

CO-HOUSING OF SENIORS – 'OPEN POPOWICE' CASE STUDY**

Mariusz Dybal

University of Wroclaw

mariusz.dybal@uwr.edu.pl

1. Introduction

1.1. Popowice Laboratory

The paper presents findings from the "Open Popowice" ["Otwarte Popowice"] meeting that took place in September 28th, 2018. "Open Popowice" meeting in Wroclaw, Poland was organized as part of the inauguration of the Popowice Laboratory [Laboratorium Popowice]. This event was the first of the planned series of meetings and workshops with the inhabitants of Popowice as part of the Popowice Laboratory, ProPoLab in short. It was to examine the needs of residents, mostly seniors, in relation to public services and the involvement of Popowice district residents in the activities of the Popowice Laboratory (ProPoLab 2018b, p. 3).

ProPolab is a visible part of pilot called Co-housing of Seniors. The pilot challenge is to implement the concept of senior co-housing using the tools used in the co-creation model. The experiment takes place in Popowice district, part of Wroclaw municipality, where involving local residents – seniors – local leaders, we (project implementers) want to develop the space to implement joint plans and meet the diagnosed needs (ProPoLab 2018a, p. 6).

What will the laboratory look like will be decided by the stakeholders (municipality, housing cooperative, developers, residents, social and church organizations, others) involved in the project. As project implementers, we encourage the main stakeholders to develop their own definitions, tools and model of the JOINT PUBLIC SERVICES creation, which will be a huge step in changing public awareness in Poland, including thinking about public services.

The project is therefore a combination of theory and practice. The University of Wroclaw provides theoretical tools and diagnoses that allow them to be used in practice as a "living laboratory". The Active Senior Foundation [Fundacja Aktywny Senior], local non-government organization, is responsible for the

** Co-creation of Service Innovation in Europe (CoSIE). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 770492.

The content of the publication reflects the authors' views and the Managing Agency cannot be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

practical issues related to the ProPoLab and seniors. After all, seniors functioning in their place of residence know best what their needs are. The project will help them to realize their needs.

Co-housing of Seniors along with other eight individual (but interlinked) pilots form up EU CoSIE project. CoSIE is an acronym for Co-creation of Service Innovation in Europe. CoSIE is a consortium of 24 partners from 10 countries. According to the CoSIE, public service innovations can be achieved by creating collaborative partnerships between service providers and service beneficiaries. During the implementation of CoSIE (2017-2020), the collaborative partners will test and develop the diverse methods of co-creation in the field of public services (Sakellariou 2018, p. 8).

1.2. Theoretical framework of the research

Population is aging. Mainly as a result of increasing longevity and low fertility rates. According to the data the world's share of persons aged 65 years and over will increase from 8% in 2015 to almost 18% by 2050. In developed countries, the aging of population is even more severe. For example, in the countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) ratio will increase from 16% to 27%. Moreover, in the OECD countries the share of the population aged over 75 in 2050 will be similar to the share of the population aged over 65 years right now (OECD 2015, p. 8).

This issue leads to a serious challenge in terms of economic, social and political sense. Challenges are so important and contemporary that European Commission has announced 2012 the European year for active ageing and solidarity between generations. Therefore, one can find studies which deal with the issue taking into account various points of view.

Economists may be interested in economic changes or in building "appropriate" pension system. One can recall here the works of Stiglitz (1986); Barr (1992); International Labour Organization (1993); World Bank (1994); Szumlicz (1994); Golinowska (1995); Żukowski (1997); OECD (1998); Góra (2003); Blake (2006); Jakubowski (2013); Chłoń-Domińczak (2016).

Financiers can examine fiscal costs linked to pensions, health care and long-term care; trade off between adequacy and sustainability as well as investment efficiency and rate of return of pension funds. Here among others one can find works of Queisser (1999); Davis (2001); Ambachtsheer and Ezra (2001); Yermo (2002); Stańko (2003); Willmore (2004); Dybał (2008); Chybalski (2012); Bielawska (2015); Szczepański (2016); Makarski et al. (2017); Rutecka-Góra (2017); European Commission (2018); Marcinkiewicz (2018).

Sociologist on the other hand may dispute over the quality of life of seniors. Here one can recall the works of Nussbaum and Sen (1993); Golini (1997); Długosz and Kurek (2006); Gałuszka (2006); Daszkowska (2007); Długosz, Kurek and Kwiatek-Sołtys (2011); Milkowska (2012); Mollon and Gil (2014); Błędowski (2014); Janiszewska (2015).

Co-housing is example of co-creation which could be defined as a process in which people who use services work together with professionals to design, create and deliver services (SCIE 2015). Therefore, co-housing means co-creation of social housing policy for elderly people, which is a heart of Popowice Laboratory. Here one can recall the works of Osborne (2006); Kim (2006); HAPPI Report (2009); Durrett (2009); Zaniewska (2011); HAPPI2 Report (2012); Zralek (2012); Alves (2013); Best practice report (2013); Voorberg et al. (2014); Killock (2014); Sundberg (2014); Labus (2015); HAPPI3 Report (2016); Osborne (2018); Brandsen et al. (2018); Wiktorska-Świecka (2019).

Since co-housing is not so widespread in literature like co-creation or co-production, we put trust that this paper could be an valuable addition to it.

1.3. Research methodology

The paper presents mainly findings from the “Open Popowice” meeting. The meeting took place in the Open Space formula. This American method has been chosen because of the freedom and decision-making nature it gives its participants (Owen 2008).

The form of the meeting was chosen so that the guests could freely talk to each other about the issues affecting the neighborhood. The meeting in its formula was to be OPEN to all interested parties, including socio-economic entities that have a real influence on changes. The inclusion of stakeholders in the discussion with the residents is in our opinion necessary to jointly create solutions tailored to the residents. In our opinion this meeting method fully supports co-creation process of co-housing (Spotkanie 2018).

Open Space is a method for convening groups around a specific question or task or importance and giving them responsibility for creating both their own agenda and experience. Therefore, our key task was to identify the question that brings people together: How do we (seniors) live in Popowice now and how we want it to be in the future?

The answer for this question one may find in next section of the paper. In the following step we compared data from Open Popowice meeting with the 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis – report on sociological research over the city's inhabitants (Kajdanek and Pluta 2017). The findings from this comparative analysis one may find in other subsection.

To sum up research object are residents (mostly seniors) of Popowice district (*sensu stricto*) and Wroclaw inhabitants (*sensu largo*). Research subject is quality of life of seniors. Research aim is to identify needs of residents in relations to public services. To achieve the goal following research tasks has been implemented:

- find out answer for the question how do we (seniors) live in Popowice now and how we want it to be in the future?
- compare above answer with 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis report.

The research years cover mainly 2018 with the feedback of 2017. In the paper following research methods has been used: analysis of scientific literature and normative documents, open space methodology, comparative analysis, statistical analysis.

2. Analysis of the research results

2.1. Research context

As mentioned at the beginning, the paper presents findings from the “Open Popowice” meeting that took place in September 28th, 2018. This event was the first of the planned series of meetings and workshops with the inhabitants of Popowice as part of the Popowice Laboratory (ProPoLab). It was to examine the needs of residents, mostly seniors, in relation to public services.

ProPoLab is supported both by University of Wroclaw (theory provider) and Active Senior Foundation, local NGO with valuable contacts and achievements with senior residents of Popowice estate. Jointly we form Polish team and its pilot called Co-housing of seniors. Together with other eight pilots we represent EU consortium CoSIE (Co-creation of Service Innovation in Europe) under the Horizon 2020 programme.

In ProPoLab we wanted to reach as many people from Popowice district as possible, who are not indifferent to the housing estate which they live in and want to participate in the process of its development. We believe that a sustainable change in public services can be achieved, among others by stimulating the inhabitants as to their values and current needs. We also believe that it is worth discussing surrounding problems in order to work out solutions together.

In our project, our supreme goal is to involve the widest possible groups of residents to jointly design social activities. The concept of co-creation has been emphasized in such a way that all possible interested social groups can jointly implement various or different projects in the field of social activities. Our sub goal is to activate the inhabitants of Popowice to engage in social life and change the surroundings. It is also about encouraging to get to know each other better and build neighborly bonds, and above all to co-create future together. Co-creation is a joint action aimed at improving the quality of life and the usefulness of the activities offered to society (public services). It occurs at every stage of development of these services. Co-creation manifests itself in the constructive exchange of various types of resources (ideas, competences, experience, knowledge, goods, etc.) that increase the value of public services, both individual and collective. In our opinion the advantages of co-creation are associated with increased prosperity, a shared vision of the common good, strategies of action and the emergence of new, previously unknown public services (ProPoLab 2018a, p. 7).

2.2. Research process

The "Open Popowice" meeting was organized on 28 September 2018 as part of the inauguration of the Popowice Laboratory, which is part of the EU CoSIE project. This event was the first of the planned series of meetings and workshops with the residents of Popowice. The meeting was held in one of the hall of the local church. The event started at 10 AM and lasted until 4 PM. Motto, and at the same time the introduction to the conversation, was a simple question: How do we live in Popowice now and how we want it to be in the future? There was more than 70 participants and around 16 stakeholders such as developers, Popowice housing association management, architects, representatives of municipal authorities, NGO's, European Parliament local office representatives, media, etc. During the meeting 23 topics were raised and 128 cups of coffee were drunk.

After the participants took the seats, the rules of the meeting were presented by Zawisza from the DO Foundation. According to the open formula of the meeting, each participant could submit any topic for discussion in a smaller group and invite other participants to the conversation. Immediately after the opening, the interested parties began to submit specific, important topics for them, including living conditions, neighborhood relations as well as leisure and cultural entertainment. Each submitted topic has been saved on the appropriate card. And the person reporting it himself, on a specially prepared wall for this purpose, chose the time and space for further discussion in the area of interest. In this way, the participants of the meeting independently created agenda, which served them as a list of topics and contents discussed, available at all times. Participants of the meeting divided themselves into smaller groups, corresponding to the thematic areas, which were discussed. It is worth noting that during the meeting the participants chose in which areas they want to participate and on what topics they want to talk about (Spotkanie 2018).

The result of thematic meetings in smaller groups was a set of notes prepared by the participants. Notes are publicly shared and could be reach at http://propolab.f-as.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/otwarte_popowice_materialy.pdf

During the break, participants of the meeting could eat a tasty meal. During the meal, discussions and conversations of the participants continued in an unrestricted and relaxed form. During the summary of the meeting, everyone present could express themselves. They could tell in a few sentences about their expectations about the meeting, the conclusions drawn on it, and the impressions and feelings after the meeting. All present listened to each other with great attention (Spotkanie 2018).

The Open Popowice meeting gave its organizers valuable material, allowing to determine the expected directions of changes, indicated by the participants. At the same time, it was the first meeting in many years, during which, in an open atmosphere, residents were able to freely exchange views and outline visions of their expectations and future changes. The findings from the meeting and comparative analysis with 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis report one may find in next subsections.

2.3. Open Popowice findings

The result of thematic meetings in smaller groups is a set of notes prepared by the participants. One may find here http://propolab.f-as.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/otwarте_popowice_materialy.pdf all notes written by the Open Popowice meeting participants. According to the data we have 23 topics raised.

Due to the raised subjects we can divide all topics into 5 main parts:

- infrastructure;
- safety;
- environmental protection;
- participation in a social life, personal development, culture;
- social security, health protection.

It is worth saying that infrastructure topic was most welcomed by the participants. Probably due to the highest visibility of the topic. In this section participants quoted following subtopics:

- most beautiful Popowice housing estate;
- lighting of Popowicka clearing;
- development of inter-block space to improve the living comfort of people (seniors mainly);
- platforms for wheelchairs and strollers on ground floors in buildings at Jelenia street;
- benches in greater quantity;
- monument 17 00'00 " meridian on Popowicka clearing;
- "hostling" issue.

As one can see people did not only complain about infrastructure but also passed their general feeling that they are satisfied with the estate. Mostly due to spacious green areas, clearings, parks, Odra river bank access, good logistic. Nevertheless participants pointed out several activities that could improve comfort of living, mostly seniors. Residents also mentioned "hostling" issue – renting private apartments for short stay without any required permission.

Security was another raised topic. Here inhabitants quoted following subtopics:

- not enough local police;
- local police officers are not known by the residents;
- not enough municipal police;
- dangerously on the streets in the evening;
- drinkers destroy well-kept parks;
- no one pays attention to the devastating people;
- graffiti on the walls, destroyed lawns and shrubs.

From the above list and discussion on the meeting one can draw following conclusions. Residents feel that there is not enough law enforcement, especially during evenings and in parks. As a result public goods are devastating and inhabitants do not feel safe.

Environmental protection topic was third most welcomed by the participants. In this section participants quoted following subtopics:

- ecology in Popowice;
- caring for greenery;
- cutting out dead trees;
- cutting out mistletoe;
- development of general space;
- construction of parking lots destroys greenery;
- limiting trimming of bushes on lawns;
- more trees and shrubs.

From the above list and discussion on the meeting one can draw following conclusions. Residents are environmentally conscious and they know that environment should be protected even for the price of technical inconvenience (longer route to the parking lot).

Second to last topic was quiet broad because covered issues like: participation in a social life, personal development, culture. In this section participants quoted following subtopics:

- creating a community: integration, cooperation, kindness;
- sport and integration;
- schools should become centers of activity of the local community (in the afternoons);
- intergenerational integration – activities of young people and the elderly;
- communication between residents and the Council of Popowice estate;
- construction of a Culture House;
- creation of the Culture Center in the part of the clinic building.

From the above list and discussion on the meeting one can draw following conclusions. Residents are eager to meet new persons and learn/develop new skills. The problem is communication and integration but could be solved through sport, proper used of already existed constructions or developing new ones. The elderly could also share their invaluable experience.

Last but not least topic was dedicated to social security and health protection. In this part participants quoted following subtopics:

- security broadly understood;
- security on the estate;
- day care home for seniors + volunteering;
- issue of rescue silence;
- issue of loneliness.

From the above list and discussion on the meeting one can draw following conclusions. Residents, mostly seniors feel lonely but know what supposed to be changed. They require a space where can prepare meals, develop skills and interests, see the movies, organize a library, meetings and lectures, offer volunteering and experience

2.4. Comparison with 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis report

According to the 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis report respondents are pleased with its living conditions. To be precise 73.7% of respondents are pleased living in their homes/apartments, 83.8% are pleased with living estate conditions and 83.1% are pleased living in Wroclaw (Kajdanek and Pluta 2017, p. 56). Moreover, residents of Popowice estate are the most satisfied from all survived estates. So we can confirm our findings from “Open Popowice” meeting that Popowice inhabitants are satisfied with its estate.

Diagnosis says that the most troubling problems of spatial and ecological order in the place of residence are, above all, those generated by cars and their drivers / owners. Almost 2/3 of respondents notice the problem of incorrectly parked vehicles, and more than half the problem of cars moving at excessive speeds. About 1/3 of respondents pay attention to the issues of throwing unsorted garbage, vandalism and property devastation as well as illegal throwing and tossing garbage to neighbors. Problems noticed by a minority of respondents are primarily the phenomena of destruction and devastation of greenery and tree felling (20%), driving cars emitting high emissions (13%) and burning poor quality fuel at home (10%) (Kajdanek and Pluta 2017, p. 61). It is worth to mention that also during “Open Popowice” meeting problems of infrastructure and environment were raised and said as a crucial one.

The second category of problems raised in 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis report was the disruption of public order and a sense of security. Residents of Wroclaw included the most troublesome phenomenon of soliciting for money and begging (nearly 1/3 of them). Roughly every tenth Wroclaw citizen pointed to problems of fights and beatings near their place of residence, also among neighbours, as well as thefts and burglaries (Kajdanek and Pluta 2017, p. 64). It should be noted that participants of “Open Popowice” meeting also mentioned security as an important issue.

According to the 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis the most important issues to ensure a good quality of life in the estate are: the availability of parking spaces (43.4%); condition of streets and pavements (40.7%); air purity (39%); the number and condition of green areas close to home (37.5%); access to public transport (25.6%); availability of furnished public places where you can meet, sit down and talk (21.6%); availability of furnished playgrounds for children and recreation places for adults (16.5%); the ability to supply food and necessities for the home (15.2%); mutual kindness of residents (12.2%); availability of pubs and restaurants, cafes (8.5%); offers of cultural events (7.0%); availability of kindergartens and nurseries (5.8%); social activity of inhabitants (2.7%) (Kajdanek and Pluta 2017, p. 68). It is worth saying that majority of above issues was raised during “Open Popowice” meeting.

3. Conclusion

Research aim of the article is to identify needs of residents in relations to public services. To achieve the goal following research tasks has been implemented:

- find out answer for the question how do we (seniors) live in Popowice now and how we want it to be in the future?
- compare above answer with 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis report.

According to the data, Open Popowice meeting participants raised 23 topics structured into 5 main parts:

- infrastructure;
- safety;
- environmental protection;
- participation in a social life, personal development, culture;
- social security, health protection.

It is worth saying that infrastructure topic was most welcomed by the participants. Inhabitants did not only complain about infrastructure but also passed their general feeling that they are satisfied with the estate. Mostly due to spacious green areas, clearings, parks, Odra river bank access, good logistic. Nevertheless participants pointed out several activities that could improve comfort of living, mostly seniors. Residents also mentioned “hostling” issue – renting private apartments for short stay without any required permission.

According to the data, Popowice residents feel that there is not enough law enforcement, especially during evenings and in parks. As a result public goods are devastating and inhabitants do not feel save. Participants of “Open Popowice” are environmentally conscious and they know that environment should be protected even for the price of technical inconvenience (longer route to the parking lot). Moreover, residents are eager to meet new persons and learn/develop new skills. The problem is communication and integration but could be solved through sport, proper used of already existed constructions or developing new ones. The elderly could also share their invaluable experience. Last but not least, residents, mostly seniors feel lonely but know what supposed to be changed. They require a space where can prepare meals, develop skills and interests, see the movies, organize a library, meetings and lectures, offer volunteering and experience.

Findings from the “Open Popowice” meeting are supported by the 2017 Wroclaw social diagnosis report. Diagnosis says that the most troubling problems are related to spatial and ecological order as well as the disruption of public order and a sense of security.

Acknowledgements

Co-creation of Service Innovation in Europe (CoSIE). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 770492.

The content of the publication reflects the authors' views and the Managing Agency cannot be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

References

- Alves H., (2013), *Co-creation and innovation in public services*. The Service Industries Journal, 33(7/8), 671-682.
- Ambachtsheer K.P., Ezra, D.D., (2001), *Fundusze emerytalne – jak efektywnie pomagać majątek ich członków*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo ABC.
- Barr N., (1992), *Economic Theory and the Welfare State: A Survey and Interpretation*. Journal of Economic Literature, 30(2), 741-803.
- Best practices in self-administration of communal senior housing, Co-EldeRly Best Practice Report (2013). Retrieved from <http://kollektivhus.nu/pdf/BestPracticeReport131116.pdf> [date of access: 22.06.2019].
- Bielawska K., (2015), *Skutki finansowe odwrotu od reformy emerytalnej z 1999 roku dla Funduszu Ubezpieczeń Społecznych*. [in:] *Dylematy teorii i praktyki ubezpieczeń*. Sułkowska W., Strupczewski G. (Eds.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Poltext.
- Blake D., (2006), *Pension economics*. Pension institute.
- Błędowski P., (2014), *Ekonomiczne aspekty starzenia się ludności*. [in:] *Wyzwania XXI wieku. Ochrona zdrowia i kształcenie medyczne*. Majkowski J. (ed.). Warszawa, t. 3, 357-367.
- Brandsen T., Trui S., Bram V., (2018), *Co-Production and Co-Creation Engaging Citizens in Public Services*. New York: Routledge.
- Chłoń-Domińczak A., (2016), Impact of changes in multi-pillar pension systems in CEE countries on individual pension wealth. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance*, 17(1), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474747216000238> [date of access: 10.09.2019].
- Chybalski F., (2012), *Skuteczność i efektywność systemu emerytalnego. Koncepcja analizy i próba pomiaru*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Łódzkiej.
- Davis E.P., (2001). *Insurance and Private Pensions Compendium for Emerging Economies*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Długosz Z., Kurek S., (2006), *Demographic ageing in European Union countries*. [in:] Komornicki T., Czapiewski K. (Eds). *Europa XXI – Regional periphery in central and eastern Europe*. Warszawa: Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization, 185-198.
- Durrett Ch., (2009), *The Senior Cohousing Handbook: A Community Approach to Independent Living, 2nd Edition*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
- Dybał M., (2008), *Efektywność inwestycyjna funduszy emerytalnych*. Warszawa: CeDeWu.
- European Commission., (2018), *The 2018 Ageing Report: Economic and Budgetary Projections for the EU Member States.*, (2016-2070), Brussels: European Commission.
- Golini A., (1997), *Demographic trends and ageing in Europe. Prospects, problems and policies*. Genus, 53(3-4), 33-74.
- Golinowska S., (1995), *Wybór reformy systemu emerytalno-rentowego dla Polski*. Polityka Społeczna, (5-6).
- Góra M., (2003), *System emerytalny*. Warszawa: PWE.

- International Labour Organization. (1993). World Labour Report 1993. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- The Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI) Report, (2009). Retrieved from
https://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/Resources/Housing/Support_materials/Other_reports_and_guidance/Happi_Final_Report.pdf [date of access: 10.06.2019]
- Housing our Ageing Population: Plan for Implementation (HAPPI2) Report (2012). Retrieved from
https://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/Resources/Housing/Support_materials/Other_reports_and_guidance/Housing_our_Ageing_Population_Plan_for_Implementation.pdf [date of access: 10.06.2019]
- Housing our Ageing Population: Positive Ideas (HAPPI 3) – Making retirement living a positive choice (2016). Retrieved from
https://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/Resources/Housing/Support_materials/Other_reports_and_guidance/HAPPI3_Report_2016.pdf [date of access: 10.06.2019].
- Jakubowski S., (2013), *Prawno-ekonomiczne aspekty gromadzenia i lokowania środków przez otwarty fundusz emerytalny*. Wrocław: Prawnicza i Ekonomiczna Biblioteka Cyfrowa. Uniwersytet Wrocławski. Wydział Prawa Administracji i Ekonomii.
- Janiszewska A., (2015), *Obraz starości demograficznej w krajach UE a stan zdrowia jej mieszkańców*. [in:] *Jakość życia ludzi starych – wybrane problemy*. Janiszewska A. (Ed.) (25-48). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Kajdanek K., Pluta J., (2017), *Wrocławska diagnoza społeczna 2017. Raport z badań socjologicznych nad mieszkańcami miasta*. Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski. Retrieved from <http://www.repozytorium.uni.wroc.pl/Content/89133/zip/> [date of access: 27.05.2019].
- Killock J., (2014), *Is cohousing a suitable housing typology for an ageing population within the UK?* Retrieved from
<http://www.kollektivhus.nu/pdf/BoydAugerScholarship2011FinalReport.pdf> [date of access: 27.05.2019].
- Kim G.H., (2006), *Designing the cohousing common house, Schemata Workshop*. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/schemataworkshop/docs/cohousing_common_house_design [date of access: 27.05.2019].
- Labus A., (2015), *Domy Międzypokoleniowe odpowiadają na starzenie się społeczeństwa w XXI wieku*. Łódź: Acta Universitatis Lodziensis Oeconomica 4(315).
- Makarski K., Hagemejer J., Tyrowicz J., (2017), *Analyzing The Efficiency Of Pension Reform: The Role Of The Welfare Effects Of Fiscal Closures*. Macroeconomic Dynamics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21(5), 1205-1234.
- Marcinkiewicz E., (2018), *Uwarunkowania rozwoju dobrowolnych programów emerytalnych. Perspektywa makro- i mikroekonomiczna*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Łódzkiej.
- Miłkowska G., (2012), *Poczucie jakości życia seniorów w wybranych krajach Unii Europejskiej*. [in:] *Prace Naukowe Akademii im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie. Pedagogika*. (21), (235-251). Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo im. Stanisława Podobińskiego Akademii im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie.
- Mollon P.E., Gil A., (2014), *Edukacja a jakość życia seniorów*. Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Akademii im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie.
- Nussbaum M., Sen A., (1993), *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- OECD. (2015). *Pensions at a Glance 2015: OECD and G20 Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933301119> [date of access: 19.05.2019].

- OECD. (1998). Retirement income systems: the reform process across OECD countries. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Osborne S.P., (2006), *The new public governance?*. Public Management Review 8(3), 377-387.
- Osborne S.P., (2018), *From public service-dominant logic to public service logic: are public service organizations capable of co-production and value co-creation*. Public Administration Review, 20(2), 225-231.
- Owen H., (2008), *Open Space Technology: A User's Guide*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers. Retrieved from www.bkconnection.com
https://www.bkconnection.com/static/Open_Space_Technology_3rd_EXCERPT.pdf [date of access: 19.05.2019].
- ProPoLab. (2018a). Retrieved from http://propolab.f-as.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/broszura_propolab_wroclaw_2018.pdf [date of access: 19.02.2020], 6.
- ProPoLab. (2018b). Retrieved from http://propolab.f-as.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/wkladka_do_gazety.pdf [date of access: 19.02.2020], 3.
http://propolab.f-as.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/otwarте_popowice_materialy.pdf [date of access: 19.02.2020].
- Queisser M., (1999), *Pension Reform: Lessons from Latin America*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Rutecka-Góra J., (2017), *Ewolucja pracowniczych programów emerytalnych a przemiany demograficzne. Studia Ekonomiczne*. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach, 309, 143-153.
- Sakellariou A., (2008), *Rapid Evidence Appraisal of the Current State of Co-creation in Ten European Countries*. Turku: Turku University of Applied Sciences. Retrieved from <https://storage.googleapis.com/turku-amk/2019/04/rapid-evidence-appraisal-of.pdf> [date of access: 19.02.2020], 8.
- SCIE, (2015). *Co-Production in Social Care: What it is and how to do it*, SCIE Guide 51. London: SCIE.
- Spotkanie. (2018). Retrieved from <http://propolab.f-as.pl/spotkanie-otwarте-popowice/> [date of access: 19.02.2020]
- Stańko D., (2003), *Polish Pension Funds – Does The System Work? Cost, Efficiency and Performance Measurement Issues*. London: The Pensions Institute, Cass Business School.
- Stiglitz J.E., (1986), *Economics of public sector*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Sundberg F., (2014), *Cohousing and resource use. A case study of the Färdknäppen cohousue*. Retrieved from http://www.kollektivhus.nu/pdf/cohousing_and_resource_use_final.pdf [date of access: 28.05.2019]
- Szczepański M., (2016), *The Impact of Polish Pension Reform on Present and Anticipated Conditions of Public Finances*. Economy, Business (10), 46-54.
- Szumlicz T., (1994), *Modele polityki społecznej*. Warszawa: Szkoła Główna Handlowa.
- Voorberg W.H., Bekkers V., Tummers L.G., (2014), *A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: embarking on the social innovation journey*. Public Management Review, 17(9), 1333-1357.
- Wiktorska-Świecka A., (2019), *Co-creation of public services in Poland – Mission (Im)Possible? A case study on senior social housing policy at urban level*. [in:] *Polish Political Science Review*, Article accepted, awaiting publication.
- Willmore L., (2004), *Universal Pensions in Low Income Countries*. Initiative for Policy Dialogue, Pensions and Social Insurance Section, Discussion Paper No. IPD-01-05. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.381180> [date of access: 10.09.2019].

- World Bank, (1994), *Averting the Old Age Crisis: Policies to Protect the Old and Promote Growth*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yermo Juan, (2002), *Revised taxonomy for pension plans, pension funds and pension entities*. Washington D.C.: OECD Publishing.
- Zaniewska H., (2011), *Mieszkania starszych ludzi w Polsce. Sytuacja i perspektywy zmian*. Warszawa: Instytut Gospodarki Mieszkaniowej.
- Zralek M., (2012), *Przestrzenie starości*. Sosnowiec: Oficyna Wydawnicza Humanitas.
- Żukowski M., (1997), *Wielostopniowe systemy zabezpieczenia emerytalnego w Unii Europejskiej i w Polsce: między państwem a rynkiem*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Poznaniu.