KATARSIS
Plenary Workshop 6 on Methodology Development

National Technical University of Athens
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Patission 42
Athens

Present: Diana MacCallum, Jean Hillier, Frank Moulaert, Stuart Cameron (UNEW), Serena Vicari, Chiara Tornaghi (UNIMIB), Derrick Purdue (UWE), Isabel André, Alexandre Abreu, Patricia Rego, André Carmo (CEG-UL), Andreas Novy, Barbara Beinstein (SRE), Santiago Eizaguirre, Marisol Garcia, Marc Pradel (UB), Bas Tierolf (Verwey-Jonker), Blank Plavova (MU-Brno), Dimitra Siatitsa, Maria Mantouvalou, Louis Wassenhoven, Maria Mavridou, Haris Konstatatos (NTUA), Abdelillah Hamdouch (CNRS), Len Arthur (UWIC), Marthe Nyssens (CERISIS-UCL), Denis Harrisson (CRISES-UQAM), John Andersen, John Ploger (RUC), Laurent Fraisse (CRIDA), Nola Kunnen (Curtin, Western Australia), Stijn Oosterlynck (KU-Leuven, Belgium), Pasquale De Muro (U. Roma, Italy), Michael Edwards (UCL, UK), Jim Segers (City Mine(d), Belgium/UK), Andrea Membretti (U. Pavia, Italy), Marica Frangakis (morning Day 1 only) (Nicos Poulantzas Institute, Greece).

Apologies: Judy Orme (UWE) , Dina Vaiou (NTUA), Tomaš Sirovàtka, Jiři Winkler (MU-Brno), Molly Scott Cato (UWIC), Juan-Luis Klein (CRISES-UQAM), Ine Pisters (RG), Matteo Scaramella (Abaton), Ine Pisters (RG)

Thursday 5 June

0930   Welcome

Louis Wassenhoven (NTUA) welcomed participants to Athens. Professor Wassenhoven was standing in for the NTUA team leader, Dina Vaiou, who was not well enough to attend.

All participants joined Prof. Wassenhoven in wishing Dina well.

Jean Hillier outlined the program for the workshop.

0945   KATARSIS state of the art until now (Chair: Jean Hillier)

Dimitra Siatitsa: Progress Report on WP2 (see presentation here)

Marisol Garcia: Progress Report on WP3 (see presentation here)

Frank Moulaert: Progress Report on WP4

The WP2 and WP3 reports have been completed in draft form, and are under review in consultation with the coordination team. Both are expected to be complete by the delivery date of July 2008.

Drafting of the WP4 report is being coordinated by Serena Vicari and Frank Moulaert; the report includes contributions from several partners in order to cover its range of theoretical influences. Therefore, final delivery is likely to be delayed.

Denis Harrisson: discussion (see summary here)

General discussion:

Abdelillah Hamdouch (to Marisol, on WP3): suggest that the opposition between centralised/decentralised governance should not be as sharp as the diagram implies. In France the situation is more intermediate. Also note that AFIP as an organisation is very active and strategic in exploiting openings to promote new ideas.

Marisol: Using existing networks to promote new ones

Abdel: yes.

John Andersen (to Marisol, on WP3): about the distinction between strong/weak and top-down/bottom-up strategies – some governance regimes make certain types of networks easier. For example in Denmark bottom-*linked* strategies are supported. Suggest reference to Michael Woolcock – bridging/bonding social capital.

Len Arthur (on WP4):
- would it be useful to introduce a distinction in the dimensions of social innovation between social change and incorporation? This is an

important tension which afflicts many socially creative strategies; attention to this might help in understanding success. Denis Harrisson's 'future scenarios' touched on this tension – does the wide dissemination of an innovation imply its institutionalisation? If so, does this imply a form of incorporation rather than social change?

- Suggested reference: *The Dynamics of Contention* (McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly)

Jean Hillier: is this tension similar to that between informal and formal strategies? Often incorporation (in the legal sense) is necessary for projects to access funding.

Isabel Andre (to Abdel and Marisol, on WP3): Networks are indeed crucial, they link small scale initiatives with global institutions. Many local projects rely on support of big mainstream foundations, for instance. They manage this through *personal* networks.

Andreas Novy: complemented the Barcelona team on a very nice presentation and a systematic analysis. The tables are very useful, but tables always have a tendency to be incomplete. Relations and scale require a more fluid, complex theoretical understanding, but how to present this in 2 dimensions? Practitioners often call for this, it is a tension we need to think about further.

Jean Hillier: tables are always necessarily reductionist, but still helpful!

Abdel Hamdouch (to Denis): To add to the '3 futures', another one: incorporation by the private sector (let the NGOs be innovative, then we can appropriate the actions we like)!

Jean: As in 'corporate social responsibility'!

Denis: But is this still social innovation? Surely it becomes more instrumental in its nature, less about empowerment,

Abdel: yes it can still be social innovation. AFIP shows this – its methods are upgraded when taken on by the private sector, they don't lose their innovative character.

Stuart Cameron: A useful concept to think about might be *universalism*. Social innovation might often be particularistic – how can it become universal in its impact on society (and thus effect societal change)?

John Pløger: We need to distinguish between social innovation goals and toolboxes. Perhaps it's the latter we should define, as some groups are just looking for thinking about social innovation, because people we heard from want to change an improvement in their 'life-style' own lifestyle (rather than changing to change society).

Frank Moulaert: That sounds like a good goal to me.

Isabel André: EQUAL is a good example of how social innovations can be appropriated by public institutions to generate new and better ways of policy delivery. Can NGOs do this?

Marthe Nyssens: These theoretical debates need to be put in context. In North America, the debates on social/ethical enterpreneurship draw on the concept of social innovation much more than in the EU, where a more institutionalist view of diffusion is more common. But then the meaning of social innovation is quite different from the one that is used in EU or which we use. In the European context, the process of institutionalization of the social enterprises has often been closely linked to the evolution of public policies. In the States, social innovation is expected to expand through the growth of the enterprise itself

Marica Frangakis:
- We could liken the process of incorporation to what happens within political parties – where good initiatives are taken up as policy, autonomy is compromised.
- It would be very interesting to consider the effects of voting systems (eg majoritarian vs proportional, party systems)

Stuart Cameron (to Marisol, on WP3): about the use of state regime models. In WP1.3 it became clear that welfare regimes are changing, and that this has important implications for how governance creates space for social innovation (e.g. in Sweden and UK). Suggest that more thought needs to be given to regime trajectories, rather than relying on a static typology.

Frank Moulaert: This should be the subject of a paper for the Vienna conference.

Andreas Novy (on Denis' 'possible futures'): we should stop using the word 'dissemination' – it implies a linear/one-way process of knowledge production – dissemination – use which is wrong. I prefer 'knowledge sharing' or 'knowledge exchange'.

Abdel Hamdouch: or 'diffusion' or 'cross-learning'.

Nola Kunnen: Thank you. Indeed the exchange is not linear or one way. In Australia, community-based actors are important players in influencing government thinking – and indeed academic thinking. I like 'dialogue'.

Jean Hillier: We seem to be coming around to a relational view.

Frank Moulaert: From a practical point of view, we need to keep using the words 'dissemination/valorisation' because the Commission demands this. We can adopt a broader view on sharing and learning, but keep a place for these activities.

Jean Hillier: This is ironic in the context of a discussion about how local groups can influence policy.

Frank Moulaert: It is a small concession to make. Disseminating our products does not preclude dialogue.

Denis Harrisson: On the broader issue, I agree with Andreas, and CRISES promotes partnership research based on two-way dialogue. My use of dissemination referred to the spread of social innovations through society – this can happen in many different ways. In general, looking at the circulation of ideas/knowledge through society is a weak aspect of social innovation research to date.

Len Arthur: Are there overlaps with the Demologos project here? WP3 suggests that governance context has a big influence on the cases – Demologos tries to tackle this complexity, but this makes it harder to understand. In sum: if context is full of tensions, and this means that social innovation is highly contingent, are social actors understanding and/or using this?

Jean Hillier: Context conditions *opportunity*.

Jean Hillier: Requested Jim Segers' views on dissemination, as a non-academic user.

Jim Segers: Dissemination/expansion is very important to the way City Mine(d) operates – it has expanded from one city to three, in which the institutional contexts are very different. This gives us some protection from local contingencies (e.g. the disappearance of both public and private funding sources in London due to the Olympics and the credit crunch). Thus, we can use this buffer to nurture smaller local projects whose resources are fixed.

Jean Hillier: Why incorporate?

Jim Segers: Incorporation (in the legal sense) allows the organisation to employ full time staff – as Dimitra said (WP2), professionalisation is important to achieving our mission. Otherwise, there is no continuity.

Frank Moulaert (replying to Len): Demologos was about socio-economic development in space; its particular contribution was a theoretical/metatheoretical synthesis. An important aspect of this was the role of social agents, in the context of the constraints and opportunities that institutional dynamics imply. The methodology we developed allows analysis of social innovation and change processes in recognition of both path dependency (context) and innovative agency. Some case-studies addressed how to create alternative actions/futures, counter-hegemonic discourses.

Andreas Novy: Experimentation is important here, and generally requires public funding. This is a political question.

Marica Frangakis: Success often involves compromise.

Jean Hillier: Asked for further comments. Receiving none, she summed up the key issues to come out of the discussion:

- The role of state, civil society and private actors in social innovation
- The pros and cons of incorporation [n.b. incorporation in the legal sense has advantages and disadvantages to non-government organisations. 'Incorporation' can also refer to a process which empowers actors by including them within the status quo (appropriating their will?), rather than by changing society]
- The importance of personal qualities and networks of innovators.
- Non-linearity – trajectories of change, circulation of knowledge.

Jean thanked all participants and the session was closed at 1110.

1110   Coffee and tea break

1200   Session 1: The role of theory and metatheory in social innovation analysis (Chair: Andreas Novy)

Frank Moulaert, Diana MacCallum and Jean Hillier: Social Innovation: a scientific reflection on the role of theory (presented by Frank Moulaert – see presentation here)

This presentation was incomplete at this stage due to time.

Serena Vicari and Chiara Tornaghi: A transversal reading of social innovation across existential fields: questions to the methodologists (working notes towards WP4 and WP5) (see presentation here)

Stijn Oosterlynck: discussion (see summary here)

General discussion:

Len Arthur:
- suggested that the literature on social movements covered many similar issues – why haven't we engaged with this literature?
- Also, the idea of structuration (Giddens) seems to be missing from the conversation as a way of dealing with the agency/structure duality. Nikos Mouzelis is a good reference as someone who has moved the structuration theory forward – could help with the social innovation theoretical project.

Andreas Novy: The mobilisation of agency is a very important part of Frank's project.

Abdel Hamdouch (to Serena and Chiara): Something is missing in the education analysis. How does different organisation of a service lead to new norms, connect with governance? The 2 models are good, but suggest adding another level which involves new ways of seeing the role of education itself.

Jean Hillier: We need to clarify how we are using 'institutional theory', as people are using it in different ways – as a theory of organisations, or as a sociological concept.

Diana MacCallum: To return to this morning's discussion, this also applies to the word 'incorporation'!

Pasquale De Muro (to Frank):
- How to reconcile the Deleuzean approach with the need for practical implementation?
- Can see a common 'spirit' through the IAD, Deleuze, ABCD approaches, but they are theoretically inconsistent.
- Concerned about the use of the term 'assets', which refers to property owned, representing a 'having' dimension – a legacy of fetishism? We need to focus on 'doing' (creating, loving, working, participating) and 'being' (knowledgeable, equal, free) dimensions.
- Concerned about the treatment of 'needs', which implies a 'patient' view and isn't consistent with a focus on agency. We should focus on people capacity to take action to achieve objectives.

Frank Moulaert: IAD does not adopt a passive view of actors *revealing* of their needs.

Pasquale De Muro: I will raise the issue of how we conceptualise needs, rights and assets later.

Jean Hillier: An asset is something that is owned. The Deleuzean focus is not on what it *is*, but on how it *works*.

Nola Kunnen: The point is taken, but it remains important to identify 'assets' as things that are present in the community and can be used – we need to map assets in order to make them known and usable, to support agency. The Fetish critique is dubious, but worth exploring further.

Michael Edwards: I have a similar concern about the word 'capital' (as in 'social capital').

Andreas Novy: invited Serena and Chiara to respond.

Serena Vicari: A good point about normalisation/generalisation – we will incorporate this into our interpretation. The structure of associations is an important variable which should be related to state regimes. However, we don't have enough information to properly understand civil society in this (national/regional) context.

Marica Frangakis: Suggest that the passive/active distinction is a dangerous one – it supports oppressive discourses used by the EU.

Andreas Novy: Suggested that the discussion needs to continue, and that Frank's presentation should be completed – how about shortening the lunch break to provide another hour of time?

All agreed. The session was broken at 1330.

1330   Lunch

1445   Session 1 (continued)

Frank Moulaert: resumed and completed the presentation started earlier (Social
            Innovation: a scientific reflection on the role of theory). The presentation is
            a work in progress, a basis for a first draft of the WP5 paper.

General discussion

John Andersen: Is there a place for critique of theories that support
            dominating/oppressive projects in society?

Frank Moulaert: Indirectly, yes. The important thing about the SOK (Sociology of
            Knowledge) approach is that it uncovers and contextualises 'hidden'
            attitudes towards capitalism and society and, thus, provides a basis for
            challenge. It helps us to *integrate* a critique of the mainstream into our
            analysis.

Len Arthur: Would it help to separate different levels of analysis? That is, distinguish
            theory as a heuristic tool (i.e. as a conceptual framework) and theory as
            explanation. This is a slightly different distinction than that between
            metatheory and theory. The heuristic tool helps us to develop theoretical
            questions – it comes between the aims and the analysis (cf. Pearce on
            'conceptual pragmatism').

Frank Moulaert: I will deal with this question tomorrow in my presentation on
            holistic method. Metatheory provides a conceptual framework to look at
            theory making as a social activity in particular contexts.

Len Arthur: But the distinction I suggest is at the level of theory – there is a heuristic
            stage before the analysis itself – a way of ensuring that we ask the right
            questions. One key problem that Weber identified with social science is the
            reconciliation of politics, norms, social purpose etc with scientific methods.
            There is no answer, but only a need to be open and honest about
            presuppositions.

Frank Moulaert: SOK goes beyond this – it looks as science as a practice, and helps to
            show how certain approaches become dominant in certain contexts.

Len Arthur: Okay.

Serena Vicari: Our analysis of forms of social innovation was an inductive process in
            order to develop a heuristic device. We don't want to reify theoretical
            concepts – the process is a pragmatic construction of knowledge.

Frank Moulaert: With social progress in mind. But theory is missing from this
            inductive process.

Serena Vicari: Because it is not there in the material. But we need the empirical work
            to develop the theory.

Frank Moulaert: This implies that there is no **one** scientific way to look at the dynamics of social change.

Serena Vicari: Of course.

Andreas Novy: Our way of knowledge production is a circular process in which analysis abstracts from and enriches empirical observations, and is in turn challenged/enriched by feedback from those with empirical experience – this would lead to a more robust kind of theory. But this circularity is not built into the Katarsis programme.

Frank Moulaert: Your paper for Vienna should raise this issue.

Abdel Hamdouch:
- Standard methodology is to work from cases/data → hypotheses → abstraction → thinking about the invisible forces. An alternative is to start with both theory and data. Are we building a new methodology?
- What are the links between the different theories you present? Why do we need to find these links?

Frank Moulaert: The SOK approach reveals more commonality between these approaches that I suspected.

Abdel Hamdouch: It needs to be connected to Serena's/Chiara's analysis of the cases.

Frank Moulaert: We should show the complementarity between the two approaches, but not integrate them.

Andreas Novy: We will return to this discussion tomorrow.

Session 1 closed at 1530.

1530   Session 2 Case-study methodology in social innovation research (Chair: Marisol Garcia)

Dina Vaiou, Dimitra Siatitsa and Haris Konstantatos: Qualitative approaches for the study of bottom-up innovative initiatives in diverse (socio-economic) contexts: the experience of Katarsis WP2 (presented by Dimitra Siatitsa and Haris Konstantatos – see presentation here)

Marthe Nyssens: Social economy research and methodology: the case of the European research on work integration social enterprise (see presentation here)

1630-1700 coffee break

1700 Session 2 (continued)

Pasquale de Muro: Discussion: Five years after SINGOCOM (see summary here)

General discussion:

Marisol Garcia: What term could be used instead of social capital?

Pasquale de Muro: Could say social relations.

Len Arthur: Frank mentions emancipation and power, do the two case studies provide means of anchoring these? Refers to work by Ben Fine who analysed social capital and suggests that this often involves misuse of Bourdieu, involving economic colonisation of sociological lifeworld. Bourdieu identified social capital as just one source of social power. Fine points back to the sociological origins of the concept.

Abdel Hamdouch:
- Agrees that comparative analysis is useful
- Suggested that there is a problem with always going back to redefine concepts, in contrast to neo-liberalism which keeps its concepts simple. Suggests we should not abandon concepts like social capital but just explain them.

Marthe Nyssens:
- Agrees with Pasquale's point on social capital
- Space was not an aspect of her research project
- Essential feature of social enterprise is that they are not-for-profit organisations

Haris Konstantatos:
- The texts compared by Pasquale are actually different in scope.
- Suggests that in policy circles the term social capital is emerging and could be seen as a victory for the social economy movement.

Michael Edwards: Concept of non-profit is difficult. In fact it usually means non profit distributing. It is a slippery concept, for example in the UK, housing associations are non-profit organisations in this sense but large and commercial. Similarly, co-operatives make and distribute profits to members.

Pasquale's responses:
- To Abdel – just wants to stress implications of using social capital, that it is reducing human life to a form of capital, reversing means and ends of human life.
- To Marthe – What distinguishes social enterprise is not goals but priorities. For example, private firms like Nike may have activities with social objectives but their priority is profit, not social goals.
- To Haris – suggests that in civil society context, you should explain the implications of using terms such as social capital.

Alexandre Abreu: Agrees that we should not use term social capital but wants a more radical critique, not ethical but theoretical. This is because social relations are not a form of capital even if they are used in production. An essential feature of capital in capitalism is its accumulation.

Laurent Fraisse: Asks whether we should give up analytically-useful concept for ethical reasons. The problem arises from the colonisation of terms, and the same occurs with social innovation.

Andreas Novy: In WP1.5 Governance the question was posed as to whether social enterprise contributes to empowering people. One aspect is its re-appropriation of the idea of socially and ecologically-useful labour

Stijn Oosterlynck: As long as capital is treated as a social relation the term social capital is OK

Stuart Cameron: Suggested that social enterprise can relate to space, or perhaps more precisely to place. In the UK, the concept of community business has been used to describe social enterprises operating in specific disadvantaged neighbourhoods and meeting the needs of those neighbourhoods.

Marthe Nyssens: Around 10 years ago there was a debate about whether we need the concept of social enterprise. Suggested that users favoured this term as it puts the activity closer to the market. Suggests it links UK concept of third sector and French social economy – it is actually the same as social economy

Alexandre Abreu: Reply to Stijn. Social relations which form capital involve accumulation and social capital does not involve this.

Pasquale De Muro: commented that this is still an ethical argument

Marisol Garcia: There is an issue concerning how different actors use terms such as 'social enterprise'. We need to recognise there are many traditions. There is a tendency for northern European traditions to dominate. It is important to consider inputs of actors' terminologies and their use in different conditions

Session 2 closed at 1800.

1800   End of working day

Friday 6 June: Working Day 2

0930   Session 3: Social innovation experiences and participatory action research (Chair: Derrick Purdue)

John Andersen: Action Research and social innovation (see presentation here)

Denis Harrisson, Jean-Marc Fontan, Juan-Luis Klein et Benoît Lévesque: Partnership research: a mode of production and knowledge transfer (presented by Denis Harrison – see presentation here)

Nola Kunnen, Stronger Communities Research Institute: Asset and Strength Based Community Development (see presentation here)

Jim Segers: Discussion (see summary here)

<u>General Discussion</u>

Frank Moulaert:
- question to Nola Kunnen about needs-based v strength-based approaches. Frank said that one needs to look at what people's needs are before one looks at strengths. NB needs aren't necessarily negative but what people want to happen.
- IAD model (Integrated Area Development) – focus more on needs than on assets to satisfy them, perhaps linked to a feeling that the welfare state would provide for their needs?
- We should to be more positive about relating assets to needs to satisfy needs.
- Comment to Jim Segers – the legitimacy of knowledge is related to power.

Nola Kunnen: ABCD (or strengths based community development – SBCD) isn't about avoiding needs or the need for external resources but incorporating needs into the conversation. The key issue is who puts the issue of needs onto the agenda and how.

Chiara Tornaghi: how can you give incentives for people to enter participatory processes? The most powerful external people often don't get involved.

Denis Harrisson: action research should come from the community wanting it as much as the funders.

John Andersen: there needs to be a good image of the researcher as good and trustworthy.

Nola Kunnen: researchers have agency in the ways they frame research design. E.g. they can build in finances to pay local 'community researchers' and relationships with the community should be built before the research starts.

Isabel André: what do you mean by asset mapping? I think that mapping in the sense of maps' production is really a good tool to involve local population in

projects. Example of Lisbon project (Cova da Moura neighbourhood) – promoted by IRHU – Portuguese public institute of housing and urban rehabilitation, which used ABCD mapping in 3D using GIS – a good visual technique easily used by local population (immigrants with low levels of education).

Jim Segers: CityMin(e)d finds what's missing is often 'what can we achieve together?' in partnership research. People have had enough of experts 'watching' or 'observing'.

Len Arthur: trade union education is important. PIP – Problem, Investigation, Plan. 1970s educational practice together with shop stewards. The process end point was often insufficient if just Plan. The end point needs implementation and evaluation/reflection. The Plan must be practical ideas.

Marthe Nyssens: How is partnership research different from action research? AR practitioners and researchers do both. Partnership research is agreement between parties about a project but both partners don't necessarily do that project.

Abdel Hamdouch: AR means that research ends with action. Partnership research doesn't necessarily.

Frank Moulaert: explained Katarsis user involvement – to build a platform for possible joint research projects.

Derrick Purdue: Summing up. Going back to the power issue. Who holds the power varies. Lots of different types of power – financial, knowledge etc etc.

Session 3 closed at 1130

1130 coffee break

1200   Session 4 Instructive case studies of social innovation analysis (Chair: Stuart Cameron)

Andrea Membretti: The case of *Centro Sociale Leoncavallo* as an example of social innovation (see presentation here)

Isabel André and Alex Abreu: Exploring the dynamics of social innovation through art: the case of Montemor-o-Novo, Portugal (presented by Alexandre Abreu – see presentation here)

The above presentation was followed by a short video made by the people of Montemor-o-novo.

Laurent Fraisse: Social and solidarity-based economy as a new field of public action: evaluation of the social utility of SSE initiatives as a method for promoting social innovation (see presentation here)

Len Arthur: Discussion (see summary here)

General discussion:

Santiago Eizaguirre:
- to Andrea, on Leoncavallo – Can you identify different epochs with respect to the participation of people?
- On flexible insitutionalisation – How can we prove that case studies of social innovation produce a redefinition of public governance?

Andrea Membretti: Leoncavallo had 3 distinct periods:
1. 1970s – a very political time, but it was all about people demanding to satisfy their own needs – single-issue participation.
2. 1980s – the number of people using the centre was very much reduced, leading to the closing of the centre (this was an ideological decision)
3. early 1990s – the student movements created a new public; intellectuals started to support the centre – a different sort of participation based on broader social vision. Nowadays very few participants are motivated by single-issue concerns.

Stuart Cameron: invited responses to Santi's other question

Isabel André: In Montemor-o-novo the local government and local actors often get involved in other political activities – relations between local initiatives and public agents lead to *constant* redefinition of governance.

Len Arthur: the UWIC term 'deviant mainstreaming' (see WP1.5 report) is close to what you are calling flexible institutionalisation – it tries to capture the conditions of creative initiatives in a possibly hostile mainstream environment – live with what you can't change, change what you can.

Marisol Garcia: we like the idea of uneven development as what shapes (geographically) political action (Trotsky) – how, where and when movements appear. Are the case studies we've seen here linked to uneven development? We need to address such questions, otherwise risk drowning in the micro with no connection to other levels.

Laurent Fraisse: My example is Region Provence/Côte d'Azur, we've tried to assess progress over time. Behind each new kind of program is a specific political context – e.g. the socialist/green coalition – it is a challenge to sustain these programs beyond the life of that context. Also, programs reconfigure existing networks, as they need collective actors to implement them – where social networks are very fragmented, a top-down approach can help build communities.

Stuart Cameron: In London local political change also has affected socially creative strategies.

Isabel André: We mustn't forget the relationship between adversity and social innovation. Potential for social innovation may be highest in the most disadvantaged regions.

Serena Vicari – but often the opposite is true – where conditions are worst, there is the least action. Some level of resources is needed for people to be mobilised.

Andreas Novy:
- The current mood seems timid and defeatist in comparison to that of the 1960s-70s (cf. Leoncavallo) – we don't have such clear causes anymore.
- We need to recall/introduce the notion of upscaling – innovation potential emerges from bottom-linked/local initiatives. This could be a key contribution of Katarsis, help to deal with the contradictions we see between local autonomy and the need for public support.
- Montemor-o-novo as a good example of how important the political system/context is for social innovation – a communist mayor?

Isabel André: Yes.

Abdel Hamdouch:
- the Paris ???The Lille case is an example. Pressures from the bottom (asking the mayor to coordinate), and the socialist-green majority interacted to create an agent of social change. Also built networks with academics.
- (ref. Len's discussion) Case study analysis needs to be qualitative as well as statistical in order for the case to be inspiring.

Laurent Fraisse: Agree about the Paris Lille case, but context is still important. The network already existed to allow demands to be formulated. This isn't always the case in other places.

Len Arthur:
- Agree with Stijn (ref discussion Session 1) on the difficulty of generalisation, and his preference for 'abstraction'. I like to think about *transfer* – how the rich experience of a case might apply in other contexts.
- Applied to the present cases – are they examples of emancipating/emancipated space? Do such cases have an (incremental) impact on the face of domination?
- Another useful concept is that of *transitional demands/actions* – how does local action relate to bigger questions (e.g. climate change – local impacts? local practices?)
- We need to pay attention more to the public sector, traditionally an important site of activism. Public agents react to the pressures (e.g. reducing public expenditure) they face, and can support local demands on central government – an example of transitional demands.

Isabel André:
- The idea of inspiration is very important, not just for the scientific community but also to local actors.   E.g. the protagonists of the video we presented feel inspired by having their work recognised in this way.

- We should try to build methodological bridges between the case study and action research approaches. Case studies should not simply demonstrate/test theory, but also return something to the protagonists – inspire action, disseminate their work, strengthen their capacity to intervene.

Abdel Hamdouch: And add to their credibility and fundability.

Nola Kunnen: In community development we consider this a criterion for research validity/relevance – that the people who contribute can understand, believe and use the findings.

Stuart Cameron: question on the imagery of the presentations – Leoncavallo came across as hard, associated with conflict and stress; Montemor as softer, creative, consensual. Is this a realistic impression? Should we accept the possibility of both conflict *and* consensus as starting points for social innovation?

Isabel André: not sure. In Montemor there was indeed conflict, but arts *looks* soft.

Alexandre Abreu: an essential element is the history of class struggle – in Montemor the activities and venues symbolise local understandings of this struggle; this relationship is very clear to both us and the users. The Communist mayor deliberately built on this.

Jean Hillier: question on the role of outsiders – often in small towns and agricultural communities outsiders aren't very welcome – how to facilitating agents fit in without conflict?

Alexandre Abreu: This wasn't the case in Montemor – although agricultural history, it is not an isolated or closed community. This reinforces the importance of geography and space!

Serena Vicari: We have stressed path dependency and past struggles, but what should we do now, when no urban movements are mobilised (cf. Andreas earlier). Should we look to these special cases (specific histories, presence of a leftist charismatic leader) to nurture social innovation? Is this a possible conclusion?

Abdel Hamdouch: The idea is to be inspired by such processes – this is the tradition of social movements, innovation, political pressure.

Serena Vicari: but in reality this is very few people.

Len Arthur: And the Party is no longer there to act as the memory of the class.

Isabel André: The mayor of Montemor is not simply a local actor – his example influences other Communist municipalities, and the policies of other parties too.

Pasquale De Muro: Returning to Serena's question – SINGOCOM could not solve this problem either – the evidence was mixed. The question is: how dependent is path dependency? Is it possible to break with tradition, introduce rupture/innovation, create new forces where none existed before?

Abdel Hamdouch: An inspiring reference: Martin and Sunley 2006, 'Path dependence and regional economic evolution', *Journal of Economic Geography* 6. Identified possibilities for creativity in disadvantagesdisadvantaged areas.

John Pløger: Critical realism ties present possibilities to the logic of the past. This is a difficulty. We also need to look for the past forces that don't fit present circumstances and relations.

Stuart Cameron: suggested that we return early from lunch again, to allow time for 'other business'. All agreed.

Session 3 closed at 1410.

1410   Lunch minus 10 min later…

1500   Session 5 Methodology overall: research, participation, communication and valorization (Chair: Serena Vicari)

Andreas Novy and Barbara Beinstein: Transdisciplinary communication strategies (presented by Andreas Novy – see presentation here)

Isabel André: Gender in social innovation analysis (see presentation here)

Discussion on gender issues

Abdel Hamdouch (to Isabel, on gender): there are some important dimensions missing from the analysis of education – ethics, cultural (e.g. urban/rural) and religious factors.

Isabel André: the analysis is limited to what is in the WP1 reports.

Stuart Cameron: WP1.3 identified that suburbanisation is a threat to gender equity, at least in northern Europe – in the UK women's engagement in the labour market tends to be highest in affluent households in the suburbs, lower in poorer inner city and among certain minority ethnic groups. Southern Europe might show a very different picture where separation of home from work reinforces inequality?

Isabel André: housing is a very good issue to think about this. A key question is this: should we be about creating opportunities to improve women's lives, or about changing gender relations [cf. change v. incorporation debate, Session 1]? A social innovation framework would suggest the latter, but …

Stuart Cameron: In disadvantaged neighbourhoods, activism tends to be undertaken by women more than by men. Why? One possible reason is that

girls/women have better interpersonal skills than men/boys (ref. recent television documentary) – might this be an advantage in the emerging service economy?

Serena Vicari: but note too that participation in constructing owner-occupied housing is 40% female, and more than this in developing countries.

Jean Hillier (to Isabel): if we acknowledge that gender is a social construct, why adopt a realist approach? Isn't this a contradiction?

Frank Moulaert: Realism doesn't preclude recognising social constructs.

Isabel André: I find critical realism a useful perspective for understanding gender relations as embedded in the patriarchal/capitalist system. There are other ways to understand it of course.

Laurent Fraisse: The connections between patriarchy and capitalism are not transparent or obvious – anthropological literature suggests that female/male divisions of labour are constant across all societies. Would it be useful in this respect to look at the differences/continuities between pre-modern and modern societies?

Isabel André: These societies exist on different timescales. My question: will capitalism survive the end of patriarchy? (I think yes) is a different matter from whether capitalism/modernity can kill patriarchy (surely not).

Len Arthur: There is a trend at the moment, especially in the UK, to treat gender as one of many types of diversity. The discourse surrounding this is that recognition/celebration of diversity is good business sense – that is, a rights/redistribution discourse has been replaced by a performance management discourse serving the goals of capitalism. Is Katarsis the place to address this issue? Perhaps we simply don't have the information to do it properly.

Isabel André: Yes, discourses of diversity are ambiguous and often dangerous when applied to gender relations. E.g. should we celebrate the 'fact' that women are more emotional than men, or challenge it?

John Andersen:
- Yes beware the new feminist capitalism.
- Another concern – the sexualisation of marketing and public space, creating new ways for capitalism to exploit the body.

Abdel Hamdouch: There can be no comparison of gender relations between, say, China and Sweden – the issues are different and so are the outcomes. Cultural issues are important (cf. varieties of capitalism … varieties of patriarchy?)

Isabel André (responding to John A): Female bodies have long been exploited in marketing – a new trend is that now male bodies are also exploited in the same way. Anorexia is now a big and growing problem among boys, in

some countries they are catching up with girls. This is obviously not a 'good thing' but does it suggest that sexualisation and gender are different issues?

Nola Kunnen: Still the case that the majority of people using services are female, but the majority of people in authority among service providers is male. What might a pro-feminist masculinity look like? How would that (re)shape the system?

No further questions, the presentations resumed at 1630.

Frank Moulaert: Operationalising holism in social exclusion and innovation analysis (see presentation here)

Michael Edwards: Discussion (see summary here)

1730   coffee break

1800   Session 4 (continued): General discussion

Frank Moulaert: A small mistake in your ppt Isabel is that you (or XXX whom you cite) blames the EU for not being more proactive in a number of social policy fields. But the main reason for this is that under subsidiarity principle MS prefer to keep the responsibility and power in these fields. Very often they, and not the EU are to be blamed.

Marisol Garcia: From a sociological perspective, there might be problems with holism – might a 'holistic' theory support the idea that we can tackle issues by organising, regulating (cf. urban regeneration programmes)?

Frank Moulaert: No. We holists look instead at patterns of behaviour. Organising and regulation come in the picture as collective action and how it is accounted for in the theory (pattern model). Pattern models can be adapted to include impact of collective action.

Marisol Garcia: the problem we need to look at is the unintended consequences of well-intended behaviour – good practices can still lead to problems, and we can't get a clear picture of these without in-depth sociological analysis of empirical data. We have many examples of socially creative strategies – how can we make space for the analysis of their unintended consequences (based on complex networks, motivations, behaviours … socially destructive strategies?)

Serena Vicari: Another point is the time span of the analysis – some phenomena take longer to see than others.

Frank Moulaert: This isn't a problem with the holistic methodology – URSPIC included this in the in-depth analysis. Holism can bring out shared patterns *and* outliers. Marisol's concern also strengthens the argument for holism – many things don't fit theory, but looking at outliers can help to understand these and, thus, strengthen the theory.

Marisol Garcia: Agency implies active organisation. The informal is just as important as the formal – how to include this.

Frank Moulaert: Okay.

Michael Edwards: The planning discipline is very conscious about unintended consequences – something we work on with students a lot. How can we avoid them? Answer – try analytically to think of broad trends/probabilities, and look carefully at the conditions which create/form exceptions (case studies in the context of quantitative data?)

Frank Moulaert: In our methodology, people point out differences/outliers to be analysed. This doesn't replace theory – theory helps to identify categories of interest.

Michael Edwards: a good example – UK's well-meant policies to increase home ownership → re-emergence of private landlords as powerful socio-economic agents. A terrible outcome which we should have thought of!

John Pløger: We can't improve planning and procedure by assuming that things are predictable – otherwise, why bother looking at innovative/creative practices? Our focus is on improving aspects of political and planning processes. We need creativity also in our analysis – predictability and creativity are not compatible.

Frank Moulaert: Pragmatism rejects predictability.

John Pløger: And we have to get non-predictability into planning institutions' practice.

Serena Vicari: time to close the session.

Diana MacCallum: question to all presenters – should the slide shows be password – protected on the website, or will an ordinary caveat do?

All agreed that a caveat would be sufficient.

Session 4 closed at 1830.

1830   Remaining business

D1 valorisation

Frank Moulaert:
- There was the original proposal to write manual, but the inputs are of uneven quality, accessibility and integration. It would require a complete rewrite. Instead, we will decentralise decisions on D1 to the LP/SP.
- Outputs must refer to social innovation and to the Katarsis project (mention project name and contract number "We are indebted…")

There would also be a possibility of themes teaming up as some are close to each other in content.

Dennis Harrison: asked about role of Sparring Partners

Frank Moulaert: replied that they can provide quality control function as before

Len Arthur: asked about papers already prepared by Sparring Partners,

Frank Moulaert: replied that these are already on the website

Isabel André: suggested that each Lead Partner could make a proposal to their Sparring Partners. Isabel's team would like to publish but wants the views from Sparring Partners

A three week deadline was suggested for proposals to SPs

Noted – UWE partners need to be informed

D2,3,4

Frank Moulaert: There is a good, consistent level of quality of output, even though these are at different stages of development. Aim will be to publish in a journal special issue

Jean Hillier: We need to decide which journal to target and consider its requirements before people write any more. Several possibilities were identified:
- Urban Studies
- International Journal of Social Science
- IJURR
- Citizenship Studies
- Urban Affairs
- Geoforum
- ACME

Will try Urban Studies first.

Frank Moulaert: In longer term would like to look at producing a manual, but not yet. Although existing texts are long and not very dense, well fit to be easily rewritable for manual.

Editors for special issue: Diana MacCallum, Marisol Garcia, Serena Vicari, Frank Moulaert, Jean Hiller, Isabel André, Dina Vaiou

Frank Moulaert: suggests there might be a need to target more than one special issue to include all the material.

Jean Hillier: proposed that D4 could be published in *Planning Theory*

Final Conference

Frank Moulaert: At the Board meeting it was suggested that Katarsis and Social Polis conferences should be held together in Vienna in March 2009. This would have logistical benefits and also enable more effective inclusion of stakeholders. Probably have 2 days for Katarsis and 2 for Social Polis with break between them. 9-13 March was suggested. Frank Moulaert will speak with Commission to confirm their agreement.
[FM: *Outcome of talks with EC: suggest May, with Social Polis conference first, KATARSIS conference last. Negotiations not finalised yet*.]

Andreas Novy: Notes that this coincides with 5th anniversary of Paolo Freire Centre. Would like to invite Paul Singer from Brazil and this could be linked to the conference. Theme would be to examine solidarity-based initiatives. May be able to involve the City of Vienna

Frank Moulaert: noted that key point of final KATARSIS conference is to strengthen scientific community. Final conference will need to report on all activities and results. Can't cover all results but will have to give attention to each WP.

Diana MacCallum: Note that the final conference is not another workshop.

Frank Moulaert: Proposal for content of final conference is in KATARSIS TA (attached)

Andrea Novy: Raised question of making final conference interesting to stakeholders – a discussion of methodology would have to be quite theoretical.
Suggested presentations on usefulness of methodologies by stakeholders themselves (e.g. Leoncavallo Centre)

AESOP July 2009, Liverpool

It was decided not to proceed with idea of a panel on Katarsis.

Close

Frank Moulaert:
- thanked Diana MacCallum, who will shortly be leaving the support job to take up a new position in Australia
- thanked and congratulated Dimitra Siatitsa and Haris Konstantatos for organising the meeting.

The meeting closed at 1900.

Actions arising:

Action	Who	Deadline
Update website with reports etc from WS6. Presentations to be in pdf format with a caveat added.	Diana	End June
Discuss size and nature of Di-dissem reports with Commission scientific officer, report back to lead partners.	Frank	End June
Fix new deliverable date for D4 and D5 in consultation with Commission scientific officer	Frank	End June
Develop a publication proposal for D1.i in consultation with main sparring partners for the relevant WPs	**WP1 Lead Partners**: Isabel André; Bas Tierolf, Stuart Cameron, Judy Orme, Andreas Novy	End June
Finalise deliverables from WP2 and WP3, including copy editing and proofreading	Lead Partners NTUA, UB	End July
Develop proposal for journal special issue	Jean, Frank	Following delivery of D2-4
Develop proposal and program outline for final conference, in consultation with Commission, the technical annex, and other partners to Katarsis and Social Polis	Andreas, Frank	End August