Case selection in Community Development

Deliverable 7.3 of the project:
"**I**mpact of the **T**hird **S**ector as **So**cial **In**novation" (ITSSOIN),
European Commission – 7th Framework Programme

30 October 2015

Suggested citation

Mensink, W.; Berg, Esther van den; Navrátil, J.; Špalková D.; Placier, K.; Bauer, A.; Ricciuti E.; Ferlisi, M. (2015). Case selection in Community Development: Deliverable 7.2 of the project "Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation" (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

Date:	30 October 2015
ITSSOIN deliverable:	No. 7.3
Main authors:	Wouter Mensink, Esther van den Berg
Contributing authors:	Jiří Navrátil, Dagmar Špalková, Klára Placier, Annette Bauer, Elisa Ricciuti, Martina Ferlisi
Lead partner:	The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Netherlands
Participating partners:	Masaryk University (Czech Republic), Università Commerciale Luigi Bocconi (Italy), London School of Economics and Political Science (United Kingdom)
Contact person:	Wouter Mensink Netherlands Institute for Social Research Department for Participation, Culture and Living Environment w.mensink@scp.nl +31 70 340 6051

Content

1. Introduction

The objective of this deliverable is to come to a social innovation in the field of community development, which we will study in four ITSSOIN-countries: the Netherlands, Italy, the Czech Republic and the United Kingdom.

We start this introduction by memorizing what came before, largely an exploration to come to an initial set of social innovations. First, a broad exploration of the state of the field in all ITSSOIN countries, leading up to a selection of countries and a narrowed-down scope of the community development field (based on Anheier et al. 2015). Second, a more in-depth analysis based on this selection and focus. After the introduction, we discuss the steps taken to validate our initial list, and to come to the innovation we propose to study. We end this deliverable by analyzing a number of concrete examples in our case countries, to see how well they fit the intentions of this study. In order to do this, we establish a number of criteria.

1.1. Major trends

ITSSOIN partner from all countries (Germany, Denmark, United Kingdom, Czech Republic, France, Spain, Italy, Sweden, the Netherlands) drafted vignettes outlining the national situation in the seven domains that we will study (culture & arts, social services, health care, environmental sustainability, consumer protection in finance, work integration, community development). The vignettes relating to community development are not easily comparable, due to unclear agreements about the specific focus. A number of partners narrowed the scope down to community development issues regarding homeless people and refugees, while others adopted a broader focus, often departing from notions like area development.

The focus on these groups stemmed from the connection we made between community development and social inclusion (De Haan 2000). Community development as such was agreed to be too broad a topic. A focus on community development efforts for a particular target group seemed to be a good way of narrowing down the scope. This was based on the thought that community development is often an 'activity (be it enticing industries to a small town, organizing peasants, mobilizing for minority or gender rights, providing elderly care, agitating for environmental protection, cultural rights, or better schools) [...] animated by the pursuit of solidarity and agency' (Bhattacharyya 1995: 61). As might be derived from these examples, these activities are often directed to the inclusion of particular, often disadvantaged social groups. Refugees and homeless people are two groups that often face exclusion.

The country vignettes did not give clear insights in major innovation trends[1], but did sketch the outlines of a field of political contestation (Anheier et al. 2015). Most contributions highlight political complexities, largely in relation to the recent influx of new refugee groups, after years of declining numbers of asylum applications, and increasing strictness of immigration policies (data to substantiate these claims may be found in Mensink et al. 2015). The discourse on integration fluctuated between one-way processes of 'assimilation' and two-way processes of 'inclusion', often leaning toward the former. This, in combination with reduced public support

---

[1] The term 'innovation trends' refers to general developments at a fairly aggregate level, which have affected the chosen field of activity

for asylum seekers and refugees, puts more pressure on communities to find ways of dealing with community integration. New EU member states faced harmonization of their judicial frameworks on top of this. Apart from these judicial and political issues, a number of partners highlighted developments regarding the complexities of societal integration of immigrants. European societies are not quite welcoming of refugees. Work integration and social inclusion are major challenges because of this.

1.2. Social innovation streams

After discussions on the basis of the country-field vignettes, the focus on community developments efforts relating to refugees was finally adopted. We departed from a broad understanding of refugees, including asylum seekers, immigrants whose asylum applications have been granted and refused or unauthorized refugees.

The countries in which this field will be studied are The Netherlands, United Kingdom, Italy and the Czech Republic. Italy was selected for its large influx of migrants, the Czech Republic as a country that is developing from being a post-socialist transit country to Western Europe to a destination country in its own right and the UK and the Netherlands as arrival countries.

The field report included a list of social innovation streams, which was compiled on the basis of three analyses: 1. Desk research for all four countries, 2. Expert consultation in three out of four countries, 3. Review of academic articles in which community-related projects and activities for refugees were labelled as socially innovative. The following two innovation streams came up as relevant in all three analyses:

- *Social activation, capacity building and work integration*: there seem to be many projects that target the skills and capacities of refugees. These may range from job trainings to narrative-based life resumes, and from internship programs with local entrepreneurs to entrepreneurship courses. In our interviews, we found projects targeting all three groups of refugees;
- *Self-organization and local community integration*: there are also many projects targeting the social ties and support ties between refugees and the residents of the localities in which they reside. Projects range from 'human libraries' in which resettled refugees meet locals in a public library, to neighborhoods supporting refused asylum seekers in squatted buildings and from volunteer projects with refugee community organizations to housing refused asylum seekers in private residences.

From the literature, we still added *microfinance, combating discrimination* and *community-based health* as possible social innovation streams. These, however, did not come up as relevant in the expert consultations, or in documentation regarding the four selected countries.

2. Case selection methodology

In order to get from the list of two to five potential social innovation streams to the one we will eventually study in all four countries, the consortium decided to use internal and external validation mechanisms to establish the quality of our selection and to move to a focus on one particular case.

2.1. Internal validation

The main concern that was voiced by consortium members upon presenting the results of the field study (Mensink et al. 2015), was that the connection between community development and the geographical area in which the communities dwell is lost. Some favored an approach in which area development is taken as a starting-point. This might subsequently be focused to a particular target group, such as refugees. We agreed to search for localities in which relatively large, yet heterogeneous groups of refugees live, and study the interaction with other local groups. Nevertheless, we would not assume that groups sharing a certain territory or ethnicity would automatically form a community. Bhattacharyya (1995) particularly warns for approaching community development from the point of view of ethnicity or territoriality. As we wrote in the field report:

> Rather, we must examine social relations in terms of solidarity, or particularly the lack thereof. [..] Solidarity between people living in the same area is not self-evident. Bhattacharyya argues that '[i]t is the impairment, breakdown, or absence, of this solidarity that has been one way or another the point of departure in social criticism for two centuries or more' (1995, 61). Such compromised solidarity is close to what is often called social exclusion. This would relate to situations in which the breakdown of solidarity leads to refusing opportunities or resources to a certain group, refugees in the case of this study (Mensink et al. 2015: 2).

A question that came up is how we should go about selecting localities. Should we examine only those where it is known that innovations are taking place or should we select them merely on the presence of a high proximity of refugees? This would be one of the questions to be addressed in the external validation steps to follow (2.2).

Examining the list of five innovations that we listed in the field report with the consortium, all but one seemed to fit this new approach. Micro-finance did not clearly relate to establishing solidarity in a geographical locality.

2.2. External validation

External validation occurred in two steps. First, we consulted experts in a workshop at the ITSSOIN mid-term conference. Second, we organized additional interviews with representatives of two European umbrella organizations, one focusing on resettled refugees (ECRE), another on undocumented migrants (PICUM).

Expert consultation workshop

The workshop was not widely attended, but led to good discussions with two external experts nonetheless. The experts saw both pros and cons to the two approaches to selecting localities. The advantage of investigating areas where innovations are known to occur is obviously that we will actually find innovations that we might study. Starting to investigate localities that 'merely' have large refugee populations, without knowing whether one might find innovations has the advantage of being open to allow any or no innovation to be investigated. In the end, using a pragmatic approach – going where an innovation is spotted – was favored by the experts. As an additional note: considering that the setup of the project is to study innovations – even if they are failed innovations – it would be awkward to look for cases where innovation may not occur at all.

We also discussed the notion of taking a broad perspective on refugees, versus focusing on areas with large numbers of a particular type of refugee. Do we focus on areas with large, or new reception centers? Towns or villages with a high percentage of resettled refugees? Or on areas where many refused asylum seekers reside, in camps of tents, squatted buildings or neighborhoods that are known to have many undocumented residents? The experts advised not to narrow down the scope prior to selecting the neighborhoods. Considering all three groups diversifies and deepens the level of knowledge about the involvement of the third sector and the diverse organizations and stakeholders that are active for these groups.

The experts on volunteering corroborated the selected social innovations 'social activation, capacity building and work integration' and 'self-organisation and local community integration' as relevant innovative developments. Microfinance and combating discrimination, were seen as interrelated with the above mentioned social innovations. Particularly considering that the former two were also the only ones that we found in all three analyses that were performed for the field report, we decided to take these up in further consultations with external experts.

2.3.   Further expert consultation

In August and September 2015, the researchers interviewed experts from two European/International umbrella organizations, advocating for and offering services to refugees: The European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) and The Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM). We recruited our experts from these two organizations because their international memberships, enables them to compare and reflect on trends, developments and potential innovations in various countries, both in Europe and neighboring regions. Furthermore, these experts, working in European and international offices, are in contact with national branches, which provide them with access to and knowledge about local activism and initiatives. Finally, these two organizations together, account for representation of a broad range of target groups in the consultation, as ECRE aims to advance the rights of refugees, asylum seekers and displaced persons ('all those seeking protection against their loss of rights due to displacement'), whereas PICUM aims to safeguard the rights of undocumented migrants.

The European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) is a European alliance of 90 national non-governmental organisations. ECRE promotes fair and humane European asylum policies and practices in accordance with international human rights law. It aims to advocate protection for refugees in the broadest sense, encompassing not only access to asylum, legal and physical protection, but also integration. The organization engages in research, advocacy and the sharing of knowledge and expertise (www.ecre.org, accessed September 2015).

The Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM) is a network of individuals and organizations from 31 countries, aiming to safeguard social justice and human rights for undocumented migrants. PICUM has 149 platform members (organizations) and 116 individual members who are involved in, or wish to contribute to national and local humanitarian initiatives for undocumented migrants, including human rights organizations, faith-based organizations, trade unions and humanitarian organizations. PICUM provides the connection between the local level, where undocumented migrants' experience is most visible, and the European level where policies relating to them are deliberated (www.picum.org, accessed September 2015).

Refugee self-organizations 'out of the shadows'

The representatives of both organizations corroborated the judgment of the expert that took part in the Paris workshop. Also they argued that the two innovation streamss were relevant. Both expressed a preference for focusing on 'self-organization and local community integration', rather than on 'social activation, capacity building and work integration'. Our respondent at ECRE argued:

> it is a very good way of understanding people, and their behaviour in the host countries. Furthermore, it helps to understand migration itself, because communities are connected not only in Europe, also outside of Europe. If you take for instance Eritrean people, the diaspora is spread all over the world. The case of self-organisation is not only interesting to see how people meet what needs, but also shows how and why people come to Europe, their strategies, how people find their migratory path.

Nevertheless, this only applies if this broad theme is more focused. Self-organization of refugees, as such, is not a new development at all. Refugee community organizations have existed for a long time. The new, innovative development seems to be that self-organizations are more visible now. This is largely due to their struggle for emancipation. This is particularly visible with groups of refused asylum seekers and other undocumented people that have 'come out of the shadow', as one respondent put it, clearly expressing their presence and claiming their rights. This is particularly prevalent in the Dutch group that calls itself 'We are here' and the UK campaign 'Still human, still here'. In many cases, it is not third sector organizations that advocate for these groups, but the groups themselves turn into advocates. According to one of our respondents, a major development is that such self-organizations are increasingly recognized as legitimate actors or stakeholders, particularly by local authorities. This helps to strengthen their impact. Moreover, it creates very different dynamics when it comes to integration with the host community, and NGOs working with refugees. This is also likely to differ strongly among the countries in the study. Our respondents at ECRE added:

> What is interesting about Italy and some Eastern European countries: Because the institutional field is very weak, and the reception conditions are very poor, people are forced to work together. ECRE members in Eastern and Southern European countries, are less reluctant to really work together with refugees, and not to only consider refugees as clients. They work with refugees as mediators. The way these members see and use their relationship with refugees seems to be quite different than how it is seen and used in Western or Central European countries, where refugees are less easily included in their work. So the researchers might find interesting initiatives in countries where the official services for asylum-seekers are imperfect and flawed. In Italy, many organisations work with refugees. It is because they do not have a choice, they are forced to work with asylum seekers more on an equal footing, because they lack staff, funding, or interpreters. The tradition of civil society and NGOs in the South in this field is different, in Western European countries, NGOs are more institutionalized and maintain close relations with institutions, which makes them more distant to refugees. Refugees are seen as clients. Whereas in Italy, civil society is more informal and more flexible.

Another new development is that self-organizations are often no longer based on ethnicity, as many Refugee Community Organizations are. Instead, they unite around notions like being refugees, or being paperless. Our respondent named the Greek Forum for Refugees in Athens as an example, but also the Dutch We are here group serves as an example.

Country-dependent selection of localities

Both respondents argued to examine the national context carefully before deciding on which locality, or localities to select. For some countries, like the Netherlands, they would recommend urban areas. Had Germany been part of our selection of countries, it might have been good to focus on smaller cities, in which initiatives are coordinated well. This would be helpful in terms of data collection. For other countries, like the Czech Republic and Italy, rural areas might be also, or even more interesting. Many migrants work in agriculture there. These impressions are confirmed by our findings in the field report (Mensink et al. 2015).

Criticism of focusing on innovation

Both our respondents were uncomfortable with the notion of social innovation, for two reasons. First, focusing on 'new' practices draws the attention away from 'regular' services and types of advocacy that have always been necessary, and will be likely to be necessary in the future as well. Many needs of refugees are stable, and require very basic support. Our respondents regard social innovation as a trendy term that 'looks good' on grant applications by third sector organizations. Because of this trend, it is increasingly difficult to be funded for the basic support that is still very much needed.

A second issue is the notion that social innovation denotes new solutions that are supposed to be *better* than other solutions. Many third sector organizations perceive that governments increasingly limit the supply of public services and support to which refugees are legally *entitled*. One of our respondents argued:

> Social innovation [by the third sector] should not compensate states obligations. We should not favor innovation [by the third sector] for needs that are considered as basic needs. The same holds for housing, there are interesting citizens initiatives in the field of housing, but governments should guarantee [the right to] housing.

The other respondent added to this by saying that many of the umbrella organization's member organizations

> would never see themselves and their services as the ideal solution, because they fill a gap that is left by governments which are reluctant to provide basic rights [...] See the example of London Housing, matching undocumented with people with a spare room. They would not see their efforts as a sustainable ideal solution for the problem of housing.

At the same time, it seems clear that the lack of public provision of certain services is the *raison d'être* for many existing NGOs. For the Netherlands, for instance, researchers estimated an increase in the number of support organizations for undocumented people from about 30 to about 100 in a period when public services were restricted (Van der Leun en Bouter 2015). Many refugees still struggle with basic needs, like shelter or housing. This creates major imbalances

between them and the host community. Community development, following the definition we provided, is animated by an endeavor to further solidarity and agency. If we regard community disintegration from the point of view of social exclusion, it makes sense to focus on cases that do more than 'merely' establishing stronger ties.

To sum up: the main recommendation of the consulted experts are to: focus on innovations that do more than 'filling the gaps governments leave in providing essential basic services', and to critically reflect on the political intentions behind concepts like social innovation.

3.   Social innovation activities

In the process of preparing our field report, and in the subsequent validation effort, we came across numerous concrete activities that exemplify what we will now call 'community integration by way of self-organization' in the countries we will study. In this final section, we go through a number of them, arguing which types seem to be more or less relevant to our study. The objective here is not yet to select a specific case study for each country, but rather to further streamline our thinking to enable this search.

Based on the above, three selection criteria seem to be important. Focusing on community integration by way of self-organization implies that objectives of the cases to be studied should 'exceed' the offering of basic services, and should foster solidarity and agency. When we talk about community integration, we clearly refer to a two-way process, focusing on social inclusion, rather than on notions like 'assimilation'.

Hosting refugees in private residences

One of the most pressing issues that presented itself over the course of 2015, has been to deal with emergency shelter for the large groups of refugees that came to Europe. Politicians have argued for 'creative' or 'unorthodox' solutions. Citizens of many countries, often out of dissatisfaction with slow government response, have set up grassroots initiatives to host refugees in private residences.The Italian chapter in the field report mentioned an example of such a project:

> "Rifugiato a casa mia" (Refugees at my place) is a pilot project by Caritas (13 sections around the country) which supports a new form of reception for applicants for international protection and/or refugees, and consists in the accommodation of those vulnerable groups in citizens' families. The Project addresses two target audiences: on the one hand, the refugees, which are proposed a form of accommodation alternative to institutional circuits; on the other hand, families that can experiment hosting people from different backgrounds and cultures (Mensink et al. 2015: 47).

Moreover, like in other countries, the Italian case also shows the role that churches play in hosting refugees. This development, together with private hosts, is considered initiatives by informants. In the United Kingdom, there are similar projects, such as a faith-based one called Housing Justice. Also the Czech Republic knows similar projects, albeit in a fairly informal form.

In the Netherlands, initiatives have come up under titles like 'I am a host for a refugee' and 'TakeCareBnB'. From the perspective of social innovation, it is interesting to note that the

Dutch Refugee Council issued a statement urging people to be cautious about becoming a host (Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland 2015). Based on previous experiences, such as with refugees in the Yugoslavia war, there were issues with traumas, dependency relations and refugees losing rights to housing. Moreover, the Council argues that housing is a responsibility of the Dutch government. From this point of view, hosting refugees privately might be a novel solution, but not necessarily a better solution than properly organized public housing. This shows that focusing on cases like this would be interesting if the objective were to establish different stakeholders' views on what constitutes a 'better solution'.

Even if such cases may be considered social innovations, we may wonder if the social problem at their root is a community development problem. If we regard community development as efforts to further solidarity and agency, it partly holds up. It is clearly an example of showing solidarity. The 'agency' indicator is more problematic. Obviously, one might argue that being sheltered is a very basic condition for establishing agency. Still, furthering agency is not likely to be an outspoken objective of such schemes. Moreover, at a more basic level, it seems that such cases are rather about providing basic services than about fostering community integration. All in all, we may conclude that these types of cases are probably not the most suitable for our study.

Getting to know your neighbors

Particularly the Czech field report provided a number of relevant examples of establishing ties between refugees and their neighbors:

> The "Next-door Family" project provides the refugees an opportunity to meet new people, learn their life stories and learn more about the culture of other nations. In the Czech Republic the project started in 2004. So far 1232 Czech families and families of foreigners living in the Czech Republic took part. The project consists of sharing Sunday lunches among neighbours in a family environment. The Sunday meeting takes place in one of the family's home - either at the Czech or migrant family's home. One of the families is the host. Therefore, they prepare for the Sunday lunch visit and program. The choice to become the host always depends on the interests of the families involved. At each meeting, there is an assistant, who meets both families in person and gets in touch with them and exchange the information about the other family and also during the meeting. The meetings promote communication, better understanding of other cultures, building personal relations between Czech families and the families of foreigners, as well as integration of foreigners on a personal level. The project is run by an NGO and funded by the Ministry of Interior.

> The project „Let's Meet at Six" invited people to go out and meet their neighbours, who they usually do not meet. It is an integration project which brokers contacts among Czech citizens and foreigners from the third world countries living in the neighbourhood – in the form of common sit-down -and-chat. They can taste different meals, talk in different languages and see interesting culture program as well as meet various people. Also the integration centres in the locality have been involved in the project - including non-governmental organizations, schools, kindergartens, municipalities, religious institutions, etc. Here the workers of these organizations meet the foreigners

and citizens close to their homes in friendly atmosphere and get to know each other better. The project is run by an NGO and funded by the Ministry of Interior and EU programme (EIF) (Mensink et al. 2015: 59-60).

Further exploration in the Netherlands led us to a comparable case. The human library, or living library (Mensenbieb in Dutch) started as an initiative that took inspiration from a Danish example.[2] The first incarnation was organized at the 2000 Roskilde festival. The basic premise is that people can 'borrow a person', rather than a book. The idea is to foster meetings between people who are often unlikely to meet, people with very different positions in life. Meeting refugees is only one of many incarnation of the living library concept. The project received the Dutch National Innovation Award in 2006. It is an example of a spin-in: an innovative civic initiative that was adopted by the Dutch Refugee Council.

Again, we may wonder whether such innovations are the most relevant in terms of our focus on community development. Clearly, they are highly suitable if we focus on developing social ties. If, however, we also focus on furthering solidarity and agency, the contribution of projects like these is not immediately clear. Moreover, the level of self-organization is not obvious. It seems to be that these types of cases are often projects of publicly funded NGOs. As such, also these types of projects are perhaps the most suitable for our study. It would be interesting, however, to establish whether these projects have effects that 'exceed' establishing contact.

Local Exchange Trade System

An example which did not appear in the preparation for the field study, perhaps because it is no longer functional, is the Local Exchange Trading System (LETS) in Woudrichem, a small town in the South of the Netherlands (Smets en ten Kate 2008). This was an initiative by two locals. They established it after having understood that residents of the local asylum center had very few opportunities, yet had an urge to meet locals. Apart from establishing social ties, it was also meant to offer these refugees useful ways of spending their time. There was a local currency, a 'LETS house' and many related activities, such as a discussion evening, language classes and a nursery. It also facilitated the possibility to meet each other at home. Moreover, it allowed asylum seekers to step out of the 'waiting room', the period in which they wait for their statuses. The initiative received support from nonprofit and commercial organizations.

Such a project seems to fit all three criteria that we highlighted. It is very much an example of self-organization and community integration, it deals with more than offering basic services, such as shelter, and it 'exceeds' establishing contact. Moreover, it establishes links to the notion of social innovation, the other relevant innovation stream that we presented in the field report.

Embedding refugee community-organizations

In most countries, there are self-organizations of refugees, which are often referred to as Refugee community organizations (RCO). This does not seem to apply to all countries, however, such as to Italy. Particularly those refugee groups that arrived more recently are not

---

[2] The original initiator was not available for an interview. The following is based on desk research and on a telephone interview with Hermen Jan Rijks of Stichting Mensenbieb

well organized there, according to informants. The Paolo Sarpi area in Milan is an example of an area with well-established migrant groups, with stronger social networks.

In the Czech republic, the Vietnamese community is organized rather well. However, it is difficult to distinguish between refugees and other types of migrants. This is not necessarily a problem for our study, however, as it will allow us to map social networks. This does not mean, however, that we can use terms like refugee and migrant interchangeably.

The crucial factor for the current study is how they go about interacting with host communities. At this stage, it is not yet clear whether all countries have examples of refugee communities that interact strongly with host communities. If there are such examples, as we have seen before, they establish novel ways of fostering emancipation and coming 'out of the shadow' in order to become legitimate players in the governance of refugee matters. This generally involves stronger community integration. With respect to the United Kingdom, the field report argued to examine:

> grassroots organizations of refugees [that] meet basic needs. We might think of Somali community groups providing space, advice, cooking classes, etc. This may apply to both refugees with a status and to refused asylum seekers. These small-scale organisations often link up with other voluntary organisations and they are often one of the few ways of reaching these often hidden communities. Not all of their work could probably be labelled as socially innovative, but they certainly form an interesting basis for exploring new ways of addressing social needs (Mensink et al. 2015: 35).

With respect to the Netherlands, a concrete example is the so-called 'We are here group'. It is a collaborative initiative of refused asylum seekers, the squat movement and a number of NGOs (e.g. Amnesty International). They started by squatting an abandoned church building, to meet a very basic need: shelter. Interestingly, they received tremendous support from a local youth-group that was affiliated with deacon's office of the church. Moreover, a large local support network formed around the group, involving many volunteers, neighbors offering all sorts of services, local shop owners who provided food, cultural organizations who organized concerts by members of the group, university professors who organized classes (the so-called 'we are here-academy'), etc. The group is also very active in terms of advocacy, and regularly makes the national news. They even set up a co-operative recently, to work on things like activation and work integration.

Also this seems to be an example that meets all three criteria: community integration by way of self-organization, exceeding the organization of basic services and exceeding 'mere' social contact. Moreover, this project is unique in the sense of all the domains it covers: shelter, education, advocacy, social activation, etc. We might call such an initiative a 'hybrid movement'.

Refugee community development

Next to self-organizing projects in which community development really happens from the bottom-up, it also makes sense to consider examples of government-driven efforts that directly target self-organization. This might involve both subsidies to NGOs that promote self-organization, but also broader policy changes to cut back on professional support An interesting case might be the UK-based organization Praxis. As part of its work, it was involved

in drafting a 'refugee community development model' in 2006, for the now-defunct National Refugee Integration Forum. The model established connections between broad community development policy and the particular group of refugees. Praxis defines Refugee Community Development (RCD) as 'a process of fostering opportunities for collective action to address the shared needs and interests of refugee settlement and integration. It is about challenging barriers to settlement and integration and realising the rights of refugees to be recognised and to actively participate as equal UK citizens'.[3]

Additionally, Praxis supports self-organizations, such as the London-based initiative Brighter Futures, a self-advocacy group of active young asylum seekers, refugees and other migrants. This group partners with Kazzum, a community theater-group which turns up in unusual places. This network of organizations looks promising in terms of self-organization, community development and offering services that exceed establishing contact.

4.   Concluding identification of the social innovation stream

In this report, we highlighted the steps we took to select a social innovation stream in the community development domain that we will study in four ITSOIN countries. We explained the focus on refugees, referring to asylum seekers, refugees with a status and refused asylum seekers. We summarized the literature review and expert consultations we performed to gather examples, and explained the further steps we took to validate our selection. In the end, we settled for the stream 'community integration by way of self-organization'. We will select geographical areas in which we know innovations to have occurred.

Examining concrete examples, we proposed to focus on cases that demonstrate: 1. community integration by way of self-organization, 2. Objectives 'exceeding' the offering of basic services, and 3. Objectives to foster solidarity and agency. In other words, we will focus on projects that work with and for refugees, have an element of self-organization and are socially innovative in the way they address social problems beyond the traditional way of meeting basic needs, and aim to integrate refugees and the host community. Examples such as a Local Exchange Trading System (LETS), what we might call 'hybrid' refugee community organizations with strong links to host communities, and 'refugee committee development models' seemed to be most suitable.

When selecting concrete geographical areas for each countries – our next step – we will need to take into consideration whether it makes sense to aim for areas with highly topical issues (i.e. areas that have recently received large numbers of new refugees), or areas with older refugee groups. These are obviously not mutually exclusive. In fact, new arrivals might try to go to places in which members of their ethnic group already reside. If so, the interaction between old and new groups, and the host community, is likely to be very interesting. If not, and this might be particularly the case in areas to which refugees migrate for seasonal work, the setup of old and new groups is likely to be quite different.

---

[3] http://www.praxis.org.uk/manage/cmsincludes/files/Refugee%20Community%20Development%20 MOD EL.pdf.pdf

5. References

Anheier, Helmut, Gorgi Krlev, Georg Mildenberger en Stina Preuss (2015). Country selection for the ITSSOIN project. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN). Brussels: European Commission – 7th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

Bhattacharyya, Jnanabrata (1995). Solidarity and agency: Rethinking community development. In: Human Organization, jg. 54, nr. 1, p. 60-69.

De Haan, Arjan (2000). Social Exclusion: Enriching the understanding of deprivation. In: Studies in Social and Political Thought, jg. 2, nr. 2, p. 22-40.

Mensink, Wouter, Esther Van den Berg, J. Navrátil, Špalková D., A. Bauer, E. Ricciuti en M. Ferlisi (2015). Field Description in Community Development. Part 2 of deliverable 7.1 of the project: "Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation" (ITSSOIN), European Commission - 7th Framework Programme. Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

Smets, Peer en Saskia ten Kate (2008). Let's meet! Let's exchange! LETS as an instrument for linking asylum seekers and the host community in the Netherlands. In: Journal of Refugee Studies, jg. 21, nr. 3, p. 326-346.

Van der Leun, Joanne en Harmen Bouter (2015). Gimme Shelter: Inclusion and Exclusion of Irregular Immigrants in Dutch Civil Society. In: Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, jg. 13, nr. 2, p. 135-155.

Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland (2015). Vluchteling op zolder? Geraadpleegd 17-9-2015, via http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/actueel/nieuws/vluchtelingenopvang-op-zolder.