclusion of these topics as well as the connection between them. The scientific coordinator finds it still too early to try and produce a comprehensive rationale and suggests it to be developed gradually, particularly on the basis of the results from the initial WPs. As a leader of WP2, I am asked to "provide a draft strategy report laying out detailed guidelines for achieving the outcomes for this WP. These guidelines will consider the Themes suggested but will prioritise, adapt and elaborate new contextual areas that he considers to be key for structuring the findings and subsequent country and comparative reports for WP2. This structured approach would facilitate and focus the gathering and analysis of data while also making it possible to elaborate a comparative report using data grouped according to common themes."

Each one of the themes contains quite a lot and research often starts from such a wide topical approach. However, the challenge now is to narrow them down. To do so, we have to ask ourselves why we should write anything at all. I tried to answer that question under the first heading, "Why do we need a baseline study?". My answer was derived from the title of the project, "combating Inequalities through Innovative

Social Practices of and for Young People in Cities across Europe”. Hence, we need WP2 in order to get to know about the inequalities that are supposed to be combatted through innovative social practices of and for young people in cities across Europe. The inequalities reside in what I’ve called the problem-side. After the analysis of the proposal, we know that WP2 has to cover the solution-side as well.

This provides us with a clear rationale for WP2. It consists of two sides. The problem-side includes the problems of inequality and not only the symptoms but also the causes of it, with the aim “to improve our understanding of the policy context across Europe within which public sector policy-makers and their social partners currently act” (O2). The solution-side includes “policies and support directed at encouraging young people’s economic activity and civic engagement at EU, national and city levels” (O3). The two sides should also be treated as related to each other, clearly expressed in the first and fourth objectives. Thus, the themes have to be elaborated on the basis of this rationale. In line with what I suggested under the heading “Analytical and comparative areas/themes”, this means to reinterpret them as contextual areas.

5. … reinterpreted as five contextual areas

I first of all want to underline the structural character of these contextual areas. They consist of societal structures and systems of crucial importance for young people. Thus, the focus is on the structural causes of inequality, also understood as the structural determinants or the generative mechanisms. Focusing on structural causes means that the areas have to be defined analytically. In reality, there may be significant overlaps, as the Hamburg team underlines in their comments (3 of March). Such overlaps are, as I see it, neither possible nor desirable to fully avoid. Therefore, the analysis has to be supplemented by a synthesis with an emphasis of the intersections.

Thus, I suggest that we work with five areas and I will present them briefly below. They all contain both symptoms and causes of inequality. Thus, it is in these areas the policies have to “show evidence of a changing structural response” (O4). In each one of these five areas, I’ve selected indicators of inequality. The selection of these indicators has been guided by a number of requirements. I wanted to select indicators that are well known and well defined at the European level. Other requirements were that data on these indicators have to exist at the EU and national levels, enabling comparisons between the countries. That may also make it likely that data exist at the city level, although I don’t know about that. If not, well-grounded assessments made by partners may be sufficient.

To fulfil the requirements above, most of the indicators have been selected from the so-called dashboard of EU youth indicators, released by the EU Commission in spring 2011. They are also used in the latest *EU Youth Report*, published in September 2012 (European Commission, 2012a). This report includes data on all the indicators and for each one of the countries involved in Citispyce. There they will be easy accessible for all the partners. Besides the EU youth indicators, I’ve selected some additional indicators from a recently published report by the Eurofound (2012) called *NEETs – Young people not in employment, education or training*. I want the partners to use the indicators as point of departures for the following work procedure:

1. Indicators of inequality: The partner should try to find the corresponding data on these indicators at the city level and also, if possible, data which shows the variations within the city. If the data doesn't exist, well-grounded assessments should be sufficient, perhaps at least in terms of more or less, rough estimates. The indicators have been selected in order to indicate the symptoms of inequality. As such, they will be comparable. They will make it possible for me to make comparisons in the final WP2 report. The indicators shouldn't just be presented but I also want you to reflect on what they mean. The most interesting thing is not the indicators, but the reality they refer to so if indicators are not available in your city, perhaps you can capture and represent that reality in other ways, but then also including ideas of how to make it comparable. Reflections and reasoning texts are more than welcome. Also, please highlight the problems with indicators and comparability
2. Causes of inequality: In addition to presenting these data, the partners shall try to explain the causes behind them, with regard to each one of the five areas; i.e. to make the causes of inequality understandable. That will make it necessary to explain how for example the labour market or the education system operates but in brief and with regard to the need of understanding the causes of inequality. What do we need to know in order to understand the causes of inequality? We don't need to know everything about for example the labour market but more precisely how it causes inequality, affecting young people.
3. Structural policy support and response: The partners should examine the current state of play of policy, practice and language used at national and city levels with regard to tackling the symptoms and causes of these inequalities. For each one of the areas, the public sectors' policies and support directed at encouraging young people's activity and engagement has to be uncovered. Furthermore, the partners have to identify the extent to which these policies register the inequalities and show evidence of a changing structural response. A useful help and starting-point could be the recently published *National Youth Reports 2012* (European Commission, 2012c).

Below, I will present the areas briefly, just to give some initial food for thought. Regard it as a contribution to the common reference of concepts, thoughts, theories and research that I think we need to build up. This is just a start, so please add more when you write your reports. In particular, enrich us with contributions from your own work. In this effort, I think we should use and build further on results from similar projects. One such project which I've already mentioned is Social Polis (2007-09), funded by the European Commission, DG Research, under the "Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities" theme of 7th Framework Programme. Reports from that project have been published as articles in the journal Urban Studies (July 2012), but they are also easy accessible at the web page, available at:

http://www.socialpolis.eu/ (accessed 13 March 2013). Another project which I think it would be a waste not to take advantage of is WILCO, available at: http://www.wilcoproject.eu/ (accessed 13 March 2013).

The Hamburg team wonders in their comments about the division below 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. “The welfare system (5.2) is clearly a structuring factor when it comes to the economy (5.1) and power (5.3). Hence, we recommend to see the welfare system as an element that needs to be reflected in all five areas.” Let me just underline that I agree. The areas should be regarded as analytical ones. Feel free to use another structure but make sure that you incorporate all the five areas.

Furthermore, if you want to include another area, feel free to do so. For example, the Rotterdam team has stated that “to adequately capture the Dutch situation, we would probably have to include the area of police and justice (especially prevention policies/first offender policies).” Please do that, but make sure that there is sufficient space to deal with the other areas adequately.

5.1. Economy and labour market

In *Social Polarisation, the Labour Market and Economic Restructuring in Europe: An Urban Perspective*, Pratschke and Morlicchio (2012: 1892) present three definitions of polarisation. The three of them are based on income, class and insider/outsider respectively. According to the authors (2012: 1902), many scholars view the third type of polarization, exclusion from paid employment, as a primary form of social stratification in contemporary Europe. Unemployment and perhaps in particular long-term unemployment may serve as appropriate indicators to that.

Regarding the first type, income polarisation has increased in European countries since the 1980s, “driven by rapid increases at the top of the scale, alongside stagnating real wages for routine employees and, in certain cases, an expansion of the ‘working poor’” (2012: 1892). Financialisation has been accompanied by a massive shift of resources from wages to profits. Concomitantly, the second type of polarisation, class polarisation, has included an increase in temporary work, outsourcing, small firms and the destructuring of working time, which ”have particularly negative effects on young, low-skilled workers, women and immigrants, potentially reinforcing labour market segmentation” (2012: 1902).

However, these restructurings of the economy have taken place unevenly across Europe. To understand the differences and why they have occurred, we need to know something about the differences between the economies in terms of composition, industrial vs financial, orientation (export like for example Germany?) etc. Useful reports and articles on that are Becker J and Jäger J (2011), Becker J and Weissenbacher R (2012) and the annual reports from the EuroMemo Group, for example the last one, EuroMemorandum (2012).

Regulations and industrial relations constitute key aspects of the differences, for example to what degree the labour market is covered by collective agreement. The reports on industrial relations by the European Commission have used such regulations as a basis for classification. I’ve found those classifications, for example presented in European Commission (2008: 45), instructive in order to understand the differences between the economies in Europe.

Please use the indicators below, have a look at the figures in the reference and try to find the corresponding ones at the city level. How do you want us to understand them? What do they tell us? Please, present your reflections and interpretations. Make your in-depth analysis of the position of young people.

1.	2.1. Youth unemployment rate 2.1.2. Long-term youth unemployment rate Definition (European Commission, 2012a: 109): "Share of unemployed youth 15-24[2] without a job for the last 12 months or more among all unemployed in this age group." Also defined at the Eurostat web page: "The long term unemployment rate is the share of unemployed persons since 12 months or more in the total number of active persons in the labour market. Active persons are those who are either employed or unemployed."[3] As the Cracow team highlights, this should not be mixed up with long term unemployment share, which "is the share of the unemployed persons since 12 months or more in the total number of unemployed." As the Cracow team suggests, use both these indicators if possible. Source: Eurostat EU LFS. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 23)
2.	2.2. Youth unemployment ratio Definition: Share of unemployed among the total population (employed, unemployed and inactive), aged 15-24. Comment: This balances out differences in MS activity rates, which influences unemployment rate. Source: Eurostat LFS. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 22)
3.	Youth employment rates, EU Member States, 2007 and 2011 Reference: Eurofound (2012: 11)
4.	Young people in temporary employment, EU Member States, 2007 and 2011 Reference: Eurofound (2012: 16)

[2] This is relatively flexible as age bands may be different at city level and also between cities/states.
[3] Available at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/en/une_esms.htm (accessed 10 of April 2013)

5.	Young people in temporary employment because they could not find a permanent job, by country, 2007 and 2011 Reference: Eurofound (2012: 17)

We want you to make it understandable for us why the young people are affected by the inequality indicated above. We want you to make the causes of inequality understandable. To do this, you need to present the wider context of the national economy. What kind of economy is it and what kind of causes (structural determinants, generative mechanisms) of inequality does it contain?

What are the policy support and response to the symptoms and causes of inequality? For example, what policies exist to "activate" the citizens to work? What about employment policy and employment services, their scope and targeting to the youth, especially labour market training? The Hamburg team raises two points with regard to youth unemployment:

> *With regard to youth unemployment (as in section 5.1), we'd like to raise two points: First, in some countries youth unemployment is high because unemployment in general is high (Greece), in others, youth unemployment is high despite unemployment in general is not so high (Denmark). So there are clearly different systematic factors at work which we need to dig out and compare. Secondly, as Henk has reminded us, new policy initiatives (Youth Guarantee) like promising apprenticeships etc can be rather lame and do nothing but "park" young people in superficial bubbles of supported schemes that do not bring them any closer to the labour market at all; a critical reflection of current national and local strategies against youth unemployment will be very helpful; here, as indicated above, we should try to include which young people are targeted and which are not.*

These are important points which I fully subscribe to. What they highlight is the more general need to go beyond the apparent facts.

The Birmingham team underlines that there also need to be a section on unemployment in general. Against this backdrop, young people can then be foregrounded. Data and analysis of intersecting factors like race, ethnicity, gender, class etc will also need to be built in. I'll leave it to each partner to decide about this and include factors that seem pertinent.

5.2. Welfare regimes

In chapter 2, I presented housing and education as two areas, separated from the area dealing with welfare. Then, the Brno team commented on 1 of March that housing or education policies compose a part of welfare (regime). They are right about that. Indeed, Cameron et al (2011) in an article resulting from Social Polis, use the theory on welfare regimes to explain the differences between housing systems in Europe. For these reasons, I've decided to make housing and education sub-areas in the area of welfare regimes. This means that the theory on welfare regimes and the developments of it will become quite important in our project. Therefore, I will start to summarise it.

The theory on welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990) usually distinguishes between three types. The main difference between the types depends on where the principal responsibility lies regarding the management of risks; insurance/family, market or state. In the conservative regime, also called Central European because it has dominated in the central European countries like Germany, Austria and France, economic security is built on a mix of insurance and family. The principle is that unemployment compensation has to be earned, either through payments to insurance or housework. Compensation levels can therefore vary widely. The regime also rewards long-term employees and well-paid men with home-working wives. Single people, especially women and young people have it much more difficult.

In Britain, another welfare regime dominates, called liberal or Anglo-Saxon. This regime implies primarily a reliance on market solutions. The labour market is deregulated and the welfare state designed to create a basic security. The support from the welfare state is minimal, usually means-tested and therefore also predominantly selective, as opposed to general. The same compensation is paid to all, regardless of previous income.

In Sweden, a welfare regime called social democratic or Nordic has dominated. In this regime, the state is primarily responsible for creating economic security. Unemployment benefits are linked to previous income. The benefits are not means-tested and welfare provision could therefore be characterised as general. Financing is secured by taxes, not insurance. The Nordic regime can therefore be said to have the citizen as a base, not the family as in the conservative regime or the individual as in the liberal one.

The theory on welfare regimes have been debated and elaborated over the years, for example in Sykes R, Palier B and Prior P M (eds) (2001) where a fourth type is analysed, prevailing in southern Europe. Also a fifth type has been identified. The theory has been criticised by for example Bob Jessop (2002: 68) who yet retain the concept of welfare regime but “emphasizes how welfare regimes are structurally coupled with modes of economic growth (including their insertion into the international division of labour) and more encompassing modes of regulation”. As such, welfare regimes belong to the “normal” and do not exist only to manage risks. That paves the way for including for example housing and education in the analysis.

Thus, a theory on welfare regimes still has something important to say. Among else, a recent book by Morel N, Palier B and Palme J (eds) (2012) has convinced me about that. Also, the WILCO project uses the theory in a constructive way. However, as Andreotti A, Mingione E and Polizzi E (2012: 1926) contend, “the current configuration of many welfare systems (Esping-Andersen, 1990) can no longer be seen only in terms of the national system, but must also be seen as a mix of central and sub-national policies, where the term ‘sub-national’ stands for government bodies at a lower territorial level than the central government— i.e. counties, regions, municipalities, provinces, comunidades, etc.”

As a response to this development the concept of the local welfare system (LWS) has been launched (2012: 1926), defined by the authors as “not fixed and stable structures, but dynamic processes in which the specific local socioeconomic and cultural conditions give rise to: different arrangements of formal and informal actors, public or not, involved in designing and implementing welfare policies; and different profiles of people in need.” Does this mean that the so-called third sector or civil society is in the process of replacing the public sector in local welfare production? In that case on what conditions and with what consequences for the situation of young people?

As the Brno team clarifies, post-communist welfare states in general don’t really fit into the pattern of welfare regimes. Then, please present your own understanding. How is capitalism regulated? How are risks managed? What about the responsibility of the state, family, market or civil society? Are there any other patterns, similar to welfare regimes? Does a welfare regime exist at least to some extent? Or should it be conceived of as a hybrid? Would the concept of emergency welfare states be more appropriate?

5.2.1. Access to social income, social and health services

Please use the indicators below, have a look at the figures in the reference and try to find the corresponding ones at the city level. How do you want us to understand them? What do they tell us? Please, present your reflections and interpretations. Make your in-depth analysis of the position of young people.

6.	4.1. At-risk-of- poverty or exclusion rate 4.1.2. For young people (18-24) compared to total population Definition: The share of young people (18-24) who are at risk of poverty and/or severely materially deprived and/or living in a household with very low work intensity compared to total population. Source: Eurostat EU SILC. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 48)
7.	4.2. At-risk-of poverty rate 4.2.2. For young people (18-24) compared to total population Definition: The share of young people (18-24) living in families with an equivalised disposable income below 60 % of the national median equivalised disposable income (after social transfers) compared to total population. Source: Eurostat EU SILC. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 50)

8.	4.3. Severe material deprivation rate 4.3.2. For young people (18-24) compared to total population Definition: percentage of the population that cannot afford at least three of the following nine items: 1) to pay their rent, mortgage or utility bills; 2) to keep their home adequately warm; 3) to face unexpected expenses; 4) to eat meat or proteins regularly; 5) to go on holiday; or cannot afford to buy a: 6) TV 7) Refrigerator, 8) Car, 9) Telephone; compared to total population. Source: Eurostat EU SILC. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 51)

We want you to make it understandable for us why the young people are affected by the inequality indicated above. We want you to make the causes of inequality understandable. To do this, you need to present the wider context of the welfare regime. What kind of welfare regime is it and what kind of causes (structural determinants, generative mechanisms) of inequality does it contain? On what conditions do young people get access to unemployment benefits? Access to health care services? Access to social work (counselling, day care, prevention, activation, empowerment, providers)? Access to emergency social services? What are the policy support and response to the symptoms and causes of inequality, indicated above?

5.2.2. Housing

You need to describe your housing system briefly and explain how it may cause inequality, in particular regarding young people. For example, what tenures exist and what is the composition of them in your city? Use the indicators you find appropriate. In addition, please use the indicator below, have a look at the figures in the reference and try to find the corresponding ones at the city level. How do you want us to understand them? What do they tell us? Please, present your reflections and interpretations. Make your in-depth analysis of the position of young people.

9.	0.4. Mean age of young people leaving the parental household Definition: Mean age of young people leaving home. Source: Eurostat EU LFS. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 47)

We want you to make it understandable for us why the young people are affected by inequality in the housing area. We want you to make the causes of inequality understandable. To do this, you need to present the wider context of the housing system.

What are the policy support and response to the symptoms and causes of inequality? For example, what support exists to homeless youth? What services are provided at local level by the city, NGOs, counselling, short-term housing, shelters, crisis centres, social benefits to cover housing expenditures etc?

5.2.3. Education and training

You need to describe your education system briefly and explain how it may cause inequality. Please use the indicators below, have a look at the figures in the reference and try to find the corresponding ones at the city level. How do you want us to understand them? What do they tell us? Please, present your reflections and interpretations. Make your in-depth analysis of the position of young people.

10.	1.1. Early leavers from education and training Definition: % of the population aged 18-24 with at most lower secondary education and who is no longer in education or training. EU target: Less than 10 % by 2020. Source: Eurostat EU LFS. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 38)
11.	1.4. Young people (20-24) having completed at least upper secondary education Definition: Percentage of young people aged 20-24 having completed at least upper secondary education (ISCED level 3c) Source: Eurostat EU LFS. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 36)
12.	4.6. Young people not in employment, education or training (NEET) Young people not in employment, education or training (NEET) Definition: Young people (age group 15-24 not in employment, nor in any education or training. Source: Eurostat LFS.

We want you to make it understandable for us why the young people are affected by inequality in education and training. We want you to make the causes of inequality understandable. To do this, you need to present the wider context of the educational system. What kind of educational system is it and what causes (structural determinants, generative mechanisms) of inequality does it contain? What opportunities exist for young people at the local level?

What are the policy support and response to the symptoms and causes of inequality? For example, what is the response to drop-outs (work with the family, binding social benefits to school attendance etc).

5.3. Power, democracy, citizenship and civil participation

In another article resulting from Social Polis, Eizaguirre et al (2012: 2000) claims that “the basic identification of labour markets with nation-states no longer holds in global labour markets: individuals and groups have to search for a new sense of belonging different from national labour market participation”. Furthermore, this challenges the notion of social citizenship based on national contracts and redistributive policies. The principle of social justice has now increasingly been replaced by the objective of social cohesion, the authors claim, articulated at different levels ranging from the nation-state to the neighbourhood. As the authors conclude, “this substitution weakens the character of citizenship as a process in which political tensions and conflicts are negotiated in societies”.

Please bear this in mind and use the indicators below, have a look at the figures in the reference and try to find the corresponding ones at the city level. How do you want us to understand them? What do they tell us? Please, present your reflections and interpretations. Make your in-depth analysis of the position of young people. In comparison with the previous draft, I’ve added “civil participation” in the title, suggested by the Cracow team as it makes it justified to include participation in culture and sports in the scope of the analysis. The Cracow team underlines the consistency of this with the inequality of opportunities approach promoted by Amartya Sen.

13.	6.1. Young people's participation in political organisations/party or community/environmentally-oriented organisations Definition: Self-reported participation in activities of a political organisation or political party or a local organisation aimed at improving their local community and/or local environment in the last 12 months. Age 15-30. Source: DG EAC Flash Eurobarometer on youth. Reference: European Commission (2012a: 81)
14.	6.2. Participation of young people in political elections at local, regional, national or EU level Definition: Percentage of young people aged 18-30 who declare that they participated in political elections at either local, regional, national or EU level in the last three years. Source: DG EAC Flash Eurobarometer on youth.

	Reference: European Commission (2012a: 77)

We want you to make it understandable for us why the young people are affected by inequality with regard to power. We want you to make the causes of inequality understandable. To do this, you need to present the wider context of the government/governance structures. What causes (structural determinants, generative mechanisms) of inequality do these structures contain? What are the policy support and response to the symptoms and causes of inequality regarding power?

6. Outline of the ten reports

In the preparation of this report, I've had a look at the WILCO project to see what we can learn. The WILCO project, funded by the European Commission (FP7, Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities), is presented at the web page as a "project aiming to examine, through cross-national comparative research, how local welfare systems favour social cohesion". Here, I won't go into any details on the project but just review their way of organizing the reports to find out what we can learn. They have published "National reports on local welfare systems focused on housing, employment and child care". This is how they describe the rationale:

> *The country reports describe the background for our later research. The project focuses on local welfare. However, national welfare systems vary strongly and it is necessary to clarify this historical background against which our analysis of the macro, meso and micro levels within cities will be set. In the country reports, we describe the historical-institutional background on the basis of two dimensions, the structure of the overall welfare state and the degree of centralisation within the structure of the welfare state and the position of 'the local' in shaping welfare. Second, we have made an inventory of variables that must be regarded as formal pre-conditions for local welfare policies and initiatives. These variables include key regulations, financial provisions, contractual arrangements and entitlements. We have specified these variables for the three policy fields of child care, employment and housing.*

Ten such country reports have been written. They are divided into four sections: General background, Housing, Employment and Child care. What can we learn from this? Let me make some observations on the basis of a comparison between the focus of WILCO and CITISPYCE. The two projects are similar in the sense that they both deal with innovations. According to the statement quoted above, the focus of WILCO is on local welfare. CITISPYCE has a more narrow focus. On the basis of my previous analysis, I suggest that we describe it as the symptoms and causes of inequality affecting young people, combatted through innovative social practices of and for young people.

For these reasons, we don’t need to cover as much as WILCO does and we should avoid doing it because then we would run the risk of blurring our focus. Instead, we should be careful to maintain our focus sharp. Just as WILCO, we need to describe the “the structure of the overall welfare state and the degree of centralisation within the structure of the welfare state and the position of ‘the local’ in shaping welfare”. However, we don’t need to specify the formal pre-conditions for local welfare policies and initiatives to the degree that WILCO does.

Besides the country reports, a total of 20 European cities have been studied in depth in the framework of WILCO. These reports also have a common template, consisting of four sections: Transformations in the labour market, Demographic changes, Immigration and Housing. The reports contain a lot of important information and they could be very useful for us. However, the template has been designed on the basis of the focus of WILCO. For that reason and from our perspective, I think it contains some abundance of information and our reports should keep a sharper focus. We need to remind ourselves of ST7, to “ensure focus on interpretations of inequalities and young people (16 – 24) and innovation in the social field”.

I want the reports to be divided in three chapters, explained below. Roughly, the proportions between the three chapters should correspond to 20-70-10. The reports should try to incorporate and at least show an awareness of the following transversal topics:

- The European context of increasing divisions and austerity.
- The EU response to the crisis, in particular regarding young people.
- Key socio-demographic features as age, class, gender and origin/ethnicity.

6.1. The city – a presentation

Here I want you to present your city, its demography (socio-demographics, age groups, gender, ethnicity etc), position in the country, historical background, culture (historical and cultural understanding is included in the call fiche). Regarding statistics, there are of course differences between the cities and nations. Please, try to use the statistics defined at the EU level and make sure that you include definitions or references to definitions.

6.2. Inequality in the cities and the response to it

Here I want you to write about the symptoms and causes of inequality in the five areas as well as the policy support and response to it. The cities should be understood in their national contexts, which probably mean that you will have to start with the national context and then clarify how the causes operate in your city. I don’t intend to impose a template on you as I want you to make sure that you cover the intersections. As long as you deal with all the indicators, makes the causes understandable and identify the extent to which "policies register the inequalities and show evidence of a changing structural response", I will be pleased and you can choose which outline you like.

Please include some explanation on who is considered young in the country/city and why. Although this project focuses on people 16-24, statistics as well as youth policies may consider different age bands in different countries. Therefore, it could be interesting to provide some reflections on this for the national/city context. An interesting point made by the Birmingham team concerns current government measures of deprivation. "There needs to be some discussion about the models used by governments for measuring deprivation in each country. For example, in the UK the move from absolute to relative measures and deprivation indices etc."

Some partners have asked me about the time frame. For some indicators above, I mention years and for others I don't. This is just because I've copied them in from the references. In one reference, two years are covered and in others just one year. It's certainly a good suggestion to streamline this. Thus, if possible and accessible, use data from both before the crisis (perhaps 2007) and recently.

6.3. Life for young people in the city

In a final section, I want you to make a more qualitative assessment of your city. You can use the results from the previous sections but also add some new facts, impressions, experiences etc. Don't be too subjective, but rather reflective on the empirical results from the previous sections. Where is your city heading? How is the mood in your city? How is it to live for young people in your city today? As the Athens team states in a framework for their report which they sent to me, "this will be a qualitative assessment, involving a highly reflective analysis, where the above data, general information and experiences stated in the report will be constantly discussed among the members of our research team and validated by young people living in Athens." This sentence captures the essence of the chapter very well and it's certainly a good idea to ask young people to validate it.

7. Formalities and deadlines

As I see my role, I will do my best to support and help you but I will also put pressure on you if you don't keep the deadlines or meet the required standard. The report should be written in a normal academic style and include references. Please, feel free to put in a lot of references to make it possible to know more for those who want to. To facilitate comparisons everyone should use the Harvard reference style.[4] The report should have the size of a normal academic article. That means 6-8.000 words and at a maximum 10.000 words. The report should use the same format as this report, which complies with the editorial guidelines, issued by the scientific coordinator.

[4] Available at: http://www.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/SAGE_Harvard_reference_style.pdf (accessed 14 March 2013)

The reports should aspire to combine excellence and relevance, maintained by for example European Commission (2009). Therefore, it’s important that the reports reflect the experience and knowledge of the practitioners involved in Citispyce. The report shouldn’t be written by the researchers in their isolation but the practitioners must be given the opportunity to contribute, comment and influence (where there are practitioners involved). The researchers have to take advantage of the experience-based knowledge of the practitioners.

The deadline is set to 2 June but for those of you who keep me regularly updated and calm, the deadline will be extended to one week later, 9 June. Everybody should then have the opportunity and also feel the obligation, hopefully, to comment on each other’s reports. I’m sure that there will be a lot of good points and ideas in the individual reports. For that reason, I hope that we could learn from each other and perhaps incorporate some good ideas from others in our own reports to make the reports more comparable. At the next meeting, there will be a session on the D2.2 reports. On the basis of comments from me and partners as well as the discussions at the next meeting, the authors will have to finalise their reports and submit them to me, on 1 August at the latest.

- 20/3: First version of the WP2 Strategy report circulated to the partners. The WP2 Strategy report is read and commented by the partners at the same time as they start to work on their own reports.
- 3/4: Deadline for partners sending comments to me on the WP2 Strategy report. Please, be as precise and clear as possible.
- 11/4: Final version of the WP2 Strategy report circulated to the partners.
- 2/6: Deadline for a next-to-final version of the reports for those partners who haven’t kept me regularly updated and calm.
- 9/6: Deadline for a next-to-final version of the reports for those partners who have kept me regularly updated and calm.
- 1/8: Deadline for the final version of the reports.

8. Final comparative report

I will return to this later.

References

Andreotti A, Mingione E and Polizzi E (2012) Local Welfare Systems: A Challenge for Social Cohesion. *Urban Studies* Vol. 49, No. 9

Becker J and Jäger J (2011) European Integration in Crisis: the Centre-Periphery Divide. Paper presented at the 17th Euromemo Workshop on Alternative Economic Politicy. Avaliable at: http://www2.euromemorandum.eu/uploads/ws5_becker_jaeger_european_integration_in_crisis._the_centre_periphery_divide.pdf (accessed 11 March 2013).

Becker J and Weissenbacher R (2012) Berlin Consensus and Disintegration. Monetary Regime and Uneven Development in the EU. Paper presented at the 18th Euromemo Workshop on Alternative Economic. Available at: http://www2.euromemorandum.eu/uploads/becker_weissenbacher_berlin_consensus_and_disintegration.pdf (accessed 10 March 2013).

Brookes N, Kendall, J and Mitton L (2012) City Report: Birmingham (WILCO project). . Available at: http://www.wilcoproject.eu/public/assets/img/uploads/WILCO_WP3_Birmingham_17.pdf (accessed 11 March 2013)

Cameron S, Gilroy R and Miciukiewicz K (2011) Social cohesion in housing and neighbourhood research in Europe. Available at: http://www.socialpolis.eu/fields-themes/housing-neighbourhood-and-health/ (accessed 12 March 2013).

Ecorys (2011) Assessing practices for using indicators in fields related to youth. . Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/news/study-on-the-uses-of-youth-indicators_en.htm (accessed 14 March 2013)

Eizaguirre S, Pradel M, Terrones A, Martinez-Celorrio X and García M (2012) Multilevel Governance and Social Cohesion: Bringing Back Conflict in Citizenship Practices. *Urban Studies* Vol. 49, No. 9

Esping-Andersen, Gösta (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Esping-Andersen, Gösta (1999) *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Eurofound (2012) *NEETs – Young people not in employment, education or training: Characteristics, costs and policy responses in Europe.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Available at: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef1254.htm (accessed 10 March 2013).

EuroMemorandum (2010/2011) Confronting the Crisis: Austerity or Solidarity. . Available at: http://www.euromemo.eu/euromemorandum/euromemorandum_2012/index.html (accessed 11 March 2013)

EuroMemorandum (2011) European integration at the crossroads: Democratic deepening for stability, solidarity and social justice. . Available at: http://www.euromemo.eu/euromemorandum/euromemorandum_2012/index.html (accessed 11 March 2013)

EuroMemorandum (2012) The deepening crisis in the European Union: The need for a fundamental change. . Available at: http://www.euromemo.eu/euromemorandum/euromemorandum_2013/index.html (accessed 11 March 2013)

European Commission (2008) Industrial relations in Europe 2008. European Commission (Employment and social affairs) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?type=0&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=IRIE&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en (accessed 12 March 2013).

European Commission (2009) Challenging Futures of Science in Society – Emerging Trends and cutting-edge issues. Report of the MASIS Expert Group setup by the European Commission. Available at: ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/sis/docs/sis_masis_report_en.pdf (accessed 13 March 2013)

European Commission (2011) Commission staff working document. On EU indicators in the field of youth. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/evidence-based_en.htm (accessed 14 March 2013)

European Commission (2012a) EU Youth Report. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/eu_youth_report_en.htm (accessed 10 March 2013).

European Commission (2012b) *Employment and Social Developments in Europe*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

European Commission (2012c) National Youth Reports 2012. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/national_reports_2012.htm (accessed 11 March 2013)

Jessop, Bob (2002) *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Morel N, Palier B and Palme J (eds) (2012) *Towards a social investment welfare state? : ideas, policies and challenges*. Bristol: Policy

OECD (2011) *Divided we stand - why inequality keeps rising*. OECD: OECD Publishing

Pratschke J and Morlicchio E (2012) Social Polarisation, the Labour Market and Economic Restructuring in Europe: An Urban Perspective. *Urban Studies* 49(9) 1891–1907

Sykes R, Palier B and Prior P M (eds) (2001) *Globalization and European Welfare States*. China: Palgrave

WILCO (2012) Welfare innovations at the local level in favour of cohesion. Available at: http://www.wilcoproject.eu/ (accessed 13 March 2013)

World Health Organization (2008) *Closing the gap in a generation : health equity through action on the social determinants of health : final report of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization