



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



HOOD INTERVENTION MODEL

*methodology adaptation to the primary
target needs
intermediate version
March 2022*

www.hoodproject.org

Summary

1. THE METHODOLOGICAL STARTING POINT

- 1.1 Open Dialogue and Enabling-coplaning
- 1.2 From Dialogical practices to Enabling Co-planning
- 1.3. Main characteristics of the methodology

2. FIRST PILOT EXPERIMENTATION: TOWARD ADAPTATIONS

- 2.1 Introduction to the field work
- 2.2 Main adaptations: collection strategies
 - 2.2.1 Asking for participation
 - 2.2.2 First meeting and concrete setting
 - 2.2.3 Mindset disposition and professional attitude
 - 2.2.4 Collecting the dream
 - 2.2.5 Networking
 - 2.2.6 Documentation
- 2.3 Conclusions about the pilot phase

3. FROM PILOT TO SPREADING THE METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 introduction and how we have been working in this phase
- 3.2 Results of pilot phase: methodology and intervention model
 - 3.2.1 From methodology to systemic actions
- 3.3. Results from the pilot phase: training suggestions

4. INTERMEDIATE CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER STEPS

- 4.1 sustainability and feasibility
- 4.2 lacks and weakness points
- 4.3 what's next

INTRODUCTION

The core pillar of the HOOD project consists in the adaptation and testing of the Enabling Co-planning approach, in an early intervention framework, within the daily work of different organisations that work with homeless people in different countries. Specifically, the HOOD operative partners, included in this project's activity, are based in Greece, Italy, Spain and Denmark. They differ from each other in terms of dimensions, mission, and kind of services. Projekt UDEFOR (DK) do outreach work in the streets with rough sleepers, Ufficio Pio (IT) works with an early intervention approach with people who recently become homeless, SJD (SP) has a wide range of services, moving from day-centers to Housing First projects, as much as Klimaka (GR), that, furthermore, is rooted in the tradition of support for people suffering mental health problems.

Since the beginning of January 2021, all these partners have been learned, tested, and adapted in their daily work the Enabling Co-planning approach, under the supervision of the University of Turin (IT) that developed it drawing from Dialogic Practices. This document comes from the first pilot phase of the project and collects knowledge and insights developed together by partners. The essay will be further updated by the end of the project, on the basis of the findings coming from further implementation of the approach.

The essay is structured as follow: the first chapter focuses on the Enabling Co-planning, considering its roots anchored in the Dialogic Approach developed in Finland in the mental health sector and in the UN Convention for Rights of People with Disabilities. Core pillars and features of the approach will be discussed in detail, considering the substantial change it promotes in social work. The second chapter retraces the steps done by partners in the so-called "pilot phase". The third one considers the following phase, aimed at spreading further the approach, beyond the few number of pilot cases. Finally, a section dedicated to intermediate conclusions and to further steps of the project ends the document.

For a deeper knowledge of the project and of the Enabling Co-planning methodology with homeless people, you can visit the website of the project: <https://hoodproject.org/>. There you will find further materials: videos, reports, documents, journal articles related to the issue presented in this essay.

CHAPTER 1: THE METHODOLOGICAL STARTING POINT

1.1 Open dialogue and Enabling Co-planning

The initial aim of the HOOD project was to apply Open Dialogue and – in a broader sense – a dialogical mindset to the work with homeless people. The expression “**Dialogical Practices**” refers to a psychosocial approach born to take care of people who live the experience of mental suffering in a more effective way than traditional approaches (Ulland et al 2014). Since 1987, in the wake of Alanen’s (1991) work on "Adapted to Need Treatment", the approach has been experimented within the context of Western Lapland, in collaboration with the department of psychology of the University of Jyväskylä. There, in Keropudas, a group of professionals was interested in developing a family-centered approach to more complex mental health problems (Seikkula, Arnkil 2013). Besides, the manager, Jaakko Seikkula, defined the approach they used as "Open Dialogue" (Seikkula et al., 1995). After that, over the years, the trials carried out by the team of the psychiatric hospital Keropudas was gradually systematized until, by the end of the 90s’, it provided a basis for the reform of the community care system of that area (Seikkula Arnkil 2006). Thanks to the impressive results in terms of effectiveness, this way of working has gradually attracted the attention of the scientific and professional community (Aaltonen et al 2011). The main reason for this is that Dialogical Practices shape a different scenario for the care of people with mental suffering laying, on a theoretical level, at the intersection between the thought of Gregory Bateson, particularly concerning the reflections in his fundamental text *Towards an ecology of mind* (Bateson 1972) and the writings of the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin (Holquist 2003).

The Dialogical Approach main goal is to develop a comprehensive model of treatment centered on the family and the social network. Hence, the intervention implies a vision in which the social network is considered as an active agent of change (Olson, Seikkula, Ziedonis, 2014). Thus, the network around the person and the family is mobilized within the therapeutic context, in order to identify new perspectives and ideas on the problem. In the context of Dialogical Practice we can state that the network is the main tool to produce positive changes (Tarantino, 2014cit.).

In the framework of Dialogical Practices, one of the more effective approaches is **Open Dialogue**. Open Dialogue is a way of working with people with mental health or social problems, designed as a process that offers a different way of understanding the reasons for the experience as long as an effective and empowering way to find resolution (Olson et al 2014).

In this respect, Open Dialogue integrates social care and therapeutic intervention (Freeman, Tribe, Stott, Pilling, 2019) since it implies coherence among all the subjects involved in the network approach. The intervention is carried out through meetings engaging the entire network system, which include the person needing support (Razzaque, Stockmann, 2016). Nevertheless, Open Dialogue is not a method, in the sense that it is not a technique, but is more of a way of thinking and conceptualizing, an attitude (Barone, Morretta, Gulino, 2017). The Open Dialogue, as Cutolo (2017) suggests, is a “conversational intervention” which focuses on the way people relate, in particular on the way they interact through language (Cutolo, 2017cit), in order to empathize the mobilization of

people internal resources and their network (Razzaque, Stockmann, 2016). According to Seikkula "to consider our consciousness as intersubjective means to abandon the pattern of individuals as subjects of their lives, that is, to abandon the idea that the center of coordination of actions exists within the individual. Rather, we describe the Self as polyphonic" (Seikkula, 2014). To the aim of underlining this process, Seikkula and colleagues insisted on the metaphor of Bakhtin's **polyphony** (on which we will go back in the next pages) which puts particular emphasis on dialogue. In the Open Dialogue, the dialogue is among many voices coexisting within the network, without privileging any of them (Arnkil, Seikkula, 2013). This way of understanding is introduced by the linguist Bakhtin (1984) to describe the relationships between the characters in Dostoevsky's novels, which he calls polyphony. Indeed, a fundamental aspect of Dostoevsky's writing, according to Bakhtin, was the dialogical interactions between characters in structuring the story itself, rather than being bound by a monological author (Bakhtin, 1984cit). The concept of "polyphony" allowed Seikkula and colleagues to deal with the multiplicity of internal and external voices present in a collaborative network meeting with the objectives to create new shared understandings (Olson et al., 2014 cit). As reported by the Finnish team (1995) since the first publications on the subject, there are seven basic principles that characterize the Open Dialogue (as detailed in Seikkula, Arnkil, 2014): Immediate help; Perspective of the social network; Flexibility and mobility; Accountability; Psychological continuity; Tolerance to the uncertainty; Dialogue and polyphony. In this respect, Seikkula points out that these elements are not separated but, on the contrary, often overlap and occur simultaneously in practice (Olson, Seikkula, Ziedonis, 2014). Those seven principles represent the range of values on which the twelve elements of fidelity of Dialogical Practice are most focused which, as explained by Olson and Seikkula (2014cit), are the following (described in detail in Olson, Seikkula, Ziedonis, 2014cit): two or more professionals at the team meeting; family participation and social network; use of open-ended questions; answering the things spoken by the person; emphasize the moment; solicit multiple points of view; use of a relational focus in dialogue; responding to dialogue and behavioral problems with a practical and meaningful style; emphasize the words used by the person and his stories, not the symptoms; reflections between professionals in meetings; be transparent; tolerate the uncertainty.

Recently, the results of many studies suggest that since network meetings conducted with the Open Dialogue method can improve the smoothness and redistribution of power among network members, the dialogue process could be appropriate in the context of people who have suffered trauma and violence (Dawson, Einboden, Mccloughen and Buus, 2021). These researchers highlight the possibility that Dialogical Practices may offer benefits in different social contexts since it produces a non-pathology-based experience, where people define their own problems and feel heard and validated (Dawson, Einboden, Mccloughen and Buus, 2021cit). Moreover, the consistency between Dialogical Practice and the deinstitutionalization processes has been acknowledged: according to Cutolo (2017cit), e.g, the Open Dialogue "seems to bring to completion what in Italy the Basaglia revolution had intuited and started. Hence, if the importance of the context in determining the disorder (the total institution) is central, it is essential to work in the social context without remaining tied to an old institutional culture, developing more modern, and more "abstract" tools, to produce

change [...]. There is something powerful that Open Dialogue acts, and it is the importance (implicitly) assigned to context and language or the two "social" categories within which human life unfolds. With an approach that focuses on dialogue, allowing its spontaneous flow to generate new levels of reality" (Cutolo, 2017, p.13).

If the Open Dialogue is the most effective way of intervention when it comes to people with mental health problems, another important part of Dialogical Practices is the **Anticipatory Dialogue** (Arnkil 2018). This type of operational declination of the approach was born within the field of early intervention (Arnkil 2013). Since indeed the scientific community is in favour of early intervention, the issue facing practitioners is well expressed by Tom Arnkil: the question is whether the orientation of early intervention is to "direct" the person's future or to promote their empowerment in such a way that the person himself, together with his family and who is significant to him or her, assume the direction of their own existence (Bergstrom et al., 2018). Therefore, directing the future of the other person and promoting empowerment are two alternative operations: it is not possible concretely within an intervention to do both (Toomey, 2011). This puts the professional in front of a preliminary choice concerning the nature of the path he wants to activate. If we move in a traditional mode, indeed, the professional has at his disposal a series of "lenses" to observe the life of the person. Through assessment grids or usual practices, the professional finds himself having at the disposal tools that put him in a predictive position towards the life of the person (Curto, Marchisio 2020). Almost automatically, often without even realizing it, as it collects information the professional formulates hypotheses about what would be better whether there was or was not in the present and the future of this person. Understanding early intervention as aimed at increasing empowerment rather than orienting assumes, on the contrary, that the professional puts himself in a dialogical position: renounces the presumption of knowing the destination and better road, and place yourself in a new position offering not orientation but support (Cain Fanshawe, 2021). Only in this way the person can be supported to imagine the desired future since the future takes shape in people's minds only if they are given space. Space to imagine it but also space to not be able to imagine it, maybe, and try again next time. In this enabling mode, any suggestions would not guide but, on the contrary, it would risk blocking the process because they immediately lead back to the relational position in which you-the-professional know (indeed you are suggesting me) where I should get and what I'd better do, and I-the-person-in-need just must get there: it is an asymmetrical position.

On the contrary, a completely different position is that in which we are together in front of the future seeing it as an open field. In this framework, the person does not have to guess the future that the professional is thinking it's best for them, but can focus it to build it through the authentic freedom and power to choose it.

Hence in early intervention Dialogical Practice introduce the Anticipatory Dialogues with a mainly empowering – not at all predictive – function. It is a way in which the person and the family are accompanied to "remember the future", that is, to place themselves in a positive future moment and look back, reconstructing what are the things that in that (future) moment make life happy and what are the aids and choices that led up to their (Seikkula et al., 2003). In this way, the present, which is full of worries and indecision, is "approached by the future" (Seikkula, 2014), seen as a

condition that not only could be overcome but is already overcome in the direction of something positive. The role of the facilitators of these dialogues is not to "direct" the idea of future but to ask questions aimed at bringing out what the person thinks and to validate it (Seikkula et al., 2001). Even the notes as the questions do not have the function of "notes" from which then the professional will have to deduce or formulate indications but of visual support to the reasoning of the person. In this mode, people observe the world from a point of view that is their only point of view located in a social space from which they alone can see their field of possibilities (Arnkil, 2018).

1.2. From Dialogic Practices to Enabling Co-planning

The Dialogical Practices have therefore shown important potential both in terms of effectiveness and scope of application (Seikkula et al., 2011). From the first experiments in the field of mental health, in fact, the methodology has also extended to other areas in which it is necessary to build together changes in a person's life (Massi et al., 2019). The changes that the Dialogical Practices can generate have been shown over the years more intense than those brought by the classical methodologies, both in-depth, and in breadth, and durability (Seikkula et al., 2011cit).

In recent years, in the context of supporting people with disabilities to a full adult life, there was also a need to develop methodologies and approaches that were more consistent with the new guidelines provided by **the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities** (Marchisio, Curto 2019). In this context the research team Center for Rights and Living Independently of Turin University has been developing an innovative approach aimed at providing support for the life project called Enabling Co-planning (Marchisio, 2019).

Enabling Co-planning is not strictly a Dialogical Practice: it would not be correct to say that the Enabling Co-planning uses neither Open Dialogue nor the Anticipatory Dialogue: there are some substantial differences.

The main difference is that Open Dialogue is a practice with a therapeutic vocation while Enabling Co-planning is an empowerment approach, aimed at supporting life projects. In the use of this methodology, the "change" that is generated in the person's life does not necessarily start from the need or the desire to overcome a crisis, nor even less from the identification of a pathological element, but it can also be an instrument for accompanying a life path that for social, context or personal reasons needs to be supported for a period or the whole course of life.

Another difference is the reference to the right-based model (Lang 2009) and, consequently, to the freedom and full participation in society, which in the Dialogic Practices is not a key element, while it is foundational in the Enabling Co-planning (given the derivation from the paradigm of the UN Convention). In this sense, while the Dialogical Practices are substantially compatible with taking care within a context of institutionalization – for example, they are born in a psychiatric hospital – the Enabling Co-planning needs, to be effective, to be developed in a deinstitutionalization framework (Mezzina, 2014). In this sense, the Enabling Co-planning collects the suggestion related to the polyphony of voices, but it integrates it with the theme of the restitution of subjectivity as key to the path of deinstitutionalization that underlies the analysis that Pier Aldo Rovatti makes of the thought of Franco Basaglia (Rovatti, 2013).

In deepening each reference, it is important to keep in mind that the subdivision in different currents of inspiration of the Enabling Co-planning allows a more linear description of the methodology but forces the representation of the approach which is structurally integrated.

Enabling Co-planning is a methodology to accompany the definition of a life project, based on equality of rights, opportunity, and access to citizenship (Marchisio, 2019). As simple as it is, the first step to start designing the future together is to meet each other. This statement, which seems completely trivial, is not at all for those who – professional, person in need or family member – know how difficult an authentic encounter among the social worker is, the person and the family in the social and educational system. The methodologies and organisational models that are currently more widespread, in fact, imply that professionals meet-to-assess: they are entitled to define the objectives, the tools, and the direction of the life project of the person in need, who is called to comply with the intervention laid down for them. The prevailing social work models move structurally in a diagnosis-intervention-compliance framework: the professional assesses the situation and proposes intervention. The family and the person can decide whether to comply or refuse. The fact that in classic intervention models the crucial phases are in the hands of the social services does not depend, therefore, on the disposition of the professionals but responds to a precise organisational and management model. In this framework, the dialogue with the person and the family takes place, but it maintains a secondary role concerning the decision-making process. The procedures, in fact, do not provide the professional with tools to effectively support the desire and the life plan that the person makes on himself, or in any way aimed at basing the design on this desire and aspirations. In the Enabling Co-planning framework, therefore, the professional must work to create a space for the family and the person to shape their life project. However, this space is not generated once and for all: it is through the talks, in fact, and only through these, that we decide on which side to proceed, whether to follow the direction that was established together or to modify it, how to move if you are faced with a crisis, to a problem, to a change. Nothing is decided by the professional alone and there is nothing to comply with.

In the Enabling Co-planning, the meeting takes place through dialogical relations. The dialogical relations, we have seen some characteristics so far, are relations by definition without a strategic intent, and in particular, without the strategic intent to change the other person (in all the facets that this changes the other can have, to the simple to make him change his mind). This is the reason why trying to insert a dialogue mode into a classic methodological or organisational model runs the risk of completely distorting it. If we are within an intervention mode in which it is the professional who defines and indicates the objectives and the family remains the choice to join, then the task of the professional necessarily becomes to try to orient the paths of others in the direction that he considers more correct or better for the person. However, guiding, orienting, leading are strategic tasks, which by definition cannot be conducted through a dialogue practice. A dialogical relationship is, therefore, by definition "an open, non-prescriptive relationship devoid of the strategic intent to change the other" (Seikkula Arnkil, 2013, p. 13).

Here too it is important to point out that these descriptions are devoid of moral evaluation: the idea of a strategic relationship must not lead to thinking of a sort of "second aim" in which the good of the other is used instrumentally to gain advantage for himself. **“Strategic”** and **“dialogical”** are

simply different relational modes that start from different assumptions and give rise to different ways to support life paths. In general terms, the most consistent influence that the Dialogical Practices have on the Enabling Co-planning concerns precisely the encounter with the other: the Dialogical Practices tell us that we can never fully understand or explain another person from our point of view (Seikkula Arnkil, 2014cit). It follows that when I try to do it, when I think I can do it, or when my organisation, my tools, my goals require me necessarily to accomplish that kind of assessment, this arises modes of exercise of power that are incompatible with an accompaniment that upholds rights and self-determination. The fundamental extraneousness of the other is therefore seen in these approaches not as a problem but as a prerequisite for the dialogue as long as the reason that makes that dialogue necessary. We are not far from what Basaglia said in his essay "The body, the gaze and the silence" in which he states that "the possibility of communicating, of building a mode of otherness, of creating a dialogue presupposes a spaced space, a silence from which the word is born, a look from which the seeing is born" (Basaglia, 1965, p.31). Even in that essay, Basaglia reflected on the relationship between subject and object, and in particular, he focuses on the role that the process of "objectification of the sick" had in the construction of the system of power of the disciplines of cure (Basaglia, 1979).

Hence, when we move from strategic relationship to dialogical, it is ultimately a matter of changing our understanding of the nature of the relationships that produce changes. We enter the perspective that the purpose is to bring about a lasting and positive change in people's lives, but not to determine their direction. This element constitutes a fundamental node when we speak of support planning since we are in a universe of meanings and practices in which the strategic mode is today the most widespread, preached and practiced. In many areas of social work, indeed, the relationship between professionals and people seeking help is structured from a basic asymmetry, that is structural, and generated by the crystallization of the position of "who helps" and "who is in need". Hence, the basic assumption of the classic way of conducting the support is therefore opposed to that of the Enabling Co-planning, that is not due to the professional's worst moral attitude, but to the assumption that the professional would be able to see the person's life better than the person themselves.

On the contrary, the Enabling Co-planning does not claim that the person sees better than the professional, but that the person's point of view on his life is unique, invisible to the professional and, above all, that is what the intervention planning must be based on.

In the methodology we are describing we move in terms of **life project**: the conflict of power to determine who sees the best is misleading. What builds and sustains a life path is not the attainment of the right vision about the existence of the person, but the dynamic through which this vision is built, the foundation of every choice on the respect of the point of view of the person and the construction of a relationship of trust through which each one of the choices that end up composing the existence it is reached. It is the process that constitutes the project of life, not the content of every single choice.

In this sense, we could say that if in "Enabling Co-planning" there is a prevalent term is certainly the second: here in fact the dialogical inspiration of the co-planning methodology intersects with the other key factor: **empowerment**.

1.3. Main characteristics of the methodology

The experience of Dialogical Practices is based, as we have seen, on the construction of a transformative dialogue located within a social network (Gergen et al., 2002). The Bakhtinian suggestion is taken precisely to define the deeply constructivist character of this dialogue (Bakhtin, 1929). The dialogue between professionals, people needing support and other subjects of the network is not characterized, in fact, as a discourse about reality, an episode, a profile of personalities that exists "outside", but it is itself a place of definition and redefinition of the object and the meaning of interaction (Seikkula Olson, 2003).

The Dialogue to which these practices refer is therefore very different from the conversation which usually occurs between professional and person. In the usual positivist epistemological model, the professional's task is to gather information about a condition, a situation, an "objective" reality. The Dialogical Practices, on the contrary, collect the proposal of Bakhtin to go beyond the idea of "extracting" information: the dialogue itself is used to build knowledge in a shared field of meanings. Hence, the Polyphonic Word is, according to Bakhtin, "constructed by layers": the meaning is not pre-existent but is generated by the succession of the interventions of the different actors in the dialogue. This concept of the polyphonic word is also found in the thought of Roland Barthes, who understands the expressive mode whereby "the word wriggles under the weight of the replication of the imaginary anticipated interlocutor" (Barthes Flahault 1980) in which the interlocutor who helps to build the space of speech is not only the physically present one but can also be interior. This resonance of inner and external voices forms what Bakhtin calls the polyphonic society of persons and personalities (Pontius 2014): all are present in the dialogue and contribute to the construction of shared meaning.

This is the opposite of what happens in classical professional discourse where the professional bases their action on a positivist perspective ignoring the alternation of voices – internal and external – and considering them "noise". In a positivist framework, in fact, the aim of the professional within an interview would be to extract the "right" and "final" information, not to "construct" a shared meaning.

The contribution of Seikkula challenges this positivist attitude, as he first conceptualizes the therapeutic conversation as "dialogical" in the sense described up to now, giving it a matrix substantially constructivist. Hence the therapeutic conversation becomes the place where, provided that certain rules and attentions are used, meaning is built.

One can understand why this way of re-thinking the encounter between the professional and the person in need leads to a crucial role of the other voices, of the network. When it comes to constructing a shared meaning, indeed, the professional is no longer centered on collecting information (which he could collect from the formal network and the papers) but they are interested in picturing what the things that are happening in that life do mean to each person involved.

The centring on networks is closely linked to another of the key elements that Enabling Co-planning took form Dialogic Practices: **polyphony**. In fact, it is the involvement of networks that defines the very possibility of a polyphonic word, which does not force speech within the narrow boundaries

among person and professionals (Seikkula et al. 2001). It is essential to be clear: in the Enabling Co-planning as in the Open Dialogue being dialogical does not mean just being kind. Professionals tend to understand the invitation to engage in dialogue as an invitation to be more accommodating or more polite. Of course, a dialogue mode cannot be used if the professional has an abrupt attitude, but the behavior is only a small part of the dialogue. Dialogical attitude is primarily a way of understanding the relationship between subject and object in the construction of meaning. You can be much more easily dialogical and rude than you can be dialogical and positivist. Dialogue is, therefore, to be understood – as Gergen says – as an "authentic activity that takes place jointly between people". This activity simultaneously is communication, production of identity, and meaning (Gergen, 1999). In Enabling Co-planning the difficulty that the person is going through becomes the opportunity to create and redefine the fabric of stories, identities, and relationships that build the self and the social world. Here lies the passage between the polyphony theorized within the philosophy of language and the polyphonic discourse with the therapeutic vocation object of the intuition of Seikkula and colleagues. The concept of dialogism is transformed into a process of co-evocation of meanings, listening, and understanding. It is not a single voice that defines the object of the discourse: dialogicity and polyphony are closely linked.

Enabling Co-planning also borrows from Dialogic Practices one of the greatest differences between this method and systemic family therapy since it does not focus on the structure of the family, but on all the people involved. This means that the "system" is created in every new dialogue, in which the conversation itself builds reality, not the rules of the family or the structure of the system.

When it comes to Enabling Co-planning, therefore, polyphony is called into question both during co-productions with all participants and during the involvement of the network. The person is understood, described, and accompanied within a polyphonic existence, in which each aspect is structurally constructed by multiple voices, interactions, supports, expectations, actions. The person is not described by a single voice, it is not assumed that there is a tool, a checklist, or even just a speech or a professional language that can describe their existence.

The person-in-his-life is gradually described and redescribed by a set of voices, images, situations that interact with each other and among which there is always, and increasingly consciously, the voice of the person himself. This set of voices also defines the path of support to independent life: we are no longer in the classical social work projects, in which what needs to be programmed is "an intervention". It is a matter of accompanying a project of life by inserting the necessary support so that it responds to the wishes of the person and his significant others and ensures respect for their rights. It is a project of life that starts from the polyphony of the description and becomes polycentric in the implementation, giving rise to a real polyphony of existence.

The main consequence of this way of understanding psychosocial discourse is a different distribution of power between the professional and the person who asks the social services for support (Mezzina, 2017). In fact, if reality is built in the space of a polyphonic discourse, the professional's own possibility of seeing the situation "objectively" or "from the outside" is lacking. It is this change of purpose and perspective that defines the different relationships of power. It is Bakhtin himself, who was reflecting on the characteristics of language and did not imagine a therapeutic use of dia-

logue, who defined this type of discourse as "without rank", calling the power dimension into question (Bachtin 1975). We can affirm that Open Dialogue is born in contrast to the classic professional discourse because it questions both its roots: content and shape.

At the level of content, the **traditional professional discourse** is rooted in the diagnosis-intervention-compliance system while at the level of form it is based on the distance allowed by the technical language that is understood and mastered only by experts. The dialogical model questions these two aspects, proposing as an alternative a discourse that is built in a structurally horizontal and recursive way.

Since they were first experimented, the Dialogic Practices are in the dialectic between certain terms: freedom, power, democracy, education, and truth (Foucault 1996). The relations among those terms define the very possibility of redistributing power in the relationship, which determines the actual possibility of freedom to build a new life path.

The Dialogic Practices, therefore, have primarily to do with a renunciation of power. This renunciation involves a loss for the professionals since they have to give up on the power of defining problems, orienting interventions, decide what the person should do.

The goal of this choice of renunciation, which will then become the goal of the Dialogic Practices themselves, is to generate new meanings and find alternative solutions to issues that appeared to be unresolved (Galbusera Kyselo, 2018).

In this sense, the origin of Enabling Co-planning is not very far conceptually from the distribution of power as intended in Dialogical Practices. The crucial shift consists of the **transition from imagining actions to change the other to imagining actions to change themselves** that professionals should accomplish. As a dialogical professional, you no longer need to change the person, but you need to question what you do, what you say, the places, the times of your operating modes (Seikkula Arnkil, 2014).

A key element of the Dialogic Practices that differentiates Enabling Co-planning from other intervention planning methodologies is **uncertainty tolerance** (Seikkula Arnkil, 2014). In classical support paths, uncertainty and risk are a weakness. In the classical social work framework, in fact, we need circumscribed and static definitions since the solutions we have available are essentially circumscribed and static and, above all, are "solutions" to a very limited number of problems. In classical support planning, also because of the tools we have that are essentially classificatory, we tend to describe the problems promptly (e.g.: lack of autonomy) and assume that causal relationships are basically linear. Again, this is not a bad attitude of the professionals: the organisational model in which the professionals are immersed requires to activate models of knowledge and explanation of this type, because, in essence, the professional feels that he does not have a space for action that allows him to activate articulated supports that take into account, for example, the fact that linear causal relationships rarely exist in the real world.

The tolerance of uncertainty, proposed among the key elements of the Dialogic Practices, allows us first of all to widen the field of description: the Enabling Co-planning expands it potentially to infinity, removing the constraint to terminate the description before starting the action. This bond is, in fact, a legacy of the medical model, which responds to the above-mentioned diagnosis-intervention-compliance scheme but is unsuitable to the purpose of accompanying an existence. It is as if we

were to say that to be sure that with our life partner things will work well, we must first finish the phase of knowledge in which, through tests and descriptive grids, we know them in all their aspects, and then we can start to hang out. Anyone who has a life partner knows that people are not static: the way a person is, the resources they show, the ways they daily conduct the existence naturally change over the course of life, and change especially based on the experiences that you live, cohabitation and marriage included. In this sense social work classic methodologies appear to be naïf: it seems to us that describe a priori in depth a person with "scientific" methods and techniques (where "scientific" is used as a synonym for evaluative and classifier) is, not only impossible, but cannot be considered a condition for being able to understand what that person can do, what is right for them, how to support them.

On the contrary, the Enabling Co-planning, integrating the dimension of encounter, that of project, and that of action in daily life, approaches the existential dimension globally. This comes from the right-based approach: supporting the person in a life based on equality with others contains in itself a great deal of guidance on how to achieve it. Based on the equality with others, it, therefore, becomes an important methodological indication useful at any time and at any indecision to find the direction. In this framework, also the right to uncertainty is based on equality with others, meaning for the person to the possibility of trying, to change their mind, to change the course of their life.

In this sense, Seikkula says that "the tolerance of uncertainty is the opposite of any kind of evaluation tool" (Seikkula et al., 2003). Seikkula, in fact, notes a problem in the use of assessment tools. If I use an evaluation tool, any tool, I am necessarily assuming three elements: first, that there is something to evaluate, second, that this something is so capable of describing the person that it is relevant for the path I intend to begin, and third, that the professional is the one who possesses the knowledge and the power to evaluate (the evaluation is never reciprocal). These three assumptions in classical social work support paths are so taken for granted that they are never explicit and their acceptance – implicit – by the family and the person is the condition to be supported: you cannot be included in a support program if you refuse to be assessed at the terms the social work states.

All this, which is inherent to any tool or grid evaluation, completely weakens the ability to make a path that is authentically empowering. The Dialogic Practices are the opposite, says Seikkula, as they start from the joint definition of the problem and possible solutions in a polyphonic, choral, "without rank" encounter. Polyphony does not occur if there is one voice among others that is more authoritative in the definition of something or someone. To allow me to be within a definition of the polyphonic problem, I need a high level of uncertainty tolerance both at the organisational level and at the level of relational competence of the professional. The tolerance of uncertainty, indeed, changes the position of the professional that is no longer found with the task of ruling and managing processes. In this process, the professional, for example, will not give the floor to the person in the meeting who brings the point of view he considers most appropriate but will make sure that everyone has the same opportunity to speak. They will not judge the things people say, not even in their mind, not even positively ("she is right" or "her husband is right"), but they will bring together the views of all. This process redefines the very meaning of security/insecurity: security here is intended as the security of listening, of response, of legitimacy (Seikkula Arnkil 2006cit). It is no longer the

professional who has to be sure to control the process but is the person in need who must be sure that what he says will be accepted, heard, and not judged or interpreted.

Within the dialogic methodologies, as well as in the Enabling Co-planning, this is not a strategic mechanism. It is necessary to specify it because the professionals are carriers of a decennial culture of "control of the processes" and often still assume they have a "more objective vision". Hence, for many professionals is a very complicated operation to leave the strategic intents. Being dialogical is not about making everyone feel listened to improve compliance but is a way to enable people to bring out their resources, giving them the power and actual freedom to use them for the purposes that they define themselves. In Enabling Co-planning this aspect is closely linked to the dimension of capacitation because it involves the possibility of people becoming agents of their own existence. The tolerance of uncertainty allows the professional to "suspend" the anxiety to describe "correctly" and to clear the field of any claim of "objectivity". The demand for support in the classical mode always poses a question like "what should we do?"; thanks to the tolerance of uncertainty in the Enabling Co-planning this question is kept open until the collective dialogue produces an answer or dissolves the need for action. Immediate advice, rapid conclusions, and traditional interventions apparently "resolve" faster, but do not create the fertile field for the development of the person's resources, causing the lack of empowering work. Taking up the purpose with which the Enabling Co-planning is born, that is to accompany people to lead the kind of life they want, it is then very important that it is always the person and the family to define the type of life they want to lead, and that the professional does not define objectives and directions. Regarding the definition of the path this aspect brings into play the dimension of trust and "who decided it?" always present at every moment of the co-planning.

CHAPTER 2: FIRST PILOT EXPERIMENTATION: TOWARD ADAPTATIONS

2.1 Introduction to the fieldwork

The first phase of the HOOD project focused on the introduction of the Enabling Co-planning methodology within the daily work of each organisation partner of the project. As described in the previous chapter, Enabling Co-planning shows several features which are very dissimilar from what social workers are usually expected to do. Hence, in order to be able to introduce such a deep change in the daily practice, we needed to first explore which were the contact points (meaning the tools, the habits, the practice that was already consistent with the methodology) and which were the more significant discrepancies. This was acquired through the “preliminary phase”, in which each organisation was asked to reflect on themselves both in terms of services provided and professional approaches.

This phase was essential since social work practice is closely related to cultural narratives and representations. Therefore, in order to change the way of functioning of social worker’s practice, a process of re-building the cognitive platforms that underlie those practices was needed. In the social sphere, this process of change is remarkably complicated. This is because in the socio-educational field everything that is done and affirmed is exposed to **social desirability**. That implies that there are words and self-descriptions considered right and others judged as wrong, first of all on an ethical level. On that account, some sort of moral bias is always present when social workers describe what they do: the explicit discourse through which social and educational services describe themselves tend to portray their job as already corresponding to an emancipatory model following what’s prescribed as morally desirable. Rarely, instead, they discuss the part of “social control” inherent to their work, because considered less socially acceptable and desirable.

This is the reason why we planned the preliminary exploratory phase on the basis of a on the field methodology called “training on the job”. We needed to deal directly with the practices instead of just being told what professionals used to do.

Going on the field from the very first moment was also a strategy aimed at bringing a more effective change. That is because, in this field, words are often slippery and full of meanings even conflicting with each other. It’s common knowledge that in the social sphere more than in other work contexts, the professionals tend to reject changes that affect the job organisation and the approach they are used to. This is also due to the close connection between the social worker job and the identity dimension: professionals tend to feel attacked personally when their work approaches are criticized since they feel that the identity dimension is called into question. The pervasive rhetoric of vocation does not help in this sense: social workers are widely perceived and described as people who do this work for some sort of inner good disposition of mind, on a philanthropic basis. Thus, the identity of the social workers was socially built as good and worthy.

Consequently, the questioning of professional practices in this area implies more complex issues than just correcting a technique. Since the profession is represented as identity-based, in fact, (social work is done because you are good, altruistic,...) it becomes considerably more tangled to act in transformative terms while remaining on a technical-cognitive level.

Considering those peculiarities, the fieldwork phase was organised with the double aim of exploring the usual way of working and of paving the way for the introduction of a wider change of practices. In order to get the professional to consider the new methodology proposed, a crucial factor is for them to feel the training is compatible with their daily work arrangement, especially when training based on reflection are concerned. This is delicate matter since we often move in a misleading perspective in which the everyday socio-educational work would be on a different plan than the reflection on reference models. Therefore, space and time for thought are often branded as "theoretical", in a jargon in which "theoretical" means "that it serves no purpose", "impossible to decline into actions", "without consequences that meadows". The "theoretical" reflections, within this subculture, may be considered interesting, but they are systematically defined as poorly related to the practice. As a result of this disconnection, the time spent reflecting is systematically perceived as being subtracted from the operation: as if doing and reflecting were two disconnected operations and sometimes even in opposition. How much this conviction is shared is demonstrated by the most frequent response received by those who propose within a team, a group of workers at work, to carve out wider spaces for reflection that depart from the mere organisation of everyday life: «It would be nice, but there is no time». "There is no time" because time serves, it is understood, for the many things that are to be done, that constitute the real work. One imagines that one can work to accompany people through the difficulties of existence without wondering how they relate the tasks that the operators in that path are giving with what society currently expects, thinks, tells of those lost and those existences; without systematically questioning how the processes that are intended to foster - inclusion, rehabilitation, emancipation - are related to the power relationships between social groups, generations, in cities, in contexts that both the operators and the persons supported live and will live.

Based on the aspect described so far, the training on the job first phase was carefully designed together with each organisation, both about content and about the meetings calendar and structure. Concerning the content of the training, the scientific partner first explored if there was any strong theoretical background to practice or any previous knowledge/experience about Open Dialogue. Regarding the training structure, the time and the weekday of each meeting were designed to be completely flexible according to each organisation need. Also, the choice of participants and materials for each meeting was shaped based on organisations' features and demands.

The structure of the first phase has been organised as followed. After a preliminary – more explorative – phase about partners' previous knowledge about the methodology and specific needs, scientific partners introduced the Enabling Co-planning methodology in a two-days online Training Event, held in February 2021 (the training will be discussed in the following section).

Then, the scientific partner proceeded to support each organisation in shaping the pilot case study choice. First, a group meeting was held in order to allow the participants to grasp an idea of the Enabling Co-planning core features. After this training event, each organisation was asked to hold

an internal meeting aimed to discuss among colleagues the criteria for selecting one homeless person for each organisation to be included in the pilot case study phase. Some organisations asked to involve in this pilot phase two people, in order to avoid the possibility of losing track of the person during the following months.

The pilot phase had a double aim. First, an early methodology adaptation was needed since the Enabling Co-planning was originally conceived to support people with disabilities living with their families, not people in a homelessness condition. Second, from the very first moment of the project, the differences among organisations (and among countries) came up as a core topic. For this reason, the pilot phase was also aimed at adapting the methodology to each organisation's features and context of work. In the framework of shaping the training on the job process as stressless as possible, each organisation got to choose the frequency and the scheduling specific supervision meeting with the scientific partner for each teamwork with the scientific partner.

First, each organisation had an individual meeting with the scientific partner in order to prepare for the first «dialogical talk» with the user they choose (the so-called “Mr/Mrs Hood”). After this preparation meeting, professionals from each organisation held the first dialogical talk with the person. After the first meeting among professionals and the homeless person took place, each organisation met again with the scientific partner UNITO to oversee the implementation of the methodology and reflect on the core aspects.

In the following weeks, each organisation had further supervision meeting with the scientific partner in order to get the support they needed to co-design the personalized project for the homeless people involved. As in Enabling Co-planning is expected, each project was strictly customized on that specific person needs and features. Thanks to the support received each organisation designed an Enabling Co-planning customized project for each homeless person involved. In addition to individual supervision, two collective methodological meetings were organised, then, in order to allow all the organisation to share with the others what they had been achieving in terms of methodology skills. Those meetings were also precious moments for sharing any doubt or further adaptation needed.

The pilot phase lasted 5 months, from February 2021 until June 2021. At the end of this first training on the job period, the scientific partner met the organisations both individually and in a broader group in order to collect suggestions and indications in designing further steps.

2.2. Main adaptations: collection strategies

The methodology was proposed to the participants through the already mentioned two-days of Training Events held online in February 2021. All the participants from every partner association attended the events that lasted four hours each day. The Enabling Co-planning methodology was presented by UNITO through the lens of the de-institutionalization process that reformed the Italian mental health services in the last fifty years and Seikkula's Dialogical Practices approach to mental health services. As previously discussed here, The Finnish approach is the academic foundation and main inspiration in the Enabling Co-planning development.

Another important tool HOOD used to collect and share pieces of information was the project website. Simultaneously to the training events, some theoretical documents named “Bites” were released on the website: brief papers that summarized the various aspects of the Enabling Co-planning. Following these events, five videocasts have also been uploaded on the website, being short video showing highlights from the explanation held by UNITO during the training.

These were the main means through which the methodology was initially presented to the partner organisation in the first phases of the HOOD project. At this point the partner associations started adopting the Enabling Co-planning in their daily routine through pilot study cases, adjusting this method, exchanging reflections and findings, comparing how our differences influence the development of the intervention through Individual and methodological meetings.

Individual Meetings were implemented to support each organisation in the concrete development of the pilot study cases. Two smaller overseeing teams were established by UNITO, an Italian speaking one to support Ufficio Pio and the other with English speakers to support Udenfor, SJD and KLIMAKA. Each team consists of one Senior supervisor and one Junior. As a foundation where they could start from the participants were provided with the Enabling Co-planning template for the personal projects and meetings were held at monthly regular intervals from March to June with UNITO, described in the previous section of this document. The participants could request additional meetings and support at any time via mail. The individual meetings represented very concrete chances to have an open confrontation during the ongoing experimentation, at first regarding the simple choice of whom could have been a candidate for the pilot case studies, then, to support the participants in determining how they could handle and adapt the Enabling Co-planning into something feasible for their organisation and contexts, and finally to collect and document this early phase of HOOD project.

It is important to stress the fact that HOOD partner associations are very heterogenous regarding their services organisations, missions and the wider context of culture, legislation, institutions, and access to rights. Therefore, the pilot phase underlined these differences when it came to the early adaptations. As already mentioned, Projekt UDENFOR is based in Copenhagen, and it is a small organisation that does outreach work as a low-threshold service in the framework of harm reduction. SJD is based in Barcelona, and they are a bigger organisation with several different services. They mostly deal in residential services and day-care centres for people in a homeless situation. Klimaka on the other hand is the biggest reality involved and it is a Greek NGO based in Athens, they mostly work in mental health services and with migrants. On top of that, they work with homeless people or with people at risk of homelessness that might find themselves at the intersection with the other fields Klimaka operate in. They run both low-threshold services and day-care centres in Greece. Finally, Ufficio Pio is a foundation that operates in Torino mostly managing local social innovation or social equity project. Amongh these, there is a project targeting people recently became homeless, based on an early intervention approach.

Besides the individual meetings, Methodological Meetings were held online in plenary sessions where the participants from different organisation and countries could share the adaptation they had experimented with in their pilot case studies. They were conducted by the UNITO team which prepared activities, tools, and sheets to foster the crossed confrontation to find commonalities and

differences in the struggles for this first phase of the adaptation. One was held in March, a month passed from the training events and the partners have had the chance to concretely start the pilot study cases. Most of the participants had time to choose whom they would work with, to start the first meetings with the person involved and to produce the first draft of co-planned personal projects. The second one was held in May so to give enough time to each partner association to implement and evaluate the outcomes of the early adaptations. The last ones were held respectively in June and July. These last ones were meetings aimed to wrap up the experimental pilot phase and to start considering how to broaden the HOOD project to a larger number of people.

Finally, two tools were prepared by the UNITO team to collect the adaptations and reflections discussed during the individual and methodological meetings. One was the Adaptations Record and the other the SWOT analysis: the second was mainly aimed to assess the feasibility of early adaptations in that specific organisation and country. Every partner association started from the “pure” Enabling Co-planning methodology to then evaluate the viability of the approach in their own organisation and country. To facilitate the adaptation, the recording of the methodology was broadly divided into several components and phases that roughly characterize the UNITO Enabling Co-planning. These stages were used to organise the data in the Adaptations Record, and they also correspond to the sub – chapters that you will find discussed in the next pages.

2.2.1. Asking for participation

The Enabling Co-planning requires the “informed consent” of the person involved to be effectively enabling from the very start. This means that the person must have – at least – some level of understanding of the process, therefore after a direct explanation the person can overtly accept or refuse the request for active participation in the definition and implementation of their life project. This proposal is done by the professionals who would eventually support them in steering their life projects and achieving their personal wishes and dreams.

For HOOD this meant asking the person if they would like to participate in an experimental project, explaining briefly and in an accessible way some of the frameworks, making it clear it is different from the usual line of work of their organisation. During this pilot phase asking directly and formally for the person participation was possible for every organisation involved, except for UDEFOR that already stumbled in the first criticality. In a low threshold, streetwise service, the person’s mistrust in the social services and institutions is very real, and it sometimes takes months to gain just a little confidence. Also, the street unit seeks people out: is not the person that reaches the service but rather the other way around. This is a crucial point since this means that they may, at first, not be interested in receiving help. In this framework presenting them with a form, asking them to fill it out with us, when they have had bad experiences with authorities such as social services, the public system and so on, could risk alienate the person, pushing them away from having any contact or relation with the unit. UDEFOR found out soon that this overt request for participation – on top of other critical points that we will discuss later – was putting their hard-won trust to risk. This criticality resulted in a blocking point for the UDEFOR adaptation. Initially, they decided to discard completely this first step. Eventually, it was theorized that maybe this passage could be reintroduced

later, in situations where the trust is already firmly established, and the person is in a condition where they have the mental space and physical security to recognize and express their wish and dreams, and actively participate in the construction of their existential project.

2.2.2. First meeting and concrete setting

Since one of the Enabling Co-planning main aims is to empower, the choice regarding the location and time of the meeting is strategic to clearly convey, through a simple choice and from the very start, that, this time, it is the person that gets to decide. They must set where and when the meeting will happen. Maybe the meetings could be held at the person's temporary housing solution or somewhere else that they might prefer, maybe a bench in a park or perhaps a café; some concrete supports might aid the process and works as a concrete mediator, as some water, a coffee, maybe never beer etc. Their meaningful relatives ones might also attend at this meeting if the person wishes so. The concrete setting must be an empowering space, organised in such a way that helps the professional in giving back the power to the person they are meeting, especially if the person chose – or maybe for some organisation there was no other choice - that the meeting is happening in a more traditional office. This means that a circular setting is preferred, where all the chairs are the same and where there is no desk between the person and the professionals. In addition to that, it might help if the person always can see the notes that the professional is taking.

Udenfor had no trouble adapting to this step because they already met the person on their condition: in the streets and places they spend their days. During the pilot phase, Ufficio Pio organised the meetings according to the requests of Mrs. and Mr. HOOD: the social workers met Mrs. HOOD in several parks of the city, while Mr. HOOD was met mostly online, also due to the pandemic situation. Thanks to this training, Ufficio Pio will maintain the adaptability of the setting as an organisational practice, while still considering the specificity of each situation and person.

The same happened to SJD, that, however, preferred a mixed approach where they both used their adapted offices and other locations chosen by the person. Ufficio Pio particularly struggled when it came to letting the person choose the time of their meeting and they ended up adjusting by the professional according to working times, logistics and institutional network needs.

2.2.3. Mindset disposition and professional attitude

Traditionally the social practitioner utilizes several lenses to observe a person's life – these lenses can be as concrete as paper grids, but they might also be as abstract as thinking categories. From now on we will refer to this as the “professional gaze”. The gaze organises the professional perception of the person, of their story, and of their narration. Most of the time, it helps the professional to make sense of an uncertain world, gaining certainty in an otherwise complex reality, making it predictable and therefore manageable. Hence, these traditional lenses put the professional in a predictive and evaluating position concerning the person's life. Often during the meetings – while they collect information – the social workers almost automatically assess the situation, and then make hypothesizes on what would be better for the person present and future situation. Little room

is left for the professional to empower the person they are working with: if they already know where they want to go and the best way to get there, it makes no sense at all for them not to say so and not to try to guide the person in that direction. Therefore, the practitioner first step is to have the ability to see different scenarios, and to do so their position must change.

The Enabling Co-planning aims to overcome the practitioner's traditional role. The professional must be aware of their gaze and actively work to create an emptiness of categories and judgment of value. In the context of the Enabling Co-planning methodology, this technique is referred to as the "empty pot technique". Through an active process of awareness of our own professional gaze, the professional aims to co-construct new meanings. The professional needs to listen and comprehend the person's point of view. During each meeting, the discourse's object – the problem, the need, the intervention etc. – is not defined and assessed by the professional through their a priori categories, but by a multiplicity, a polyphony, of voices. Enabling Co-planning needs the social worker to give up the intrinsic power embedded in their role. To dismiss the power does not only mean avoiding deciding for the other but also, for instance, defining the other, pronouncing statements on their lives or interpreting the meaning of what they say. The core switch at a conceptual level consists in the transition from imagining action aimed to change the other person to imagining concrete measures to change oneself as a professional and even our own organisation when it is required. Changing the other person holds several layers of meaning: changing their minds, getting them to change their attitude, persuading them that a certain thing is better for them than something else, etc. Dismissing the power implies transforming the traditional nature of a relationship aimed to promote a certain and set change, into a supportive and enabling one where the person gives the direction and the way to get there. The development of a life project is enabled not by every single choice, or rather every single achievement of operational goals, but by the process itself. The kind of relationship adopted is the foundation for the whole process of Enabling Co-planning. If the approach is still strategic – for instance the social worker might say something like: "to get the person to understand they should..."; "to persuade them to..." – then any efforts and tools adopted will be in vain. The practitioner must actively and intentionally shift from a strategic to a genuine, supportive, and enabling relationship. To raise the awareness of the fact that they cannot give the real, ultimate, and true account of the event or the situation anymore. None of them detains the truth. Indeed, they need each other to shape the meaning of what is happening. From a point of view of power redistribution, the dynamic whereby the social worker defines the best path for the person to take and expects their "adherence to the treatment" lapses. It is now the person who sets their own goals and priorities, steering the direction of their existential project and the professional adheres to the person's perspective. An effective power redistribution also ends the opportunities of defining strategic alliances aimed at changing what the other sees, thinks, and does, but it opens spaces to build authentic dialogue between peers.

The professional mindset and attitude were some of the hardest aspects to implement during this pilot phase. However, these aspects sit at the very core of the Enabling Co-planning methodology and they were crucial for the present experimentation and for future adaptations. All these criticalities just couldn't be solved once and for all, a definitive adaptation feels impossible being such an unpalpable part of the methodology, so dependent on the specific education and difficulties of each

practitioner. Besides that, each case-study was deeply different and dependent on the person's story, mental/physical health, beyond further contextual factors such as their original culture, country, institutions, legislation etc. Thus, criticalities were dealt with periodically during the individual meetings with the UNITO overseers, without ever really "solving" them but through a continuous open confrontation on each case-study.

A first operative step was to equip the participants with practical tools and "glasses" to recognize their professional gaze and how power is exercised in their daily work routine, analysing each part: the power to define, the power to include or rather exclude, the power to give or deny an opportunity, the power to establish who deserves what and when, the power to define and evaluate access requirements.

Still, all the organisations involved reported the same difficulties: being aware of the gaze was hard, to dismiss the power and let the person be in charge of their life project without steering in the direction they thought it was best was even harder. However, the empty pot technique was also one of the elements that social workers found more interesting, and they gained new awareness on themselves and their own gaze thanks to it. Klimaka chose a person for their study case that was severely in debt and at high risk of homelessness cause their health condition didn't allow them to work. During this pilot phase, the person was at risk of an abrupt eviction with an oncological treatment ongoing for the next two months. This level of emergency immediately prompted the KLIMAKA professionals to find an immediate solution.

The practical uses of the Enabling Co-planning were detailed but easy enough to adopt, but what was the most difficult was the process of actively giving up power to enable that shift from a strategic to an enabling and equal relationship. There were several useful concrete measures to promote this modality: suggesting the participants to talk as they would talk to persons when they were facing other professionals prevented them from using a double language – a first one for thinking and a second one for talking to them; to avoid imagining before the meeting what the person will say could help them manage their predictions making it easier to accept when the person said something unexpected, as discussed above.

Renouncing the power guaranteed by staff meetings was another suggestion made by the UNITO team during some of the individual meetings. But each process called for different changes, according to contextual features. The participants were asked not to plan interventions on separate premises, and they were suggested to replace staff meetings with sessions where the person could be present. This was practically impossible, and the practitioners continued to have meetings without the person. Hence, they were suggested to write and discuss as if the people were present. This measure tried to eliminate all the spaces where the work team would hold total power to direct intervention and to define problems and solutions, fostering the need to construct a new way of talking about their work.

2.2.4. Collecting the dream

When the social worker is freed from the evaluating tools, and the assumption that they owned the definitive and correct definition of the situation is gone, they will need the real engagement of all

the people involved to have a solid foundation for the person's project. Moreover, giving up the evaluation process, finding out new ways to define the existential direction are essential. With this optics, it is necessary for the professional to adopt a dialogic position: they will assume that they both know better and as far as the goal and how to get there is concerned, they will adopt a supporting position not orientational. Hence the person will be sustained in imagining their desired future, which will develop slowly in their minds when an authentic space – of goals, of things to do – appears empty without the professional ever-present predictions and set-in-stone reality.

Practically, during the meetings the person is supported in “remembering the future”: thinking of a joyful future, far enough away not contaminated by a difficult present where, perhaps, one feels stuck. Traditionally in the original Enabling Co-planning, the professional guides the person to go backwards, tracing the good things that will make their lives happy in that wishful future. The professional also leads them to imagine what support, and choices brought them there. In this way, the present – that is charged with worries and doubts – is “approached from the future” and considered a condition that is not only surmountable but something that it has already been overcome. It needs some time to go through the whole process – at least a couple of hours – and more than one session might be needed so that the person has time – during the meeting and between them – to let that joyful future emerge.

During this process is important to “collect the dream”. Most of the time, in the original UNITO methodology, there are two professionals present at the meeting: one is talking and leading the dream emersion, and the other one is taking accurate notes of what the person is saying. Usually, they both know the person already and if they don't, on a previous occasion the permission is asked for the professional to be accompanied by a colleague. The one taking notes ask for direct permission to write and explains why they are doing it. They also need to make sure that they can see and understand what has been noted. It is crucial that the professional reminds the person as often as they can that their critical feedbacks are not only welcome but that they are needed. They can add, take off, or change any of the notes the practitioner is taking. And this is true not only during the personal project drafting but at any time. The person needs to feel like this is their project and that they have a real say about what is going to be in it because that wishful dream will become the foundation and the motivational engine that drives on the action in the present and an essential engagement tool in their personal project – just has it has been explained at the end of the previous sub-chapter. This is especially true in the Enabling Co-planning where professionals dismiss their power, and they no longer detain the “true reality” of the person's situation.

A difficulty that all the partner organisations experienced was the struggle to have enough human resources and time to have two professionals present during the meeting. The organisations found several solutions. Some started by having a slower paced “future meeting” diluted concretely in several consecutive meetings. SJD and KLIMAKA ended up using an audio recorder, to eventually report the person's exact words in a separate session, presenting them the transcription in the following meeting. At first, there were preoccupations that a recording device could put the person under pressure and make them more self-conscious about what they were saying and how they

were saying it. It has still been decided to record the session after they asked permission and an explanation of the reasons of that choice.

It has been established that the wishful future perspective needs to be free from the hardships of the present. So that the person can see themselves in a position where these hardships are solved, and they can work their way back from there.

KLIMAKA chose to work with a person that had an oncological diagnosis with an uncertain prognosis, even though they knew that this could be difficult. An oncological condition can certainly make the process of imagining any future hard, and a joyful faraway one even harder, the person can feel stuck in an uncertain present. During the individual meeting, it has been hypothesized that maybe a shorter time perspective in the future could have helped picture a possible future. So, the person was asked to picture themselves two years from now, in a future where they got better. The practitioner facilitated the process through very concrete questions: who's there at Christmas? Where do you see yourself living?

The same adaptation was implemented in a pilot study case with SJD. The Spanish participants involved a young adult, barely in their twenties. The young adult was also a migrant and he struggled to get their papers in order and with little certainty of where they will end up in a closer future. Being a young adult on top of being a migrant made picturing a future in ten years' time quite difficult for the person. Hence during the individual meetings, the participants decided to shorten the future perspective to five years into the future.

UDENFOR struggled to hold this as a self-contained and formal moment at the beginning of the experimental phase. Taking notes and overtly asking for participation was already particularly critical, they immediately felt it could have been overwhelming for the people they were working with. Moreover, for most of them, it would have reminded too strongly of the meetings in more institutional and traditional services they learnt to avoid. The same was true for having two professionals present at the same time. The Danish organisation mission is to approach people who fell out of the system to accompany them informally and gradually. Most of the time simply through reducing damage and – when possible - orienting them and supporting them to apply for benefits and needed papers. It descends that they usually work on very short-term goals. Most often than not their goal is to simply gain the trust of the person so they would accept their help. The participants also pointed out that a lot of the people they work with are struggling with mental health issues, and a paranoid chain of thoughts are not unusual when you have been homeless for a long time. This consideration points to the feasibility of adopting Enabling Co-planning especially if integrated with an early intervention approach – that is, with who people recently became homeless. They still experimented the methodology with three people in three different study cases. They tried to collect the dream through an informal conversation where the professional casually asked the person if the person had a dream and where they saw themselves in ten years. The results were indeed dismal in at least two of them. The third never really had further developments because the professional went on paternity leave.

The first study case engaged a former artist and – when asked to picture the future - all they pictured was the possibility to get some of their art back. During the individual meetings, it was suggested that the professional didn't fight this past-oriented wish but, rather, to go with it, and maybe while they proposed to help the person trace and collect - at least some pieces - they could eventually and spontaneously find their way back to future possibilities. When the professional proposed this possibility to track and retrieve some of their art the person didn't show up for months.

In the second case-study, UDENFOR involved a person that essentially saw themselves in Shanghai living with a woman whom he met online. In this future, he had a job and started a family with her. This is a dream that immediately triggered the practitioner to assess it and predict the possible outcomes: who is this woman? Is she even real? Is this a scam? All of these are very real preoccupations that a professional might have. The social worker working on the study case, they were relatively new to the UDENFOR organisation, and their latest former experience was inside a Mental health Hospital. Their professional gaze was strictly hinged on an evaluating, strategic and traditional perspective. They soon realized that they couldn't be the professional to experiment HOOD methodology because the Enabling Co-planning lenses were non-consistent with the ones they were used to. This risky dream was still a future perspective - far and desirable enough - to activate a powerful engine for the person to start moving pro-actively for their life in the present. To go to China you need papers, and you need money, and to get these you need a job. It wasn't the work of the professional – considering Enabling Co-planning – to oblige the person to do a reality check and evaluate the dream feasibility. It is risky for the social professional to take the reality principle upon themselves, as by forcing the person to question their perception and dreams the trust in the relationship itself was in danger hence that engine might be lost, such as the empowering relationship and goal. It was still important that the professional supported the person in an equal, enabling relationship. Indeed, they could express their worries through personal/subjective preoccupations and lead them towards other confrontations within their network: more relevant professionals, personal meaningful relationships that the person trusts, peers that went through similar occurrences etc.; in other words, it will be their network, their context and reality itself to force that check eventually, not unlike what happens in the lives of all of us. And what if they still want to go to China? To empower also means to empower to make mistakes and support the person when, and if, they fail.

Ufficio Pio worked with two very different people: a woman in her 20s in a homeless condition, but enrolled in the university and a middle-aged man, who after a divorce lost the job and ended up living in the street. They also differ for their relationship with Ufficio Pio: a social worker of the organisation has already accompanied the young woman for a year, thus they share a quite longstanding relationship of mutual knowledge; while the man was a first-contact for Ufficio Pio. Both of them worked with a single professional and, therefore, the dream was also collected by one person. In the young woman's project, the dream and its systematisation played a central role: the young woman repeatedly took up the form she had filled in the following meetings with the social worker in order to modify it and plan her path.

Mr HOOD, on the other hand, showed an initial benefit from being able to imagine himself happy, in a future far from the situation of serious housing emergency and suffering he was experiencing.

The dream, however, was not transcribed and systematised by the social worker and did not become a central tool in his pathway.

If for the young woman, rereading her dream had an effect of empowerment, activation, and appropriation of her project, this did not happen in the case of the man, a fact that perhaps contributed to a lower awareness on his part about his ownership of his project. The dream, also because it was not turned into a tangible design tool by the professional, did not have the effect of empowerment and activation on him.

2.2.5. Networking

The importance of the network is a significant feature of Enabling Co-planning, although it could also seem a recurrent element in many other approaches. The main difference with other methodologies is that the network is not only a resource to solve problems but also a central place where to find voices that help define them. In the UNITO approach the People are known, described, met, and always seen by professionals as embedded in their network. Beginning immediately to talk about the situation in terms of network allows the practitioner, at any step of the process, not to imagine, think, and discuss anything about the person as they had intrinsic features that determine their existential situation, regardless of contextual and historical dimensions. With the network, we refer to everyone's system of relationships in terms of exchanges – both material and symbolic, role - stereotypes connected with the imaginaries, commitments, relational events, habits, and ties. Nevertheless, the professional must always pay attention not to assume a strategic attitude – both within ourselves or in the relationship – of the one who is collecting information. The main changes are not triggered by the outcome and evaluation - what we learned about the person's network - but by the process of collecting it. Indeed, it requires an effort to identify the meaningful people in our daily lives - this is a necessary step in developing the project, but it must not become a way to assess the person; it opens a space to describe their everyday lives from their own perspectives, without it being translated, adapted or inserted in interpretative models. So, the power relationship will develop from the very early stage as much more symmetrical than a relationship in which one actor has the skills, languages, and knowledge to describe the other, while the other has no legitimate words to talk about themselves. Moreover, considering the content, to think and talk about someone while always considering their contexts of network and life brings about much a richer description, which enables a better definition of truly personalized and effective intervention.

Practically this meant collecting the person meaningful and less meaningful relationships asking and writing on the personal project why that person was important and what role they played in their life. This was not an easy fit, the person experiencing homelessness often has poor social networks. To not have a personal/familiar security network is one of the underlying causes of homelessness. On top of that, a lot of the people living in homeless conditions find themselves at the intersection of being migrants. They might have a robust network, but it is not in any proximity. Thus, most of the people involved in the pilot phase had poor - faraway networks or, at best, a few peers who experience their own condition and some acquaintances that seldomly helped them out, towards which they had mixed feelings. During the individual meetings the participants were encouraged to

collect even the more mundane – or even detrimental – daily interactions, underlining that these relationships were as important to collect as the meaningful ones: maybe professionals or people they engage with but that they don't particularly like. Most of the organisation involved found out that – in their perception - this was borderline not feasible or not as useful. In the case of Ufficio Pio, network mapping was a very important activity for the young woman. It allowed her to understand which people she considered to be part of her network and, independently, she subsequently activated nodes of this network with respect to her project: in particular, she asked a professor she had met in the past for help in studying for university tests. In addition to that, the mapping enlarged the network itself: in order to pursue her goals, the woman entered into relationships with and asked for help from new figures, in this case supported by the social worker.

However, most of the organisation involved still collected some network from all the participants. The second step – according to Enabling Co-planning – was to contact the person's family members, friends, even acquaintances to inform them of the project and eventually to ask directly for their support. This was a blocking point for all the organisations involved for all the reasons that have been already explained in the previous paragraph.

Finally, they were asked to connect with other bureaus, volunteers, and professionals. The ones who spent a lot of time with the needed to be actively involved in the personal project through a brief explanation of the methodology framework. Others were to contact when the personal project required for the person to request papers, benefits, access to a workplace etc. This was easier to experiment with, and it was something the participants dealt with in their daily work outside of the HOOD project. Nevertheless, they were still prompted to transform the administrative process - that they were used to conduct autonomously - into an empowering experience for the person. They were encouraged to involve the person directly and to ask for their collaboration, to offer their support in contacting a certain professional or bureau without making that call themselves – when possible. Furthermore, they were asked to personally contact other co-workers and volunteers that worked with the person daily, to involve them in the project and foster an enabling approach in accord to HOOD experimentation.

Although a professional network is truly empowering when the people involved are working harmoniously to enable the person, this adaptation was not always feasible. KLIMAKA called out the difficulty to foster an enabling approach within the network of professionals and they underlined the need to develop a flexible and realistic action. SJD being the organisation with more transversal services to support the person, from the shelter to the daily services had the highest number of professionals not directly involved in HOOD to work regularly with the person. It was suggested to inform them of the project framework and to ask for their collaboration. Something analogous happened to Klimaka: the practitioners reported that they didn't have the time or the skill to actively foster enabling approach within their own organisation on such a large number of co-workers.

2.2.6. Documentation

It has already been established through this chapter that the documentation and the personal project need to be as precise as possible. It is necessary that the person can find and recognize their own words, and not the professional's translation of them. It is extremely powerful and enabling you to see your own words written down in an official document, it represents concretely the abstract concept that you do have the actual possibility to steer your own personal project. To this end, it is essential for the professionals to stress the fact that the person's approval and critical feedback is needed for every part of the personal project: starting from the dream collected to the operative goals and strategies to get there. It is crucial to remind the person as often as possible that their opinion and corrections are not only welcome but that are needed. They can add, remove, or change any of the project contents as they see fit. And this is true not only during the personal project drafting but at any time. Hence the transparency and total accessibility of the personal project is key. After a first draft, the person is provided with a copy, and they are asked to revise it. After this revision, a final draft of the complete personal project – including all the person's feedback - is provided and thoroughly explained to the person for a new revision. This final draft includes but is not limited to the person's dream perspective. The dream is translated by the professional into operational goals. Therefore, the dream perspective becomes the foundation of the operative goals, and very concrete actions descend from these goals. They are not objectives that the person must achieve to improve themselves or their situations, but actions that the professional must perform to support the person in the path they have chosen towards their future. Finally, there is a calendar where all the actions for the next three months are scheduled in detail: when? What are we doing? Who is doing it? It is essential that the professional-oriented goals, the process and results indicators and the calendar are all aimed to assess the professional's work, not the person's performance or expected improvement.

The participants were reminded to always keep in mind that the person would have own and read the project, and when each organisation drafted the personal projects, they send copies via email to be revised by the UNITO team. Afterwards, feedbacks were given during the individual meetings, mostly concerning the objective articulations – affirmative sentences, the sentence subject is the professional, the words are inclusive, and the jargon is non-technical, this wording is implicitly assessing. The participants were also encouraged not to rush the actions planned in the project and to meticulously develop the objective into micro-actions that felt reachable and doable by the person rather than paralyzing and intimidating macro-actions. The indicators were asked to be made it was requested that the indicators be measurable and easily verifiable.

Ufficio Pio decided to partially adapt the form proposed by the scientific partner (maintaining the elements considered central by the team such as: the dream, the mapping of the network, the description of the actions linked to the objectives). At the moment, Ufficio Pio has dismissed the previously used internal documents aimed at keeping track of the work carried out, and has replaced them with the new HOOD form, agreeing this change with the area manager. KLIMAKA and SJD dealt with an accessibility project, they both involved foreign people that had trouble reading Greek and Spanish respectively. As a solution, they both needed a translator to provide the person with a

copy of the project in their mother tongue that they could own and consult at any time. KLIMAKA didn't find any viable translator and they asked the person if a Greek document was still ok. UDENFOR participants couldn't adopt the personal project as it was expected from the Enabling Co-planning, mainly because they couldn't ask for the person direct participation in an experimental project. Consequently, they couldn't hold the "future meeting" and they could just collect the dream in a casual conversation neither they could show up with a ten pages project where the professional took note of everything the person said. Therefore, they wrote down what they collected afterwards. They were asked to write these pages like the person had the possibility to read them. This was done so that the professional couldn't just use their usual vocabulary to define problem and solution and still adopt an equal and enabling writing style. The calendar was also adapted shortening the timespan to better fit the need of each organisation.

2.3. Conclusions about the pilot phase

It is premature at this stage of the HOOD project to draw any final conclusions, yet some general trends and common blocking points emerged during the pilot phase.

A spread criticality amongst the partner associations was the network collection and involvement in the personal project. The Enabling Co-planning was theorized and experimented in working with people with cognitive disabilities. A common characteristic within the people in this group of people is that they generally have a very robust network surrounding them. This is true both on a personal and professional level. A lot of services, bureaus, professionals, volunteers, family members are intertwined in a person's everyday life, they contribute, and they have an active and meaningful role in supporting them. This is not the situation for people living in a homeless situation. On the contrary, a poor social network is often an important risk factor and an underlying cause to homelessness, as well as difficulty in interfacing with the administrative apparatus leading to barriers to access information, resources and benefits that might be available. On top of that, the person experiencing homelessness might also experience a sense of guilt, shame, and personal responsibility for their situation that hinders the personal willingness to contact people that used to be in their life to ask them for support.

HOOD implementation during this pilot phase seemed to work best when the person involved was at risk of homelessness and at worst where the person had already been in a homeless situation for a long time. But the determinants to those results are not some intrinsic characteristics of the person or some generic personal merit. To put it plainly, the longer someone has settled in a homeless situation and identity, the harder it is for them to picture a different future, especially when one must constantly think about their survival on the streets. How can someone even start thinking about self-realization or the existential direction of one's life when every day their most basic needs are not even met? Shelter, food, clean water, personal hygiene. Thus, when they are asked to picture a different future in ten years, it becomes impossible to see a different situation for themselves

and it feels like they are being mocked by the professionals. As emerged by the activity on the early intervention approach developed in the project, time represents a core component in the work with homeless people: indeed, the longer one lives in extreme poverty, the more one loses relational, imaginative, and activating capacities. From the pilot phase described in this report, it emerges that the Enabling Co-planning methodology is particularly suitable for working in integration with an early intervention approach, aimed at contacting people as soon as they become homeless.

Another observation was that to implement the practical advice regarding the mindset and the professional attitude was easy and straight-forward enough for the participants, but to genuinely give up the power in the relationship was really hard and dependent on the individual practitioner, characteristic and education, because power is not something you hold, but it is something that has to do with who you are.

The intimate perception of oneself as good, just, and rightful professionally – and personally – is at stake; your own identity is being discussed, therefore dismissing that power is a complicated, painful, and intimate process. This is especially true when the organisation of the services itself reinforces – even requires – you to hold and use that power. It takes time, but it does not suffice. Direct tutoring is needed, and therapeutic support, in addition to personal and professional motivation to challenge oneself and change one's way. All these elements help foster a genuine dismissal of the power in the relationship and actively shift from strategic to enabling and equal relationships.

It must be remarked that some of the partner associations started with some facilitating factors, for instance, Klimaka already had open dialogical trainings, and the dialogical approach was already present in their organisation DNA. The same can be said for UDEFOR structural informality.

To conclude on a positive note, it still appeared that some level of adaptation for the Enabling Co-planning was possible, even within all the cultural, political, and organisational bindings. HOOD involves different countries, different services and institutions with different missions – from outreach work to residential services, from early intervention to academic research – and what is emerging from this pilot phase is that, although a systemic, rigid and clear adaptation seems impossible, different shades of it are, as through a spectrum of enabling relationships we could see the results in the small realities and in the good-willing professionals involved in the study cases during this pilot phase.

CHAPTER 3: FROM PILOT TO SPREADING THE METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction and how we have been working in this phase

As mentioned in describing the pilot phase, participants had been trying to apply the Enabling Co-planning methodology to case studies (one or two homeless people for each NGO). During this phase, the participants were asked to collect all the adaptations required in order to make it feasible for their organisations to involve, in the next phase, a broader number of beneficiaries. In the whole course of the first six months, professionals experimenting on the field were asked to collect their observations and thoughts, as long as adaptations were put in place and critical issues. All those observations had been collected in an “adaptation record”, along with those that arose during both formal and informal meetings. Three events sanctioned the shift to the next phase: the group methodology meetings held in June and July 2021 (online) and the Learning Teaching Training Activity held in September 2021 (in Turin). Those events had been structured in order to facilitate the sharing and the collection of the pilot phase results which the scientific partner would use to design the next phase.

In the context of the methodology meeting, participants were required to prepare a presentation explaining how they would structure the following phase and which were the main worries about that. In particular, each organisation was asked the following questions:

- How many new professionals do you imagine being involved in the second phase of broader testing? What would be their profile?
 - Regarding your own organisation and the suggested number of professionals involved, which elements of the co-planning concrete setting do you feel will be easily explained and implemented for your «new colleagues» in this second phase?
 - And which ones could be really hard?
 - Which elements of the relational setting and professional mindset do you feel will be easily explained and implemented in this second phase?
 - And, on the contrary, which ones could be really hard?
 - Which practical elements of the anticipatory dialogues meetings do you feel will be easily explained to your «new colleagues» and implemented in this second phase?
 - And, on the other hand, which ones could be really hard?
- Since we are entering the second phase of HOOD project, we need to ask you to reflect upon your own organisation. Which organisation elements can be considered enablers and which ones are barriers to the adaptation of the Enabling Co-planning methodology?
- Would it be feasible for your organisation to implement on a larger scale the project documentation used during the pilot phase?

Each organisation had one month to internally discuss the answers and then was required to present them to the large project group at the July methodology meeting.

Once all the answers were collected, the scientific partner structured the Learning Teaching Training Activity (LTTAA) on what had come up. LTTAA has held between September and October in Turin, a three-days-long event training occurred in presence, with the participation of all the operative partners involved in HOOD. Only CESIS, a scientific partner from Portugal, had not the possibility to participate in presence due to Covid restrictions.

The first activity held in the LLTA was freely adapted from the “world café” training methodology. This training methodology was chosen since it is founded on informal conversation and setting, hence the world café: smaller tables, food and beverages provided to create a facilitating, safe and welcoming environment. This informality serves the goal of mobilizing personal thoughts and resources to foster learning, to share competencies and eventually generate significant change. In addition to this, due to the Covid-19 restrictions, participants had a very poor possibility to meet in person in the first year of the project, hence the need to facilitate the debate and to build proactively a relaxed atmosphere.

The first activity lasted three hours and involved 15 participants. The participants discussed in two smaller groups – each group having representatives from each partner association and country – sitting around two thematically different tables for two consecutive sessions.

The Enabling Co-planning methodology was addressed at one table and organisational and systemic issues at the other. Each table serves a different purpose, as the table shows.

Table 1- LTTA world café activity goals

Group	Table 1	Table 2
Theme	methodology and adaptations	Organisational and systemic issues
Activity goals	<p>Recall the first phase of the experimentation – giving us a fresh start on HOOD after the summer break – creating together an adaptation register that summarizes the work done so far by every partner association.</p> <p>Support each partner association in planning IO2, both in training operators according to the HOOD methodology and in extending the experimentation to a much larger number of people.</p> <p>Identify commonalities and differences between the adaptations implemented by each partner, in different countries, services and organisations.</p>	<p>Identify the systemic and organisational variables that have an actual role in the operative adaptations of the methodology, recognizing the concrete effects these aspects have on everyday practices and professionals’ daily work.</p> <p>Understand which one of these variables can be directly changed to implement the adaptation, which ones are a critical point in need of some adjustment, and which are just set in stone with really nothing that can be done about it.</p>

While the participants switch tables, at every table the facilitators stayed. The tasks of each facilitator included:

- Soliciting input from all participants
- Taking notes on the discussion
- Summarising the discussion to the next group to encourage contamination and exchange of ideas between the groups
- Presenting, if necessary, the results of the discussions at the concluding plenary session.

When it comes to the reflection on methodology and adaptations the participants were asked to start from the adaptation record collected in the past six months. They were provided with a table taking the Enabling Co-planning methodological steps and comparing them to the adaptations made so far in the experimental projects (Tab.2).

It highlighted the availability of a possible adaptation to the specific context or service and asked the participants to reflect upon the reason for this feasibility – or not. It concluded by asking the participants to picture how these implementations could be used further down the road of the HOOD project.

Some of the most significant adaptations were already presented in the registers and the other parts were left blank to allow participants to add each missing piece.

Table 2- methodology and adaptations

▪ Table 2: methodology and adaptations				
How it's done in the UNITO methodology	Operational meaning & adaptation status	Why is that?	Experimented adaptation so far	Possible adaptation? How to use it in io2?
...

Although they shared the same structure, each participant was provided with a table reflecting, in terms of content, the path taken so far by their organisation, presenting the different steps and approaches they took in the early stages of HOOD experimentations as they were collected by UNITO.

With regard to organisational and systemic issues, the sheet proposed asked the participants to reflect upon their own organisation and services. Organisational facilitators and barriers to HOOD implementation had already been expressed by the participants throughout the project's duration and they had been meticulously collected.

The facilitator presented an overview of all the information gathered and the participants needed to recognize the organisational variables, to understand which one of these factors have the possibility to be directly changed to implement the adaptation, which ones are a critical point in need of some adjustment, and which are just set in stone with really nothing that can be done.

Furthermore, a specific quadrant of the table provided aided the identification of systemic variables that have an actual role in the operative adaptations of the methodology.

The facilitators prompted the recognition of the concrete effects these aspects have on everyday practices and professionals' daily work through a series of questions:

- Can you recall any time you have dealt with these systemic aspects? What happened?
- Do you feel that these aspects have made your life easier or harder (more fatigue)?
- How do you think these systemic aspects affected your everyday work?

The process concluded with a plenary session in which the facilitators returned the outcomes of the discussion to the participants.

The second part of the first activity took place after the lunch break. During the break, the UNITO facilitators had the chance to organise the information surfaced at the discussion tables.

This session first goal was to give comprehensive feedback on the outcomes of the discussion, asking the participants to give their impressions along the way in an open discussion where each partner association could give their contribution.

The second main goal of this wrap-up activity was to co-create a methodology implementation and adaptation draft based on the idea, reflections, and observations of everyone involved during HOOD project so far.

Smaller tables and chairs were set in a semi-circular set to encourage free circulation of ideas and impressions between participants. In front of the participants stood one facilitator who aimed to enable the conversations by presenting the organised data, focusing on the commonalities and differences that emerged between all partner associations during the previous discussions. The other facilitator recorded the session by taking notes of every intervention.

After those activities, the group had established the main characteristics of the larger methodology experimentation.

The participants spent two days immersed in the LTTAA: tackling training, workshops, and field visits. They were continuously asked to analyse the culture permeating the social services for which they work to find structural and methodological criticalities, and often during the process, they were challenged to look critically at their own organisation and practices as professionals working in a vaster, more complex, and inter-twined context of policies, services, and institutions.

In the final activity, the participants were asked to picture the HOOD follow up meeting in ten years, they had to describe their work environments, their organisations, and their country in a situation where everything changed for the better. This process was not dissimilar to the one people face during the Enabling Co-planning first meetings when they are asked to imagine a happy future in five years.

The exercise served as a more light-hearted, positive, and conclusive moment where the participants could vent. It allowed them a longer-term gaze unconstrained by the contingent reality of services, giving them the possibility to be free of the limitations and binds all social workers experience when they work in a very real and concrete service.

In this activity, the participants were asked to work in small groups based on their nationality and partner association they belonged to. The participants were asked to keep in mind everything they had experienced during HOOD experimentation and this LTTAA in Turin.

Each group could find their own place where to work separately from the others and they have been given 30 – 40 minutes to come up with a group output to present to the other participants in final plenary session.

3.2. Results of pilot phase: methodology and intervention model

3.2.1 From methodology to systemic actions

Both the meeting held in July 2021 and the LTTAA event brought more awareness about the fact that testing a dialogical methodology with homeless persons carries along with several broader implications. The possibility to look at the situation from the point of view of the person seeking help is, in fact, one of the deeper differences between dialogical practice and conventional methods in social work. The pilot phase gave the participants the possibility to “feel closer to the users” rather in a sense of being more capable of seeing the complexity of the marginalization reality than in a sense of psychological identification. This way, professional began to underline more and more often that in their experience the success of a recovery path tends to be determined by background and system-related factors rather than individual features. In the context of their daily practice, professionals testing the dialogical approach felt closer to the users defining a common struggle to deconstruct social and cultural barrier which defines the homelessness experience. On one hand, this aspect came up as a country related factor: each territory involved (often on a regional basis even more than on a national), showed its peculiarity when it comes to the factors which influence the homelessness experience, as health and social system organisation. On the other hand, in a broader sense, the exchange between professionals engendered by the HOOD project allowed each organisation to recognize a common struggle among them as professionals in order to get the homeless people they work with better access to right. The possibility itself to use the methodology in each country came up as more related to the context and the policy level than to personal characteristics of the homeless people met.

Sharing their experiences, the participants agreed that homelessness is not, of course, just a matter of being without a home (as the label may suggest): marginality is a more complex issue, mainly related to access to human, social and civil rights. The use of the methodology in the pilot phase allowed the professionals to explore the issue of access to rights in a more practice-related way. In the Enablig Co-planning approach, in fact, the role of the professional is no longer to change the person (in the sense of re-educate them) but is to support them to access the human, social and civil rights they are entitled to. This call into question two aspects. First, professional work is strongly hindered when the person they work with is entitled to a very limited set of those rights. This is the case, for example, of the increasingly high number of homeless people who are undocumented migrants. Thus, consequently to the shared immigration policy, their access to social and civil rights is very poor. Second, even when the homeless person would be entitled to rights, this access is strongly restricted from the high threshold of the services that should help in this sense. This often results in a lack of access to health services, to employment support, to the housing itself which

determines a vicious circle. People leave at the edge of communities since they have no access to rights and are not able to accede to the rights since they live at the edge of communities. In this sense, an effective methodology should include a set of policies aimed to entitle and allow concrete access to human, civil and social rights to the persons in a situation of marginality. The pilot phase brought the professionals involved a deeper awareness about the complexity of the situation of the people they tried to support. Dialogical practice, in fact, asks the professional to look at the life of the person they are helping not only through the label suggested by the professional culture. When professionals are involved in Enabling Co-planning they have to deal no longer with a characteristic (“this is homeless”, “this is a disabled”) but with a person who collects many characteristics. People supported are no longer just homeless, but they are seen as men, women, young, old, residents, immigrants, fathers, mothers, ex-soldiers or ex-workers: who have been facing a more complex exclusion condition rather than just being “homeless”. Some of those conditions are especially discriminatory: for example, being an immigrant (especially undocumented) or a person with mental health issues but also simply being a woman, or being illiterate. Which conditions are more subject to discrimination and how those characteristics interact do not depend on the person profile but are socially and culturally determined. That is the system – social, health, cultural, educational – which defines and constructs what in that specific context leads to a deeper marginalization.

When access to rights is concerned, the common experience of the professionals in the pilot phase showed that the intersection of many discriminations defines a more remarkable difficulty for the professional to facilitate the access to rights (and in a broader sense to the society itself). Hence, all those elements of discrimination have to be taken into account with tools that do not only address the “homeless” part of the life project of the people.

As we saw so far, the possibility itself to apply the Enabling Co-planning methodology is strictly related to a systemic view of the homelessness condition. During the pilot phase, the professionals involved underlined some points of inconsistency with the policy level and the social-healthcare system in general. Notably, the system shows incompatibility with the methodology when the social work path is expected to keep the person in a structural disempowered position. Professionals brought so many examples of those incompatibilities that a more systematic collection has been planned for the next phase. Some of the more common examples shared are the expectation that the person would tell their story to each service and each professional they meet, or the inner power asymmetry connected to the idea that the person has to show they are deserving help. Those examples are connected to the idea that “something in that person is wrong” and that’s why they are homeless, thus the role of the professional is to “discover what’s wrong” and somehow fix it, while the role of the person is to “overcome their condition” meaning to commit to change all those personal characteristics which makes them different.

Those examples, as the others collected, show a structural problem in facing complex issues of social extreme marginality (represented in our societies by the “homeless” person) within an individual model of fragility, rather than a systemic one. This aspect seems to be a huge barrier to innovation in social services.

In the final months of the pilot phase participants more and more reflection about professionals' experience experimenting the methodology in the project had been collecting. The first phase of the experience showed that in order to pursue some sort of effectiveness in the support of homeless people, a broader picture rather than just the methodology has to be taken into account. The framework the participants pictured after the first six months of Enabling Co-planning, in fact, included four dimensions that had been showing their connections with the methodology effectiveness.

The first dimension that came up as relevant is the policy level. The HOOD methodology, as long as the Enabling Co-planning, is not a policy-neutral approach. That is the methodology can be applied only if some conditions are fulfilled. Since Enabling Co-planning is an emancipatory approach in order to be effective it needs to be developed in a deinstitutionalization framework (Mezzina, 2014). The approach, in fact, takes up the suggestion related to the polyphony of voices, but it integrates it with the theme of the restitution of subjectivity as key to the path of deinstitutionalization that underlies Pier Aldo Rovatti's analysis of Franco Basaglia's ideas (Rovatti, 2013). Thus, as expected, the pilot phase showed that is not feasible to apply the Enabling Co-planning in all those contexts that have some sort of "total institution" characteristics, as they are detailed in the Erving Goffman work *Asylum*. On the contrary, the Enabling Co-planning in homelessness field needs to be applied in the context of rights first policies (for example the housing first framework). The main obstacle to the new perspective application in the pilot phase was the widespread staircase approach not only in the professional attitude but in the policy structure itself. The need to demonstrate to be deserving in order to get further possibilities is in fact in open contrast with rights-based approaches as Enabling Co-planning.

Moreover, the pilot phase showed that Enabling Co-planning requires the policy structure to be systemic: the services and the policies need to be consistent and coordinated. For this reason, in this perspective, the philanthropic way of helping has no long-term results since it lacks the possibility of bringing structural changes to the policy level. In this sense, the participants reflected on the role of third sector entities (which they are). In this respect, two issues came up more strongly. On one hand, participants developed a strong awareness that the role of third sector organizations' is also defined by what they do with the users: using the Enabling Co-planning allowed them to experience a deeper connection with the users, rethinking many disempowering practices they encountered in their previous work. On the other hand, we will go back to this in the last paragraph, in rights-based perspective the role of third sector organisations seems to be more focused on the advocacy level rather than in replacing lacking public services. In this respect, participants underlined the importance of considering advocacy a proper task, time-consuming and needing a proper budget and proper planning.

Rethinking to the policy level helped participants to reconsider their tasks and, in consequence, their own organisational level.

The organisational level includes the way each organisation arranges the tasks, the daily job of the professional, schedules, workspaces but also concerns what is expected from each professional in terms of outcomes of the job as long as in terms of attitude, perspective, tools used.

At the organisational level, the case study conducted in the pilot phase showed that in order to be able to apply Enabling Co-planning, all the dimensions concerned should be addressed. In particular, the outcomes expected have to be consistent with the approach. This means that not only the operational part of the work has to be involved but also the management. In terms of daily job organisation, participants pointed out that Enabling Co-planning is a time-consuming approach, especially in the first phase, that requires organisational changes. In order to make the methodology feasible, in fact, the management of each organisation has to acknowledge the framework: the change of methodology carries along with a paradigm shift that cannot be concretely promoted in lack of awareness.

Moreover, after the pilot phase professionals pointed out that this kind of approach to the life project should be conducted by public service since only the public service could keep a directing role toward the network.

Even if the pilot phase had been showing the relevance of many other dimensions, the professional attitude is still a core aspect when it comes to methodology effectiveness.

Beyond the endemic professionals' resistance to change, which also depends on the age of the professional as long as on the specific service subculture, some other issues came up from the pilot phase.

The professionals involved detected a more common disposition to integrate new tools (as specific tables, checklists etc..) compared to a spread resistance when the request is to change the basic structure of the work. As we saw in the introduction to the methodology, Enabling Co-planning is a tool but is mainly a way of understanding psychosocial discourse and planning is a different distribution of power between the professionals and the homeless person. By seeking to implement within the services what the rights-based model prescribed, therefore, one of the first elements that characterized the application of Enabling Co-planning was the search for a way for an encounter between operator and individual that was not based on the usual mechanisms of assessment of need and that would allow, precisely, for this reason, to open up new spaces of operational scope and reflection characterized by more symmetrical and dialogical interactions. This challenged the fundamental structure of social work, which leads on an asymmetrical basis.

From the very first moment, it seemed crucial to discuss the possibility of a meeting in which the diagnosis, the label that identified the discomfort, were not considered as the only possible gateway to understanding the existence of the other. However, this approach appeared to stand in deep contrast with what is usually required of the professionals in social and educational services, starting from the point in which the operator has to "fix" the condition of the other by imposing a term, or a definition. This step became a primary condition of professional action; however, the means of support resulting from it were able to provide only individual and fragmented responses.

Through the modality of Enabling Co-planning, the label is no longer what determines the intervention: as a consequence, its usefulness in the encounter is lost. This does not mean, in response to very frequent criticism, that working in a rights-based model means thinking that diagnoses, situations of substance addiction, or the experience of mental suffering do not exist. Renouncing the label does not mean denying its existence but subtracting its power, founding its own professional

action in the awareness that none of these elements can, or should, be treated as what determines the course of a life, the available support, the existential opportunities that person should be given. As simple as it seems bringing this change into the daily job profoundly questioned the inner structure of the work, especially when it comes to power distribution.

The power distribution dimension is, thus, a matter both of services organisation and professional attitude. The pilot phase also showed a further dimension that contribute to this crucial aspect of social work with homeless people: the narrative and the meanings culturally attached to homelessness.

It is crucial to notice that in Enabling Co-planning this narration assumes a primarily operative meaning. Listening to personal history is not, in fact, in itself a novelty within socio-educational practices. However, this listening usually takes place within a framework in which the professional performs an act of competent and active listening, but it will not be that story, that desires or that dream to define the path and the intervention; the meanings and the priorities that the individual expresses are not usually the elements on which the social service will base their decision. The operators listen to the story and then proceed with the assessment, the evaluation, and the definition of the appropriate intervention according to the labels they have identified. It is important to underline that this does not happen because of the person's bad will but for all the elements – organisational and related to conceptual models – inherent to the individual medical model. It is as if the operator were saying "I may find your story interesting, but to help you, I need to know what's wrong". On the contrary, in the rights-based model of work put in place by the services in recent years, the story and the vision of the other take on the role of guiding the whole process. What changes compared to a classic life project is the point of view, because the point of view is that of the homeless person on themselves.

All this has very concrete consequences since the construction of the dream has sociodemographic determinants and needs specific rehabilitation work to be rebuilt.

3.3. Results from the pilot phase: training suggestions

The shifting phase between the pilot and the extension processes also allowed the scientific partner to collect some suggestions about the training methods that would be more effective given the participants' characteristics.

As we mentioned before, training in social work is always a sensitive issue since values, sense of self, political awareness is always involved. Furthermore, the pilot phase had been showing deep differences among participants both in terms of the homeless population encountered and in terms of internal organisation and mission.

The most important result in these terms can be considered the shift from the methodology to the framework as a starting point for the practice. The participant repeatedly underlined how the marginality model, the narrative, the intervention framework affects their daily job more than any "method" that would be applied. Especially in the case of a rights-based methodology, as the one HOOD project is experimenting, participants pointed out how the pilot phase experience showed

them that sharing the rights-based framework affects more the practice than any technique that may be applied. Hence, the internal training phase designed to support the spreading of the approach to a larger number of beneficiaries and professionals should concern with both framework and methodological aspects. The shared idea is that the more effective way to enhance the intervention knowledge and awareness would be systematically connecting the experience of professionals to the elements that came up as result of the pilot phase.

When it comes to the methodology, differences between territories and organisation lead to consider it not as a rigid method but as a spectrum of approaches and operational possibilities that each professional should consider in the next phase. Hence, the tool built for the data collection will reflect this idea of “methodology shades”, allowing the participants to continue blending Enabling Co-planning suggestions with pre-existing approaches.

As a result, in terms of training methods suggestions, the pilot phase showed the peer education and concrete discussion about the daily job as much more effective than the classic teaching method through lectures and seminars.

CHAPTER 4: INTERMEDIATE CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER STEPS

4.1. Sustainability and feasibility

When it comes to sustainability the main result of the pilot phase may be considered the challenge to the idea that one methodology, one technique, one intervention model could be able to resolve complex social issues as the marginality shade that is usually named homelessness. There is, in fact, a relatively common idea about where the funding aimed to contrast social problems may be directed that lead to the preference in financing intervention at an individual level. As a result of the extension of medical categories to social phenomena and issues, in the contexts in which resources are displayed there still is "the public expectation that treating the pathological symptoms of people, it may free us from wider social problems" (Ehrenberg 1997 p.25). This expectation is extraordinarily rooted in the social services, in social worker professional culture as long as in the policy-makers funding frameworks.

Hence, when sustainability is concerned, it's crucial to identify the framework that guides the funding, in order to prevent the direction of the resources to intervention based on an individual-medical model.

The model of explanation, in this sense, ends up influencing the choices related to welfare policies, giving priority to some models of intervention against others: if you tend, in fact, to represent and treat social problems as a set of micro-pathologies of which people are carriers, as a result, rehabilitation-individual based interventions will be preferred, for example, to collective, community-based and emancipatory models of intervention.

As one of the most relevant results, the pilot phase allowed participants to understand that the categories of thought which they know and describe phenomena, and the professional discourse they are used to are linked to a specific theoretical model that changes in space and time: there is a paradigm, a system of assumptions, knowledge, and beliefs, which determines in a powerful way what one should do in services. As simple as it seems, that is something often lacking those who work in social services. Operators speak, act, and make decisions daily about people's lives based on their narrations, the priorities that are defined in their paths, the models of explanation of their behaviours. One of the elements that the HOOD pilot phase has brought to the attention of participants is precisely this: the relationship between paradigm and social work with homeless people is much closer than we used to think. The work with homeless people seems in fact to find in the daily practical dimension a prevalent, if not totalizing, aspect. This carries with it the risk of a substantial invisibilization of the connections with the paradigm within which one acts daily. Many services which daily work with homelessness may culturally consider "theoretical" reflections as interesting, but they are systematically defined as poorly related to the practice. Because of this disconnection, in professional culture, there is a widespread and systematically reinforced detachment between doing and reflecting (intended as organised, collective, systematic reflection), which are perceived

as belonging to two separate spheres: the “non-random, non-voluntary possibility to reflect, to exchange experiences between colleagues, to welcome innovations and rework them” (Canevaro, 2006, p.13).

In this way, the disconnection between theoretical paradigms at all levels – together with the relative reflection on them – and the operating models, represented as two different worlds, is nourished. This context of “pragmatic hyperrealism”, as Benedetto Saraceno defines it, “only authorizes the discourse around the visible reality of the present” (2019, cit. p. 41), denying the fact that each action – especially in a context full of power implications such as the educational one – brings with it a wealth of definitions, positions and meanings that, being tacit, ends up acting implicitly and unconsciously through the daily actions of social workers and educators.

When it comes to feasibility, the pilot phase showed that what would be needed in order to make it feasible for participants is not a simple training course on a new methodology but a systematic process involving networks and communities. Within the rights-based framework, the objective of social work is indeed no longer the evaluation, planning and structuring of interventions appropriate to a certain type of situation or diagnosis, but the creation and multiplication of exchanges in a negotiation network, which includes the material, emotional, symbolic, identity and cultural dimensions. Furthermore, the systematic implementation of the rights-based model of inclusion challenges the assumption that processes have to be centred on the objectives of autonomy, which are in turn based on the idea that social inclusion stems from the person’s “improvement of the damaged skills” (Saraceno, 2017, p. 164) and therefore on the progressive acquisitions that are allowed, in the end, to those who manage to live on the basis of equality with others. This framework lead to individual intervention models, which had been demonstrated as poorly effective in marginality situations.

As a result, we need models that, in order to function properly, do not base their practices on the distinction between those who manage and those who do not. The goal is no longer to ensure that “the weak cease to be weak in order to be able to share the stage with the strong” but, as Benedetto Saraceno states, to change the rules of the game, to build a scene, networks, communities to which everyone can belong, and where each citizen is allowed continuous, situated and rooted exchanges of “skills, interests and rights” (Saraceno, 2017, cit. p. 164), regardless of their own characteristics.

4.2. Lacks and weakness points

The deep reflections and the enhancement of the model of intervention achieved through the pilot phase also led to more awareness about some critical points.

HOOD tries an adaptation working almost exclusively on the methodology level and professionals’ education, but it became apparent that many of the struggles to implement the Enabling Co-planning could not be addressed solely by working on the individual professional and the practical experimentations. Some difficulties requested the participants to tackle wider issues such as the prac-

tices in their services, the larger culture and imaginary surrounding the homeless, their country policy levels on access to rights and the larger organisation of the services for the homeless that descend from these.

The context recognizes the homeless condition with stigma and shifts the responsibility of inequality and homelessness from the socio-economical determinants to the person themselves. The common reasoning is that if you found yourself homeless, you must have done something wrong. This reinforces the feeling of deep shame about one's circumstances and confirms the personal feelings of guilt. During this pilot phase, it emerged that the services for the homeless are not immune to this stigma, there are recurring underlying mantras that run through the professional minds and that leak into the structure of the services itself: to get a house you should earn it, you should prove that you are good enough, functional enough, healthy enough. You should prove that you can provide for that house and maintain it, living up to the professional's standard. You should prove yourself worthy, do not drink, do not use drugs, have a stable income - following the instructions and showing compliance to the "treatment" deemed right and good for you.

Those lines of thinking exemplify straightforwardly a fact: not only does the professional holds a terrible and very real power over one's life, but also the organisational structure reinforces their convictions as just and rightful, allowing them to be unaware of that power. Most of the services for the homeless are organised in a way that we can refer to as the "staircase approach", a step approach with a funnel effect to the access to particular "benefits" as the right to housing. It starts with the reception stage - shelters, social canteens and day-care; then comes the second step - shared housing and training dwellings; if one performs accordingly, they can get to the third step - regular dwelling with a time-limited occupation and agreement based on special conditions; finally, permanent social housing can be earned if one has been compliant to the project, functionally making the professional the arbitrary gateway between each step of the ladder. This concrete possibility to regulate access to rights is where the power in the strategic relationship dwells.

Besides all the participants' individual efforts, peer, organisational and political pressure is crucial for this change to be systemic and not arbitrary and individual. This wasn't the scenario for HOOD's participants: they had the framework of a European project, online training events, individual and methodological meetings, but no mission to foster a structural change in their organisation and context.

For HOOD to be truly effective and for the adaptation to be systemically viable, the work on the professionals and the methodology experimentation are not enough. These aspects should be founded on a policy level that endorses a "Housing First" approach to the organisation of the services for the homeless. This approach prioritizes the right to have a house regardless of any kind of performance. Ground zero is not a shelter, ground zero is regular social housing, not time-limited or on training dwellings, that they can start paying back when, if ever, they have the possibility. Only after one has access to a house unbounded by special or performance conditions, they can start picturing a happy future, gradually taking responsibility for their life course, and gaining power over the direction of the professional's intervention. The social workers – stripped of their gateway

role and the power that comes with it - become tools for sustaining the person in exploring the life's possibilities, helping them gain experience, self-awareness and learn how to navigate the life possibilities they can reach, still facing and dealing with their personal difficulties, that might never be "solved".

4.3. What's next?

The UNITO team will keep in touch with the participants they worked with during the Pilot phase of this experimentation. Supporting them directly in the process of spreading the methodology and training personnel within their organisations. Two monitoring tools are the main means to collect and share information in this second phase. They are not the exclusive way to do so and every partner association can implement any ulterior documentation they might produce.

These adaptations tools are two online forms that are:

- The USER REGISTRATION form; this one is needed for the UNITO team to easily associate a user code to every new project that the organisation are working with. The person filling the form has to create the code using the first two letters of the professional working with the person and their organisation. This form collects the basics for the person's dream and briefly ask the professional to summarize the personal project: network, context and actions planned.

The professional should fill this form for every person they are working with— generally once, an update might be needed if any drastic shift in the dreamscape appears. It can be done alone or as a team, having just one participant filling the form after a shared discussion.

- The PERIODIC REVIEW form; is a more flexible tool. It has to be filled once a month, at least and It can be a team discussion summarized by one professional or rather it can be the individual reflection of the professional working directly with the person. It asks the participants to report episodes related to the IO2 experimentation and ask the professional to reflect upon it: it was a strategic relationship or an empowering one? Where did the power lie in this situation? Which actions are being taken?

One periodic review can be used to describe all the study cases the organisation is working on, or rather it can be decided to fill a separate form for each personal project the partner organisation is working on.

These two tools are the common base the UNITO team created to collect and share the information, in fact, the data will be available for everyone to check through a google sheet directly connected to the forms; on top of that these forms give the UNITO team the possibility to organise the information and to monitor the situation without directly talking with every single professional who is going to be involved during this second phase.

We encouraged the participants to utilize these tools accordingly to their organisations needs to smoothly implement their already existing working routines without the necessity to dedicate specific time to discuss HOOD exclusively. To facilitate this process the forms might also be accessed through the professional mobile and be filled during the professional scrap time.

In the next months will be improved with the data collected from each participant: the aim is to design a spectrum of practices and organizational models able through which each country can assess the rights based orientation of the practices they are implementing. This common framework will be useful in order to share progressively acquired knowledge and expertise in the future.

REFERENCES

- Aaltonen j., Seikkula j., Lehtinen k. (2011), *Comprehensive Open Dialogue Approach i: Developing a comprehensive Culture of Need-Adapted Approach in a Psychiatric Public Health Catchment Area in Western lapland Project*, in "Psychosis", 3, 3, pp. 179-91.
- Arnkil, T. E. (2018). *Dialogical Meetings In Social Networks*. Routledge Arnkil, 2018
- Bakhtin M (1984), *Sulla polifonicità dei romanzi di Dostoevskij*, in Id., *Tolstoj*, a cura di V. Strada, il Mulino, Bologna, pp. 131-41 (ed. or. 1929).
- Bachtin, M. M., Kanaev, I. I., Medvedev, P. N., & Vološinov, V. N. (1995). *Bachtin e le sue maschere: Il percorso bachtiniano fino alla pubblicazione dell'opera su Dostoevskij (1919–29)*, A. Bari: Dedalo.
- Barone, R., Morretta, A., Gulino, E. (2017) *Open dialogue. Un intervento innovativo con la famiglia e la rete sociale nel Dipartimento di Salute Mentale di Caltagirone Palagonia*, in "Nuova Rassegna di Studi Psichiatrici", Vol 14.
- Basaglia F. (1965), *La distruzione dell'ospedale psichiatrico come luogo di istituzionalizzazione*, in "Annali di Neurologia e Psichiatria", 49, 1, pp. 72-85.
- Basaglia F. (1979), *Conversazione con Venturini*, in E. Venturini (a cura di), *Il giardino dei gelsi. Dieci anni di antipsichiatria italiana*, Einaudi, Torino, pp. 00.
- Bateson G. (1972), *Verso un'ecologia della mente*, trad. it. G. Longo, Adelphi, Milano
- Bergström, T., Seikkula, J., Alakare, B., Mäki, P., Köngäs-Saviaro, P., Taskila, J. J., Aaltonen, J. (2018). *The Family-Oriented Open Dialogue Approach In The Treatment Of First-Episode Psychosis: Nine-teen-Year Outcomes*, in "Psychiatry research", 270, 168-175.
- Cain, M., & Fanshawe, M. (2021). *From Emotional Crisis to Empowerment: The Journey of Two Mothers*, in "Infants & Young Children", 34(3), 225-240.
- Curto N, Marchisio C (2020), *I diritti delle persone con disabilità*. Carocci Editore.
- Cutolo, Giovanni. (2019). Language and context into the therapy of early psychosis: the post-rationalist approach dialogues with the Open Dialogue. 1. 51-69.

- Dawson, L., Einboden, R., McCloughen, A., & Buus, N. (2021). *Beyond Polyphony: Open Dialogue In A Women's Shelter In Australia As A Possibility For Supporting Violence-Informed Practice*, in "Journal of Marital and Family Therapy", 47(1), 136-149.
- Foucault m. (1996), *Discorso e verità nella Grecia antica*, Donzelli, Roma
- Freeman, A. M., Tribe, R. H., Stott, J. C., & Pilling, S. (2019). *Open dialogue: a review of the evidence*. *Psychiatric Services*, 70(1), 46-59.
- Galbusera L., Kyselo M (2018), *The Difference that Makes the Difference: a Conceptual Analysis of the Open Dialogue Approach*, in "Psychosis", 10, 1, pp. 47-54.
- Gergen k. j. (1999), *An Invitation of Social Construction*, Sage, London.
- Gergen k. j., mcnamee s., barrett f. j. (2002), *Realizing Transformative Dialogue*, in N. C. Roberts (ed.), *The transformative Power of Dialogue*, Emerald, Bingley, pp. 77-105.
- Holquist m. (2003), *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*, Routledge, London.
- Lang r. (2009), *The United Nations Convention on the Right and Dignities for Persons with Disability: A Panacea for Ending Disability Discrimination?*, in "Alter", 3, 3, pp. 266-85.
- Marchisio C, Curto N (2019) *Diritto al lavoro e disabilità. Progettare pratiche efficaci*. Carocci Editore.
- Marchisio C, Curto N (2019) *Intermediate Results Of The Application Of An Evidence-Based Method: The Work Intellectual Disability Environment*, in "ITALIAN JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR INCLUSION", v. 1, pp. 137-154
- Marchisio C, Curto N (2019) *Lavorare oggi per i diritti nel campo della disabilità*. In Maurizio Colleoni (a cura di) *Immaginabili Risorse. Disabilità, cittadinanza, coesione sociale*. pp.163-173, Milano: Franco Angeli
- Marchisio, C. (2019). *Percorsi di vita e disabilità. Strumenti di coprogettazione*. Carocci.
- Massi, G., Chaves, M. C. M., Wosiacki, F. T., Paisca, A., Lima, R. R., Tonocchi, R., & Hey, A. P. (2019). *Autonomy And Participatory Aging: A Dialogical Practice*, in "Revista CEFAC", 21(6).
- Mezzina, R. (2014). *Community Mental Health Care In Trieste And Beyond: An "Open Door–No Restraint" System Of Care For Recovery And Citizenship*, in "The Journal of nervous and mental disease", 202(6), 440-445.
- Mezzina, R. (2017). *Paradigm Shift In Psychiatry: Processes And Outcomes*, in "Mental Health at the Crossroads" (pp. 97-110). Routledge.
- Olson, M. (2015). *An Auto-Ethnographic Study Of "Open Dialogue": The Illumination Of Snow*, in "Family Process", 54(4), 716-729.
- Olson, M., Seikkula, J., & Ziedonis, D. (2014). *The Key Elements Of Dialogic Practice In Open Dialogue: Fidelity Criteria*. The University of Massachusetts Medical School, 8, 2017.
- Rovatti P (2013), *Restituire la soggettività. Lezioni sul pensiero di Franco Basaglia*, ab, Merano.

- Razzaque, R., & Stockmann, T. (2016). *An Introduction To Peer-Supported Open Dialogue In Mental Healthcare*. BJPsych Advances, 22(5), 348-356.
- Seikkula, J. (2014). *Il dialogo aperto: l'approccio finlandese alle gravi crisi psichiatriche*. Giovanni Fioriti Editore.
- Seikkula, J., & Arnkil, T. (2014). *Open Dialogues And Anticipations. Respecting Otherness In The Present Moment*. Finland: Teema.
- Seikkula, J., & Arnkil, T. E. (2013). *Metodi dialogici nel lavoro di rete. Per la psicoterapia di gruppo, il servizio sociale e la didattica*. Edizioni Erickson.
- Seikkula, J., & Olson, M. E. (2003). *The Open Dialogue Approach To Acute Psychosis: Its Poetics And Micropolitics*. *Family Process*, 42(3), 403-418.
- Seikkula, J., Aaltonen, J., Alakare, B., Haarakangas, K., Keränen, J., & Sutela, M. (1995). Treating psychosis by means of open dialogue. The reflective team in action: Collaborative practice in family therapy, 62-80.
- Toomey, A. H. (2011). *Empowerment And Disempowerment In Community Development Practice: Eight Roles Practitioners Play*, in "Community Development Journal", 46(2), 181-195.
- Ulland, D., Andersen, A. J. W., Larsen, I. B., & Seikkula, J. (2014). *Generating Dialogical Practices In Mental Health: Experiences From Southern Norway, 1998–2008*. "Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research", 41(3), 410-419.

EU project by



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI TORINO

