



WILCO

Welfare innovations
at the local level
in favour of cohesion

WORK PACKAGE 5

SOCIAL INNOVATIONS IN NIJMEGEN, NETHERLANDS

Joost Fledderus, Francesca Broersma
Radboud University Nijmegen

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION - LOCAL BACKGROUND OF THE SOCIAL INNOVATIONS	1
2. WELFARE INNOVATIONS IN UNEMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING	3
2.1. Work Corporations.....	3
2.1.1. Short description	3
2.1.2. Conceptions and ways of addressing users.....	4
2.1.3. Internal organisation and modes of working.....	6
2.1.4. Interaction with the local welfare system	7
2.2. A Future for Everybody.....	9
2.2.1. Short description.....	9
2.2.2. Conceptions and ways of addressing users.....	10
2.2.3. Internal organisation and modes of working.....	10
2.2.4. Interaction with the local welfare system	11
2.3. Sirocco	13
2.3.1. Short description.....	13
2.3.2. Conceptions and ways of addressing users.....	14
2.3.3. Internal organisation and modes of working.....	15
2.3.4. Interaction with the local welfare system	15
CONCLUSIONS	16
BIBLIOGRAPHY	20
LIST OF TABLES.....	20

INTRODUCTION – LOCAL BACKGROUND OF THE SOCIAL INNOVATIONS

Over time, a strongly left-wing political culture emerged in Nijmegen. Its key values related to the protection of the less well off: solidarity, equal opportunities to participate in society and the urge for an ‘undivided’ city (see the WP4 report for Nijmegen). Over the past few years, a fear for increasing divisions between residents in the periphery (roughly the West and the areas around the canal) and other areas (North, East and centre) brought these discourses to the foreground. What these discourses mean for the ‘innovativeness’ of the city is rather ambiguous. For some, Nijmegen has been always a front-runner when it comes to social renewal because of the progressive and entrepreneurial spirit that appears to arise from politics and the university. For others, however, the city has too long been a ‘caressing’ state, while sometimes an ‘innovative kick’ might have been better. The need to take care of the less well-off has led to a comprehensive local welfare system with a passive role for the recipients of that help, they argue. Yet, now that Dutch municipalities are facing big financial cutbacks, the maintainability of such a system is threatened. Moreover, there are broader (national/European) trends, as well as national policies and regulations, which undeniably have an influence on the way Nijmegen organises its local welfare. To begin with, like elsewhere in the Netherlands, the ‘Neighbourhood Development Programme’ (*wijkaanpak*) has changed the role of housing corporations in neighbourhoods and paved the way for experimentation. Furthermore, on-going decentralisation of welfare, especially in the field of care, has an impact on thinking about how and by whom welfare policies should be implemented. Finally, perceptions of the rights and obligations of people on income support has also changed.

In 2007, the so-called *wijkaanpak* was launched. Throughout the country 40 disadvantaged neighbourhoods were labelled as so-called ‘attention areas’ (*aandachtswijken* or *krachtwijken*). For these neighbourhoods, extra financial resources were made available. Especially in the larger cities, such as Amsterdam, this had a significant impact on neighbourhoods because major regeneration projects could be initiated. In Nijmegen, however, people were actually surprised to hear national government appointed one of its neighbourhoods (*Hatert*) too. The general belief was that Nijmegen did not have problems on the same scale as the larger cities. Nevertheless, the *wijkaanpak* did have an impact on Nijmegen because it influenced the role of housing corporations within the field of neighbourhood regeneration. Not only did they become responsible, financially and logistically, for the completion of the programme, the *wijkaanpak* also consisted of an integrated, more holistic approach towards neighbourhood regeneration. Besides improving the physical environment, the *wijkaanpak* also aims to enhance the broader ‘quality of life’ (*leefbaarheid*) in disadvantaged neighbourhoods - i.e. to improve the social and economic environment too. Furthermore, citizen participation and partnering with local organisations were main themes in the *wijkaanpak*. Accordingly, projects such as ‘A future for everybody’ and ‘Sirocco’ are best understood against the background of the *wijkaanpak*. Housing corporations now take up initiatives in the social domain additionally to their ‘core business’ of providing affordable housing:

For example, we let people in Hatert write and perform a theatre play that is paid by the corporations, I think 40,000 Euros. Back then they said, are you completely insane, we are not going to pay that. Eventually they did invest the money. But they thought that was very distant of what they were supposed to do and sometimes it did hurt. But now, particularly about investing in the social domain, corporations are more and more convinced that investing on that domain also adds value to their real estate. Not that that would be their primary goal, but it is for them an important factor to keep doing their job. To keep providing sustainable social housing. (District manager)

Another national trend that has affected how welfare is implemented at the local level is the continuing decentralisation of welfare (and in particular care) policies from central government to municipalities. In addition to the complete decentralisation of youth care services, more and more caregiving services that used to be part of the 'General Act on Special Healthcare costs' (*Algemene Wet Bijzondere Ziektekosten*, AWBZ), and thus a (financial) responsibility of the central government, have been included in the Law of Societal Development (*Wet Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling*, WMO) and are now the responsibility of municipalities. Although the central government supports local governments with these transitions, in times of increasing budget restraints municipalities have to do more with less. Furthermore, the WMO - a law that concerns the provision of services for citizens in difficult conditions, such as, for example, the elderly, people with a handicap or psychological problems, but also people with financial problems - stipulates that citizens should have an independent living and participate in society as much as possible.

To achieve this purpose, municipalities are free to set their priorities wherever they feel there is a more stringent need for support. Although the first parts of the WMO reform are expected to set in early 2014, and in its complete form in 2015, the municipality of Nijmegen chose to start right away with restructuring their local care arrangements in a fashion that resembles the basic idea of the new law. In a policy plan called 'Solidarity, together, and solid', the municipality points out the most important priorities of the new (local) WMO policy: focus on vulnerable groups; self-responsibility; 'community reliance' (*samenredzaamheid*); inclusive society; personalised services and de-compartmentalisation; and prevention before cure. These things come together in what the municipality has called 'social neighbourhood teams' (*sociale wijkteams*), of which pilots started in 2012. These teams consist of professionals with different specialisations, often from different organisations, and are supposed to create a network of caregivers at the neighbourhood level. According to a neighbourhood manager of the municipality, the idea of social neighbourhood teams denotes a radical change:

The experience is that residents of a neighbourhood are often able to solve a lot of things together, without the need of professional assistance. There is a big, natural preparedness to do something for somebody else, if you are asked to do so. The social neighbourhood team builds a broad neighbourhood network of people, associations and organisations that want to do something for their neighbourhood. ... That is the youngest development we are experimenting with. I expect that will be a revolution. We have of course the advantage of the WMO; I really think that that is going to mean a revolution.
(District manager)

Parallel to the developments in the field of care, also when it comes to income support measures, such as social assistance, new or announced national laws and regulations emphasize that everybody should participate in society, whether you are handicapped or unable to find paid work for example - such as the possibility of obliging people to do a 'returning favour according to capability' (*tegenprestatie naar vermogen*) and the to be introduced 'participation law' (*Participatiewet*). Again, municipalities carry the responsibility for getting as many people as possible 'active', but their financial means are severely cut. Since Nijmegen has been investing in expensive subsidised labour in the past decade (see WP4 Nijmegen), a radical shift was needed. In an attempt to still offer people a chance for a job, the concept of 'work corporations' (*werkcorporaties*) was introduced.

Accordingly, these developments in combination with the historically strong focus on taking care of the weak, pose a real challenge for the city of Nijmegen. However, as all

three innovations in this report indeed attempted to increase the role of citizens, a shift seems to be made, albeit it not without hurdles.

2. WELFARE INNOVATIONS IN UNEMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING

2.1. Work Corporations

2.1.1. Short description

In the summer of 2011, several so-called ‘work corporations’ (*werkcorporaties*) started operating in the municipality of Nijmegen. These work corporations aim at reemploying social assistance (WWB) receivers with a considerable distance to the labour market by offering them a place where they can combine work and education. Basically every entrepreneur can initiate a work corporation, as long as it complies with a few conditions: it should offer people a chance to develop themselves (mainly through education); the service or product delivered should have societal relevance (which may be interpreted very broadly); and a work corporation should be able to be self sufficient. Also important is that working at a work corporation should have a temporarily character; this means that after two years at maximum, people should leave the organisation. Because of this, it really differs from forms of subsidised labour in the Netherlands, where people could be employed for more than ten years.

The concept of work corporations was introduced in the city by the local Labour Party (*Partij van de Arbeid*, PvdA) in their party programme of 2010. In just two sentences, the party expressed the need for the development of work corporations in order to preserve subsidised jobs. It mentions a particular foundation (Foundation Dagloon) as an example, which successfully provided jobs for homeless people, by doing contractual work in the urban upkeep service sector for *inter alia* the municipality and a big garbage collection company. When the Labour party formed a coalition with the Green party (*GroenLinks*, or GL) and the social-liberal party Democrats ’66 (*Democraten ’66*, or D66) in 2010, work corporations were included in their common manifesto. Here, the concept was seen as an instrument that could better constitute the outflow of beneficiaries to work than subsidised labour could. Still, no detailed plan about what was regarded as a work corporation was developed yet. In March 2011, a policy plan was published which made the idea more concrete. Work corporations were explicitly considered as a new reemployment scheme to ‘modernise’ subsidised labour (Gemeente Nijmegen 2011).

The need for rearranging reemployment services was given by the financial cutbacks that were imposed by national government. In fact, the municipal budget of 26 million Euro for reemployment in 2012 would be brought down to 13 million Euro in 2013 and eventually to 8 million Euro in 2014 and thereafter. Hence, in order to ‘realise the ambitions’ of the municipality with respect to reemployment, the municipality was forced to adapt their current policy in an ‘innovative fashion’. This meant the reduction of subsidised jobs to zero, the creation of work corporations and cooperation between municipal organisations that were dependent on subsidised employees. Yet, it was believed that work corporations should not be seen as a one-on-one replacement for subsidised jobs. A work corporation should operate on the intersection of business and civil society. This can be seen as one of the innovative elements of the project. For the municipality, the possibility for a reemployment organisation to earn money is the particular new aspect. For the organisations that are familiar with subsidised labour it is especially the educational facet, the emphasis on personal development, and responsibility for outflow to work which breaks with tradition.

Work corporations are not new in the Netherlands. The idea has already been used for unemployed youth between 2004 and 2008 in three Dutch cities, financed by an ESF-subsidy. Yet, the municipality of Nijmegen clearly states that it does not work with a ‘blue-print’. Rather, they have been trying to develop a flexible model which suits the locality of Nijmegen, and which could be changed according to experiences through time. Especially important here is the recognition of existing organisations that are already executing certain programmes with characteristics of the work corporation concept. The involvement of these organisations from the very right beginning led to the start of six work corporations in October 2010: “We have actually written the plan how work corporations must look like during the discussions with those [interested] organisations” (Mark van der Velden, policy advisor). Now, there are over ten work corporations active in Nijmegen.

Table 1 provides some of examples. Most work corporations are part of larger welfare organisations, but also a few private companies started a work corporation. Some are based on a particular method which is used in other cities in the Netherlands as well.

Table 1. Examples of work corporations in Nijmegen

Work corporation	Short description
Social Work Inter-Lokaal (<i>Maatschappelijke Dienstverlening</i>)	20-25 users, giving help to low-income clients of migrant organisation <i>Inter-lokaal</i> in combination with higher secondary vocational education
World Cooks (<i>Wereldkoks</i>)	20-25 users, cooking and serving food in a restaurant in combination with lower secondary vocational education
Solar Train (<i>Zonnetrein</i>)	3-6 users, driving a solar-driven touristic bus in combination with bus drivers license
Bike-work (<i>Bike-werk</i>)	6 users, repairing bikes in combination with higher secondary vocational education
2Switch Green & Maintenance (<i>2Switch Groen & Klussen</i>)	30-35 users, doing maintenance in neighbourhoods, mainly around social housing in combination with several courses
Fashion with a mission (<i>Mode met een Missie</i>)	20-25 users, sewing clothes for a fashion line in combination with lower secondary vocational education
Craft Square (<i>Ambachtsplein</i>)	5-15 users, traditional master-apprentice relationship learning a particular craftsmanship in combination with lower secondary vocational education
Dar & Breed, urban upkeep services (<i>Dar & Breed onderhoud van parken</i>)	4-6 users, maintaining municipal parks

2.1.2. Conceptions and ways of addressing users

For the municipality, the most important aspect of the work corporations is that after one or two years users will gain sufficient skills to be able to find a job on the regular labour market. The municipality distinguishes several types of clients, with differing talents and capabilities. It states that for every individual it should be judged whether working in a work corporation is the most suitable reemployment strategy, and moreover, whether the available work suits the client, since work corporations also differ from each other (Gemeente Nijmegen 2011). Hence, there is some level of personalisation involved: not every person that receives social assistance benefits is automatically qualified to join a work corporation. This personalisation is represented in the composition of the group of users of different work corporations. For instance, *Fashion with a Mission* attracts only

women (of which many are single parent), while *Green & Maintenance*, *Bike-work* and *Solar Train* consist only of men.

The professionals and managers of the work corporations generally agree that education and teaching ‘technical’ skills is important, but attaining social skills is at least as essential. This includes basic elements of being an employee, such as getting on time, asking for a free day or planning holidays, calling in sick, etcetera. But it also means learning to cooperate with other participants, taking responsibility, and being an active employee. This might be somewhat more important for participants have had no education at all and have not worked at all during their lives, compared to users with already completed education, such as the participants of *Social Work*.

Most work corporations would prefer to have intrinsically motivated participants. Therefore, almost all users of the different work corporations must have an intake conversation or sometimes even an official job application. Most work corporations wanted to know whether potential participants like the activities that come along with the job they are trained in and whether they would like a regular job in this particular profession. Two important reasons for selecting on intrinsic motivation were mentioned: (1) it is almost impossible to complete the programme successfully without a certain passion or preference for the profession; and (2) the performance target that has been set for outflow to work cannot be reached with unmotivated workers.

Lack of capabilities often does not matter at most work corporations (or is even a ‘requirement’ in terms of educational level). Exceptions include working at *Social Work*, which requires a certain level of social skills and language fluency, and *Solar Train*, which requires affinity with driving. For the corporation *Green & Maintenance* however even motivation is not that important. The manager of this work corporation acknowledged this makes it sometimes difficult, especially if you want to get users a regular job. On the other hand, he said that some people enter with great reserve, but after twelve months they like it so much they actually would like to stay even longer. A project leader from *World Cooks* also noted that a slight form of pressure would not be wrong, if that is necessary to persuade participants; “It is always possible that someone finds out after a couple of weeks that it is not so bad after all”, she says. However, in case of the reversed scenario- a participant lacks any form of motivation - sanctions may be given. Users signed a contract with the municipality where basic rights and obligations are described. A sanction could include a (temporarily) reduction of the received benefit - for example if a user has not shown up repeatedly. Until now, this measure has been rarely used. Some project leaders noticed that it would be useful to have more options to put pressure on users, for instance, when a participant is absent for a longer period. Yet, one user complained because he voluntarily applied for a work corporation, and had to sign the contract after a few weeks working there. Because he was not urged to participate by the municipality, he was astonished to find out his benefit could be stopped if he did not comply with the rules.

People enter work corporations for different reasons. One participant of *Fashion with a Mission* said the opportunity to get a diploma was the most important motivator for her to participate. A diploma will give her more chance on the labour market, she thought. For another participant of *Fashion with a Mission*, the work corporation is just a step in between to a higher level of education. Yet another client, who thought her chances on the labour market were already very small because of her relatively high age, especially values the social contacts at work and the rhythm of a working live. Professionals emphasise as well that having colleagues to chat with is very valuable for people who have been unemployed for a long time. Moreover, for some participants, just the fact that they

must change things at home to be able to go to work - for instance, arranging child care - already assures their world broadens.

Most work corporations try to encourage an ordinary work environment with a manager (or project leader or mentor) and his or her employees. Participants who were interviewed therefore regard themselves mainly as employees, although they don't receive salary (they keep their social assistance benefit plus a 600 Euro bonus after half a year). A user (of *World Cooks*), however, said he likes to see himself as a student, being occupied with learning rather than with work. At the same time, many project leaders also try to create a safe and lenient environment - as a project leader from *Fashion with a Mission* said, "if they cannot succeed here, then where can they?" Users indeed said they appreciate the absence of work stress (although this might differ between work corporations) and that they feel they could ask and tell anything to the project leaders.

In general, the concept of work corporations stems from the idea that people who are in need of guidance in their search for a job, are still able to generate income. In this sense, the municipality looks at what clients of social assistance are capable of rather than what they cannot do. This is clearly represented in the vision of the *Craft Square*, which takes empowerment as its main goal: guiding participants to develop the feeling that they are in control over their own life, the confidence that everything will be all right and the sense that they can do something about their situation.

2.1.3. Internal organisation and modes of working

If an existing organisation or a new organisation wants to become a work corporation, a starting grant will be appointed after approval. Instruments that are used for the reemployment (such as coaching and education) are also financed by the municipality. Structural overhead costs and a-structural development costs must be compensated by the income it earns by selling the services or products it offers. The first 1.5 years this will be partially funded by the municipality, but after two years, this should all be covered by the work corporations. The concept of work corporation does not apply to for-profit companies - all profit should be invested in the reintegration of the clients.

There are a few possible types of work corporations. A first type is a 'traditional' work corporation. Such an organisation tries to get people back to work through work experience and education. A second type is called a 'broad' work corporation. Here, 'activation' is part of the organisation as well. Activation is especially suitable for people who have not worked for a long time and who really need to develop certain basic social skills in order to do regular work. A third type only focuses on this activation part, and could be considered to be a recruiter for the other two types of work corporations. In practice, most work corporations are the traditional type, because this form is best suited to generate income. Nevertheless, work corporations that involve activation too, such as *Green & Maintenance* could be beneficial, since work corporations then "organise basically their own breeding ground to assure outflow to their own work corporations" (Policy advisor).

At a basic level, three parties are involved in a work corporation: the work corporation itself, the municipality, and (often) an educational institute. The responsibilities for the first two parties are clearly described in the development plan of the municipality. The work corporation is involved with the selection of participants; creates a personal reemployment programme/development plan for the participant; guides the participant during the development process; and provides education/training. The municipality has the primary role in the recruitment of participants, if possible in cooperation with the work corporation; provides required facilities for the reemployment programme according

to the Act Work and Social Assistance (Wet Werk en Bijstand, WWB) and other regulations; and monitors the output target (in terms of outflow of clients). The municipality makes a contractual arrangement with the work corporations. The content of the contracts is not always the same. Some work corporations have to comply with a performance target - for example, 66 per cent of all participants must find a job or follow a higher level of education after they finished the programme of the work corporation. Other work corporations do not have to fulfil any targets. This could depend on the characteristics of the participants or the sector people are trained in. For instance, the labour market for bus drivers and bike mechanics is fairly good compared to the fashion or clothing branch. Therefore, the municipality might expect higher rates of outflow for work corporations in the former sector than for the latter. Project leaders however do not always understand why there are differences in the contracts between the work corporations and the municipality.

Almost every work corporation cooperates with an educational institute or provides an internal educational programme. Often, the study programme has a duration of one year, sometimes two years (e.g. *Social Work* and *Bike-work*) but there are also educational programmes that are more flexible, such as getting a bus driver's license, which could be done in a much shorter period. Educational institutes are sometimes involved in screening the participants to assess if they have the desired educational level. Many work corporations provide extra language courses for participants who have difficulties with speaking, writing and reading Dutch.

The internal organisation of the several work corporations differs per work corporation. Often, participants work for circa 25 to 30 hours per week, of which circa eight hours of education. Educational programmes are followed at the work place if possible - teachers attend the work corporation instead of the other way around. How participants are helped with developing the practical, technical skills differs. Sometimes, general guidance, specialised help and project management are divided among different persons, but sometimes multiple functions are carried out by the same person (e.g. *Fashion with a Mission*).

2.1.4. Interaction with the local welfare system

As noted, the municipality has involved existing organisations active in the field of subsidised labour or reemployment services to develop a plan for work corporations. For several work corporations, such as *Green & Maintenance*, *World Cooks* and *Social Work*, the launch of the plan actually meant just a continuation of their policy. This could mean the impact on the governance of the local welfare system is not particularly high. Nevertheless, the emphasis generating income and the outflow to regular work has led or still has to lead to some changes in the management of these organisations. The necessity to generate income will put more pressure on organisations to look for potential buyers of their product or service. Sometimes, the municipality is the biggest or sole commissioner of the service, as is the case with *Social Work*, because it is in its interest that the service is delivered. In other cases like *Green & Maintenance*, a housing corporation is the biggest client because they benefit from the service (maintaining their buildings), but also because participants of the work corporation may be renters of their housing.

Yet, what probably has more impact on the governance of the local welfare system is the shift of responsibility for reemployment from the municipality towards the organisations in the field. Especially organisations that were used to working with subsidised employees are now required to think quite differently about the future of the participants. Reemployment was never something these organisations had to worry about. Many work corporations recognise the importance of close collaboration with the specific economic

sector to be able to assure outflow to regular work. For example, *Bike-work* cooperates with a big cycle company because they are in need of employees. Hence, participants in that work corporation have high chances to find a job there. *Solar Train* has close connections with the taxi sector, so that it can send their recently schooled drivers directly to employers.

The concept of work corporations is still relatively new and the municipality clearly maintains that there is room for development. There have already been a few points of discussion which may lead to some changes in the future. First of all, several work corporations complain about the lack of flexibility of educational programmes. The Regional Education Centre (ROC), which provides secondary vocational education, is currently unable to deviate from the general start of educational programmes, which is September each year. This means that for several work corporations (e.g. *World Cooks* and *Fashion with a Mission*) in September the first group will exit and an entire new group of participants enters. This could have a negative impact on the continuity of the company, since a group with relatively many capabilities will be replaced by an inexperienced group of users. It is investigated if there are possibilities to increase the flexibility of the ROC.

Secondly, the cooperation between the work corporations will have to be improved, say some managers. As the manager of *Solar Train* argued,

“Everyone has the same assignment, and if you have to purchase certain services, why won’t you buy it at a fellow work corporation? For instance, if the train has to be painted, why wouldn’t I let it do by men of 2Switch [Green & Maintenance]? And if 2Switch has to drive from point A to B, why won’t they be transported by our train? We already have a concrete cooperation with World Cooks, because they also offer arrangements which include a ride with our train, while we can offer an arrangement which includes dinner at World Cooks. Then you will strengthen each other.” (Manager of *Solar Train*)

A manager of *World Cooks* thought the cooperation between work corporation can be very useful if a participant is not entirely happy at his current work corporation: “if someone is somewhere else and he says he would like to cook, well then they just have to call us. That little network has to be more visible.” She also wanted the municipality to assist more with regards to achieving reemployment. Many work corporations expressed their doubts whether they can really realise the expected outflow to regular work. They often lack the experience in getting in touch with the regular labour market. This knowledge is available at the specialised departments of the municipality, they argue.

A fourth potential problem is that there is a tension between the performance targets and the type of clients that are selected by the municipality. It could be that if the performance targets are difficult to reach, work corporations could request a higher entry level in terms of social skills and intelligence. Then the question could be whether the original target group enters the work corporation.

The municipality wants to take enough time to see if the concept can develop into a successful instrument. Hence, at least all current work corporations will continue in the near future. It is too early to say something about the ‘success’ of work corporations. The municipality will carry out an evaluation at the end of 2012. Currently, project leaders are satisfied how things are going right now, particularly when it comes to the personal development of the participants. The number of work corporations is now set at 16. The municipality especially hopes that more private companies will be interested in forming a work corporation by offering single learn-work trajectories.

2.2. A Future for Everybody

2.2.1. Short description

Housing corporation Portaal, together with the municipality of Nijmegen, started the project '*A future for everybody*' in 2009 because the province (Gelderland) reserved money for the development of 'innovative living arrangements' within a larger programme. It was not stated clearly what was meant with 'innovative living arrangements', but the focus had to be vulnerable groups. For Portaal, it was about participation in the broad sense - participation in the local community as well as contacts among residents.

The plan is directed at the neighbourhood of *Wolfskuil* (Wolf's Hollow), which is located in the city part *Oud-West*. It was built partly in the period 1910-1920, partly after World War II. Relatively many people with a weak or vulnerable social-economic background live here. The mean age is higher than average and there is a larger share of ethnic minorities than in the city as a whole. Social cohesion is under threat because of great distance between native residents and ethnic minorities but also between 'traditional' residents and newcomers, a lack of involvement with the neighbourhood, and nuisance on the streets, particularly by youth. There are some signs that the quality of the social climate is slowly increasing though (Gemeente Nijmegen 2012).

The central goal of the project is to involve residents in restructuring of the neighbourhood. In collaboration with residents, ideas should come up about innovative forms of housing regarding to themes as welfare, care, education and work. The project entails the rebuilding of a square and the development of houses for mentally ill residents as well as for elderly. There are also plans to build dwellings especially for elderly of ethnic minorities, in combination with houses for youngsters and or teen mothers, in order to stimulate the interaction and integration between these groups. There are two important sub goals: (1) to have a process aimed at connecting the needs of residents, active societal partners and entrepreneurs; and (2) to experiment during the process with stimulating residents' own responsibility and entrepreneurship of vulnerable people. Since a lot of building plans had to be postponed because of the economic crisis, the focus is now especially on the social sub goals. In general, the project fits the spirit of the new Law of Societal Development (*Wet Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling*, WMO) very well (see Introduction).

The project is divided in several phases. The first phase consists of employing a process manager, who is hired from an external consultancy company. In the second phase, this process manager makes an inventory of demand and offers in the neighbourhood on relevant issues. The next phase is designated to involve residents, front-runners, active societal partners such as the professional soccer club NEC, entrepreneurs and (potential) end-users of the real estate in the development of innovative ideas. Then, it is decided whether the innovative forms of housing are feasible, and the sixth and last phase is appointed to implementation. The two last phases are not executed yet. The municipality of Nijmegen and Portaal have set up the project together, but in the second and third phase the municipality is the main party, while in the fourth and fifth phase the housing corporation leads the project. In the last phase, both parties will deal with implementation and completion. The entire project costs around 150,000 Euro, where 25,000 Euro is contributed by Portaal and the municipality, and 100,000 Euro is funded by the Province of Gelderland. The greatest part of this money used to pay for the process manager.

2.2.2. Conceptions and ways of addressing users

In the project plan it is stated that residents of the Wolfskuil, along with the ‘end users’ of innovative forms of real estate, have to come with concrete plans for the realisation of these innovations. They also should have a role in the development and implementation phase and have the final responsibility in the daily practice after implementation. One of the basic principles of the project is to ‘make use of everybody’s talent and the focus on what is possible’. The project leader of Portaal underlines this: “It is not about doing everything for big groups of people, especially not that. It is about facilitating that they can do it by their selves.” How residents exactly are seen becomes clear in the way they were involved in the ‘good bye’ festival of a central, old square that was about to get demolished and rebuild:

What we did is to say good bye of the square with a lot of residents, where we also [involved] an artist and a poet from the neighbourhood, and a family who baked Turkish pizzas. [...] It was more in the direction of co-production, as in communicating about how was the neighbourhood, back then and now. We tell stories, you could tell your own story. There were different people who did something, made a product of the neighbourhood. Former residents were invited too, so it starts with thinking from the viewpoint of the resident, what would it mean for him or her? Next to resident they were a producer too that day. (Process manager)

Hence, residents are regarded as co-producers rather than passive consumers. The idea is that people do something because they can experience direct benefits to themselves and to others. The head of the Hobby Centre said “the power of entrepreneurship, the power of creating something on your own, that is important for the neighbourhood”. The process manager argued that it would be great if someone comes into the Hobby Centre practicing his or her hobby, and to see the same person as a small entrepreneur some time later. This is exactly what happened with one of the residents. He was the father of the family who baked Turkish pizzas (lahmacun) at the square. He received some help to buy a covered mobile stall, to sell his pizzas throughout the city regardless of the weather. This allows him to make some extra money next to his subsidised job. He also became a member of the neighbourhood committee as the only resident of foreign descent.

2.2.3. Internal organisation and modes of working

The process manager started with a so-called ‘neighbourhood safari’. This is a method to get familiar with the neighbourhood by talking to residents and professionals, to come ‘behind the front door’ of role models, but also of vulnerable persons. All these people were asked what they do in the neighbourhood, how they experience that, what needs to be done, what do people need to achieve that, what are their intentions, how do they work together, etcetera. Some people were asked to help with the so-called *Kuul contact week*, along with professionals from the most important organisations in the neighbourhood. During this week, residents and professionals paired up to consult other residents about their concerns, their needs and their willingness to become active in the local community. A total of 102 people were consulted. One of the results was that people would like to have more contact. It appeared to be that people have great willingness to do something for the neighbourhood too. Another very important outcome was that many networks exist in the neighbourhood which are not easily visible.

It was not only the social networks of residents that mattered. The network of local organisations was also crucial in encouraging participation. The project leader of Portaal emphasised this:

There is no longer any organisation that can do this on its own. You need cooperation on neighbourhood level with the most important stakeholders, to create a network in order to protect the most vulnerable areas. And at the same time, that regular networks keep an eye on other networks, for example women of migrant origins who cook every week. Actually there are two things, cooperation with other organisations and searching for networks you don't know. (Project leader Portaal)

Hence, different organisations play a role in the project. Investments are made in a so-called Hobby Centre, which is a place where residents can practice their hobbies and come together. The intention is to turn this centre into a so-called 'Neighbourhood Factory', which is supposed to become self-sufficient by delivering particular services or products by and for residents. Also Foundation Dagloon is involved in the project. This foundation gives homeless people the opportunity to work for a small reimbursement. They were asked to help with demolition work. In the same vein, people who are mentally ill participate in cleaning back alleys and maintaining play grounds. Although it was tried to involve ethnic minorities too, it appeared difficult to reach them.

2.2.4. Interaction with the local welfare system

The most important impact on the governance of the local welfare system in Nijmegen would be that the intentions of the project demand a change in attitude from professionals and local administrators. Stimulating the involvement of citizens can be facilitated, but also hindered by them. This was underlined by the process manager:

An aspect in which I am now... is what is the role of partners and the role of the government, or the role of Portaal. Because they can help or bother a lot. They can really discourage you taking up the initiative. For example, a group of residents would maintain a piece of ground. They ploughed and sowed the ground together and grass and flowers started growing and what happened one day... the municipality came and they mowed and straightened it. So goodbye initiative. [...] It is about that public official, or those few officials, that they are willing to listen, that they are very patient, because a delay will come, it will be difficult sometimes. And that they believe that those citizens can do a part themselves. And that they don't take over, but that they only facilitate and keep their tasks clear. Then it might be successful. (Process manager)

For Portaal, this requires a shift in culture. In the case of the good bye festivity of the square, the housing corporation would have done it completely differently in the past, the process manager said: "Portaal in this case, and the municipality would say, well, we order catering, place a draft and the Alderman says his story, done." In the interview with a resident, it becomes clear that such a shift requires time. When he requested a permit to start his small pizza business, the municipality stumbled over rules and regulations and granted his request only after many phone calls and letters. Also, he notes that "housing corporations only think about themselves." Still, the project leader of Portaal argued this situation is no longer feasible. Recent changes in policies and thinking oblige Portaal to think beyond its own organisation, which was rarely done before.

I think that the recognition of the presence of networks and that they are everywhere might be the most important discovery. But you have to look for them. Maybe that is the most innovative, how basal it might sound. Consciously searching for networks within groups you never hear or see, we never did that, neither the municipality. (Project leader Portaal)

Linked to this is the aim to connect traditionally active societal organisations to less obvious partners, such as entrepreneurs, the soccer club NEC and educational organisations. The process manager achieved to bring a group of entrepreneurs together who meet a few times per month. They agreed to provide some services for weak groups in the neighbourhood for free, such as free painting lessons. Bigger companies, such as a bank, a supermarket and a health insurance organisation are involved too, although it is not clear yet what their exact contribution would be.

During the project the idea of a so-called ‘Neighbourhood Factory’ developed. This Factory would resemble a Trust as it is known in England. Portaal saw an example of such a Neighbourhood Trust a few years ago and they would like to see if it can be realised in Nijmegen. To further develop this idea, the Hobby Centre was chosen as the location. It is believed that is a place where everybody feels welcome. In the Factory, several main aspects of the project have to come together: participation, getting together and a sense of ownership. Also local entrepreneurs and artists should be given space to get involved in the Factory. The process manager and project leader of Portaal explain how it would work:

Wouldn't it be great if that former shoe factory becomes a Neighbourhood Factory, where you can develop activities for and by the neighbourhood. Where the idea is with each other, for each other. So the people have to be owner of that neighbourhood. (Process manager)

Residents have to manage and maintain a neighbourhood centre. If everything goes well, they have to generate income from this and one way or another they should reinvest this money back into the neighbourhood. You can do that in different ways. You could talk to people, those women who come together every week to cook something, well let's sell those products. [...] But you can think of everything, people can work with local entrepreneurs, cleaning of back alleys, organising activities. Maintenance, which is now the responsibility of the municipality, could be handed to such an organisation. What we [as a housing corporation] do in the living environment could go there too, so there are plenty of opportunities. (Project leader Portaal)

According to the director of the Hobby Centre, the idea of a self sufficient neighbourhood centre has two causes. First, the dependence of subsidies from the municipality is a cyclical problem: you can only plan a few years ahead, because you never know what is going to happen when a new executive board is installed. Secondly, it would increase independence of the demands of the municipality. If they give a subsidy, they often would like to keep control over the way the money is spent. Still, it could be that in the first stage of the Factory some professionals of Portaal will be part of the management, delivering knowledge and competence to support the development of an independent organisation.

In the end, to have a successful Neighbourhood Factory, the role of residents is of great importance. The director of the Hobby Centre thinks that the Neighbourhood Factory stands or falls with the sense of ownership. Residents should be aware that a Neighbourhood Factory not only provides services or products for them, but they are a part of it: “It means that people don't have to think like, this is what we get subsidy for, no, we have to work together for it, just like other companies. [...] This [the Neighbourhood Factory] is not a company with a pure consumer and a producer, it is a co-production.” (Director Hobby Centre)

2.3. Sirocco

2.3.1. Short description

In 2009, three Moroccan fathers in Nijmegen saw that successful ‘neighbourhood father’ projects were running in other cities in the Netherlands. Together with a local welfare worker of Tandem Welfare they visited such a project in The Hague to see how it was organised. The fathers thought that such an initiative could be carried out in their neighbourhood, Hatert, too - older residents should be able to give other senior residents a feeling of safety if they frequently walked around the area. Their seniority and attachment to the neighbourhood would give them the authority to warn youngsters if they were causing problems. A ‘district manager’ from the municipality very much approved of this idea and gave permission to work out a plan. Because Hatert was on the list of so-called ‘attention areas’ (*aandachtswijk* or *krachtwijk*), the municipality had access to national funds through which the project could be subsidised. The municipality, however, asked for several conditions to be met before the project could start: firstly, the project had to involve not only Moroccan fathers but men and women from different backgrounds; and secondly, the group of residents had to consist of at least ten residents. Hence, the Moroccan founders and the welfare worker started recruiting volunteers and, eventually, around fifteen people joined the *Sirocco* team.

Although it was a necessary requirement for participation, many of the participants were unemployed. Among them were native residents, but also people from diverse ethnic minorities. Once the group of participants had been formed, a more detailed plan was worked out, together with the participants. Officially, the goal was formulated as follows: “To improve the quality of life and safety in Hatert, to improve the communication with and between residents, to increase social control in the area, to form a bridge between parents and (their) youngsters, to motivate youngsters to work on good future perspectives.”

Subsequently, the participants were given walky talkies and red jackets with a logo of *Sirocco* to be recognisable and started walking through the neighbourhood in pairs. Their task was to engage in conversation with other residents and report any affairs concerning safety and public order to the neighbourhood police officer. The idea was that the *Sirocco* volunteers would merely deal with small, simple things. Volunteers would, on the basis of their equal position, talk with residents about issues on liveability of the neighbourhood.

The group took surveillance training provided by a Regional Educational Centre. This consisted of basic competences, dealing with walky talkies, clothing, rights and obligations, etcetera. There were also meetings to encourage team building. After a few weeks of training, they hit the streets.

In the beginning, the project was considered very successful. Residents as well as shop owners were positive about the *Sirocco* surveillance teams. Aldermen, council members and political parties expressed their appreciation for the initiative. *Sirocco* was even awarded a price for best neighbourhood initiative from the local Socialist Party in 2010. There was also plenty of positive media coverage from the local newspaper and television. Nevertheless, at some point, the tone around the *Sirocco* project changed. For instance, some shop owners started complaining that the volunteers were giving them instructions on what to do and what not. There were also incidents where some teenagers intimidated the volunteers. Furthermore, cooperation within the group of participants did not always go smoothly. In short, positive comments turned negative.

Two elements in particular seem to have contributed to the escalation of problems. First, (partly) because of all the positive attention, (some) volunteers slowly shifted away from their original tasks and extended their responsibilities to other issues. For example, they were doing rounds inside shops instead of staying on the streets. Secondly, it was difficult for the professionals to explain to the volunteers that they had to stick to simple tasks, as well as signalling problems that existed in the personal lives of participants. For instance, cliques were formed within the group which made it hard to make pairs. Also, some volunteers already experienced conflicts with youngsters in the neighbourhood before they entered the *Sirocco* team. The project was finally stopped in 2011, when one of the participants of the *Sirocco* project received serious threats from young residents. Although an attempt was made to restart the project later on with a new group of volunteers, this failed.

2.3.2. *Conceptions and ways of addressing users*

The underlying assumption of the project was that older residents have a certain amount of authority that will allow them to adjust the behaviour of younger citizens. In the official reaction of the Mayor and the Executive Board it was stated that this 'ideological' framework appeared to be unachievable. For the former project leader of Tandem, the actual goal of *Sirocco* was broader than this: "Actually, our intention, and also that of the people, was that if you are visible and you are interested [in other people] and you start communicating, to get in contact with residents and youngsters, you have already won 80 percent." (Former project leader Tandem)

For Tandem, it was about supporting and facilitating people who want to contribute to 'neighbourhood society' by stimulating contact and communication among residents. In the case of *Sirocco*, this happened to be on the field of safety, but it could be on any topic. Yet, the municipality might have had more concrete ideas about the merits of the project. As the project leader of Tandem said: "A department Safety or Surveillance will look at it from an entirely different perspective. Contribution to safety, contribution to quality of life, the big words, contribution to decreasing vandalism and things like that." (Former project leader Tandem)

Hence, the initial goal of the project was lost over time and there was a process of goal displacement. The former district manager agrees that in the end, the activities of the volunteers did not match the essence of the project anymore. For him, the essence was: "That people who live in the neighbourhood get the feeling that there are people in the public space who have a personal empathy for the well-being of residents and have time for a little chit-chat about everything, but meanwhile looking out if everything goes well." (Former district manager)

According to the district manager, similar projects elsewhere perform better because volunteers stay out of the picture. Residents should keep an eye on the neighbourhood, but problems should be solved by experts. During the project, volunteers were sometimes seen as 'amateur substitutes' of police officers or supervisors. Perhaps some of them indeed felt like semi-professionals.

2.3.3. Internal organisation and modes of working

The final responsibility for the project was laid at the former Alderman of Neighbourhood Issues. The project was co-financed from the so-called 'Integral Safety Budget', which meant that mayor was partly responsible as well. The district manager of Hatert was responsible for finances, support, and communication with other parties in the municipality. He had a lot of meetings with the project leader of Tandem. If requested, he was present at meetings with the project leader and the volunteers. It was agreed that both he and Tandem arranged external communication. Tandem was responsible for setting up the project. They used their network and contacts to involve more volunteers than the first three initiators. They also had to bring structure in the group concerning dividing tasks, education, work schedule, appointments, and communication within the group, evaluation, financial accounting, and making the group independent within three years. Other involved organisations were the (neighbourhood) police and the Surveillance Department, a subdivision of the police. In practice, the volunteers hit the streets everyday from the afternoon until the evening. They had weekly meetings. Because one of the volunteers had worked as a supervisor, he helped with the coaching of other volunteers.

2.3.4. Interaction with the local welfare system

Sirocco shed light on the relationship between citizens' contributions and regular work of professionals. At the beginning of the project, it was not defined what to expect from the volunteers. Volunteers started to do things they were not supposed to do and/or which should have been left to professionals. According to the project leader of Tandem, regarding volunteers as substitutes of qualified workers placed too much of a burden on the participants. The high expectations conflicted with the voluntary character of the project:

For example, [when the municipality says] 'doesn't there have to be a signed contract', then I think, what are you doing? You get high expectations and things go wrong. You see that a lot by the way, if people want to do something in the neighbourhood and they are confronted with the funder. The funder can't say 'that's a nice idea, here's the money and we'll hear from you how it went'. [...] Now it is right at the beginning, giving money, [then] rules, rules, accountability, accountability. How does that relate to activating people who want to do something? (Former project leader Tandem)

A similar problem appeared in the attempt to restart the project. This time, the conditions to participate were tightened. Especially the first three initiators did not want to join under these new rules. Eventually, it was impossible to create a new group of substantial proportions. At least partly this could be explained by the high expectations that were written down. Hence, to make regular policy of civil initiatives may give tensions:

If it's made policy, know what you ask. You can ask a lot of residents, you can ask a lot of citizens, but if it is regarded as an instrument for your own goals, instead of for what the residents want, where do they benefit from themselves, how do they want to shape their lives in their streets or neighbourhood. If you don't take that as your starting position you get all kind of issues. (Former project leader Tandem)

In the end, a lot has been learned from *Sirocco*. The district manager still believes in these kinds of projects, as long as there is good professional guidance and professionals and residents understand each other:

But I do know that the management has to be a lot... especially when it concerns safety, that you really need to be on top of it. You cannot do it without a professional, a supervisor or a neighbourhood police officer for example. Otherwise it will develop as it has developed now. [...] Professionals and residents have to trust each other for 100 percent, whether it is on the field of safety, communication, work and income or anything. If professionals and residents can reach out to each other from that specific angle - for the residents it is what they know about the neighbourhood because they live there and for the professionals it is their expertise on that field. If you bind that together, it runs very smoothly. (Former district manager)

For the former project leader of Tandem, citizen participation will be difficult to realise when projects become associated with just one particular topic. Especially safety is a topic which is hard to make it the responsibility of residents. For example, heavy criminality cannot be handled by volunteers. Hence, it might be a strategy to connect a thing like safety to a broader topic of liveability. Residents could play different roles to contribute to the liveability of a neighbourhood. When it comes to safety, actions of residents will too easily conflict with work already done by other professionals, the project leader argues.

To summarise, several lessons can be learned from the *Sirocco* project:

- Tasks of volunteers should be clear
- The relation of the task of volunteers and tasks of professional organisations should be clear
- Media attention and high expectations can affect the attitude of volunteers
- Professionals should be able to steer volunteers in their tasks and group process
- Motivations of volunteers can be ambiguous

CONCLUSIONS

Sustainability

Although all innovations were, at least at the start, dependent on public funding, an explicit wish exists among members of all three projects to continue even if financial resources dry up. However, this urge to be self-sufficient was driven by different logics though. Work corporations would prefer to earn revenues of their own because the municipality lacks financial resources to provide extensive reemployment instruments. To be self-sufficient as a work corporation is a necessity rather than a choice. In the case of *A future for everybody*, it is not only the uncertainty of receiving continuous funding that inspired the project management to develop a self-sufficient ‘neighbourhood factory’, but also reluctance to be dependent on a single funder. Hence, the independence of subsidies will safeguard the sustainability of innovations on the one hand, while it may give more control for the initiators of innovations on the other hand. Nevertheless, these kinds of projects may always require some professional guidance at the front-end, for instance, when it comes to knowledge about certain rules and regulations. The money needed for this kind of project management now came partly from a housing corporation. Since housing corporations are suffering big losses due to a housing market deadlock, lowered house prices and increased rental income levies (and sometimes risky investment strategies), it remains to be seen whether they still find it valuable to invest in ‘social sub goals’.

One legacy of these projects seems to have been a shift towards the acceptance of a more active role of citizens. The idea is that co-production between citizens and local agents will increase the effectiveness of services and simultaneously improve social cohesion in

neighbourhoods (see Fledderus, Brandsen & Honingh, 2014). This movement requires a cultural adjustment within professional organisations, which makes it even more evident that it is innovative indeed. For housing corporation Portaal, the shift to more resident involvement was made very consciously. They agreed their traditional approach did no longer fit current times. *Sirocco* however, would not have existed if residents themselves did not express their wish for such a project. The responsible Alderman was not in favour of citizen participation in neighbourhood safety at that time, but political support was given since the initiative came from residents. It might be for this reason too - i.e. the fact that it was not the choice of the police and municipality - that the project encountered problems. Upgrading the community component in mixed welfare systems often ends up in failure because organisations “do not speak people’s language ... or they put people under pressure by demanding too much co-production and compliance” (Evers & Ewers 2012, p. 18). In particular, the propensity of professionals and municipal workers to pull welfare issues towards themselves seems to be tenacious. This may especially be the case when it concerns areas where it is believed citizens do not have sufficient skills or authority, such as safety:

Yes because then people have to come up with things and then eventually it turns into a administrative idea, or a municipal idea and then there is of course an outburst when something happens and then it is left to the institutions. And safety, especially when you look at it isolated, that is a terribly difficult thing to make it something that belongs to the neighbourhood, because there are so many catches involved. (Project leader Tandem Welzijn)

A *future for everybody* might perform better in this respect because it shows characteristics such as “learning, collective rethinking or behavioural changes” (Evers & Ewers 2012, p. 18). While this project actually failed to reach some important targets concerning the development of real estate, it provided soil for new initiatives. Hence, at the end of the day, sustainability of the projects itself does not seem the ultimate goal. Rather, it is about the wish that fundamental ideas on solutions for societal problems survive.

I think, the fact that the municipality has given a follow-up project to the process manager, and Portaal probably will start with that social innovation of that trust... That indicates that at least the cooperating partners in this have turned their vision completely. Their vision is a lot different, at least by the people who are involved in this project, than before. Because we really have seen the importance of that participation. And we always say that but here we are really doing it. (Project leader Portaal)

In the case of *Sirocco*, it was about the idea of having residents take care of problems in their neighbourhood themselves, rather than having organisations and institutions come over and solve issues:

You can approach it like hey, you are the resident in the neighbourhood. Well of course that does not matter that you identify with that neighbourhood and that you can do all sorts of things there, but that for example people can live in the neighbourhood and there are people who play a role in the neighbourhood to give form to that community. But then you approach it from a whole, then you also see it more like if you want something, what would you then like? Also because of the idea the one has to do with the other. The same if it is a mess on street and litter and rubbish, what ... do you say yes that will clean the Dar [waste company] or do you want to do something with that, do

you want something to do with schools, do you want to something with neighbourhood rangers. (Former project leader Tandem)

The Alderman of Work and Income explicitly says work corporations are used as an instrument to introduce a new way of thinking - and that that should be considered as the most innovative feature of the new policy:

The innovative part is that you give all stakeholders in the field a role. Not like somebody has an active role and somebody else a passive one. In my eyes everybody has an active role. [...] We kind of break the taboo... everybody can think something of it and say something, but also take his responsibility. But that is how it should go. Otherwise you get a situation where society says: 'jobseekers at social services, that is the responsibility of the municipality'. Jobseekers who say: 'yeah I get a job from you'. (...) Well that is what I try to break through this way of working, and such a work corporation is a means (to do so). (Alderman Work & Income)

Furthermore, the analysis suggests that innovative ideas at a higher level provide an inspiring environment for new ideas on a lower level. It was found that more complex - or 'governance' - innovations (work corporations and *A future for everybody*) go hand in hand with innovations in approaches and instruments. The several work corporations all have distinct features and some of them may be treated as innovations themselves. This includes new forms of education, innovative ways of connecting labour market to disadvantaged job seekers, and unorthodox ways of making revenues in a social context. Within *A future for everybody* the unconventional instrument of a 'neighbourhood safari' was used, while the *Kuul contact week* could be regarded as innovative too.

Finally, the selection of innovations does not represent 'best practices'. In fact, *Sirocco* shows how the course of development of innovations can be fairly unpredictable: it is both a prize-winning and a failed project. In the other cases, it is still unknown whether the projects can effectively be regarded as a 'success'. Because work corporations have been promoted as a promising instrument by the Alderman, it is politically sensitive if success (in terms of getting people back to work) cannot be proven. This could threaten the sustainability of the policy:

Politics is of course, yes they want to score fast, because within four years it has to be a success. Yes that is sometimes contradicting with yes, the development of an instrument, the learning during practice before you get results. And moreover, in this present situation, it is regardless of which instrument difficult to reach an outflow rate of more than 30 percent, or well, 40 percent. So it is especially the art to keep persisting, every time again. But that is very complicated for politics. Because especially now, in March there are elections again, you feel that in everything. There have to be results now. (Programme manager Work & Income)

They are innovations because "they present themselves as promising, rise aspirations and attract hopes for better coping strategies and solutions", not just because they work 'better' than old arrangements (Evers & Ewert, 2012, p. 3).

Diffusion

The examples of work corporations and *Sirocco* can be seen as "prototypes", models that have been found in different countries and cities and have already proven to work (Evers & Ewers 2012, p. 6). Work integration enterprises, to which work corporations belong, are described in the literature as 'real' enterprises because they deliver goods and services for

(social) markets, yet they are ‘social’ enterprises because they also create opportunities for work and social inclusion (Nyssens 2006). A project like *Sirocco* has been preceded by many other neighbourhood father projects. The first project with Moroccan fathers patrolling through the neighbourhood started in 1999 in Amsterdam. Since then, same types of projects have been spread all over Europe. They have also been documented relatively well (for example, De Gruyter & Pels, 2005). In the case of the *Sirocco*, it was indeed a project in another city that got the attention of some residents in Nijmegen. The former project leader of *Sirocco* explains this ‘idea phase’:

First of all, you see those things appear elsewhere in the country. Amsterdam is of course an example of that, of neighbourhood fathers. With other projects we were also already busy to involve people in their own environment, the liveability, well actually we have always done that as welfare work. In this case, the question was raised, in other parts of the city by the way, about can we not do something with neighbourhood fathers. From the assumption that Moroccan fathers, if you let them carry it out in a relationship with the youngsters, that there is the acceptance of their authority, a presumption. That has not been proven according to me, not at all. But that is an argument right? That it is used throughout the country.

The available funds and goals of the *wijkaanpak* then spurred the project. Also within Future for Everybody, ideas have been picked up from elsewhere, but this does not mean these ideas are accepted just like that.

And that such an innovation or idea happen to come from Portaal in Nijmegen, that that is widely accepted in Portaal while a colleague of mine went to England two years ago to see what is up with that trust, back then it was said here ‘should we do that, are we ready for that, do we want that and should we do that?’ Slowly the recognition starts to grow, in the whole organisation of Portaal, that these innovations are very important to us and that they have a clear value, for our client and for us too in that sense. (Project leader Portaal)

What is striking, however, is that innovations do not use any blueprint to mimic what is already out there. This implies that innovations, although they can build on prototypes, are rarely copied just like that. The factor of societal support might play a role here. For example, to be able to assure the development of work corporations, the municipality had to involve some local front-runners and specialised organisations. The absence of a worked-out plan gave room for these organisations to steer the decision-making.

Interestingly, all three innovations differ in origin. The concept of work corporations was coined by the municipality of Nijmegen. *Sirocco* is a clear example of a bottom-up initiative of residents. ‘*A future for everybody*’, a complex neighbourhood revitalisation project, was initiated by Portaal, a housing corporation in Nijmegen. Yet, regardless of which actor initiated the project, in the end they are dependent on the support of stakeholders. In particular, the support of citizens will increasingly be important if the trend towards individual responsibilities and self-reliance continues. In the case of work corporations, a municipal policy advisor noted that it is already becoming more difficult to find clients who want to work at a work corporation. The concept of a ‘neighbourhood factory’, a kind of trust managed by residents for residents, is obviously completely dependent on active residents. When people tried to give *Sirocco* a second chance, the initiators were no longer motivated to continue. The biggest challenge for local welfare policies may be to provide opportunities for citizens to co-produce solutions for social problems and to facilitate this active citizenship without taking over.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Evers, A. & Ewert, B. (2012). *Social Innovations for Social Cohesion. On Concepts and First findings of a cross-country study*. Paper presented at 10th Annual ESPAnet conference.
- Fledderus, J., Brandsen, T. & Honingh, M. (2014). Restoring trust through the co-production of public services: a theoretical elaboration. *Public Management Review*.
- Gemeente Nijmegen (2011). *Nijmeegse Werkcorporaties. De ontwikkeling van werkcorporaties als leerwerk omgeving ten behoeve van het re-integratiebeleid van de gemeente Nijmegen*. Nijmegen: Gemeente Nijmegen. Online. Available HTTP: http://www2.nijmegen.nl/mmbase/attachments/1087383/Notitie_werkcorporaties_03-2011.pdf (24 May 2012).
- Gemeente Nijmegen, afdeling Onderzoek & Statistiek (2012). Stads- en wijkmonitor, deel Wijk. Nijmegen: Gemeente Nijmegen. Available online. HTTP: http://nijmegen.buurtmonitor.nl/quickstep/QsReportAdvanced.aspx?report=swm_deel_wijk (November 2012).
- Gruyter, M. de & Pels, T. (2005). *De Toekomst van Buurtvaders. Professionalisering met behoud van zeggenschap*. Utrecht: Verweij-Jonker Instituut.
- Nyssens, M. (2006). *Social Enterprise. At the crossroads of market, public policies and civil society*. London and New York: Routledge.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Work corporations in Nijmegen