
Paper submitted to the 12th International conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Ersta Sköndal University College, Stockholm, Sweden, June 28 - July 1, 2016

***Solving the complex challenge of inclusive economic participation.
An explorative research on the design of IEP-sites in Flanders (Belgium).***

Nathalie VALLET, professor at the University of Antwerp (Belgium), Faculty of Design Sciences, Faculty of Applied Economics and Antwerp Management School (Master in Public Management), nathalie.vallet@uantwerpen.be

Michelle BYLEMANS, junior researcher at the University of Antwerp (Belgium), Faculty of Design Sciences, michelle.bylemans@uantwerpen.be

Simon DE NYS-KETELS, former junior researcher at the University of Antwerp (Belgium), Faculty of Design Sciences, and presently at the University of Ghent (Belgium), Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Simon.DeNysKetels@Ugent.be

Abstract:

Most initiatives within Flanders (Belgium) that focus on a (more) inclusive economic participation, are often poorly coordinated and physically dispersed in nature. As physical distances clearly create obstructive thresholds for vulnerable citizens to enjoy the benefits of these initiatives, public organizations and social enterprises are looking for alternative solutions. This paper is focused on one particular solution, being that of the creation of so-called "Inclusive Economic Participation (IEP)sites". Based on 25 quick scan case-studies and 6 focus-group debates (i.e. Grounded Theory research design), the paper reports on the elaboration of so-called strategic-spatial blueprints that help local governments and social enterprises to create such IEP sites.

Key-words:

Inclusive economic participation, strategic-spatial blueprint, Grounded Theory, Flemish cities

Introduction

The ever-increasing amount and changing profile of socially deprived urban citizens, turns the policy-wise ambition of a (more) inclusive economic participation into a significant but also complex challenge (Spear et al., 2001; Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005; Bouchard, 2009 and 2013; Conforth and Brown, 2014). As the socially deprived position is often related to a weakened economic position, organizations taking up this challenge are particularly interested in the question: how can socially deprived urban citizens participate economically as a consumer and as a provider of labor in a more solid way?

In this paper, we focus on the inclusive economic participation challenge as experienced in Flemish cities¹. To further fine-tune our research focus, we have made an inventory of all urban Social and Solidarist Economy (SSE) initiatives within Flanders. Although such an inventory represents only a part of all urban inclusive economic participation initiatives - mainly the formal registered ones involving SSE-organizations - it does generate relevant and useful inspiration. As such, we uncovered a relatively large but geographically highly scattered amount of initiatives throughout Flemish urban territories². When reflecting on this particular research finding with a panel of experts in socially deprived urban citizens (see: Research Methodology, IEP-Reference-Platforms), the problematic nature of this geographical spreading is explicitly emphasized. After all, the spatial spreading makes it quite difficult for socially deprived urban citizens to get a clear overview of all the existing initiatives, let alone to find and obtain the best fitting support. Physical distances clearly create obstructive thresholds. As such, we decided to further fine-tune our research focus on the particular challenge of the spatially dispersed nature of inclusive economic participation initiatives within Flemish cities.

To remedy and take up this challenge we have introduced the concept of a so-called "Inclusive Economic Participation (IEP)site". Inspired by the ideas of the urbanist Manuel Castells (Castells, 1989, 1996 and 2010; Stock, 2011), we define such an IEP site as: a spatially concentrated "hub" or location in cities that accommodates public, third sector and profit organizations who jointly strive for a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived citizens, both as a consumer and as a provider of labor. We assume that the concentrated accommodation of an IEP site will minimize the previously described thresholds, as well as simplify information, coordination and mobility efforts. Thus, finding the appropriate support will presumably become less complex.

In relation to this solution, our research goal is to develop overall models or so-called blueprints for the installation, development and exploitation of these IEP sites. A blueprint specifies how the inclusive economic participation ambitions of all partners involved can be actually realized. In line with the multi-disciplinary expertise of our research team (i.e. experts in social economy, public management and architecture & urbanism), our research efforts will be focused on a particular kind of blueprint, being that of a so-called strategic-

spatial blueprint. In an initial working definition, the strategic features refer to (i) the strategic meaning of the IEP site i.e. the importance and relevance of an inclusive economic participation in relation to the long term challenges of the city, (ii) the strategic and organizational design of the IEP site i.e. the organizational features including the strategic decision process and structure, and (iii) the strategic impact i.e. the degree in which the activities of the IEP site actually contribute to a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens. The spatial features of the blueprint refer to (i) the spatial context i.e. the precise location of the IEP site, (ii) the spatial design of the IEP site itself i.e. the composition and architectural features of the site and its buildings and (iii) the spatial impact i.e. the degree in which the spatial design of the IEP site actually contributes to a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens.

As the concept of an IEP site is new, the inspiration of already existing blueprints is not self-evident, if not absent. Therefore, our major scientific challenge will be to construct these strategic-spatial blueprints ourselves. We can however find relevant and useful inspiration in already existing IEP site “related” initiatives (see: Research Methodology).

Within this paper we will report on the results of a first, inductive inspiration exercise to design strategic-spatial blueprints for IEP sites in Flemish cities. This inspiration is based on two explorative research projects covering 25 quick scan case-studies and 6 focus-group debates. Given our previously described research ambitions, the following research question will be answered: what can we inductively learn from both explorative research projects in relation to the specific nature of strategic-spatial blueprints for IEP sites in Flemish cities? What kind of topics and respective points of attention are important to be specified and elaborated in view of the “governance” (i.e. the installation, development and exploitation) of these IEP sites ?

It must be clear that the research results of this paper relate to only one step within a longitudinal process of subsequent research projects. In a previous paper we have focused mainly on the inductive conceptual elaboration of an IEP site (Vallet, De Nys-Ketels and Bylemans, 2016). In this paper the strategic-spatial blueprints and their particular features are of central importance. As such, additional reflections and design suggestions are made in comparison to the previous paper.

As far as the structure of this paper is concerned, a first paragraph will report on the research methodology. A second paragraph will present the research results. In response to the previously defined research question, we will subsequently report on the strategic and spatial topics as well as the inductively uncovered points of attention. Finally, we will conclude with some overall lessons learned.

The research methodology: looking for inductive inspiration

As the concept of an IEP site is non-existing, the design of the strategic-spatial blueprints is clearly explorative in nature. Thus, we choose for a qualitative research design according to the principles of Grounded Theory (Straus and Corbin, 1994; Charmaz, 2006; Morse, 2009; Stern and Porr, 2011; Birks, 2011). By gradually collecting and analyzing field data of IEP site “related” initiatives, we look for relevant and useful inspiration. These IEP site related initiatives are defined as initiatives throughout Flemish urban territories (i) in which several organizations (ii) focus on an inclusive economic participation. Given the definition of SSE-organizations (Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005; Monzon and Chavez, 2008, , Bouchard, 2009), we assume that the explicit presence of at least one SSE-organization will guarantee the inclusive economic nature of the initiative involved. In view of the geographical spreading as well as the practical manageability of both explorative research projects³, we eventually select a set of 25 IEP site related initiatives located in different urban territories throughout Flanders.

Each initiative is investigated by means of a so-called quick scan case study. For the data-collection within these case-studies we use three complementary techniques being (i) written or digital documents (e.g. brochures, internal policy notes and website-information), (ii) visual representations (e.g. plans, maps, photos and self-made sketches), (iii) open and/or half-structured interviews⁴ and (iv) observations (e.g. visits to the SSE-initiatives by the researchers). Given our research ambitions, the collected data relate to the existing strategic and spatial features of each initiative. Although we have defined these features by means of an initial working definition (see: Introduction), we further specify and adjust them during the data-collection itself. Thus - and according to the overall principles of Grounded Theory - the continuous interaction between the initial working definition and the subsequent inductive discoveries, generates a list of data-collection items referring to the so-called topics of the strategic-spatial blueprints (see: Research Results). Also in line with the overall principles of Grounded Theory, we use complementary inventory and visualization techniques to realize a clear and easy-to-understand representation of the collected data (e.g. tables, schemes and figures). As such, the making of a comparative analysis of all quick scan case-studies is considerably facilitated.

To guarantee the overall quality and practical use of the elaborated strategic-spatial blueprints, the results of the analysis are discussed thoroughly within the so-called “IEP-Reference-Platforms” of each research project. As mentioned before (see: Introduction), our research efforts are gradually commented by a panel of policy and field experts. In particular, it concerns representatives of Flemish urban government, SSE-organizations and organizations representing different categories of socially deprived urban citizens. Additionally, and to safeguard a thorough multi-disciplinary embeddedness, these platforms also include representatives of other Flemish universities. Their academic expertise relates to the disciplines of social economy, social psychology, architecture & urban planning and law. Taken both IEP-Reference-Platforms together, six focus-group debates of approximately

three hours each were organized. Per focus-group debate approximately 20 representatives participated. The respective discussions relate to the particular features of each initiative, as well as relevant critical reflections.

The research results: finding relevant and interesting inspiration

In this third paragraph we will report on the inspirational research findings for the construction of strategic-spatial blueprints for IEP sites. On the one hand it concerns the precise nature of the so-called strategic and spatial topics. On the other hand it concerns particular points of attention for each topic.

Identifying blueprint topics

Let us first look at the strategic and spatial topics. Based on the analysis of the 25 quick scan case-studies as well as the comments made by the IEP-Reference Platforms, the initial specification of the strategic topics can inductively be redefined as follows:

- The initial strategic meaning is fine-tuned into (i) the particular urban challenge(s) that lead(s) to the creation of the initiative, (ii) the type of (inclusive) economic activitie(s) that are undertaken or realized by the different partners involved, and (iii) the (particular) profile of the target group(s) that benefit from these activities;
- The initial strategic and organizational design is fine-tuned into (i) the identity and particular role of each partner involved, (ii) the strategic ambitions (e.g. mission, goals, actions) of each individual partner separately as well as the (ambitioned) synergetic effects of the collaboration, (iii) the structure and organizational features of each individual partner separately as well as the joint collaboration, and (iv) the financial construction or features of the collaboration;
- The initial strategic impact is fine-tuned into (i) the (effective) realization of the strategic ambitions of each individual partner and their (ambitioned) collaboration, and (ii) the direct and/or indirect effects on the particular urban challenge in relation to an inclusive economic participation;

Additionally, the initial specification of the spatial topics can inductively be redefined as follows:

- The initial spatial context is fine-tuned into (i) the precise location of the site within the urban territory and its particular features, and (ii) the phase-wise or historic coming into existence of the site;
- The initial spatial design is fine-tuned into (i) the spatial lay-out and plan of the site, including the footprints of all buildings and spaces involved, (ii) the façade and architectural identity and/or communication of the site (i.e. position within the streetscape), (iii) the nature of the buildings (e.g. newly built, renovated, a

combination), and (iv) the degree of (easy) accessibility and (inter)connectedness of the site with the urban territory (e.g. a low threshold for the surrounding neighborhood);

- The initial spatial impact is fine-tuned into (i) the contribution of the spatial design to the realization of the strategic ambitions at the site (see also before: strategic features);

Although the inductive fine-tuning generates a more elaborated set of relevant topics, we have to admit that the so-called impact topics have somehow been underexposed. But at present, and as a result of a first exploration exercise, the set of nine instead of three strategic topics and seven instead of three spatial topics is already quite useful and relevant.

Identifying strategic points of attention

When further analyzing the data, we find quite interesting points of attention for the blueprints. Let us first look at the points of attention relating to the nine strategic topics.

Well-considered versus coincidental urban challenges

It is interesting to notice that the particular urban challenges (i.e. strategic topic) that lead to the creation of IEP site related initiatives, are not always clear and explicitly defined. As will be illustrated later, joining forces is not so much a question of creating deliberate and conscious alliances in view of a well-defined challenge, but rather of being concerned in the “overall” problem of inclusive economic participation and being accidentally situated “next to each other” (see also “Site-exceeding but coincidental and hampered joint strategic ambitions”). And when particular specifications or choices of future challenges are made, the nature often differs according to the different partners involved (e.g. public actor, SSE-organization). Most often these challenges refer to specific economic activities and/or particular groups or profiles of socially vulnerable citizens (see also “A diverse kaleidoscope of economic activities” and “Struggling with the precise meaning and intention of inclusiveness”).

From a governance perspective, the absence of clear, well-defined and consciously shared challenges may weaken the identity and mere reason of existence of an IEP site. As such, synergetic effects and investments may become temporarily and non-structured, instead of long-lasting and well-structured. Therefore it is important to formulate the particular urban challenges that lead to the construction of an IEP site, in a clear, well-defined and consciously shared way.

A diverse kaleidoscope of economic activities

When analyzing the different types of economic activities (i.e. strategic topic) within the 25 IEP site related initiatives, we can distinguish three interesting research findings.

First, the research results uncover a rich and diverse set of economic activities, including for instance the construction and maintenance industry (e.g. repair, handyman services,

laundry, cleaning), the (bio)agricultural and food industry (e.g. bio-production of fruit, vegetables and juices, horticulture and gardening, urban agriculture and self-harvesting initiatives), the creative industry (e.g. eco-design, recycling furniture and clothing, arts-and-craft activities, exhibition facilities), the mobility, logistics and distribution sector (e.g. bicycle hiring-repair-selling shops, packaging), the retail sector (e.g. social groceries, catering services), the consulting and education sector (e.g. job-coaching, buddy-services, training, co-working facilities), tourism (e.g. farm-tourism and children's farm initiatives) and care & wellness (e.g. child-care, social restaurants, services for elderly people, water- and animal-related therapy).

From a governance point of view, this rich and diverse set of economic activities creates opportunities for distinguishing different types of IEP sites and associated blueprints. According to the particular requirements of each economic activity, other arrangements have to be made concerning for instance the specific profile of the partners, the infrastructural facilities and the required investments. Based on the comments of the IEP-Reference-Platforms, the following types are considered to be relevant and useful: (i) a *specialized* IEP site focusing on only one particular economic activity or sector, (ii) a more *generalist* IEP site focusing on a broad range of (complementary) products and services, (iii) a *unique* or *tailor-made* IEP site combining a well-considered selection of economic activities in accordance to the specific needs of a certain neighborhood, (iv) a *traditional* IEP site focusing on traditional Flemish SSE-activities like for instance maintenance, catering and distribution/packaging, (v) an *innovative* IEP site focusing on new SSE-activities like for instance the creative industry, tourism and wellness.

A second set of research findings concerns aspects that presumably influence or determine preferred economic activities. As such, the so-called "historical tissue" of a city is often referred to as favoring the presence of a particular type of economic activities above others (e.g. the textile industry, the agricultural sector).

From a governance perspective, it is important to investigate why and how the profile of the IEP site should – or should not – respect a certain "historic tissue" or economic tradition of the city? Certainly from the perspective of the (local) public partners involved, we notice that this can be an important issue. As such, the IEP site is supposed to fit for instance their particular city marketing ambitions which can imply the emphasis on a particular economic identity (e.g. a green city, a creative city, a touristic city, a commercial city). Consequently, the installation of a specific type of *historically embedded* or even *economic heritage* IEP site comes into our minds.

A third and last set of research results concerns the simultaneous presence of consumption (e.g. a social restaurant, recycling stores, child care facilities) and employment activities (e.g. workshops, production cooperatives). In a lot of IEP site related initiatives both types of activities are present, albeit not necessarily in a deliberate or consciously elaborated way

(see also “Site-exceeding but coincidental and hampered *joint* strategic ambitions ”). In general, the underlying rationale - if present – of accommodating both activities within the existing initiatives, is related to an overall concern of each partner for a fully-fledged service for socially deprived urban citizens: “the more, the merrier”.

From a governance point of view, the suggested combination on an IEP site, can be seen as being in line with some, already existing initiatives. Thus, the suggested combination is presumably a feasible and sense-making construction. But, a more consciously elaborated combination seems to be recommendable as the intensive, synergetic and optimized use of an IEP site by socially deprived urban citizens is probably influenced by a (more) harmonious development of both types of activities.

Struggling with the precise meaning and intention of inclusiveness

When considering the 25 IEP site related initiatives as well as the comments made by the IEP-Reference-Platforms, a lot of information is collected on the users or target groups of an IEP site (i.e. strategic topic). On the whole, we can distinguish five research findings that all seem to reflect a kind of struggle with defining and marking out the concept of inclusiveness.

First, most participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms believe that IEP sites may not be used or destined exclusively to socially deprived urban citizens. In order to prevent stigmatization, IEP sites should not be associated with for instance (i) “gated” economic communities for deprived citizens only, (ii) “isolated fortresses” or (iii) socio-economic “ghettos”. In contrast, IEP sites should be open to all urban citizens, regardless of their socio-economic profile. Simultaneously, other participants however emphasize that such a mixed use may eventually scare off or even exclude socially deprived citizens as they risk not to be served, helped or supported in a proper or tailor-made way. When being or becoming a minority within the mix, chances are high that their specific needs will not be met by organizations looking for scale effects realized in serving mainly the non-deprived majority.

From a governance perspective, these rather ambiguous research findings emphasize the caution with which the notion of inclusiveness should be defined and operationalized within an IEP site. In respect to a certain degree of openness, an IEP site should not be exclusively destined for socially deprived urban citizens alone, but should nonetheless guarantee that socially deprived urban citizens are and remain the principle target group of the site.

A second research finding is less or more related to the previous one, but is based on the analysis of the 25 quick scan case-studies. In line with the desired openness we detect that this is clearly the case for most consumption-related activities (e.g. recycling stores, bicycle rent-and-repair shops), but far less for employment-related activities (i.e. jobs, training and education facilities). Thus, the latter still focus predominantly on the support of “only” socially deprived urban citizens.

This additional research finding is again interesting from a governance point of view. Although an IEP site may be more or even solely inclusive in relation to the employment-related activities, it may be less or even not inclusive in relation to the consumption-related economic activities. As such, a kind of semi-inclusive meaning can be associated with the concept of an IEP site.

A third set of research findings is once again based on the analysis of the IEP site related initiatives. In particular, it focusses on the identity of socially deprived urban citizens. Notwithstanding the use of similar criteria⁵ and categories⁶, few partners of a particular initiative focus on only one category. Instead, they usually try to support the inclusive economic participation of more than one and mutually different – complementary ? - categories. Additionally, we notice that priorities and preferences are most often used by public partners. In view of the realization of particular policy goals (i.e. target-group related electoral ambitions) and urban challenges (e.g. target-group related unemployment rates or social endeavors), they seem to be most sensitive in choosing and favoring particular categories or profiles above others.

From a governance point of view, the particular identity and categories of socially deprived urban citizens create opportunities for distinguishing different types of IEP sites and associated blueprints. According to the requirements of each category, other arrangements have to be made concerning for instance the specific profile of the partners, the offered support and the required facilities. Based on the comments of the IEP-Reference-platforms, it is therefore relevant and useful to distinguish (i) a *single* versus (ii) a *multi*-category IEP site. Additionally, it is important to decide whether category priorities will be used or not? Presumably and based on the existing IEP site related initiatives, the public actors will prefer such category specifications.

Fourth, most participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms explicitly emphasize the need to pay also attention to new or “not traditional” profiles of socially deprived urban citizens. Based on their observations and experiences, these profiles are associated with the aftermath of the contemporary economic crises and some emerging societal trends. When considering the aftermath of the economic crises, the participants pay a lot of attention to the increasing amount of bankrupt self-employed citizens or small businessman who have no “financial safety net” created by successive generations within the family to help them overcome difficult times. When referring to societal trends, the participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms mainly focus on two phenomena. On the one hand there is the growing amount of work-stress related illnesses (e.g. burn-out, depression) that prevent a full economic participation as a provider of labor, but simultaneously increase their economic expenditures as a consumer (e.g. medical and household services). On the other hand, there are the family-related challenges (e.g. the care for elderly and financially deprived family-members, the mental and financial constraints of one-parent families).

From a governance perspective, this growing diversity within the population of socially deprived urban citizens generates the need for a diverse set of solutions. In view of the previously described new profiles, there is clearly a need for more temporary, tailor-made and mental coaching support facilities. Based on the comments of the IEP-Reference-Platforms, the following types of IEP sites may offer this kind of support: (i) a “creative (re)energizing spot”, (ii) a “decompression zone⁷”, or “a discrete, non-stigmatizing free port⁸”.

A fifth and last set of research findings concerns aspects that clearly influence or determine preferred profiles of users and target groups. As also noticed when discussing the preferred economic activities, the so-called “historical tissue” of a city can favor a particular type of target group above others (e.g. low-skilled seasonal workers, deprived senior citizens).

From a governance perspective, it is once again important to investigate why and how the IEP site should – or should not – respect a certain “historic tissue” of the city when discussing the profiles of the users and target groups?

On dominant partners and institutional frameworks

When analyzing the identity and particular role of each partner (i.e. strategic topic), we can distinguish three relevant research findings. Taken together, they seem to emphasize the presence – need ? - of dominant partners, as well as the influence of institutional frameworks.

When considering the amount of partners within the 25 IEP site related initiatives, we notice a variation between two or three up until five organizations. According to the participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms, this limited amount of partners can be explained by two phenomena. On the one hand there is the piloting phase in which most of these initiatives presently find themselves. And on the other hand there is the high competitive institutional context in which the enthusiasm to join forces by Flemish SSE-organizations is considerably moderated. Consequently, SSE-organizations seem to prefer a diversification strategy of their own product and service portfolio, rather than to cooperate with “rivalry” partners.

From a governance perspective, these findings suggest two implications. An IEP site may gradually include more partners according to an emergent versus carefully planned growth pattern. As such, not only the amount but also the specific profile of the partners involved may change in the course of time (e.g. the “initiators” versus “followers”). The concept of an IEP site thus becomes considerably more dynamic than initially thought of. The second implication concerns the explicit awareness of potential obstructions (i.e. threats) and facilities (i.e. opportunities) for a joint consortium provoked by institutional frameworks. The high competitive institutional framework for instance in which Flemish SSE-organizations have to operate, clearly seems to jeopardize the formation of large partner networks. Although this is not self-evident, governance principles within the IEP site blueprints may try

to overcome or remedy the possible obstructive effects of these institutional frameworks. A well-considered or complementary alliance agreement may for instance exclude aggressive competition and stimulate cooperation.

A second set of research findings relates to the many comments made by the IEP-Reference-Platforms on the particular position of SSE-organizations. Given their explicit and fundamental focus on an inclusive economy, all participants agree that IEP sites certainly should accommodate SSE-organizations. Whether their position should be dominant or even exclusive is however not self-evident, on the contrary. Different point of views seem to circulate. From a more practical point of view, the overall financial feasibility and the long term survival of an IEP site, demands for a considerable cash-flow and return-on-investment that cannot be realized by SSE-organizations alone. Their financial capacities are not only moderate because of their dominant focus on *social* instead of *economic* or financial goals, but also due to forthcoming policy changes within Flanders that restrict their public financing facilities (i.e. subsidies) and urges them to look for "money on the free and private market". From a more principle point of view, there is the ideological conviction of some participants that the performance of profit organizations is per definition superior, more dynamic and better than that of SSE-organizations. Another reasoning denies or rejects the uniqueness of the added value of SSE-organizations and thus the necessity of their presence on an IEP site. And a third argument is based on the conviction that only mixed alliances between "regular" or profit and SSE-organizations can generate innovative management solutions for an IEP site.

From a governance perspective, these findings on SSE-organizations are interesting. Given the definition of SSE-organizations (see: Research Methodology), their presence is undoubtedly vital and necessary for the bare existence of an IEP site. After all, the inclusive economic thought is embedded in their DNA. On the basis of the numerous comments however, it becomes clear that an IEP site cannot depend entirely and alone on their presence. Because of financial, policy-wise and ideological (i.e. convictions) reasons, the presence of other third sector and even profit organizations is advisable.

Finally, and less or more related to the second set of research findings, but based on the analysis of the 25 IEP site related initiatives, it becomes clear that in most of these initiatives a public partner is involved who "financially" by means of subsidies and financial investments, or "spatially" by means of the disposal and/or rent of a public domain, location or building, facilitates and stimulates the respective initiatives. This however does not mean that (i) the public partner is still present once the stimulation job is done, nor (ii) that the public stimulation is realized in an active and dominant way, nor (iii) that a public partner is always present and necessary (i.e. there do also exist some grass-rooted initiatives in which no public partner is involved). Nonetheless, the public partner seems to play a considerable role in realizing the so-called intertwining nature of the IEP site related activities (see also

“Site-exceeding but coincidental and hampered *joint* strategic ambitions”). When reflecting on the particular identity of the public actor, we notice that mainly the local or urban governments seem to play an important role. The public profile can however become more complex, as also combinations or consortia of different public agents on various policy levels occur (e.g. the province, the Flemish community, the federal Belgian state or European funding agencies). In such a complex situation, considerable conflicts of interest can emerge (e.g. based on different electoral and/or ideological ambitions) that result in a rather unfavorable or even hostile setting for an IEP site. After all, the IEP site construction risks to be constantly drawn and gorged into a much wider and tense political debate with difficult to master trade-offs. This is certainly the case when the IEP site itself is used as a trade-off for other political aspirations (e.g. education, housing, mobility).

When considering the governance implications of these last research findings, it becomes clear that public partners and especially local governments fulfill a vital role, certainly in the start-up of an IEP-site. This is mainly due to the provision of financial means and basic facilities. To prevent that conflicting interests of different public actors complicate and jeopardize the start-up, it is important to clear out these differences as soon as possible and to specify explicitly the *joint* public ambitions and the consequences for the role of each public actor separately. Admittedly, IEP sites may also be created without the support of a public actor. As such, a distinction can be made between the blueprint and governance of a (i) *publically* or formally initiated versus a (ii) *grass-rooted* IEP site.

Site-exceeding but coincidental and hampered joint strategic ambitions

When analyzing the strategic ambitions (i.e. strategic topic), we can identify again three relevant sets of research findings.

A first set concerns the action-radius of an IEP site. According to most participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms, organizations situated on an IEP site should be prepared to collaborate also with partners located outside the site itself. As such, they emphasize that an IEP site should take up the strategic role of “connector” and/or “facilitator” of region-wise inclusive economic participation activities.

From a governance point of view, these findings suggest that the strategic ambitions of an IEP site should - may ? - be site exceeding and match the profile of a kind of base-camp for a region-wise inclusive economic participation network.

When analyzing the 25 quick scan case-studies, we find a second interesting set of research findings. In particular, we notice that the intertwining nature of these initiatives is often the result of (i) a coincidental joint spatial location or opportunity, and/or (ii) a rather general or vague ambition of the local public actor to jointly accommodate organizations that support “in some kind of way” an inclusive economy. Let us further explain both findings. Indirectly, most partners of the IEP related initiatives – and certainly the SSE-organizations - do share a

common concern for an inclusive economy, but they have not deliberately chosen for each other and negotiated for instance a mutually reinforcing set of activities. In other words, the shared location is often the result of a “coincidence”, rather than of a well-elaborated and negotiated decision amongst all partners involved. Additionally, we notice that the most deliberate reflection is often made by the local public actor. When the socio-economic policy targets emphasize the economic participation of socially deprived urban citizens, the local public actor can benefit (politically) from a well-considered intertwining effort on the IEP site. After all, this might generate a high commitment of all partners involved and thus increase the actual realization of the respective policy target. But, when considering the 25 quick scan case-studies the deliberate reflection of the local public actor is not always that clear and convincing. As such, the development of joint and synergetic strategic activities is for instance seldom an explicit demand formulated by the local public actor.

When considering the governance implications of these findings, it becomes clear that the intertwined nature of an IEP site should be a well-considered and explicitly negotiated joint strategic ambition. In particular, this might be initiated by the local public actor (i.e. additional role of the public actor in comparison to the roles mentioned in “On dominant partners and institutional frameworks”).

When further investigating the possible causes of the coincidental nature of the intertwined activities, some participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms refer to the previously described setting of Flemish SSE-organizations (see also “On dominant partners and institutional frameworks”): SSE-organizations seem to consider themselves rather as mutual competitors than as partners to be joined in a close cooperation. A few participants also emphasize that the competition within the Flemish SSE-sector is much higher than generally assumed by outsiders. Therefore deliberate strategic alliances are not self-evident.

From a governance perspective, it is important to be aware of the potential threats and opportunities for a conscious and deliberate joint strategic ambition. After all, this is an essential ingredient of our IEP site concept. Although it is not yet clear how to overcome these threats, we can assume that they are closely related to the specific nature and policy-wise setting of Flemish SSE-organizations. Additionally, a more conscious joint strategic ambition can be stimulated by an alliance agreement in which a set of joint ambitions and associated actions is explicitly stipulated. Thus, the overall competition can hopefully be moderated in favor of a well-defined - and safe ?- cooperation. This cooperation can also be the result of a (gradual) growth strategy: subsequently, alternative joint strategic ambitions can be elaborated, tried-out and evaluated. As such, a more organic approach of gradual commitment-building takes place.

In search of a missing organizational design

In relation to the structure and organizational features (i.e. strategic topic), we have collected only a limited amount of relevant information. In line with the principles of Grounded Theory, a second data-collection phase is therefore certainly needed. On the basis of the present data, we can however already uncover some relevant items.

In general and based on the 25 quick scan case-studies, it becomes clear that joining forces does not automatically imply the elaborating of a joint organizational structure. On the contrary, the joint organizational design of the IEP site related initiatives is often poorly elaborated, if not missing. Presumably, and according to some participants of the IEP-Reference-Platforms this is due to the coincidental nature of the joint strategic ambitions: what is not well-considered in the first place, will not be further elaborated afterwards.

To safeguard the realization of the joint strategic ambitions, it is however important to dispose of a supportive joint structure. As these strategic ambitions are part of the network identity of an IEP site (see before), this is also the case of the supportive joint structure. From a governance point of view, it is therefore advisable to certainly elaborate such a strategy-compatible network structure.

A second set of organizational features relates to the focus on socially deprived citizens (see before: "Struggling with the precise meaning and intention of inclusiveness"): the network structure should guarantee a simple, transparent and tailor-made coordination of all IEP site services.

To realize this, special coordination mechanisms are needed like for instance a permanent liaison platform (Daft, 2010; Luhman and Cunliffe, 2013). Such a platform can function like an "easy-accessible central information desk" that takes care of the basic coordination between the different services and products offered by the various partners involved. As such, it receives, informs and sends on socially vulnerable citizens to the right or most suitable partner(s) on the IEP site. Additionally, this permanent platform can also fulfill the role of mediator when a special, more intense or highly tailor-made support is needed (e.g. for the new and changing profiles of socially deprived citizens: see also before). In order to be effective, the permanent platform should however have intense and structurally embedded contacts with all IEP site partners.

When considering the particular coordination of (more) temporary IEP site services (e.g. special events or happenings) additional coordination mechanisms can be installed by means of temporary task forces (Daft, 2010; Luhman and Cunliffe, 2013). In view of the specific nature of each temporary service, the taskforce will consist of (temporary) representatives of the partners involved.

Another governance implication besides the use of special coordination mechanisms, concerns the power distribution of the network structure. When the partners really want to engage socially deprived citizens, it might be advisable to explicitly involve the latter in the

joint strategic decision process itself. As such, socially deprived citizens can participate actively in defining the joint strategic ambitions and offered services. An explicit participation might also be useful in particular types of IEP sites, like a creative (re)energizing spot, a decompression zone or a discrete, non-stigmatizing free port. The precise meaning of (re)energizing, decompression or free port, is subjective and has to be clarified also by the subjects themselves (i.e. socially deprived citizens).

A third set of organizational features relates to the information on “On dominant partners and institutional frameworks” and “Site-exceeding but coincidental and hampered joint strategic ambitions”.

From a governance point of view, the various partner profiles (e.g. see also before: public actors, SSE-organizations and profit organizations) have implications for the network structure that should be compatible with the different structures and strategic decision processes of each partner separately. The elaboration of a workable, respectful and (thus) acceptable joint strategic decision process is therefore vital but not easy. After all, this joint strategic decision process should also overcome particular threats for cooperation, like the previously mentioned institutional frameworks that increase the competitive setting for SSE-organizations.

When considering the particular role of the local public actor, additional governance implications for the network structure can be identified. As the local public actor fulfills an important role in the start-up of an IEP site, it seems likely that this actor also initiates the design of the network structure. Thus, the features of the network structure will presumably be strongly influenced by the organizational preferences or culture of the local public actor (e.g. coordination mechanisms, participation modes and the precise nature of the strategic decision process). When however more than one public actor is involved, additional consensus-building mechanisms will be needed to unite the different preferences and interests into “one public voice”.

A last governance implication relates to one particular function of an IEP-site, being that of a region-wise “connector” and/or “facilitator” (see also “Site-exceeding but coincidental and hampered joint strategic ambitions”). Such an IEP site-exceeding function clearly coincides with a site-exceeding network structure. The question is then: in what way and to what extent are the partners located outside the IEP site, structurally equal to those located on the IEP site? Should their activities be for instance equally intense coordinated by the permanent liaison platform? Or, should they have for instance the same power and influence on the joint strategic decision making (e.g. the infrastructural investments on the IEP site itself)?

In need of financial stability and long-term engagements

In relation to the financial construction and features of the collaboration (i.e. strategic topic), we have once again collected only a limited amount of relevant information. A second data-collection phase is therefore once again needed. One important point of attention however can already be identified. When reconsidering the information reported in “On dominant partners and institutional frameworks”, we notice that SSE-organizations seem to fulfill a vital role on an IEP site. But, due to changes within the Flemish institutional frameworks concerning also the financing of the SSE-sector, the future survival and thus (long-term) presence of SSE-organizations on IEP sites is not fully guaranteed.

From a governance perspective, a more stable financial setting that stimulates long-term engagements of SSE-organizations is very important. After all, it is in joining the right expertise, stimulating mutual learning and building trust that an IEP site will be able to realize its ambitions. This however demands for a stable partnership over time. To remedy this institutional situation is not easy because it is the result of a dominant neo-liberal mind-setting in which the free market ideology cuts heavily in public budgets and social corrections are out of order. As such, solving this problem demands for wider countervailing public debates and sector-wise lobbying of the SSE-sector and of the third sector in general.

Identifying spatial points of attention

After having discussed the uncovered points of attention for the strategic topics, let us now turn to the points of attention related to the seven spatial topics of an IEP site blueprint. As the research findings have been discussed extensively in other publications (De Nys-Ketels, Vallet and Bylemans, 2015; Bylemans, Vallet and Van Acker, 2016), we will summarize in this paper the major headlines.

Neglecting and underestimating the importance of “space”

A first set of data encompasses all spatial topics of the blueprint. When analysing the 25 IEP site related initiatives, we notice that the spatial topics are seldom consciously and deliberately taken into consideration. As such, the SSE-organizations have for instance not prospected nor evaluated all potential locations before choosing a preferred urban spot (i.e. how can different locations contribute to the actual realization of our inclusive economic participation ambitions?). Instead, they often make the best of a spatial opportunity offered by for instance the local public actor. Deciding whether to accept or to refuse this offer is not so much based on spatial qualifications but rather on policy-wise considerations (e.g. operational and strategic ambitions of SSE-organizations).

From a governance point of view, it is clear that the importance and features of a location are not automatically taken into consideration, let alone evaluated on their merits. However, as the spatial setting can hinder the accessibility for socially vulnerable citizens (see: Introduction), triggering the spatial awareness of all partners involved becomes an important challenge. This can for instance be done by opening a joint discussion on the listed

spatial topics of a blueprint: what are the relevant spatial topics to be taken into consideration when we want to create an IEP- site?

On morphological variety and urban spatial tissue

In relation to the location and its features within the urban territory (i.e. spatial topic), we can identify two interesting research findings.

First, we notice that the morphology of the 25 IEP site related initiatives clearly covers a variety of alternative forms. Thus, the so-called intertwined activities are located (i) within one single building or premises (ii) within a well-defined domain or restricted area, (iii) within a particular urban neighborhood and (iv) along a spatial and/or digital “track” of permanent and mobile settlements throughout the larger territory of the entire city. Translated into the location features of an IEP site we could distinguish (i) a *single-building* IEP site, (ii) a *campus* IEP site, (iii) a *neighborhood* IEP site and (iv) a *satellite* IEP-site.

When reflecting on this initial research finding from a governance perspective, it is plausible that another morphological form implies other governance challenges (e.g. challenges of scale, demarcation, entries, available/absent facilities, needed investments, compatibility with other functions on the same location, and ownership). It is therefore advisable to elaborate alternative governance scenarios for each morphological form (i.e. what are necessary and/or optional points of attention?). A future in-depth analysis of the 25 quick scan case-studies can already provide an initial impetus for the elaboration of these scenarios.

Second, we notice that locations are often influenced by the specific identity and “(historical) spatial tissue” of the city. As such and based on the analysis of the 25 initiatives, an IEP site can for instance be located within a desolated factory building, a former industrial domain, a cultural heritage site, an impoverished neighborhood or the (expanding) periphery of a growing city. As the location is often provided by the local public actor (see also “On dominant partners and institutional framework”), it may concern newly developed or re-destined public domains. For grass-rooted IEP-sites, this is of course not the case. Then, also privately – individually or collectively - owned locations are used.

From a governance perspective, it is important to investigate why and how the location of an IEP site can, should or should not be explicitly embedded in the historical spatial tissue of a city? Certainly from the perspective of the public partner(s) involved, such an explicit choice can match particular aspirations (e.g. on city innovation or urban planning). The question is however: does the particular location fit and support the actual realization of the joint strategic ambitions of all partners involved? And, is it an easy-to-find and highly accessible location for socially deprived citizens?

A flexible, complex and creative spatial design

In relation to the phase-wise or historic coming into existence (i.e. spatial topic), the spatial lay-out (i.e. spatial topic) and the nature of the buildings (i.e. spatial topic), we can detect three, somehow interrelated research findings.

When considering the life-cycle of the 25 quick scan case-studies, we can identify various growth patterns (see also "On dominant partners and institutional frameworks"). Some patterns are rather organic or emergent, while others deliberate and carefully planned. The pace and nature of the patterns is mainly influenced by occurring societal challenges (e.g. an overall economic crises, a city-specific problem with socially deprived citizens) and/or financial dispositions. The latter consists of "boosting" versus "vanishing" financial resources. These growth patterns usually coincide with spatial and architectural expansions versus re-developments and even scale-downsizing of the location. This can be realized for instance by an over-dimensioned initial architectural design (i.e. with enough free or not-yet-fully defined spaces), flexible wall-constructions and multifunctional spatial use.

From a governance point of view, such an evolutionary pattern clearly demands for a so-called "flexible" spatial design. When new challenges and financial opportunities arise, additional space and -- new, other, redesigned - architectural constructions are needed. When challenges however disappear and financial threats become apparent, scale-downsizing and the dismantlement of existing spaces are inevitable. As such, the spatial lay-out and composition of future IEP sites will presumably be (very) flexible and dynamic in nature.

Speaking of the spatial lay-out and the footprint of all buildings and spaces involved, the flexible nature is only one feature. In view of the previously described "underestimation of space", the spatial lay-out is also often coincidental. And, in view of the morphological variety, the spatial lay-out is also very divers in nature. And, in view of the urban identity and (historical) spatial tissue, the spatial lay-out can also be very city-specific.

Therefore, and from a governance perspective, the spatial lay-out or footprint of an IEP site is clearly the result of many spatial influences and/or choices. Taken together with the aspirations of an inclusive economic participation, this presumably generates the need for a complex or unique and tailor-made spatial design.

When analysing the nature of the buildings and spaces involved, there is once again a high variety of functions (e.g. for workshops, storage, trading, training, co-working, encounter and leisure), constructions (e.g. new buildings, renovated premises, connective roads, public spaces, green zones) and use (e.g. defined or non-defined and "open"). Thus, most IEP site related initiatives give rise to small spatial communities or micro-neighbourhoods within the urban environment.

In view of the earlier defined complexity of the spatial design, an extra complexity is added by the preferred fit between the inclusive economic participation ambitions on the one hand

and the needed versus present and/or newly to be designed buildings and spaces on the other hand. Various combinations of spatial functions, constructions and uses will have to be taken into consideration. From a governance point of view, this demands for a very creative and inventive spatial design.

An open and embedded urban space

In relation to the façade and architectural identity (i.e. spatial topic), as well as the degree of accessibility and (inter)connectedness (i.e. spatial topic) we can identify a last set of inspiring research findings.

When reconsidering the information on the target groups and partners (see also “Struggling with the precise meaning and intention of inclusiveness” and “On dominant partners and institutional frameworks”), the “open” nature of the spatial design seems to be very important. As such, a future IEP site should not only be easy accessible for socially deprived citizens, nor should it be only preserved for the direct users and suppliers located on the site. Instead, it should also be accessible or open for citizens living in the nearby neighborhoods and even in the entire city. When the IEP site role of “connector” and/or “facilitator” of region-wise SSE-initiatives is once again taken into consideration, an IEP site should also be accessible or open from a much wider geographical territory than that of the city.

Within the 25 quick scan case-studies, this “open” or easy-accessible and (inter)connected nature is realized by different types of spatial interventions. Thus, there is for instance the presence of interconnecting public spaces (e.g. play gardens, sport facilities, bicycle lanes, public transportation routes) that invite neighboring citizens to visit and make use of the site. Or, there are the wide entrances within the façades of the site that make the respective initiatives very visible and appealing. Or, there are the participatory design processes, in which inhabitants of the neighborhood and/or the city are explicitly asked to co-design the entire site. Or, there are the investments in regional inter-connective (public) transportation infrastructure.

From a governance point of view, it is important that the spatial design of an IEP site includes an overall easy-accessibility, as well as an explicit (inter)connectedness with the surrounding neighborhoods, the entire city and even far beyond. When considering however the specific barriers that different types of partners and/or citizens may experience – including socially deprived citizens - it becomes clear that a multitude of mutually reinforcing spatial interventions is needed. A future in-depth analysis of the 25 quick scan case-studies can already provide an initial impetus for the elaboration of these interventions.

Identifying the interaction between strategic and spatial features

When analyzing the research findings of both explorative research projects, there is a last set of research findings that seems to be worthwhile mentioning. In addition to the strategic and spatial topics, it concerns the way in which an explicit fit between both topics is or can be made?

Within the 25 IEP site related initiatives, we notice that most partners seldom reflect on how the spatial features of a location (e.g. the buildings, the spaces) interact and may facilitate the realization of their inclusive economic participation ambitions, or vice versa. Of course, we have to admit that the precise nature of these interactions is not yet clear from even a theoretical point of view. However, during the debates of the IEP-Reference-Platforms such interactions are nonetheless perceived as very relevant, interesting and necessary for the successful installation of an IEP site. When discussing the research results, most participants suddenly became aware of the mere existence of these interactive effects. But, as most experts in inclusive economic participation are not experts in architecture or urban planning, this ex-post spatial awareness does not really come as a surprise.

From a governance perspective, these rather absent reflections on the interactions or synergies between the spatial and strategic topics of an IEP site blueprint, emphasize the need to specify governance principles that explicitly raise a spatial-strategic awareness by all partners involved. As such, it is important that all partners look for a positive or reinforcing fit between the strategic and spatial features in a systematic and (more) conscious way .

Conclusions

Within this paper we have presented the results of two explorative research projects on the design of so-called IEP sites in Flemish cities. An IEP site is defined as a spatially concentrated “hub” or location that accommodates public, third sector and profit organizations who jointly strive for a (more) solid economic participation of socially deprived citizens, both as a consumer and as a provider of labor. The central research question of this paper is: what can we inductively learn about the specific nature of the so-called strategic-spatial blueprints aiming for the governance, i.e. the installation, development and exploitation of these IEP sites? What kind of topics and respective points of attention are important to be taken into consideration?

As far as the specific nature of the blueprints is concerned, we have identified nine strategic and seven spatial topics. For most strategic and spatial topics, we also have identified different points of attention as well as associated governance implications.

When considering the more general lessons learned, we would like to emphasize three particular experiences.

First, there is the methodological experience. By means of the inductive research method we have been able to generate a considerable amount of new, but also challenging and triggering insights. In relation to the strategic aspects, we were for instance surprised by the richness of alternative economic activities and partner profiles, but somewhat intrigued and puzzled by the struggling with inclusiveness, the unclear – unsafe ? – position of SSE-organizations, the coincidental nature of the joint strategic ambitions and the missing organization network structure. In relation to the spatial topics, we were much inspired by the uncovered morphological variety and the unique quest for openness and urban embeddedness, but puzzled and intrigued by the overall underestimation of “space” and the need for flexible, complex and creative spatial designs.

Second, there is the multi-disciplinary experience. Combining strategic and spatial features clearly encompasses much of the essence of most IEP site related initiatives. Additionally, they also seem to encompass most commitment and feasibility concerns of the (potential) partners of an IEP site as experienced within the debates of the IEP-site-Platforms (i.e. what are the needed strategic engagements and spatial investments?). As such, the specific multi-disciplinary nature of the blue-prints has proved to be very useful. Admittedly, this combination is however not self-evident, certainly not the elaboration of the spatial features and the identification of strategic-spatial interactions.

A third and last type of experience concerns the wider setting or societal embeddedness of our IEP site concept. Although an in-depth elaboration of the policy and/or institutional challenges of the third sector, and of the SSE-sector in particular, was not our initial research focus, we have discovered however that they have considerable consequences for our IEP site concept. As such, we have noticed how dominant neo-liberal or right-wing ideologies within Flanders (i.e. the ideal of the free market and superiority of the profit sector) seem to jeopardize the future survival of the SSE-sector, an important key player within our IEP site blueprints. Thus, we find it important to take this wider policy-setting and societal embeddedness certainly more into consideration when defining future research projects.

To conclude, we can therefore say that the realized exploration exercise has certainly proved to be quite inspiring and useful. But, as this is often the case with first explorations, a further elaboration of our work “under construction” is certainly needed. The present research results however offer already an interesting impetus.

Notes

¹ The position of socially deprived citizens within Flanders has been investigated by the Service Platform to Combat Poverty, Insecurity and Social Exclusion (in Dutch: het Steunpunt tot Bestrijding van Armoede, Bestaansonzekerheid en Sociale Uitsluiting) <http://www.combatpoverty.be> as well as by the Centre on Inequalities, Poverty, Social Exclusion and the City of the University of Antwerp (In Dutch: OASES) <https://www.uantwerpen.be/en/rg/oases/>.

- ² We have included the territories of all large, medium-sized and small cities of the Flemish region as well as their semi-urbanized surrounding.
- ³ Both research projects lasted for max. 1 year and were realized by one senior and two junior researchers.
- ⁴ One to three interviews with mainly management representatives or directors of the SSE-initiatives.
- ⁵ Most partners of IEP site related initiatives define socially deprived urban citizens by means of the official criteria used by the Public Employment Service of Flanders (in Dutch: VDAB). In particular it concerns the criteria: nationality/language (i.e. non-native), education level (i.e. low skilled), physical/mental work ability (i.e. limited and/or absent) and age (i.e. older than 50) <http://partners.vdab.be/kansengroepen.shtml>. and <http://www.vdab.be/english>.
- ⁶ A variety of categories is used amongst which (i) mentally and physically disabled citizens, (ii) non-native and low skilled young citizens, (iii) impoverished or poor senior citizens and (iv) non-native unemployed women.
- ⁷ An idea that has been suggested in particular when it comes to the re-integration of ex-convicts as a particular type of socially deprived citizens.
- ⁸ For some "new" profiles of socially deprived urban citizens it is a taboo to openly recognize their deteriorated socio-economic position within society.

References

- Bylemans, M., Vallet, N., and Van Acker, M. (2016), *IEP sites: Combining planning tools to address planning uncertainty*, paper presented at the International Architectural Research Conference of the European Association for Architectural Education (EAAE), 15-18 June 2016, Lisboa (Portugal).
- Birks, M. (2011). *Grounded Theory, a Practical Guide*, Sage, Los Angeles.
- Bouchard, M. J. (ed.) (2009). *The Worth of the Social Economy. An International Perspective*, PIE Peter Lang, Ciriec collection Social Economy and Public Economy, Brussels.
- Bouchard, M. J. (ed.) (2013). *Innovation and the Social Economy. The Québec Experience*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Castells, M. (1989). *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban-regional Process*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*, Blackwell, Malden.
- Castells, M. (2010). Globalisation, Networking, Urbanization: Reflections on the Spatial Dynamics of the Information Age. *Urban Studies*, 47(13), 2737-2745.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, Sage, London.
- Conforth, C. and Brown, W. A. (ed.) (2014). *Non-profit Governance, Innovative Perspectives and Approaches*, Routledge, New York.
- Daft, R. L. (2010). *Organization Theory and Design*, South Western, S.I.
- De Nys-Ketels, S., Vallet, N. and Bylemans, M. (2015). *Development of Strategic-spatial Blueprints for Different types of IEP sites, Social Economy Organizations in Synergistic Networks*, paper CIRIEC Conference, 15-18 July 2015, Lisboa (Portugal).

- Luhman, J. T. and Cunliffe A. L. (2013). *Key Concepts in Organization Theory*, Sage, Los Angeles (California).
- Monzon, J. L. and Chaves, R. (2008). The European Social Economy: Concept and Dimensions of the Third Sector. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 79(3), 549-577.
- Morse, J. M. (2009). *Developing Grounded Theory, the Second Generation*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creeck (California).
- Moulaert, F. and Ailenei, O. (2005). Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present. *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 2037– 2053.
- Spear, R., Defourny, J., Favreau, L. and Laville, J. L.. (ed) (2001). *Tackling social exclusion in Europe. The contribution of Social Economy*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Stern, P. N. and Porr, C. J. (2011). *Essentials of accessible Grounded Theory*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creeck (California).
- Stock, W. G. (2011). Informational Cities: Analysis and Construction of Cities in the Knowledge Society. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(5), 963-986.
- Strauss, A. L. and Corbin, J. (1994). *Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*, Sage, London.
- Vallet, N., De Nys-Ketels, S. and Bylemans, M. (2016), *Exploring the conceptualization and design of "IEP-sites". SSE-initiatives aiming for an inclusive economic participation within Flemish urban cities*, paper presently in proceedings for a book published by CIRIEC (Peter Lang).