

Social economy entities and their eco-system in different European countries.

Witold Mandrysz,¹⁺ Kazimiera Wódz²

^{1,2} Institute of Sociology, The University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland

Abstract. *This study presents a comparative analysis of the findings of the international research project RESCuE project – Patterns of Resilience during Socioeconomic Crises among Households in Europe (VII UE FP). Presentation of differences and similarities in defining and understanding the concept of social economy and its background in different European countries should help to identify and understand the kind of patterns of Social Economy presented in the second part of the paper. These patterns and their background create a frame for the eco-system of social economy entities in every country. Fieldwork findings (conducted in partner countries) present the everyday practice of social economy entities in researched communities and their specific ecosystems of relations, dependencies, reciprocities, and how these factors influence individuals, households, and communities' resilience. It also gives an opportunity to present the advantages and limitations of specific entities acting in given ecosystems based on legal, socio-political, and cultural backgrounds.*

JEL Codes: O350

Keywords: community-based social economy; community resilience; community development; social capital; social economy.

1. Introduction

The social economy is a significant factor in local development and providing more services allowing humans needs to be satisfied in a better way. It may also create a complex system of management (community economy), involve non-governmental organizations in the activities of local authorities, and affect the establishment of local and neighbourhood forms of economic cooperation and mutual support. The developmental goal of the thus-defined social economy is to create an inclusive local labor market (Zybała, 2007). Juan A. T. Carpi stands that “the growing failures of the market and state are enlarging old problems (unemployment, inequality, territorial imbalance, social exclusion, etc.). The globalization of the economy, ecological stress, the crisis of public regulation and the growing and changing social needs are producing new demands for active participation and mobilization of civil society and public action.” (Carpi, 2008, p. 27). In his opinion, in this context, the social economy endowed with structural properties that make it a very relevant economic and organizational instrument in the phase of crisis and social transformation. One may assume that this instrument, closely related to the community, its values, and norms, main understanding problems of the inhabitants, may play a significant role in Local Sustainable Development.

The article presents the results of the international research project RESCuE – *The Patterns of Resilience during Socioeconomic Crises among Households in Europe* (2014–2017).

¹⁺ Corresponding author: Witold Mandrysz, +48 604061484, Institute of Sociology, The University of Silesia in Katowice, Bankowa 11, 40-007, Katowice, witold.mandrysz@us.edu.pl

The first part of the article is a short description of a concept of the resilience and conceptual frame of social economy and social entrepreneurship and its development as a part of the cohesion policy of the European Union. Presented in the second part of the article, differences, and similarities in defining and understanding the concept of social economy and its background in different countries help us to identify and understand the actual condition of social entrepreneurship/social economy activities in different European countries. It is also the base for a conceptualization of different patterns of social economy.

The last part of the article is referring to the fieldwork findings and presents the everyday practice of social economy entities and their contribution to the resilience of the households and communities in the regions included in the study.

2. Research Elaboration

The main goal of the RESCuE project is to determine the conditions and patterns of the actions that help and support, or limit and inhibit, the resilience of households being in a difficult situation. During the RESCuE project, approximately 600 narrative qualitative interviews were conducted among urban and rural households and experts in eight EU countries (Germany, Ireland, United Kingdom, Spain, Greece, Portugal, Poland, and Finland) and Turkey.

Each project partner had to collect a body of qualitative interviews with people living in households at risk in his or her respective country. Each partner was responsible for a total of 40 interviews in the respective country. Half of these were conducted in urban and half in rural case settings. In each spatial setting the following actions were conducted: implementation and analysis of a total of eight semi-structured interviews with local experts involved in the protection and/or assistance of people affected by crisis/poverty (NGO technical staff, managers of charities, neighborhood associations, local and central government, scientists etc.); implementation and analysis of a total of 24 in-depth interviews with people from social groups affected by the current crisis, in rural and urban environments. After the twelve interviews, a selected eight households were interviewed for a second time. Those cases were selected for a more in-depth data collection with the help of visual methods, due to the significance of their household biography for the RESCuE questions. After the first interview, the household was asked to take photographs of their everyday situations, inspired and focused by open guiding questions.

One of the thematic areas of this project is the influence of the NGO Sector, social economy, and social entrepreneurship in the community on the neighbourhood and household resilience). The objective of this thematic area is a comparative analysis of importance and relations between the development of social economy and social entrepreneurship, which act between welfare state institutions and resilient households, on households' everyday practices, especially under conditions of crisis. Investigate how social entrepreneurs and social economy entities contribute to the resilience of vulnerable households and communities, and how this has changed through the crisis? Which role do they play in the development of resilience in households and communities? How do the crisis and the subsequent austerity policies affect the activities of social entrepreneurs and social economy, given that they do not only depend on community and citizens' resources but also from state support in different ways? And what will vulnerable households benefit with respect to chances to develop resilience?

3. The concept of resilience

In general, it can be assumed that resistance can be understood as a phenomenon according to which some people from a given population perform better than others under the same unfavourable conditions. (Werner, Bierman, French 1977; Masten 2001) It may be assumed that resilience means an unexpected and/or above-average kind of recovery after a severe shock crisis, trauma, or other extreme events (Frankl 1959). Resilience may also mean the ability of adaptive coping skills and transformation after the initial shock (Keck, Sakdapolrak, 2013). Resilience is rather a process that is developing than a stable state; it can be lost or can be achieved. (see Promberger 2018) Understanding resilience as resourcefulness, coping strategies, remedial strategies, or life strategies, one should accept the occurrence of "a dynamic process reflecting a relatively good adaptation of an individual despite the risks or traumatic experiences it experiences." (Borucka, Ostaszewski 2008: 587-597).

Resilience understood as a social phenomenon leads to the consideration that people's, households' and the community's capacity to resile is highly dependent on the resources they can put to work in difficult situations. That would emphasize the important role of social resources for developing resilience (Nettles, Mucherah, Jones 2000) and would mean that resilience depends on a wide variety of social, cultural and structural elements that make some courses of action and certain practices available for different groups of subjects (see Dagdeviren, Donoghue and Promberger, 2016; Promberger et al., 2014; Estêvão P. Calado A. Capucha L., 2017). W. Neil Adger (2000) has defined "social resilience as the ability of the communities to withstand external shocks to their social infrastructure. This is particularly apposite for resource-dependent communities facing external stresses and shocks, both in the form of environmental disasters, as well as in the form of social, economic, and political upheaval." (Adger 2000: 361) He also said that social resilience as "institutionally determined, in the sense that institutions permeate all social systems and institutions fundamentally determine the economic system in terms of its structure and distribution of assets." (ibidem 254), so it should be defined at the level of community rather than being referred to the individuals.

4. Social economy and its community rootedness

The 'social economy' constitutes a broad range of activities that can have the potential to provide opportunities for local people and communities to engage in all stages of the process of local economic regeneration (Molloy et al., 1999). It plays an important role in the creation of new jobs and other forms of support of people threatened by social exclusion. As Amin said, the social economy encompasses entities drawn from communities, set-up to help individuals and groups from those or neighbouring communities and areas. In this sense, it is an economy insofar as it provides a marketplace to access (and perhaps trade) resources and common (rather than privately- owned) goods in the name of public service rather than profit. (Amin et al., 2002: 1)

Helen Haugh defines the social economy as a "collective term for the part of the economy that is neither privately nor publicly controlled. It includes non-profit organizations, as well as associations, co-operatives, mutual organizations, and foundations. Social enterprises are included in the social economy; however, they are distinctive of many non-profit organizations in their entrepreneurial approach to strategy, their innovation in pursuit of social goals, and their engagement in trading." (Haugh, 2005, p. 2) It should be emphasized that the profits drawn from the activity are accepted and sometimes even desired, but they shouldn't be more important than social goals. Therefore, the social economy is very

often but not in every case understood as a part of the economy between the private and public sectors, which engages in economic activity in order to meet social objectives.

The so-called commercial or for-profit economy should not emerge as an opposite activity that cannot be integrated into the notion of social economy. However, it should broadly be understood the fact of the interrelation between the for-profit sector and society to be able to advance its social elements in an evolutionary way. Hence, the solution to this is the new model of social economy, which can be put in force only by the simultaneous cooperation of all key actors in the society, including the for-profit sector. (Golob, Podnar, Lah, 2009, 637).

The emphasis is put on the idea and practical activity of the organizations of the social economy in building social capital or social innovativeness. Social economy strengthens the processes of civic participation of individuals and communities, which may strengthen the processes of social and political inclusion.

An innovative role of social entrepreneurs in the community relates to the active position in the community. Dees stated that they play the role of change agents in the social sector. It would mean that social entrepreneurs are the reformers with a social mission. They make fundamental changes in the way things are done in the social sector. They often reduce their needs rather than meet them. They seek to create systemic changes and sustainable improvements. (Dees 1998 p. 4-6) This way of understanding the role of the social entrepreneur shows the need for a very close connection between the entrepreneur with the community and its inhabitants. A social enterprise should increase local development, but the development of social enterprise also depends on the community. To understand and to fulfil social needs, social enterprise (as well as other social economy entities) should be directly affiliated through various channels with the community in which it arose.

In the concept of "Community-Based Enterprise" (CBE), Pedro and Christman (2004) emphasized the need for strong rootedness and cooperation between enterprise and the community in which it operates. They define the CBE as a community acting corporately as both entrepreneurs and enterprises are in pursuit of the common good. Therefore, CBE is the result of a process, in which the community acts entrepreneurially, to create and operate a new enterprise embedded in its existing social structure, which is managed and governed to pursue the economic and social goals of the community. CBE concept treats the community as completely endogenous to the enterprise and the entrepreneurial process. This means that in a CBE the community is simultaneously both the enterprise and the entrepreneur. (see Peredo, Chrisman, 2004) In their framework, commercial entrepreneurship represents the identification, evaluation, and exploitation of the opportunities that result in profits. In contrast, social entrepreneurship refers to the identification, evaluation, and exploitation of the opportunities that result in social value. Opportunity awareness and recognition reflect an entrepreneur's ability to discover whether supply or demand for a value-creating product or service exists. Social entrepreneurs have an acute understanding of social needs, and then fulfil those needs through a creative organization. This focus on social value is consistent across various definitions of social entrepreneurship. (see Certo, Miller, 2008)

Assuming that the local community is a community of residence, a community of territory – as Warren said (1978), it should be understood as ‘such a combination of social units and systems that performs the major social functions relevant to meeting people’s needs at the local level’ (Netting, Kettner, McMurthy 1993 p. 47). In spite of the weakening of the influence of social microstructures, the processes on the life of individuals and families, one cannot talk about their decline, the more so because local communities are a necessary intermediary between the state and family, administrative

and political units, and their socio-economic development is essential for the economic development of particular regions, as well as the whole country. (Turowski 1994)

In some definitions, the emphasis is put on the idea and practical activity of the organizations of social economy in building social capital or social innovativeness. The social economy strengthens the processes of civic participation of the individuals and communities, which may strengthen the processes of social and political inclusion.

According to Bourdieu, social capital is “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition” Bourdieu (1986:248). According to such an assumption, one may assume that within the framework of a group or community, the resources are available only to their members exclusively on the basis of the network of their mutual connections. The more extensive connections are the bigger chance for access/activation of the resources which are not owned individually.

Referring to social capital, we talk about a number of links within a given community, which allow us to create joint actions, combine efforts and accumulate resources of the individuals, institutions, organizations in order to achieve definite goals. The activation of social capital allows taking actions pursuing goals, which may not be implemented outside this network of relations and cooperation because no individual, organization, or institution would hold appropriate resources, competences, or possibilities of influencing decisions in order to achieve such goals. Not only relations within the community, but also external connections which link the community to the institutions, organisations or other communities and which allow to gain benefits in the form of resources, financial or non-financial support or new markets etc. are very important for socio-economic development (R.D. Putnam, 2001; J.S. Coleman 1998; M. Woolcock, D. Narayan: 2007). However, access to such resources is conditioned by the fact that the users/owners of the resources should recognize our claims to them by recognizing us as the members of the common network of connections. It would also be very significant in the case of social entrepreneur entities operating in specific communities. Recognized as a "member" of the network (socioeconomic structure), realizing socially important goals gains chances to be supported by inhabitants who would be more convinced to using its service or buy its products (R.D. Putnam, 2001). Within the framework of this type of connection, a number of relations and socially shared emotions facilitate mutual cooperation with the members of the network. Mutual trust of the members of a given group or community increases their possibilities of developing through reducing a sense of insecurity which accompanies cooperation with the strangers, and thus a sense of a bigger inclination to take joint actions. (Coleman 1998:109).

In most definitions, the social economy is perceived as a force that strengthens the social inclusion and the processes of civic participation of the individuals and communities, which may enhance the processes of social and political inclusion. Some authors argue that social economy organizations have the potential to strengthen social capital through participative processes, collective activities, and social innovations with the goal of resolving common problems (Olsson, 2003). Moreover, as other authors said, the social economy may encourage the participation of the citizens, allowing the most socially excluded collectives to participate in not only collective goods but also, at least potentially, in the decision-making processes of the community. (Sanz, 2013, after Serrano, Revilla, Garcia, 2016:3).

The existing social capital shared by community members enables them to cohere around addressing a particular problem that has emerged. (...) Some of the community problems can be resolved within the activities of social economy entities. Based on their analyses, the authors stated that

the economic performance of social enterprises depends heavily on using social capital as a productive tool either to compensate for the shortage or to create new forms of physical and/or financial capital. (see Birkhölzer and Kramer, 2002).

5. The patterns of the social economy based on RESCuE research project²

Based on the information collected by members of the national research teams and introduced in national reports of the RESCuE project, it is possible to identify certain 'patterns' of understanding and to define social economy, which constitute the legal, institutional and cultural circumstances underpinning how social economy entities function at the level of specific countries. The following classification is not a precise and unambiguous typology. It is rather an attempt to identify certain patterns of action of social economy entities in different countries where the RESCuE project was implemented. However, these patterns may, to some extent, help to define the relationship between the ways of understanding and implementing the idea of social economy and social entrepreneurship, and the level of resilience of the individuals and households. The main criteria of the following categorization include: the dominant way of defining and organizing social economy and social entrepreneurship entities in specific countries; the scope and degree of the connections between these entities and public institutions; the dominant financing method and the level of 'marketisation' of the activities falling within the scope of social economy. Four patterns were identified: 1. SE as a field of NGO sector activity; 2. civic entrepreneur type of SE; 3. Entrepreneur labor market inclusion type of SE; 4; Community economy/communitarian type.

✓ ***Social Economy as a field of NGO sector activity*** – the system in which social service is offered by non-profit NGOs, funded from public resources to a large extent. This pattern occurs in the countries where social services are delegated by the authorities (at the different – central/federal, regional/state, local/municipal – levels) to the representatives of the third sector. The position of the biggest third sector organizations is very strong – they are respected and professionally prepared, and their operations are based on well- educated and experienced staff and a large number of the volunteers (for example, Germany). There is also no official/legal definition of social enterprise. The institutionalized forms of social enterprises which operate *de facto* as corporations and cooperatives with a "public benefit" status, and Third Sector entities with a "public benefit" status, although not all of these organizations necessarily engage in economic activity. (A map of social enterprises and their eco-systems in Europe. Synthesis Report. Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs, and Inclusion. European Commission 2015: 22)

✓ ***Civic-entrepreneur type*** – social economy entities are considered to include both the NGO sector and social entrepreneurship. This pattern occurs where both a strong position of the Third Sector and quite a high level of decentralization is observed. Non- governmental organizations and the authorities were open to strong trends in the development of social entrepreneurship in the 1990s and early 2000s (examples, based on RESCuE project - Finland, Ireland, UK). Finnish and UK national definitions of social enterprise refer to a partial non-profit distribution constraint. In Ireland and Finland, publicly funded schemes targeting social enterprises are very limited or non-existent (in Finland, it has been a deliberate policy choice not to develop bespoke schemes for social enterprise). In

² The content contained in this chapter has been discussed in more detail in the forthcoming publication: Social economy and household resilience [in:] POVERTY, CRISIS AND RESILIENCE. NEW HORIZONS IN SOCIAL POLICY SERIES, edited by M. Promberger, M. Boost, J. Gray and J. Dagg, published by EDWARD ELGAR PUBLISHING LIMITED

Finland and the UK, and partly also in Ireland, social enterprises derive most of their revenue from market sources and particularly from the sale of goods and services to the public authorities. Inclusive governance is not necessarily seen as a core characteristic of social enterprises in these countries. (A map of social enterprises and their eco-systems in Europe. Synthesis Report. Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs, and Inclusion. European Commission 2015)

✓ ***Entrepreneur/labor market inclusion type*** – while maintaining the broad definition of social economy, the focus (based on the EU funds) was on the promotion of social cooperatives, social enterprises and other entities of socio-professional reintegration (Poland). In Poland (as well as in some other East European countries), this situation was also associated with rather weak position of the non-governmental sector, which was fragmented in the 1990s and early 2000s, acting mostly on the basis of the voluntary engagement of its members, with the lack of professional staff and financial stability. In recent years the position of the NGO sector in the social economy market has become much stronger, but during the implementation of the idea of social economy, it was Work Integration Social Enterprise (WISE) that was the dominant form.

✓ ***Community economy (communitarian) type*** – apart from the activity (often very strong) of the NGO sector and Work Integration Social Enterprise (WISE), social economy understood as an activity closely related to economic activities, but for social purposes. These activities are often bottom-up, informal, not initiated or supported by public institutions. The local relationships, norms, and ties are of great importance (the examples, based on RESCuE project - Spain, Greece, to some extent Portugal and Turkey - where the social economy is underdeveloped in terms of legal status but exists as informal community economy activities.). This model can be exemplified by the actions taken not only by small neighborhood communities but also by large production projects combining the commitment and resources of many people and institutions. However, their characteristic feature is the fact that their implementation is possible thanks to mutual trust, a willingness to cooperate, and a sense of bonding. Their effect is not only the development of the people directly involved in them but also the entire community and, thus, the high level of social identification and acceptance.

6. The role of social economy entities in the development of household and community resilience: the practical examples

Analysing the impact of the initiatives of the social economy on the situation of households, their specificity in the nine partner countries taking part in RESCuE project must be taken into consideration. The institutions of social economy and any entities operating in the third sector for the individuals and communities were described in a previous chapter. The multitude of forms of social economy and third sector in connection with such factors as history, tradition, national structure, the ethnic and religious, and political system of the countries participating in RESCuE project are the factors that make international comparisons more difficult.

Most of the examples of social economy that are presented in the research findings can be described as more or less NGO activities, or widely speaking the activities of representatives of the Third Sector: the organizations/institutions established by, or in cooperation with, public institutions or local government, supported by them, etc. There are also some examples of social entrepreneurship. There are some examples of 'community economy,' such as the no- middlemen movement in Greece and vine cooperatives in Spain.

Most frequently, these entities support the individuals and households facing hardship by 'crisis intervention' charity, distributing food, and clothes.

'...the "... "[name of the association] offers one super-market bag for every household every two weeks. The families who take part in the activities mostly suffer from poverty and unemployment. The people who are in need of these offers are primarily immigrants... ' (Greece) (Athanasaiou, Marinoudi, 2016)

This kind of support is necessary for the fulfilment of the basic needs of vulnerable individuals and households, for supporting survival strategies and for creating circumstances for building resilience in the context of dealing with hardship, extreme poverty, etc.

In the research material obtained as a part of the RESCuE project, we may find examples of the entities providing service, education, and training.

'... in Cemevi (a religious organization) education that aims to teach both Alevi belief/practices and courses such as English, computer programming, and musical instruments, are provided to the applicants' (Turkey) (Poyras, Aytekin, Sengul, 2016).

The research findings describe some examples of the entities that create jobs for their clients/supported individuals. In most cases, these jobs are the effect of publicly financed projects with short-term employment.

'In recent years, the Centre for Social Integration has been executing projects for long- term unemployed people benefiting from social welfare and disabled people taking part in the six-month programs of social employment (Poland)' (Wódz, Mandrysz, 2016).

'Some of the associations, such as Skolt Sámi Foundation, are able to use the state and municipal support to employ people, at least for short-term, with the so-called "work market support" and "salary support" system (Finland)' (Tennberg, Vola, Vuojala-Magga, 2016).

The respondents speak in a very positive way about the projects that allow them to get some stability – not only financial (based on financial support) but also or most of all, associated with engagement in a fixed profitable activity. Aside from financial resources, this kind of position offers also social relations (bonds and sense of belonging), daily activity connected with the need for responsible behavior, and cooperation.

'...and I started working here under the CE scheme, and I have loved it. ... I worked here for, and I think it was three years, on the scheme and then being a traveler, I got another two years and then when my time was up it was terrible. It was more or less that I missed it, but I used to come down voluntary, and I used to come down and do the clubs ... but then [project coordinator] called me down for an interview for the caretaking job came up, and I said that would suit me fine, so I came down, and I did the interview in here, and I got the job, and I was here for another four years ... it's really like a second home to me at this stage, and then it was funded by the Westmeath communities together, and it was great ... (Aisling, INT.HU.005) (Ireland)' (Dagg, Gray, 2016).

These are positive accounts of the impact of social economy organizations on the life of the participants. However, other accounts were not so positive. For example, Sally in London discussed her financial problems and its impact on her prospects for secure accommodation through her local housing association:

I'm living at home with two daughters, living on £20 a week [...] It was my Housing Association, my Housing Officer who put me in touch with, um, she gets me, um, food vouchers but you can only use them, you can only go to the place three times. (UK) (Donoghue, Wearmouth, Dagdeviren, 2016)

The respondents (from partner countries) participating in different forms of social employment ('work market support' and 'salary support' systems, one-Euro-jobs, paid traineeships, etc.) were usually satisfied with these activities as they enabled them to earn some money, be active, etc. Yet, on the other hand, they also criticized the short-term character of these activities.

'However, these forms of support allow only short-term employment (RHh5). Therefore, the current state approach to employment is criticized – as the local employment offices have been closed, the services digitalized

and the support for individuals to become employed are just “short-term tricks” (RE2). (Finland)’ (Tennberg, Vola, Vuojala-Magga, 2016)

It was also emphasized that ‘existing model for rehabilitating work training is criticized because it allows work training only inside the municipality structure. No such work training is allowed in the local companies, which limits the opportunity of the trainees to become eventually employed. Because of the current limitations, most people return to social services, instead of becoming employed after the training. (RE3). Without cooperation between municipal institutions responsible for the implementation of reintegration to local labor market policy and local companies, this reintegration seems to be very limited. The impact of the municipality efforts has also been limited due to the ongoing changes in the state-run employment services, which has led to the diminishing services in municipalities. (RE4) (Tennberg, Vola, Vuojala-Magga, 2016)

Moreover, the small amount of money offered in this kind of social employment was criticized as regards the law, which does not allow the recipient to cover all necessary expenses, while also reducing the possibility of finding another job.

‘He really likes her one-Euro-job, and it helps her to stay resilient. Nevertheless, she also criticizes the Jobcentre and the one-Euro-job as she sees no real perspective to get a normal job, earn more money, and leave Hartz IV ... (Germany)’ (Boost, Müller, Kerschbaumer, 2016) In some cases, the programs related to social employment are criticized as regards the lack of long-term effects associated with some form of employment and the opportunity of a stable income when the project is over obtain any fixed income.

‘The employees of the Club of Social Integration emphasize that the problem is the situation in which employers willingly employ trainees or make use of other forms of subsidized employment because they can have an employee working for free due to the fact that their remuneration is refunded. However, many employers do not employ trainees when their period of employment is over, and they look for other „employees working for free” (Poland)’ (Wódz, Mandrysz, 2016).

Some respondents claim that improper aid activities based on financial support make people dependent on the support from aid institutions or the NGO sector and that this also becomes a pattern strengthened by the processes of socialization in subsequent generations.

They do not have prospects; they need someone who gives them a job, not the money. (...) They get money, and social pathology is the same. I sometimes see small children in such communities, and I think that they will be just like their parents. (PL/U/05) (Poland) The institutions and organizations establishing or implementing the local government protection policy very often face criticism regarding their bureaucracy, not meeting the needs of the clients/inhabitants and spending the resources ineffectively.

As a rule, the assessment of NGO activity is much higher than in the case of public institutions, but there are cases, in which NGOs are criticized for focusing more on attracting projects to maintain the employment of their workers than on providing assistance:

‘some of the beneficiaries themselves question the role of the NGO’s actions. ... As he argued with emphasis, “all the money for immigrants that are coming from the European Union were spent on other purposes. They take money for immigrants, but they ask me to translate for them voluntarily”. It is obvious that they reproduce their existence by exploiting the precarious workers who lack citizen and labor rights in the social context of Greece under the existing political circumstances (Greece)’ (Athanasaiou, Marinoudi, 2016).

It should also be noted that in some cases, the possibility of obtaining support from social economy entities and the development of individual and community resilience was limited due to the insufficient level of recognition of these entities among residents of a given community. ‘Barry in Cornwall and Simon in London were not particularly aware of any support organizations beyond the

church. Thus, and particularly in times of crisis when funding is scarce, and organizations cannot always make their presence known, in many cases, the burden falls on the individual in need to seek out help, rather than be identified and approached by existing support structures. This produces a particular set of problems for both the third sector in the UK and vulnerable households. In many cases, vulnerable households do not have the resources (in terms of time, money, or other forms of capital) to seek out and engage with organizations that could help them, unless the organizations in close proximity or households are made aware of them.' (Donoghue, Wearmouth, Dagdeviren, 2016).

An example of social economy in Greece is the so-called no-middlemen movement: small and medium-sized enterprises and small family businesses (which are the prevailing Greek business model), which were on the verge of closing down and we're struggling to remain afloat and facing unpaid invoices, started selling their products directly to the consumers for cash at fixed prices through non-profit collectives, not through intermediaries – i.e., shop managers, middlemen, wholesalers, and traders – as they had done in the past (Athanasaiou, Marinoudi, 2016).

An example of such a community economy, described in national RESCuE reports, is the Spanish vine cooperative, which belongs to two thousand vine and olive oil producers who sell their products to the cooperative and receive an agreed price. The cooperative creates a number of working places and job opportunities for community members and offers other services, including training, counseling, etc. The wine-production cooperative is a source of identity and pride not only for the producers, workers, and other staff but for the town as a whole. (Serrano, Revilla, Garcia, 2016).

As far as the village or little town community is concerned, being different is often frowned upon, and it may even be dangerous for those who show such unconventionality. 'Even when rural masses migrate to the big cities, the cultural traits of the former community and the attitudes and values of the individual, change rather slowly' (Kalaycıoğlu, 2002a: 72; Poyras, Aytekin, Sengul, 2016: 16). Cooperation and mutual support are very often an element reserved exclusively for those who are recognized as the members of the local community, religious group or political party. In such cases, what is observed is the great importance of bonding social capital and a tendency to close off the community/group from everything that is foreign and unknown. This importance and exclusive (closing) character of social capital were very strongly emphasized in Turkey, where the authors presented a negative attitude of close relations and support leading to clientelism. 'One of the most important skill-building mechanisms that provide a possibility to find a job to the unemployed is the municipalities' vocational courses. Besides, being a member of the ruling party's neighbourhood organization gives people the opportunity to find a job. This clientelist organization, while creating dependency, reproduces the power of the ruling party at the local level. For example, R3 indicated that people who supported and voted for the ruling party benefited from all the state's resources. He said:

'As I said a short while ago, with the Metropolitan Municipality's vocational courses, they put women on the payroll. After they had finished their courses, the Metropolitan Municipality of Istanbul employed them at its corporations to increase their political effect in neighborhoods. They were the partisans of the ruling party looking for support. They were not serving neutrally. The municipality was full of these people. There was no way to get a job unless you were a ruling party supporter. While these practices were attracting the unemployed, needy people to contribute to the activities of the ruling party at the local level, the dependency on the very same mechanism was inevitably increasing. The opposing groups such as CHP (Republican People's Party) voters and/or Alevi people had no chance to benefit from these opportunities with preserving their political position'. (R3, Turkey) (Poyras, Aytekin, Sengul, 2016).

Table 1. The patterns of social economy, its role in the development of an individual, households and community resilience and its limitations

Pattern of SE	<i>Social Economy as a field of NGO sector activity</i>	<i>Civic-entrepreneur type</i>	<i>Entrepreneur/labor market inclusion type</i>	<i>Community economy (communitarian) type</i>
(project partner country)	Germany	Finland, Ireland, UK	Poland	Spain, Greece, Turkey, partly Portugal
Understanding of SE	Non-profit NGOs mostly funded by public resources. No legal definition of social enterprise.	Both the NGO sector and social entrepreneurship. The strong position of the third sector; high level of decentralization.	SE includes the NGO sector and social entrepreneurship, which is dominant and understood as WISEs and other entities of socio-professional reintegration.	SE understood as the NGO sector, social enterprise, and WISE (except Turkey). In practice – SE activity closely related to the community economic activities but for social purposes.
SE in practice	The very strong position of the biggest III Sector organizations, which are respected and professionally prepared.	NGO sector – diverse and competing for public funds. Social enterprises are operating on the open market selling goods and services mostly to public authorities.	Significant importance of the EU funds in promoting the idea of and understanding SE. Mostly top-down initiatives supported and financed in their initial phases by the public institutions.	Often bottom-up, informal, not initiated or supported by public institutions. The great importance of local relationships, norms, and ties.
Contribution of SE practices in individual households and community resilience	Wide range of help and social services - ‘crisis intervention’, charity, distributing food and clothes, providing services, education, and training.	Providing various forms of social service, as in the first case, by various types of NGOs, also creating a number of working places (or social employment) in social entrepreneur entities.	WISE constitute the dominant form of social enterprises in this type, achieved through the provision of a very wide range of goods and e.g., social services of general interest.	Their characteristic feature is the fact that their implementation is possible thanks to mutual trust, willingness to cooperate, and a sense of bonding. Their effect is not only the development of the people directly involved in them but also of the entire community and, thus, the high level of social identification and acceptance occurs.
Limitations	A limited number of projects undertaken by the NGO sector, facilitating some form of long-term employment (not including employment of professional staff in the NGO sector) which could give a higher level of independence from	The competition between NGO entities; short-term projects unable to create long-term strategies for the clients; existing support helps to cover necessary expenses but limits job seeking. Social entrepreneur activities sometimes are accessible only	The vocational integration activities (training and courses) are often criticized for the lack of possibility for employment after the training. WISE implemented with the financial support of public institutions often exists as long as there is external (mostly financial) support.	In some cases, cooperation and mutual support are reserved exclusively for the members of the local community, religious group or political party. There is a tendency to close off the community/group from everything that is foreign and unknown.

	external support.	for skilled and productive workers who may increase the exclusion of members of vulnerable groups.		
--	-------------------	--	--	--

(Source: author's research results)

7. Conclusions

Based on the analyses of the research material, it may be concluded that limited effectiveness of the entities of social economy results, to a large extent, from the lack of social trust or even from the fact that the community is not aware of its activity. The lack of trust is sometimes a result of associating them with aid and local institutions, which in specific communities are often treated with dislike. Existing in research areas, social economy organizations take actions supporting social and professional integration, but their actions are very often „uniform" and adjusted to the needs and competencies of low-qualified people. The support can often be highly appreciated at the introductory, training, motivating stage, which is good for a start, but at the stage of social and professional inclusion, the instruments that these entities possess are not sufficient. As a result, despite training, courses, traineeships, or public works, it doesn't result in professional reintegration; it makes beneficiaries of these institutions frustrated, and they are more and more dependent on the aid system.

The analysis of the research material allows concluding that the form of support that most effectively supports the ability to cope with difficult situations resulting from poverty and unemployment is the raising of professional qualifications supported by the possibility of an internship. In the most effective option, the training process should be combined with an internship at a specific position carried out with a potential future employer who will not only be responsible for running the given internship but can also assure good preparation of the future employee.

It may be assumed that undertaking activities and projects aimed at bigger economic independence and regular income based on paid activity would be much more effective for developing the resilience of households facing hardships in the case of poverty, unemployment, low income based on disability, etc. Based on the Spanish example of vine cooperatives, we may assume that these kinds of activities are more effective if they are community-based – developed by local organizations (cooperative of local producers of wine and olive oil), supported by public institutions, in cooperation with local business (local transport companies, local stores and other subcontractors), who are recognized as acting for public benefit by community members (sense of identity and pride based on good, widely recognized local brand).

There is a need for strong rootedness and cooperation between social entrepreneur entities and the community in which it operates, based on shared values, aims, and understanding of community needs and problems. This requires extensive relationships of social economy entities, both with individuals, institutions, and organizations operating in the local environment as well as with local values, norms, and traditions. It is especially important when we considering the role of the social economy in local, sustainable development. Assuming that sustainable local development should be based on respect for the rights and values of various social groups leading to a balance between social, economic, cultural and ecological factors, it can be stated that social economy entities undertaking economic activities to achieve social goals are an excellent instrument for creating sustainable local development. By acting in accordance with the values of a particular community, they can also shape certain social values and behaviors. Thus, they can affect the increase of community resilience, directions of local development as well as the principles on which this development will be based.

With reference to the potential of the development of the social economy, we should emphasize the role of grassroots, local social activity as a factor generating the development of social economy and favoring the stability of its institutional forms at the level of the local community. As a result, less formalized activities are omitted, such as neighborly help, which requires greater involvement of people at the level of the local communities, based on acquaintance, trust, willingness to help and cooperate, defining and solving common problems. All these elements made up the support of entities of the social economy and people who take such actions. Whereas, the lack of support causes the failure of such activities. Grass-roots social support and active cooperation and support from local authorities and public institutions give a chance for success for the entities of the social economy. Therefore, the implementation of activities in the field of social economy should be based on some similar principles and procedures as community organizing (Rothman, Tropman 1987; Haynes, Holmes 1994; Geddes, Benington (eds) 2001; Rothman 2008).

8. Acknowledgments

The article was prepared on the basis of the international research project RESCuE (*Patterns of Resilience during Socioeconomic Crises among Households in Europe*) financed by EU VII FP (contract nr KE: 613 244). The Polish part of the project was co-financed by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education and the University of Silesia in Katowice. The project coordinator is Markus Promberger from the Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung (IAB) from Germany (Nuremberg). The partners in the project are academic universities: University of Silesia (Poland), Universidad Complutense da Madrid (Spain), University of Hertfordshire (United Kingdom), Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences (Greece), University Institute of Lisbon (Portugal), Middle East Technical University (Turkey), University of Lapland (Finland), National University of Ireland Maynooth (Ireland). The authors are grateful to all RESCuE colleagues: María Arnal, Athena Athanasiou, Attila Aytekin, Alexandre Calado, Daniel Calderon, Luís Capucha, Carlos de Castro, Hulya Dagdeviren, Jenny Dagg, Matt Donoghue, Pedro Estevao, Krystyna Faliszek, Monica Gneciak, Jane Gray, Ursula Huws, Nelli Kampouri, Krzysztof Łęcki, Witold Mandrysz, Soula Marinoudi, Maria Paz Martín, Lars Meier, Araceli Serrano Pascual, Georgia Petraki, Markus Promberger, Juan Carlos Revilla, Tarik Şengül, Barbara Słania, Monica Tennberg, Joonas Vola, Terhi Vuojala-Magga, Kazimiera Wódz and Aggeliki Yfanti, and other collaborators, for their contributions in national studies and joint comparative research which were the basis of this article.

9. References

- [1] Amin, A., Cameron, A., Hudson, R. (1999) *Welfare as Work? The potential of the UK social economy*. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, pp. 2033-2051;
- [2] Amin, A., Cameron, A., Hudson, R. (2002) *Placing the Social Economy*. London: Routledge;
- [3] Amin, A. (2003) *The Economic Base of Contemporary Cities*. In: *A Companion to The City*, G. Bridge, S. Watson, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003, Malden, USA, Oxford, UK, Carlton, Australia, pp. 115-129;
- [4] Athanasiou, A. & Marinoudi, S., Boost, M., Müller, J. & Kerschbaumer, L., Capucha, L., Calado, A. & Estêvão, P., Dagg, J. & Gray, J., Donoghue, M. Wearmouth, A. & Dagdeviren, H., Poyras, U., Aytekin, E. A. & Sengul, H. T., Serrano, A., Revilla, J. C. & Garcia M., Tennberg, M, Vola J. & Vuojala-Magga T. Wódz, K., & Mandrysz, W., (2016), RESCuE project National Case Study Reports on the Social economy & household resilience (WP 10) – Greece, Germany, Portugal, Ireland, United Kingdom, Turkey, Spain, Finland, Poland; internal project materials;
- [5] Bourdieu P. (1986) *The Forms of Capital*, [in:] J.G. Richardson (ed.): *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York, pp. 241-258;

-
- [6] Böckenhoff, A. (2016) *Die europäische Debatte um soziale Innovation: Chancen und Risiken für die Sozialwirtschaft*. Sozialer Fortschritt 1-2, pp. 24-31;
- [7] Carpi, J. A. T. (2008) *The Prospects for the Social Economy in a Changing World*, CIRIEC-España, Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa, 62, Special Issue pp. 7-33;
- [8] Certo S. T. Miller T. (2008) Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts. Mays Business School, Texas A&M University, pp. 261-271;
- [9] Cohen M. (1978) *Community Organization and Illustration of Practice*. [in:] A Fink, The Field of Social Work. New York;
- [10] Coleman J.S (1998) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. American Journal of Sociology. no. 94, pp. 95-120;
- [11] Dees J. G. (1998) The Meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship" Stanford University, available: <https://entrepreneurship.duke.edu/news-item/the-meaning-of-social-entrepreneurship> 30 October 2012
- [12] Estêvão, P., Calado, A., Capucha, L. 2017, Resilience: Moving from a "heroic" notion to a sociological concept. *Sociologia. Problemas e Práticas*, no. 85, pp. 9–25;
- [13] Frankl, V.E. (1959) *Man's search for meaning*. London: Simon and Schuster;
- [14] Golob, U., Podnar, K., Lah M. (2009) Social economy and social responsibility: alternatives to global anarchy of neoliberalism?", *International Journal of Social Economics*, 36(5), pp.626-640;
- [15] Keck, M., Sakdapolrak, P. (2013) What is Social Resilience? Lessons Learned and Ways Forward. *Erdkunde*, Bd. 67, H. 1, pp. 5–19;
- [16] Masten, A.S. (2001) Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, vol. 56, iss. 3, pp. 227–238;
- [17] Molloy, A., Mcfeely, C., Connolly, E. (1999) *Building a Social Economy for the New Millennium*. Derry: Guildhall Press;
- [18] Monzon, J. L. (2006) Economía Social y conceptos afines: fronteras borrosas y ambigüedades conceptuales del tercer sector, CIRIEC-España, nº 56, pp. 9-24;
- [19] Monzon, J. L., Chaves, R. (2008) The European Social Economy: Concept and dimensions of Third Sector; *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, pp. 549-577;
- [20] Norton, W. (2014) Transparency begins at home: Why charities must state who funds them. *Centre for Policy Studies Pointmaker*: January;
- [21] Olsson, J. (2003) Una vision de la economía social europea. La economía social y el tercer sector: España y el entorno europeo, Escuela Libre;
- [22] Peredo, A.M. and Chrisman, J.J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review* 31 (2):309-328;
- [23] Promberger M. (2018) Resilience and poverty — concept, question, and first results of a qualitative nine country study, *Problemy Polityki Społecznej* pp.19-35;
- [24] Putnam R. D. (1995) *Budowanie sprawnej demokracji. Tradycje obywatelskie we współczesnych Włoszech*. Kraków;
- [25] Putnam R. D. (2001) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York;
- [26] Rothman J. Tropman J. E. (1987) Models of Community Organization and Macro Practice Perspectives: Their Mixing and Phasing. In: *Strategies of Community Organization*. F.M Cox, J. L. Erlich, J. Rothman, J. E. Tropman (eds) Fourth Ed. F.E. Peacock Publishers Inc. Itasca;

- [27] Rothman, J., (2008) Multi Modes of Intervention at the Macro Level, in Journal of Community Practice, Vol 15(4), <http://www.tandfonline.com/23> 12 November 2011;
- [28] Ross M. (1967) Community organization: Theory, Principles, and Practice, New York;
- [29] Woolcock, M., Narayan, D. (2000) Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy, "The World Bank Research Observer" no. 2, pp.225-249.

Manuscript received: 16.10.2019

Manuscript received in revised form: 11.11.2019

Manuscript accepted: 13.11.2019