

Resourcing in social enterprise – content analysis of ‘good practices’ profiled in ‘Atlas of social economy’ in Poland¹

Marzena Starnawska²

Gdańsk University of Technology

The aim of this paper is to analyze and show what processes accompany resource mobilization among social enterprises. For this, the author uses a sample of 25 ‘good practice’ examples selected and presented in ‘Atlas of social economy’ in Poland, in the most popular and well-established knowledge base web portal on social economy and social enterprise in Poland. The author makes an attempt at deconstructing the profiles of the featured ‘good practices’ and undertakes content analysis to provide insights into the processes and strategies behind resourcing.

Keywords: social enterprise, social entrepreneurship, good practice, resource mobilization

1. Introduction

In the landscape of Polish socio-economic system, social economy and social enterprise have been subject to strong public and scientific debate about its role, functions and definitions. With the introduction of EQUAL project, many undertakings have been introduced to promote social economy. As part of EQUAL social economy ventures, at times called ‘social enterprises’, have been created throughout Poland. But social enterprise concept has become more established in public and academic discourse with Poland’s access to the EU in 2004, and only in 2013 the Act on social enterprise Polish government introduce it for external consultations. So far, it has not been introduced into legal framework yet.

The promotion of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in wider, public domain has been mostly undertaken by just a few initiatives. One is a national competition for Social Enterprise of the Year, introduced in 2011 by Fundacja Inicjatyw Społeczno Ekonomicznych³ (FISE). There is also worldwide known programme by Ashoka Foundation, that has been identifying its fellows in Poland since 1995. The other initiative promoting social enterprise, come from other international programmes like from NESsT and JPMorgan Chase Foundation, which have announced the first awards for best business plan in social enterprise in 2014. These initiatives and programmes are varied in their scope and aims, but without doubt contribute to the promotion of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship development in Poland. For the purpose of this paper, the author has chosen another domain where social entrepreneurship is promoted. It is part of the programme run by aforementioned FISE organization, established as early as in 2007.

Following the implementation of its own programmes, FISE has listed 41 ‘good practice’ examples named “Atlas of ‘good practices’ in social economy” and features their profiles on the most popular web portal and key source of knowledge on social entrepreneurship, social enterprise and social economy in Poland. The aim of Atlas is to show a variety of social problems which have, at least partly, been solved thanks to the profiled ideas and solutions. As the portal states:

¹ The work on this project has been partly financed by National Science Centre, decision no DEC-2011/03/D/HS4/04326

² Department of Entrepreneurship and Business Law, Gdańsk University of Technology, contact: mstarnaw@zie.pg.gda.pl

³ Foundation for Social and Economic Initiatives

“The main idea of Atlas is to identify social economy ventures that have achieved success, are effective, do well, achieved a desired level of economic independence and want to share their experiences. In Atlas, we describe ventures that have worked for at least two years. Additional selection criterion for social ventures, is being open to cooperation, clarity in activity and sharing knowledge with others. That is why, the Atlas heroes have contributed to the content of their profiles too”.

The aim of this paper is to analyze and present what processes and behaviours are associated with resource mobilization among these social ventures, listed as ‘good practice’ examples. Although the ‘good practice’ examples do not refer to the issues and challenges of resource access, mobilization or acquisition directly, the author considers it a worthwhile task to see how the profiled cases of social ventures talk about their ventures and how they are portrayed by the Atlas editors, and to provide insights into processes underlying resource mobilization. Neither the idea of the paper, nor the intention of portal editors, is to present and manifest particular processes and actions behind resource mobilization as exemplary ones. Yet, it is hoped to show, which of these processes and actions make these ventures recognized as inspiration and promotion among social ventures.

2. Resourcing and resource access in social entrepreneurship

Resources are fundamental asset for firm growth and performance (Penrose, 1959; Newbert, 2008). The literature acknowledges that organizations do not operate alone and resources which cannot be produced inside the organization, should be obtained from other, external stakeholders (Pfeffer and Salancik 1978; Scott, 1998). Entrepreneur should know the industry where they seek for resources and so they should know these stakeholders just as stakeholders should know them, for their abilities and potential. This allows for trust on the stakeholders as resource providers (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern 2006). These stakeholders, such as customers, suppliers, investors, public agencies and other ones, also do not have unlimited amount of resources. Therefore, the task of the organization is to influence what decision resource owners make to allocate their resources to them. The dominant stream of research focuses on resource mobilization among mature organizations but more and more attention is directed to new organizations and how they manage to acquire resources (Jarillo, 1989; Venkataraman, 1997). The resources turn out to be critical for organizational growth and survival (Brush, Green and Hart, 2001).

The resource challenges are particularly characteristic to new ventures, facing various challenges in resource acquisition. Also, as a result of the organizations’ liability of smallness, and related – liability of newness (Aldrich and Auster 1986; Freeman, Carroll and Hannan, 1993; Stinchcombe 1965) potential resource providers are not able to evaluate the opportunity being undertaken by the venture. New organizations compete for resources and simply they need to employ some strategy to overcome lack of or limited interest on the side of resource providers. The resource constraints are particularly characteristic in social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs are not able to attract resources like conventional entrepreneurs. They cannot offer ownership in their enterprise as they cannot participate in capital markets; they cannot offer market rates for the resources provided, human resources in particular and so they are less likely to employ professionals and more likely to rely on support of volunteers and other human resources at lower rates. In terms of finance, at the start up social enterprises scarcely rely on venture capital, loans and credits but more often capitalize on contributions in a form of donations, grants from different agencies and bodies, member and user fees, membership (Austin et al 2006). In fact, social enterprises discover and construct entrepreneurial opportunities in resource poor environments. Martens et al (2007) summarize existing research and claim that entrepreneurs can undertake two types of strategies while coping with resource constraints: using networks and establishing legitimacy.

Social networks of entrepreneurs may contribute to resource acquisition in two ways. First of all via social contracting (MacMillan, 1990) where an entrepreneur relies on his/her personal contact network: both direct and indirect ties, and leverages on such ties to get access to the required resources. These, may also be delivered for free or at reduced rates, as part of the social contract. But also, Potential resource providers are able to learn more about the venture, via personal recommendation. Additionally, entrepreneur's links to high-status individuals can work as a manifestation of the venture's viability and quality (Shane and Cable 2002). For Leadbeater (2007) social networks constitute social capital which is point of departure for a social entrepreneur, who creates a network of contacts with different people, groups and organizations. This allows him/her to access the required physical and financial capital in the development of an organization. In another strategy, which is gaining and building legitimacy of new venture, entrepreneurs build trust resulting from the belief that the actions of the organization are proper, desirable and acknowledgeable as part of a particular system of norms and beliefs (Suchman 1995). As a result, if the organization is not given legitimacy by its stakeholders, it will be very hard to acquire resources from them. Zott and Huy (2007) offer additional insights on how entrepreneurs acquire resources using symbolic management practices. As part of these practices entrepreneurs makes attempt to draw attention of others to the meaning, importance of the object or action undertaken. The actual use or content are less important but it is its importance that becomes relevant. Therefore, symbolic actions include participation in professional organizations, emphasizing organization's achievements, employing professional processes or emphasizing and promoting associations with prestigious stakeholders.

3. Social enterprise, social entrepreneurship and 'good practices' in Poland

There is a large number of organizations in social economy landscape, and in Third Sector, that have been attributed the label of social enterprise. It is not the focus of this paper to dwell into the particularities of definitional issues. As mentioned earlier, Polish legislation has not introduced a separate organizational form that is called 'social enterprise'. Nowadays, there are vast discussions on what constitutes social enterprise (Ciepielewska-Kowalik, Pielński, Starnawska, Szymańska, 2015; Herbst, 2008) in the varied landscape of social economy organizations and beyond.

It may be questionable, however, why the author uses the concept of social venture, social enterprise or social economy initiative interchangeably. The source of data used for the analysis in this paper 'Atlas of social economy 'good practices'' indicates, that the paper should be contextualized in the social economy background. It is a definitional debate again. When prompted, why the Atlas is not titled 'Atlas of social enterprise 'good practices' the person⁴ responsible for the project says: *"It is a semantic issue. I would not say these are social enterprises in case of Atlas, but social economy ventures. It is hard to call food cooperative as a social enterprise. Or time banks (...)"*. But, the closer analysis of the Atlas portal place shows, that social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts are vastly employed in the introduction to the idea of the whole project. The reason behind this inconsistency, however, might be the following. The first collection of 'good practices' was initiated as early as in 2005, when the concept of social enterprise was almost non-existing in public and scientific debate. With time, when the 'good practices' were compiled and updated until 2013, the social enterprise and social entrepreneurship concept has become more popular and recognized, as important element of social economy landscape and clear concept to understand the idea of solving social problems via business means.

There is a scarce evidence in Polish literature on 'good practices' in social entrepreneurship. In one work, the authors present 10 'good practices' without any clarification on the selection methods used and any contextualization of this undertaking (Dudzik and Kucharski, 2006). There is one, more developed work, as an outcome of larger research project, where Karwińska and Wiktor (2008)

⁴ The author interviewed Ms Ewa Rosińska to gain insights into the background of the Atlas project. The interview took place on 18 May 2015.

propose only 4 'good practices' set in the context of the whole landscape of social economy and social enterprise organizations.

4.The idea of 'Atlas of social economy 'good examples''

The Atlas, is a part of a project run by Foundation for Social and Economic Initiatives (FISE)⁵ which is a Polish Foundation, created in 1990. Its mission is *"a systemic approach and acting to increase employment, especially among the professionally inactive groups."*⁶ It is one of the biggest organizations supporting not only social economy in Poland but the development of NGOs as well. Together with another NGO⁷ it runs Social Economy Portal⁸. It is a part of the national, well-established and most popular web portal on social economy, social enterprise, social entrepreneurship in Poland funded by the government program for social economy development support. This portal is the most informative database for many actors interested in social enterprise and social entrepreneurship issues such as policy makers, practitioners and academics. The atlas of the good practices is meant to work as a resource base about good practices in social entrepreneurship in Poland. As the portal states: *"What you can learn about here is how to acquire resources for social activity, how much it costs, how different legal and organizational forms can be used, who you can turn to in case of need of help or support"*⁹. The portal invites readers to draw inspiration from the presented examples and asks the readers to send their examples of good practice.

Following the interview with the person responsible¹⁰ for the two first projects with best practice collections, the preliminary purpose of Atlas of best practice was the promotion of social economy across Poland. She comments: *"Our aim was to promote Social Economy in general, so that people started to recognize it, associate it with something really helpful and beneficial for the society. The concept of social economy had some kind of association, And of course we wanted to show some examples, how it works, how much good it does. We wanted to shake Social Economy at that time and at the beginning, the preliminary purpose was to promote Social Economy sector, show what it is, how it grows (...) many of these ventures that we visited said: oh, I did not know we are social economy(...) what we focused more on later was to promote these examples to attract followers"*.

As this Atlas project coordinator suggests: *"the thing is that in the third round if Atlas, the idea was to stop praising Social Economy, but to give it more practical angle, so that people would start thinking 'ok, I can do this, here I have guidelines how to do it, contact details of the people who do it, go there' and this is what actually happened, from one place to the other, people were sharing their own experiences, know-how etc."*

All 41 examples were compiled between 2005 and 2013. In the first stage, FISE was working in EQUAL project – 'Searching for a Polish model of the social economy'¹¹ intended to work out a Polish model of social economy, between July 2005 and May 2008 where first round of twelve practices was collected. Another twelve cases were collected between September 2007 and June 2008 as a part of another EQUAL project 'Promotion of Social Economy'¹². The last contribution to the Atlas was when the 'good practices' were revised, updated, added as a part of implementation of a large National, systemic Project for Social Economy Support, realized as partnership of 7 biggest domestic organizations involved in support for social economy, social enterprise and social

⁵ Fundacja Inicjatyw Społeczno Ekonomicznych

⁶ <http://www.fise.org.pl/x/17043>

⁷ Klon/Jawor Association – (Stowarzyszeniem Klon/Jawor)

⁸ <http://www.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl>

⁹ <http://atlas.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/> Accessed 26 April 2015

¹⁰ The interview with Ms Ewa Rosińska, responsible for 'good practice' examples in the two projects, took place on 18 May 2015.

¹¹ 'W poszukiwaniu polskiego modelu ekonomii społecznej' See more: <http://es.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/>

¹² 'Promocja Ekonomii Społecznej' (PROMES)

entrepreneurship 'Integrated Programme for Social Economy Support'¹³ where FISE listed final 30 best practice examples for promotion. In the whole process of 'good practice' examples' selection the ventures were approached by regional bodies supporting social economy organizations in the area, sometimes they nominated themselves for consideration. The Atlas project idea was promoted throughout the whole country, also at annual, national conferences for Social Economy, where the whole environment of social enterprise organizations, supporting organizations, administration units at different levels meets to discuss social entrepreneurship and social economy issues.

The 'good practices' have been grouped into three types of profiles: 'descriptive case study', 'initiative' and 'business plan'. FISE, together with external evaluating committee, made effort to assure equal distribution of the examples across different regions in Poland and across different fields of activity. The case study is an in-depth description of social enterprise, the initiative is a short note that is meant to work as an inspiration for others, and business plan provides detailed description of the social enterprise with financial data behind it. Altogether, there are 41 of 'good practices' in the Atlas. As the two latter categories are too short for deeper analysis, also there are only 2 practices with business plans, the author has chosen descriptive case studies (25) for the purpose of the analysis in this paper.

The reader of Atlas has an opportunity to locate an individual good practice, based on its field of activity: work, housing, health, education and upbringing, services and manufacturing as the editors of Atlas comment that each of the examples of the social economy was set up with a particular social problem in mind. The portal also comments, that for those wishing to start social enterprise one of the key decisions is a choice of appropriate legal form, therefore the selection and presentation of practices can also be based on this criterion: foundation, association, cooperative (for the disabled, workers'), social cooperative, limited company, ZAZ, health services organization (NZOZ¹⁴), church unit. In Atlas, it is also summarized that social entrepreneurship responds to needs of different groups, from offering workplaces, to giving social integration opportunities and helping communities. Among the target groups the following are listed: children and the youth, the unemployed, the disabled, the excluded, local communities, other. Finally, functions of these social enterprises are presented, that as claimed, depend on the competences: work and social integration, public benefit services, mutual services, services on the open market, development of local communities, trade and manufacturing activity. It is also possible to verify the location of the practice across Poland (Picture 1).

¹³ 'Zintegrowany System Wsparcia Ekonomii Społecznej' See more: <http://www.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/zswes>

¹⁴ NZOZ is the Polish acronym for 'Niepubliczny zakład opieki zdrowotnej'. This, directly translated means that it is non-public health services provision unit, where non-public means it does not belong to the public sector.

Picture 1: Atlas of good practices in Social Economy in Poland – geographical location



Source: <http://atlas.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/>, O – refers to descriptive case study good practice location, B – to business plan good practice location, I – to inspiration good practice example

The presentation of each 'good practice' in descriptive case study is profiled across nine categories¹⁵ that structure its detailed description (Table 1).

Table 1: Categories in descriptive case presentation

CONTEXT/BACKGROUND/HISTORY
ACTIVITY/ADDITIONAL ACTIVITY
INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS/MANAGEMENT-GOVERNANCE
COOPERATION WITH LOCAL ENVIRONMENT
MARKETING
LEGAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FORM
RESULTS
PLANS FOR FUTURE
ADVICE, CONCLUSIONS

Source: <http://atlas.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/>

The Atlas is featured by FISE on its main website. Therefore, one can assume, that this is still one of the main knowledge sources about social economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Poland that is meant to work as inspiration for others.

¹⁵ In some cases, there is one additional category for financial results. But because this is uncommon across all cases, the author does not take this into consideration.

5. Methodology

As mentioned earlier, a non-random sample examples - social economy ventures, was selected from the Atlas of social economy 'good practices'. Altogether, there are 25 examples, presented and profiled as descriptive case studies in the Atlas (Table 2).

Table 2: List of 'good practice' examples profiled as descriptive case study in Atlas of social economy¹⁶

	name of the main organization ¹⁷	set-up year	location
1	Association for Development of Bałtów Municipality <i>Bałt</i> (running business activity, public benefit organization)	(2001)	Bałtów, Poland
2.	Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled (running business activity)	(2004)	Bielsko Biala, Poland
3.	Association <i>Blue Umbrella</i> running <i>Blue Umbrella</i> Health Care Unit ¹⁸ (Niepubliczny Zakład Opieki Zdrowotnej –NZOZ)	(2001)	Chojnów, Poland
4.	Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development <i>Be together</i> (running business activity, public benefit organization)	(2007)	Cieszyn, Poland
5	Association for Mutual Support <i>Be Together</i>	(1996)	Cieszyn, Poland
6	<i>Grudziądz</i> Caritas Centre – church organization (running business activity), running Health Care Unit	(1998),	Grudziądz, Poland
7	Association for Mutual Support <i>Flandria</i> (running business activity)	(1997)	Inowrocław, Poland
8	<i>Bread of Life</i> Foundation (public benefit organization)	(2003)	Jankowice, Poland
9	Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled Fire lightener manufacturer	(2010)	Jarosław, Poland
10	Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled Running small hotel <i>Mr Cogito</i>	(2003)	Cracow, Poland
11	<i>Glass world</i> Social Cooperative (natural persons cooperative)	(2009)	Krośnice, Poland
12	<i>The land of tales</i> social cooperative (natural persons cooperative)	(2010)	Leżajsk, Poland
13	<i>Emaus</i> Social Cooperative (legal persons cooperative)	(2010)	Lublin, Poland
14	Lutolska Social Cooperative <i>Elevator</i> (legal persons cooperative)	(2010)	Lutol Mokry, Poland
15	<i>Muszynianka</i> (workers' cooperative)	(1951)	Krynica Zdrój, Poland
16	<i>Secret Garden</i> Social Cooperative (natural persons cooperative)	(2007)	Poznań, Poland
17	<i>Swallow Inn</i> (limited company nonprofit)	(2007)	Radom, Poland
18	<i>Tyczyn</i> (telephone cooperative),	(1991)	Tyczyn, Poland
19	<i>Solidarni Plus</i> Association, and Healthcare Unit NZOZ: Both constitute a center for their beneficiaries	(between 1992-1996)	Wandzin, Poland
20	<i>Our little house</i> Social Cooperative (natural persons cooperative)	(2011)	Warsaw, Poland
21	<i>Help for those in need</i> Foundation, (public benefit organization) and -Healthcare Unit, NZOZ - two care centers	(2002)	Warsaw, Poland
22	Social Cooperative <i>Warsaw</i> (natural persons cooperative)	(2011)	Warsaw, Poland
23	<i>Mango</i> Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled Bowling place	(2007)	Wąbrzeźno, Poland
24	Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled	(2008)	Wilcza Góra, Poland

¹⁶ More detailed data on the cases is presented in Appendix 1.

¹⁷ As discussed later in the paper, many of the ventures are presented as systems of interdependent social economy and social enterprise organization. For the presentation purposes, the authors have presented only the main initiative in this table. The other organizations linked to the main one are presented in the table in the appendix.

¹⁸ Health Care Provision unit provides healthcare day services for patients, it is not a separate legal form, but is a part of the founding organization. It works as an independent public healthcare provider in Poland. It needs to win contracts from National Health Service to provide services for the patients as part of their health insurance

	Artists' activity		
25	Panato Social Cooperative (natural persons cooperative)	(2012)	Wroclaw, Poland

Source: own compilation based on <http://atlas.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/> data

The text document, with all descriptive case studies makes 240 pages, so each case description consisted, on average, of 9.5 page. In the first round of data coding, there have been 1124 codes generated. Throughout the coding important, more general codes and categories emerged. For the purpose of this paper, the author decided to focus on codes generated in the five following categories in profiled practices:

- CONTEXT/BACKGROUND/HISTORY,
- INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS/MANAGEMENT-GOVERNANCE,
- COOPERATION WITH LOCAL ENVIRONMENT,
- ACTIVITY/ADDITIONAL ACTIVITY,
- ADVICE, CONCLUSIONS.

This decision was made in the first rounds of coding, where the author could see most references and categories related to resource and resource acquisition, and processes behind, presented and evidenced in the profiles of 'good examples'.

As the research methods employed involve content analysis, the author uses the data presented on the portal as primary data. However, it is worthwhile to mention, that in the research process of research undertaken by FISE representatives each case was visited by a photographer and interviewer who had a number of issues and questions to be covered in the interview. Also, the data on the 'good practice' examples was reviewed and updated between 2011-2013. The person responsible for the Atlas project recalls:

"we decided (in the third round of Atlas works) to take a closer look at the 24 best practices we had, to write about them in more detail. It was more in journalist format, to show what social economy is, who are the leaders, what niches they occupy etc... we wanted to do it in a really professional way, to make it fit for other media, so others could use it. So we wanted the professional editor to write about it, correct and so on. Not like all these cases and examples from the Third sector, where everyone could write it, write about it, by accident. We took it very seriously, hired a professional photographer, interviews in the field. It was a large undertaking, I think this Atlas has lived for a really long time".

Although the main approach used for the data analysis is content analysis, the reader will see that the author works with the data (profile texts) on two levels, without distinguishing in consistent and clear way what is actually reported. At times, direct statements of 'good practice' venture respondents are quoted but also, the actual content of the profile is also used as textual data. There are many instances when Atlas editor(s) who interviewed and prepared the profiles in the descriptive case studies, quote their respondents in the profile presentation. But also, the profiles are presented using editorial and journalist approach, where what has been said by respondents, what has been noticed and observed by interviewers is structured in the profile according to the nine categories.

The author makes an attempt at looking deeper into the profiles on the 'good practices' and looks for their dominant features. But also, what is at the margins is worth consideration as well. Therefore, it is the variation among 'good practices' that contributes to understanding of processes behind resource access or acquisition.

6. Profiling and resourcing across 'good examples'

6.1 BACKGROUND/CONTEXT/HISTORY

This category is helpful to provide the reader with some insights into the 'good practices' selected by the portal editors. It does not work to serve how the messages of good practice are communicated, and what messages are like but still, indirectly, shows what examples have been chosen.

The background category shows in what circumstances these ventures were started. Some were set up in the early 1990's, where a wave of NGOs emerged in the circumstances of transformation of socio-economic system. The others belong to new organizations such as social cooperatives, established as of 2007 and later. There are two examples of traditional cooperatives (workers' and telephone) that were established in 1950's and 1990's respectively. All featured and analysed cases respond to social and economic exclusion of the marginalized groups or those in danger of marginalization. The unemployment problem is strongly emphasized in the context of the restructuration of Polish economy, and growing unemployment rate. Some selected cases exemplify direct response to redundancies made in manufacturing plants, different institutions in smaller towns that led to serious unemployment problem [*Blue Umbrella* Health Care Unit, Association for Mutual Support *Flandria*, *Glass World* social cooperative, *Muszynianka* workers' cooperative]. Other ones, set in recent years, show unemployment problems of individuals making efforts to run social cooperative [*Panato* social cooperative, Social Cooperative *Warsaw*, *Our little house* Christian Social Cooperatives]. Their situation however is not presented as particularly painful, leading to social or economic exclusion. Another area of problems giving background for the enterprise is unemployment combined with deeper challenges such as addictions, homelessness, long-term diseases (e.g. AIDS) [*Secret Garden* Social Cooperative, *Bread of Life* Foundation, Association for Mutual Support *Be Together*, Association for Development of Bałtów Municipality *Bałt*, *Solidarni Plus* Association]. The last group of examples work as a response to social and economic exclusion generated by mental and physical disabilities, these organizations have their established position in the socio-economic system and have created complex networks of interdependencies among one another [*Mango* Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled, Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled *Mr Cogito*, Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development *Be Together*]. Few others work in social care or bringing up area by running caring centers for the elderly, long-term ill people or day care for children.

In most part, **social problems** constituting context for these initiatives are presented on micro level, showing unemployment problems of individual people; unemployment groups made redundant as a result of restructuring of Polish economy in early 1990's; groups where unemployment is linked with other problems such as long-term illness, homelessness, addictions; or where a lack of adequate public support is visible in healthcare, childcare, disability support. The presented ventures/examples are not presented as systemic, institutional solutions to the wide-scale problems. In one exceptional profile, the respondent says:

"In 2000, the mayor of Cieszyn turned to us and invited to prepare a model of support for the homeless in the area". [Association for Mutual Support Be Together]

It is interesting to see, that it is the mayor who speaks of solution to social problem on a higher level. There emerges, however, a challenge, resulting from the initiative which is the perception of the local community about the beneficiaries of these social economy ventures, the negative attitude of local environment towards them. But this, is not presented in **BACKGROUND/CONTEXT/HISTORY** category on the portal, but in the **RESULTS** category. The 'practices' have made efforts to change the public perception about people with disabilities, with different addictions, and other more marginalized groups like prisoners, homeless and the results show that some progress in this area has been made. This issue is particularly relevant when the issue of community building in further parts of the paper.

There are **two main groups, proposed by the author, of legal and organizational forms** of examples presented in the Atlas. One consists of **social cooperatives** – natural or legal persons' cooperatives that have been established either with the support of existing NGO or institution or with the effort of individuals. The other group comprises of different types of social enterprises that are Associations, Foundations, Vocational Enterprises for the Disabled, Health care Units and other ones.

They constitute networks of interlinked organizations, with a long history and experience in support for the socially and economically excluded. Even though the portal lists 25 descriptive cases and each case provided the name of the enterprise, the reading into the profiles of these organizations shows how each profile is complex as it includes interdependent organizations. In individual categories such as **CONTEXT/BACKGROUND/HISTORY, ACTIVITY/ADDITIONAL ACTIVITY OF LEGAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FORM** descriptions often relate to all organizations involved.

For example Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled *Mr Cogito*, established in 2003 by two associations: one for Families - *Mental health* and one for *Psychiatry Development*, to run a hotel and restaurant and to employ mentally disabled people. After two years, a social enterprise *Lab of Mr Cogito* limited is set up. It is planned to support the hotel operation, via organizing room booking and hiring conference rooms in the hostel. Two associations, support the mentally disabled via providing them with accommodation, social care, support for their families. Some other organizational changes follow, the Association for Psychiatry Development starts organizing bookings, where *Lab of Mr Cogito* starts developing new hotel-conference business.

Another example is Association for Mutual Support *Be Together*, established in 1996. It works to support children, the youth, families with different problems, the unemployed and the homeless. They have started a social enterprise in Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development *Be Together* in 2007, where they wanted to find employment for their beneficiaries. The foundation runs Workshops, provides training and education for its employees but also for wider community. The foundation also constituted a centre for local development, which worked as an incubator for three new social cooperatives. Parallely, the Association, provides accommodation for the homeless and they, have an opportunity to earn some wages, by taking part in economic activity of the association. There are many more complex conglomerates like these among 'good examples'. They have been developed to complement one another [*Lab of Mr Cogito* Ltd and Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled from *Cracow*], sometimes the activity is so wide that the venture needs to establish another organization, sometimes existing organization want to have opportunity for business activity to have more independence and flexibility and use income generating strategies like in the case of commercial entrepreneurship, also it can be natural process when participants of Centres for Social Integration (run for socially and economically excluded) start their own social cooperatives [*Secret Garden* Social Cooperative] or when participants of Workshops for the Disabled move to work for Vocational Enterprises for the Disabled and then to work in social cooperatives established by the same association [Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled, Bielsko Biala, Poland].

The **legal and organizational forms** presented are usually chosen as a complementary form for existing organization (this relates to the '**conglomerates' group**), but this however, does not mean that their choices are correct or adequate, as suggested by the representative from Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development *Be together* – belonging to a large conglomerate – who claims they should have started with a smaller form like social cooperative. In case of **social cooperatives**, they have roots in the fascination of cooperative movement [*Social Cooperative Warsaw*], members learned about it during the training for the unemployed and in this way their choice was determined [*Panato* Social Cooperative], members at the very beginning knew they were going to start a social cooperative (especially in case of legal persons cooperatives). In some conglomerates, social cooperative was another complementary form of their activity [*Lutolska* Social Cooperative *Elevator*, *Secret Garden* Social Cooperative].

It also appears that large 'conglomerate' groups are more economically and organizationally **independent**, strong, and taking their experience into consideration, quite efficient in solving social problems addressed and economically sustainable. Another group, social cooperatives, are more **dependent**, not only on founding organizations (like in case of legal persons' social cooperatives) but also on local system supporting social enterprise and social economy development. The following quotes can adequately show the approach of their founders:

"We basically risked. Majority of people were very skeptical about it. But we thought that we would try to make it for a year. If there is money, premises, building, goodwill of the local government, it would be stupid not to try. In worst case, we will

get back to the starting point, but we cannot wait doing nothing” [Glass World Social Cooperative]

There is a lot of pressure from the external environment, especially local administration, as the local industry went bankrupt, leaving a lot of people unemployed. The cooperative is expected to bring more hope and pro-active attitude in local community, particularly among the unemployed. It is interesting to note that the supporting measures and tools, are constructed in a way, that gives a lot of safety for the founders. This generates more relaxed, not very proactive attitude of founders, as reported by the Atlas editor:

“the deciding factor (to start) was an argument that the only thing they need to do, to avoid returning the external grant, is to run it[cooperative] for at least a year. It was something they could agree for” [Glass World Social Cooperative].

There are also some **independent social cooperatives**, where exclusion of the founders was not that evident [Social Cooperative Warsaw; Our Little House Christian Social Cooperative, The land of tales Social Cooperative, Panato Social Cooperative].

In two examples, it is claimed, that the enterprises were one of the first cases of social cooperative or limited non-profit company in Poland. We can see, what diverse experience the founders have had, with public administration institutions:

“They (the clerks from Employment Office distributing funds for the start-up of social cooperatives in Poland) told us, that if we will not make it, no other social cooperative will get money from them. All the time they have told us that we are not entrepreneurs. They have done nothing to teach us about it. I have said ‘OK, but give us an opportunity to try’” [Social Cooperative Warsaw].

It appears that two organizational types of organizations emerge in the analysed practices. One are individual, bottom up ventures, that are initiated by the unemployed, choosing social cooperatives, when the cooperatives are strongly supported financially by different legislative measures and from national or EU public funds. The other group are not the sole, individually working NGOs, that but complex conglomerates, that have directed their activity towards combating social and economic exclusion. They have grown spined off into other organizations, established Vocational Enterprises for Disabled, social cooperatives for legal persons or limited non-profit companies.

6.2 ACTIVITY, ADDITIONAL ACTIVITY

As reported earlier on, social economy ventures presented here, receive some support from local governments, municipalities and get their premises for lease for free, or at reduced rates. It is evidenced, though, that they have to put some substantial effort in the renovation there as these buildings are at the poor state and need refurbishment. There are also other ways, how social enterprises acquire resources. They have been profiled in the ACTIVITY category.

As regards human resources, it is evident that in case of ventures which activity is based on social and work integration of the marginalized groups, these groups constitute human resource base for running the enterprise. There can also be employed on unpaid terms (like prisoners working for *Help for those in need* Foundation, the homeless in Foundation *Bread of Life*, the unemployed in *Grudziądz Caritas Centre*) but usually get habitat or something else in exchange. Of course, social enterprise are also acknowledged to receive support from volunteers. Such cases are evidenced in the Atlas profiles. The atlas examples also show how social ventures have been equipped with machinery or other capital by external organizations or institutions. Association Blue Umbrella got two second-hand cars from Local Police, two ambulances from local hospitals, *Emaus* Social Cooperative machinery from a closed social enterprise. They also use second hand materials, discarded by other users, for their main activity and undertake some kind of upcycling. *Lutolska* Social Cooperative *Elevator* and *Emaus* Social Cooperative run their own shops, where they sell second hand clothes,

and furniture, home equipment. Even volunteers are engaged in collecting waste resources that are used as material for fire lighteners in Vocational Enterprise from Jarosław. Interestingly, the profile shows additional value from waste collection:

„In this way, the association implemented other ways of ecological education in schools, showing that things we usually treat as waste can be recycled later on. The collection of waste is also an element of building relationships between people. In Stare Oleszyce (small town near Jarosław) employees from the Vocational Enterprise are invited for school events, but they also invite school children and teachers in their enterprise” [Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled from Jarosław]

A closer analysis of the scope of activities and additional activities undertaken and run by the ‘good practice’ examples leads to two important conclusions. One thing is that majority of these social ventures undertake a very **diversified activity, pluriactivity**. There are several reasons behind it. First and foremost they aim to keep the enterprise economically sustainable. When one kind of activity is seasonal, the founders make efforts to complement it with another one, to **maintain the employment** at the same level (Vocational Enterprise from Jarosław, Association for Development of Bałtów Municipality).

But it is done like that also, as individuals employed in the enterprise have **different skills and competences**. It is typical for social cooperatives founded by natural persons such as *Panato* Social Cooperative. But also, the marginalized groups, the disabled in particular need to be given choice of training and occupation, therefore in the training workshops or Vocational Enterprises for the Disabled the tasks and activities they make are varied too.

But the pluriactivity is manifested on a higher level of organizational structure of the good examples. They are involved in many **external programs and grants**, that may or may not be directly linked to their core activity. What is more, they often undertake varied activities to **complement and support existing** ones. For example *Blue Umbrella* Association runs a catering service, because it wants to provide adequate food for its patients in the health centre. Also, in *Solidarni Plus* Association decided to run a healthcare unit NZOZ because it was very hard for them to find medical service that was willing to cooperate with the addicts and people with long-term diseases.

The social ventures grow into different directions also as **response to local** opportunities and **resources**. It is evidenced in Bread of Life Foundation, where the profile shows:

„One should try to diagnose local resources (human or material) – it may turn out that the business idea for social venture is very easy” [Bread of Life Foundation]

And this is actually the case, as the Foundation runs farms and activities that are based on local resources and make its activity varied.

The way the examples are presented in the titles of the profiles, indicate, that the reader can expect to learn about good practices of **individual** ventures. This is evident in each case: “Swallow Inn”, “Our house” in Lutol Mokry, “Eco School of Life” in Wandzin, “Mango” in Wąbrzeźno, “Flandria” in Inowrocław, “Grodzki Theatre” in Bielsko Biała, “Blue Umbrella” Health Care Centre in Chojnów, Jurassic Park in Bałtów, “Mr Cogito” in Cracow and more. However, the deconstruction of the profiles, shows, very often **complex, systems of interdependent organizations** linked to the activity of social venture. This is introduced earlier in the paper. One profile shows, what narrative, the representative of one of the foundations thinks:

“(…) smaller forms are better, it is better to take it easy at the beginning. We started a conglomerate straight from the very beginning. When we signed an agreement with local municipality we had no money. It is not how you do these things. If it works – I will say it was worth the effort; but if it does not work, people who said we are crazy, will be right” [Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development Be Together]

The author of the paper would like to make a point that “conglomerate” concept is used for the purpose of this paper, to describe the system of interlinked organizations, however, it is not claimed that these conglomerates are likely to fail. Contrary, the analysed profiles show, that the organizations take advantages of economies of scope. Below, more insights into the background of conglomerates are presented.

The first and foremost reason is the continuation of training and employment of the marginalized groups in the job market. The conglomerates operate because they usually focus their work on the needs and requirements of the marginalized groups. The Occupational Therapy Workshops or Centres for Social Integration prepare the disabled or the marginalized to work for Vocational Enterprises for the Disabled or social cooperatives. The enterprises prepare the disabled to work in social cooperatives. For example Centre for Social Integration from *Poznań*, where *Secret Garden* Social Cooperative was established, runs a number of workshops. Individual workshops led to the start-up of a couple of social cooperatives, and *Secret Garden* was one of them. Another interesting cases are Vocational Enterprises for the Disabled (like *Mango*, *Mr Cogito Hotel*, Enterprise from *Wilcza Góra*, Enterprise from *Jarosław*) who are run by associations. They (associations and enterprises) have the same beneficiaries, and while Enterprises employ the disabled, associations for instance, provide health support, training, therapy for them and their families. The latter also run different programs and projects that promote knowledge about the health issues, the particular disability, aim for the social inclusion of these marginalized groups. Also Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development *Be Together* runs workshops that make partnerships with the social cooperatives, started by the workshop participants.

Social cooperatives are often founded as last element of this chain, either by natural persons, who go through training and preparation or are founded by legal persons, such as Associations or Foundations. Associations run workshops and Vocational Enterprises for the Disabled at the same time and this is what constitutes these conglomerates.

What is happening between the organization is the transfer of the employees, in a smooth and friendly environment for them. Sometimes the beneficiaries are pushed out into the job market, but there are situations when Vocational Enterprises need to work as “storage room” because people have such severe disabilities that they are not able to operate freely in the labour market which is the case in Vocational Enterprise from Cracow, that employs people with schizophrenia. As disabilities are different, sometimes, with guided support they can enter the job market like experienced by the participants of Occupational Therapy Workshops from *Jarosław*.

Similarly, social cooperatives started by legal persons, are founded by associations and foundations. They have longer experience with working with the marginalized groups and take opportunity to help their beneficiaries enter open job market. That is the case for *Emaus* Social Cooperative started by two NGOs that work for the disabled people and run workshops for them. Also *Lutolska* Social Cooperative *Elevator* was started by the Foundation and Association that worked with foster families and their children. The two organizations constituted the cooperative to help the youth get their first jobs and become independent. In the same vein, Artist Association from *Bielsko Biala* started first workshops, later established Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled, to help different marginalized groups reintegrate in social and economic way. Having achieved success, the association created another Vocational Enterprise.

The growth of these systems can be natural consequence of the growth of social venture activity, that needs to spin-off into another organization to reduce costs, to be able to maintain efficiency or become more flexible. For example the Association that started Vocational Enterprise from Cracow (running *Mr Cogito* hotel) also established a limited non-profit company Lab of Mr Cogito Ltd. While The Vocational Enterprise runs the hotel, the *Lab* operated the room and conference room booking. It made the working of the hotel more efficient. In the end, the services provided by the *Lab* was taken over by one of founding the Associations. The *Lab* started catering activity, hiring bikes and initiated running a new hotel-training centre.

The organizations in the conglomerate help one another via internal barter or just as part of support. For example Our House Foundation that started Lutolska Social Cooperative, lends machinery and equipment for them. They also, as reported earlier supplement each other, make orders from one another

Or, as discussed earlier, they want to complement its core activity with other business, that helps them to increase efficiency and respond to social problems in better way as reported in case of Health Care Units, where one supported catering for Health Care Centre, or provided medical service for the beneficiaries of the Foundation.

An interesting example is Flandria that is working as vast conglomerate, consisting of pharmacies, shops in different cities run by the Association. It is a large and profitable business model. But Flandria has created a community of help and support, where its beneficiaries decide to work as volunteers, because they had received a lot of support from the Association in the past.

There are almost no comments on the complexity and structuring of these complex systems. Both, the editor of the Atlas portal and the representatives of the ventures freely move from one type of activity or organization to another. It is not clearly stated what venture constitutes the best example, as many elements are presented and profiled at a time. Cooperation, governance and management is analysed from these different perspectives.

6.3 INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS, MANAGEMENT- utilizing human resources in social enterprise and building 'community spirit'

Human resources turn out to be manifested as the key issue, when internal relationships and management are analyzed. The social economy ventures employ or provide job training for the marginalized groups. This requires **a lot of attention and care** towards them as human resources as the employment function helps to meet social aim of the enterprise. So the marginalized, need to have **a reduced number of working hours, also according to the law regulating the employment of the disabled** [Vocational Enterprise running hotel *Mr Cogito*, *Swallow Inn* Ltd.] and need to be supported by instructors and psychologists [Vocational Enterprise from *Wilcza Góra*]. Also, they require supervision or external mobilization to work:

"Majority of people in the team are (...) mainly with schizophrenia. Each requires individual approach (...) They often have to be mobilized to work and if they cannot focus, easier tasks are assigned to them. When they are at work they do not think about their illness" [Swallow Inn Ltd.]

How much **caring and attention** is required shows what the representative of Vocational Enterprise from *Wilcza Góra* describes:

"The employees (there are 24 disabled people with autism) are taken care of by 10 people from staff: job trainers, majority with psychological and pedagogical background, who make effort to develop motivation, are responsible for their social integration and run individual training, also there are job instructors, who teach different work competences. Apart from them, there are therapists, therapists in music, physiotherapists who run additional classes" [Vocational Enterprise from *Wilcza Góra*].

It is acknowledged that the beneficiaries require **emotional support** too:

"The manager believes that the atmosphere in the enterprise is unique one. But maintain such unique atmosphere, other employees who do not have disabilities, cannot treat their job like ordinary one. Their commitment, being open to listen to the disabled workers, having individual approach to each of them. It is every day when they should create the atmosphere of trust and have time to talk to them, listen

what troubles them and what ideas they have to improve the working of the bowling place [Mango Vocational Enterprise]

In some cases, the employment of the disabled requires workspace, social room committed for rehabilitation. This also shows the **other requirements** while employing some marginalized groups. In their preparation and **entrance** to the open **job market**, the beneficiaries also require **additional support**. Centre for Social Integration that has supported the creation of *Secret Garden Social Cooperative* has worked a lot, to help the unemployed to start and run a social cooperative:

“As part of support for the social cooperative, people from Center for Social Integration taught the cooperative members about entrepreneurship, about getting clients, calculating costs, also they took part in the meetings with clients (at the beginning the cooperative members were afraid to go to a meeting without any supporting person, but after a year they were able to have business talks, find clients”. [Secret Garden Social Cooperative]

But the employment of the marginalized groups, is not only reported as requiring additional, or even special effort on the side of an employer. The representative from *Help for Those in Need Foundation* talks to the editor about his experience :

„After all, when I have this employee, full of enthusiasm, who is aware of the Chance they have been given, then thanks to proper training (...) I can have a grateful person, dedicated to work, engaged and competent We have achieved this aim (...) the fact that they have an opportunity to work is some kind of distinction for them” [Help for Those in Need Foundation]

The employees are the prisoners, who, by law, are required to work. As described, some of them have never worked in their life at all. So marginalized groups are also, though in rare cases, portrayed as particularly **committed to work**.

The ‘good practice’ examples, profiled in the Atlas display the challenges related to the employment of human resources. These are natural outcomes associated with social ventures’ mission, while dealing with work and social integration and require additional effort on the employer side. These challenges are overlooked in the literature on social entrepreneurship and resource mobilization.

The important emerging theme in the category of **internal relations and management** is how people get together to create a social enterprise. It is evident, that among enterprises such as: Vocational Enterprises for Disabled, Occupational Therapy Workshops preparing the disabled to work for the Vocational Enterprises or Associations and Foundations caring for the excluded, the excluded become beneficiaries and clients of these enterprises. Depending on the business model they become more or less involved in the running of the enterprise: become employed on full time basis, on paid or unpaid terms, find home. But they do not hold independence, competence and power to move into the open job market, and if that is the case, they need a lot of support as described in case of *Secret Garden Social Cooperative* or Vocational Enterprise from Cracow running *Mr Cogito* hotel. There is some interesting variation, when these are compared with emergence and working of social cooperatives, especially established by natural persons. For example in case of *Land of Tales Social Cooperative* it is reported:

“The managing board was selected as part of secret voting. The candidates were expected to explain why they want to be board members, what competences they have for this position, why they can be trusted. It was a big challenge because, in most part, they had known one another for only two weeks, and had mutual impressions and expectations only from a few meetings. From seven members, three were chosen. One left (later), because they did not get on well with the cooperative, and more, their financial expectations were higher than the possibilities of the starting venture” [Land of Tales Social Cooperative].

But in the *Land of Tales* it is acknowledged, that conflicts can happen:

“The cooperative should work as democratic community (...) Of course, conflicts can happen – this happens in the Land of Tales – but this does not lead to any strong conflicts or divisions (...). At the very start-up they had a challenge regarding the renovation (that generated conflicts). One can say that the members have managed to work out common rules of cooperation in difficult situations, and before the room with fun and play was opened, ordinary life started (...)”

But there are instances where the cooperative was established by a group of good friends, but this again does not mean lack of challenges:

“the cooperative was started by 5 friends who have strong background in Christian faith (...) but it the tram not everything goes so smoothly, we have people here, who must learn about responsibility, who want to break through (...) there are clashes and difficulties but something great emerges out of that” [Our little house Social Cooperative]

Some different experiences are pictured in case of Warsaw Social cooperative, who give their advice in the relevant category of **ADVICE**:

“If people, who have not worked together, want to start the cooperative, it can be difficult for them. That is why establishing rules for cooperation is so important. It is often marginalized issue among cooperative members. (...) but rules must be clarified up to some kind of exaggeration, collate them in one document and ask everyone to sign them! (...) we did not establish what can and what cannot be done, who does what. We thought it would work somehow, but it didn't. There was a lot of regret later. Especially when money came (into discussion) (...) It is also important to establish rules in case of break-up. Nobody thinks it can happen, but this can happen” [Social Cooperative Warsaw]

In the end, the cooperative members had to use the help of external mediator to sort things out.

Overall, the establishment and emergence of social cooperatives, is more likely a bottom up process, initiated by the founders, sometimes with great support of local environment. In case of conglomerates, these set up their own organizations, and therefore the emergin social ventures become very dependent on their founders. That is the case among social cooperatives of legal persons, Vocational Enterprises for the Disabled, Centres for Social Integration.

But social enterprise is not the place for employment, only, as presented in the profiles of social ventures. The **good atmosphere** in many of them has its origins in the efforts made to make the marginalized feel well, to become members of community. Each type of the marginalized group has its own way towards social inclusion.

“The basics of good operation of the business enterprise, such as Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled (running hotel Mr Cogito) are good internal relationships (what in the case of mentally ill people is not always easy) and good management. The role of management is caring about the atmosphere, people without disabilities should treat their work not as ordinary employment but element of supporting other workmates” [Vocational Enterprise from Cracow]

This atmosphere attracts also **other actors**, who are not meant to be directly involved in the enterprise

“The shop can be run thanks to help of volunteers (...) their reasons were different, the need to help children without home, without family (...) there is a good climate here” [Lutolska Social Cooperative Elevator]

Cooperative members and cooperative itself. are portrayed as communities, using a phrase “collective” throughout the whole profile presentation:

“It is a collective body of people working in different areas under common brand (...) it is a harmonious team, full of ideas and enthusiasm. Without creative energy and intense work, it would be difficult to imagine the success of the brand of the cooperative” [Panato Social Cooperative].

Social cooperatives experience this in practice, this cooperative strength is again characteristic for social cooperatives established by natural persons:

„In Secret Garden, there are very good relationships of a community like nature. Everyone knows that if one person did not come to work for some reason, they would have to substitute for him/her. The cooperative members help each other and their families: when one of the founders had some personal problems and had to leave the cooperative, the team decided they would employ his wife to help his family in this way” [Secret Garden Social Cooperative]

Also other employees, who are not in the group of the marginalized, experience good internal relationships:

“The employees, speaking of their relationships, compare them to a family, Many people have been employed here for 11 years, what helps in building closer relationships. Different charity events or annual Christmas eve dinner help in this integration. This adds to treating the association not only as a place where one works, but also as a common enterprise, where one needs to be more intensely engaged in case of need” [Association Blue Umbrella]

In similar vein, the workers without disabilities comment:

“The money for the job is not so important. There is a very low job rotation and it happens that people who leave, come back. Ula prefers to work with people with disabilities who while having a job – do not think about disability” [Swallow Inn Ltd]

But community experience can be seen and is emphasized not only in cooperatives. In social economy ventures, the marginalized groups are re-introduced for into work and community life for the purpose of their social and economic integration. As some challenges can be encountered, there are clear methods and ways how this can be achieved. In Wandzin, where Solidarni Plus Association runs its „ECO School of Life” it is stated:

“(...) there is a therapeutic, reintegration system that has been implemented by the Staff of the whole centre. The main element of this system are therapeutic groups where members perform particular tasks in the farm. Each group chooses its own leader, and each person has a post that is responsible for. Each day is planned and full of therapeutic activities. The inhabitants of the centre constitute „therapeutic community”. Every day, they summarise a previous day, settle conflicts, report on their work. There are strict regulations” [Solidarni Plus Association]

The community, family spirit, means and leads to high engagement among social cooperative members, also beneficiaries of the social enterprises. They may require special, dedicated attention and care but they can be more mobilized to work than employees of business enterprises. The analysis of the good practice examples from Social Economy Atlas shows, where they support the enterprise in other ways, ways that would not be expected in case of disadvantaged group:

„The employees identify themselves with the enterprise, worry about its difficulties, celebrate its successes. In difficult moments (...) they gave loans to the enterprise, they offered to reduce the amount of their work to reduce the costs, when there was less work to do. (...) they are a great capital to this company” [Swallow Inn Ltd]

Although it is not surprising when the cooperative members, engage their own private assets to sustain the running of the cooperative (even if it is not required by law), it shows, that sometimes the

engagement of the beneficiaries and employees at the same time, may go beyond any requirements, when there is a good community in the organization and around the organization.

Also the family, friends and neighbors get engaged for the purpose of the enterprise:

“The cooperation with local environment turns out to be helpful in critical situations. Margaret recalls, when all bedclothes were destroyed in the laundry. She herself and her employees, in emergency, had to collect bedclothes from neighbours and friends. People did not refuse to help them. This kind of support is possible, because the organization has achieved a very good image in the local environment” [Association Blue Umbrella]

Or like in previously reported *Swallow Inn Ltd.*, where in case of higher orders, the enterprise invites friends, for example family members. So the internal community experience is manifested in the community feeling and experience in the local environment.

The positive image and good community relationships attract other actors to become involved in the enterprise. It starts from the job the venture does for its beneficiaries or clients. Jadwiga, who works as a volunteer for *Flandria* Association says:

“When my husband was very ill, the volunteers from Flandria helped me to look after my husband every single day, also a nurse was dedicated to do it. When he died, I wanted to give it back what has been done to me, and I have become a volunteer. (...) in 2009 I set up a Senior Club (...) as volunteers we look after the elderly people in their homes, but we also look after young, disabled people” [Association for Mutual Support Flandria]

The support of volunteers for social enterprise is widely acclaimed. Our analysis of profiles provides insight into one case, where the work of volunteer is reported not only as a support but as additional challenge to the employee, as presented below:

“I have an employee who actually ... is not an employee. It is very difficult – how can I put any demands on him/her? It is awkward for me, to say to a man, aged between 50-70, who comes to work here for social purpose, that he or she works badly. I constantly keep it in mind (...) one has to rather watch, accompany a volunteer rather than intervene. (...) Sometimes it is better not to notice some things, move on, wait. (...) some people are not able to work in groups, that is why a clear division of tasks is needed. As a result, there are no situations, that someone's tasks are performed by somebody else, and the other person may feel redundant” [Lutolska Social Cooperative Elevator]

So, as seen, more effort may be required to engage a volunteer rather than an employee on regular basis.

At times, beneficiaries or clients of social enterprise can be involved in its operation. It is another way of acquiring the scarce resources but also it works as means to social and economic reintegration of marginalized groups.

„In the farm, there are women employed (...) but in harder tasks men are involved – these are the inhabitants of the house for homeless in Zochcin. They work for free and their work is treated as a contribution to running the house (...) some time ago, this solution led to some conflicts as men complained that they do not get money for their work as opposed to women who do (...) The work on the farm is supervised by an employed, competent farmer” [Bread of Life Foundation]

Again, this work as insight of how “free resources” may generate challenge and require additional effort on the side of the employer.

Internal relationships and social venture management profiled in the good examples exemplify the existence of communities within and outside the enterprises. These communities slowly perspire to change, sometimes hostile or indifferent, attitudes of local perceptions of the disadvantaged or marginalized groups.

6.4 COOPERATION WITH LOCAL ENVIRONMENT - taking and giving back - from local communities to partnerships

Among the practices, a good **cooperation with local environment** is evidenced and profiled, especially with reference to **local government authorities**, as this is the **key actor** mentioned by the respondents and referred to by the editors of the portal. It is common that social enterprises hire their premises on **reduced fees** or for free, as a **commodate**, from them [Swallow Inn, Panato Social Cooperative, Mango Vocational Enterprise, Vocational Enterprise Jarosław, Association Be Together, Vocational Enterprise running Mr Cogito, Vocational Enterprise from Bielsko Biala]. In fact in most of these cases, this is the **first and foremost information about** cooperation with local environment in the profiles of these examples. For instance, Swallow Inn Ltd. is portrayed in this section:

„Swallow Inn has good relationships with local municipality, they have already received a substantial support at the start-up, by signing the beneficial contract for hiring the premises”.

The profile of Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled from Jarosław, in the category of cooperation with local environment starts in exactly the same way:

“The association from Jaroslaw has very good relationships with local government: Vocational Enterprise is situated in the former outpatient clinic and is leased for free to them by local government (contract for 10 years until 2018)”.

At times, the local government contributes to renovation of these premises, together with other groups such as volunteers, friends, businesses. In case of Foundation of Social Entrepreneurship Development Be Together this cooperation is named as an **‘ideal’** one:

“Activity of The Foundation and Association is a model example of partnership collaboration between local government, NGOs, entrepreneurs and public institutions supporting employment in the labor market. This friendliness is very valuable. All the buildings that they use have been received for free use from the municipality. The municipality has participated in their renovation”.

However, as in many of these cases the estates require **general renovation** and a lot of effort is needed to make them usable. So it does not seem that the local governments or municipalities invest or dedicate any special resources to help social enterprises.

But there is one case, where it is reported that the municipality is unwilling to support social enterprises in this and other dimensions:

“The founders of Emma (name of the hostel), while looking for premises, wanted to collaborate with municipality. Unfortunately, the municipality of Warsaw did not consider the lease of its own buildings, even for social enterprises. Also cooperation with Local Office for Employment finished after two months of hostel start-up, although the Social Cooperative Warsaw was meant to serve as an example for other beneficiaries who would be interested in starting their own cooperative”
[Social Cooperative Warsaw].

In general, cooperation with local environment is constructed and interpreted as cooperation with municipality or local government. Representatives of the social ventures recall being supported when the local governments invest in **local roads** so that their enterprises were accessible to the general public [Swallow Inn Ltd., Vocational Enterprise Wilcza Góra]. At the same time other **local actors take**

advantage from the new infrastructure. Social ventures also take advantage from different partnerships, made with local and regional government agencies or local governments. They undertake common projects that either finance their start-up or their operation. This works as significant resource base for them. The author summarizes this area of cooperation in further parts of the paper.

It is also reported that social ventures profiled in the Atlas receive support from other local actors, stakeholders. High **school youth** were involved as volunteers in the renovation of the building where *The Land of Tales* Social cooperative started. Also, in other case, children are reported to collect waste used for manufacturing of fire lightener in Vocational Enterprise from *Jarosław*. Across all good practices, there is **only one** that mentions that **local business** supported them, it was in the renovation of the premises of the enterprise [*Land of Tales* Social Cooperative]. **There is scarce evidence that and how other NGOS or social enterprises or associations for third sector organizations or social enterprises contribute to their existence.** It is rather barter exchange, mutual exchange contracts but rather takes place within the conglomerates, not beyond.

It is also important to mention other activities presented in the category of **COOPERATION WITH LOCAL ENVIRONMENT** as far as Bread of Life is concerned: *“Stipend fund dedicated to children and youth from the area is a very important activity for the local community”*.

When profiled in this category, *Bread of Life* Foundation is reported:

“The activity of the Foundation and its individual workshops are very much embedded in local community. The workshops help to reduce unemployment in the municipality. Many people who gain vocational experience there, find jobs in the open labor market, and in some cases they start their own business (...)”

So these are areas where cooperation with local environment is approached in terms of what and how the local environment can be supported, by the organization that is already responding to social problems. Some social ventures construct doing something for their local community as key pillar of their cooperation with local environment. It is about giving, not taking, for them. It is more evident among social cooperatives. In *Panato* Social Cooperative:

„Panato employees emphasize that acting and activating local community is an essential element for them.(...) they have deliberately chosen a degraded housing district, with challenging social relationships as location for their office (...) PANATO entered the community with weak neighborhood links (...) with individual interests at stake (...) their project became successful, as the people started talking to one another, the inhabitants were invited to work together”

In terms of cooperation with local environment, it is giving, that matters, and also in case of *Muszynianka* workers' cooperative the presentation of this category basically covers:

„The very name of the organization – cooperative – underlines the strong links the cooperative has with place where it operates. The duties towards local environment are reflected in the president's words: this is the mission of the cooperative, that we earn and we can share in different situations. Już sama nazwa spółdzielni podkreśla jej silny związek z miejscem, w którym funkcjonuje (...) The enterprise very strongly identifies itself with the region” [Muszynianka workers' cooperative]

The profile presents how much and where *Muszynianka* donates and sponsors different events and groups to significant extent, by giving around one hundred Euros for charity purpose, sponsoring the purchase of ambulance. This cooperation is also meant to serve for the purpose of social enterprise achievement:

“From the very beginning, the founders of the centre cared about good relationships with local environment, they did not want to create an enclave, that operates far away from the problems of the neighbouring area although the location and the type of activity (working with the people with HIV, different addictions) was not conducive (...) The leaders have put great deal of effort with local institutions and pay a lot of attention to this activity: together with Police they give training about addictions, plant trees with school children, employ local inhabitants to work for their centre (...) as of 1996 the centre runs free holiday camps for children from families with problems” [Solidarni Plus Association]

Only few other social venture example, get involved in cooperation with local environment by giving more to the community. It is important to emphasize, that cooperation with local environment is portrayed as receiving support from local community, from local municipalities in particular, but some examples interpret their cooperation in terms of contributing more and more to the society, more than just their core activity, while displaying socially responsible behaviours.

As regards cooperation with local environment, there is vast information about different public institutions and bodies that have supported these social enterprises in various dimensions. They provide them with financial support either for a start-up or for operation.

Also social ventures are reported to receive external funding for employment of disabled from PFRON or other marginalized groups from local or regional governments. Some receive external donations as part of their statutory activity from local municipalities, but also via realization of different projects financed by public: state and EU funds, as part of different programmes and projects. In most cases the social ventures run projects are realized in partnership with local public actors and NGOs to meet the needs of the marginalized groups – not only provide job places, but also assure training, develop their skills, work on their social inclusion in all possible ways.

Local public actors also support the social ventures with required advice in administrative and organizational tasks, in all sorts of activities (recruitment for the job, assuring safety and wellbeing for the homeless and the addicts who have been placed in new communities). The respondents are acknowledging a lot of kindness and support on the side of representatives of these public institutions and local governments and their representatives.

6.5 ADVICE, CONCLUSIONS - ‘need to rely on others’

The author has also explored the content of advice and conclusions given by the representatives of the social economy ventures as reported by the interviewers. They stem from the challenges the social economy ventures have faced.

One of the speakers involved in the Centre for Social Integration that supported the start-up of *Secret Garden Social Cooperative* suggests:

“I am warning against working on your own, our Centre was built as a part of local partnership, then it is much easier to secure sources of funding straight from the beginning”.

In similar vein, the case of *The land of tales Social Cooperative* is reported:

“What was basic, especially at the early stages of start-up, was cooperation with variety of local institutions and enterprises. The people working for them were supportive via providing informal support, even in such things like looking for premises, also advice from Health and Safety offices, help (students from vocational schools) and finally funding (business)”.

Similarly, *Blue Umbrella Health Care Unit* venture provides following guidelines

„It would not have worked, if there hadn't been any support, even in everyday, little matters from friends and supportive people from local government and health and safety regulations office”.

The support on various levels of these partnership is verbalized, as it is finally the people in the institutions who support them. But building relationships does not only refer to working with local institutions and organizations. It is also about good relationships with local communities:

„(...) It is the idea [the idea of social economy venture where excluded people live in the neighborhood] that the Association has put a lot of emphasis from the very beginning. Not only acquiring financial resources, although they had to knock at the entrepreneurs' door (...) they also cared about good terms with neighbours, in places where communities were created [houses where the homeless people were settling]. They walked from house to house, made personal contacts, invited to all events organized by communities (...) Neighbours started visiting them and could see that actually normal people live there”

as referred in case of Association for Mutual Support *Be Together*.

The partnership making and building is strong and emerging theme across other examples and in other sections of profiles, where different fields of activity of these ventures are presented and when COOPERATION WITH LOCAL ENVIRONMENT is presented, where the ventures gain access to resources at reduced fees, for free, or any special terms; it is also commented with reference to finding clients, acquiring external funding:

“To be successful in this kind of venture, one needs strong collaboration between NGOs and local government. Grudziądz Caritas Centre works with Association for Catholic Families and Food Bank in Grudziądz, but according to Marek (director), there are many organizations in the local area which cope with organizational and financial problems, that it why it is difficult for them to establish partnerships” [Grudziądz Caritas Centre]

But on the level of the enterprise it is the **team effort** and **social capital** that matters. This is particularly featured among social cooperatives.

“One needs a team that is not afraid to work. That does the job, while moving towards the aim, not looking at number of hours worked or the level of salary. One can talk, one can back out, but the decision must be made. A cooperative is an enterprise, where there needs to be someone responsible, it must be well managed. In the atmosphere of trust, the team can get through the worst storms” [Our little house Social Cooperative]

Similarly, Maria from Muszynianka workers'cooperative is reported to believe that:

„cooperative can work successfully today but it may not do so well in terms of competition, as it does not have the financial backing. It is hard to start from zero and achieve something, but a group of enthusiasts with a good idea can do it”

Also this is evident in Panato case:

“One needs to be determined, to want to run own business, not to claim things, and to focus on hard work (...) we invest a lot of time in communication (...). Thanks to that, we know what are the strengths and weaknesses of team members, who will be reliable”[Panato Social Cooperative]

The *Land of Tales* Social Cooperative example, shows that the members need to treat the cooperative as a common business and engage more if it requires additional, extra work.

Among advice, it is reported, that some effort need to be made before the establishment of the

venture. Paweł, from *Lutolska Social Cooperative* gives advice about preparation in local community:

“to start social economy venture, one needs to (...) do some work for integration, some social work and to show the aim of the new social venture. Before business is started, local conflicts need to be stopped. If work integration starts without preparing the local environment, conflicts in the community will begin to pile up” [*Lutolska Social Cooperative Elevator*]

Although social ventures create local communities of support, they also need to make effort to be accepted and welcomed by the environment, especially in case where they have no previous operational history.

7. ABOUT GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES – THE PORTAL AND RESPONDENTS

While speaking about their ventures, respondents think about ‘**good practice**’ in diverse dimensions. Some take only **social dimension** into consideration

“Combining work for the elderly together with work and social activation of the prisoners, this is our biggest success. We treat it as good practice that we are trying to promote”. [*Help for those in need Foundation*]

Others propose **economic dimension** as element for good practice, and in fact they do claim to **not be called** as ‘good practice’ at all:

“I think we are not an example of ‘good practice’. You must be ‘not all there’ to start this activity in this way. I do not know people who would risk their own private asset, collateral for 10 mln. PLN (2,5 thousand Euro). If we had failed, three people from the management board would have stayed with nothing. I do not think we need to risk so much. Social cooperatives are better idea. And we, we started such conglomerate at the very beginning, smaller forms are better, it is better to start slowly”[*Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development Be together*]

There is also one more case, where managing director of the association suggests that they might be an example to follow:

“It seems to me, that we have worked out a model for operation, that is very useful in running an activity like ours” [*Association for Mutual Support Flandria*]

but this relates to the particular type of activity which is provision of health care services, linked with running pharmacies, medical equipment shops, all run by one association *Flandria*.

As suggested by the project coordinator, and seeing scarce reference of the social venture representatives the issue of ‘good practice’, they have claimed not to be even aware that they constitute a social enterprise or belong to social economy. They rarely comment and describe themselves as ‘good practice’.

7. Conclusions

The content analysis of the profiles of ‘good practices’ of social economy, provides some interesting insights into how social ventures have been portrayed in the public, Internet domain, for the purpose of promoting social economy and social entrepreneurship. The profiles scarcely acknowledge the role of social capital and social networks of the people involved in the founding and running of the social enterprise. However, the role of partnerships and linkages with public institutions, governmental agencies are emphasized, and it can be assumed that these play significant role not only in access to financial resources as reported in profiles. They might contribute to legitimacy building in local environment.

Another insight is that two types of organizational forms of social enterprises can be distinguished, and they significantly differ in terms of resource access and mobilization. One are small

organizations, rather independent, created by the socially and economically excluded group who are the unemployed. These are social cooperatives started by natural persons, formed on the bottom-up basis. They create and learn the community life and slowly become embedded in local contexts. The other group are 'conglomerates'. Here, the founding organizations such as foundations or associations, establish Vocational enterprises for the Disabled, Occupational Therapy Workshops, social cooperatives for legal persons. They work as interdependent networks of organizations that usually serve the same target groups, endangered by social or economic exclusion, but at much deeper level: the disabled, the homeless, the addicts.

The type of organization seem to determine resourcing and resource access. 'Conglomerates' are very experienced in their operation in Third Sector, and since the introduction of programmes implementing Social Economy projects in Poland, have become very skilled in acquiring external grants from Polish and EU public funds. They are also very well linked to local environments, have variety of partnerships with different institutions and organizations and capitalize on them. They have been incrementally building the legitimacy in their surroundings. Smaller organizations have been very much dependent on external funding, and their human resource structures may be fragile, depending on the strength of ties between founding members. But overall, very little involvement in cooperation with external organizations from Third Sector is profiled.

There is some interesting evidence on the resource acquisition and usage. Majority of the 'good practices' emphasize being given buildings and other immovable, for lease at reduced rates or for free, from local municipalities. This is clearly presented in the profiles. As for other resources some of them make deliberate efforts to employ discarded resources, some acquire them, thanks to the embeddedness in local communities. Also, there is, but limited, evidence and presentation of the involvement of volunteers in the

In this work, the author hopes to provide some valuable insights into the social enterprise landscape in Poland. Any critical comments are welcome.

References

1. Aldrich, H., and Auster, E. R. (1986) Even dwarfs started small: Liabilities of age and size and their strategic implications. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 8, 165-198
2. Austin J. Stevenson, H. and Wei-Skillern, J. (2006) Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different or both? *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 30(1), 1–22
3. Brush, C. G., Greene, P. G., Hart, M. M., and Haller, H. S. (2001) From Initial Idea to Unique Advantage: The Entrepreneurial Challenge of Constructing a Resource Base [and Executive Commentary]. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(1), 64-80.
4. Ciepielewska-Kowalik, A., Pielński, B., Starnawska, M. and Szymańska, A. (2015) Looking for Social Enterprise Models in Poland: Institutional and Historical Context. *ICSEM Working Papers*, No. 2015-11, Liege: The International Comparative Social Enterprise Models (ICSEM) Project.
5. Dudzik K., Kucharski T. (2006) Przedsiębiorstwa społeczne. Dobre Praktyki w: J.Hausner (ed.) *Przedsiębiorstwa społeczne w Polsce. Teoria i praktyka*, Kraków: Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Krakowie i Małopolska Szkoła Administracji Publicznej, 35-74
6. Freeman J, Carroll G.R. and Hannan M.T (1983) The Liability of Newness: Age Dependence in Organizational Death Rates. *American Sociological Review* 48(5), 692-710
7. Herbst, J. (2008) Polski Trzeci Sektor w Świetle Teorii przedsiębiorstwa Społecznego In: *Od trzeciego sektora do przedsiębiorczości społecznej – wyniki badań ekonomii społecznej w Polsce*, Warsaw: Stowarzyszenie Klon/Jawor, 124-42
8. Karwińska A., Wiktor D. (2008) Przedsiębiorczość i korzyści społeczne: identyfikacja dobrych praktyk w ekonomii społecznej, *Ekonomia Społeczna* teksty 6, 1-52
9. Leadbeater Ch. (1997) *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*, Demos, London.

10. Martens, M. L., Jennings, J. E., and Jennings, P. D. (2007) Do the stories they tell get them the money they need? The role of entrepreneurial narratives in resource acquisition. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1107-1132.
11. Newbert, S. L. (2008) Value, rareness, competitive advantage, and performance: a conceptual-level empirical investigation of the resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(7), 745-768.
12. Penrose, E. T. (1959) *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
13. Pfeffer, J. S. and Salancik, G. R. (1978) *The external control of organizations: a resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
14. Scott, W. R. (1998) *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
15. Shane S., Cable D. (2002) Network Ties, Reputation, and the Financing of New Ventures, *Journal of Management Science* 48(3), 364-381
16. Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations* (Vol. 44, pp. 142-193). Chicago: Rand McNally
17. Suchman, M. C. (1995) Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review* 30(3), 571-610.
18. Venkataraman, S. (1997) The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research. In J. Katz (Ed.), *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth* (Vol. 3, 119-138). Greenwich: JAI Press.
19. Zott Ch. and Huy Q.N (2007) How Entrepreneurs Use Symbolic Management to Acquire Resources *Administrative Science Quarterly* 52(1), 70-105

APPENDIX

Table Detailed profile data for Social Economy organizations selected for good practice examples in the Social Economy portal

	Name, set-up date, location	Aim/mission	Title of the presentation on the <i>Atlas of 'good practices' of social economy</i>
1.	Association for Development of Bałtów Municipality <i>Bałt</i> (running business activity, public benefit organization), (2001) - <i>Delta</i> Association–(running business activity) (2003) - <i>Allozaur</i> (limited company, nonprofit) (2006) set up by <i>Delta JURRASIC PARK</i> Bałtów, Poland	The economic and tourist development of the Municipality. Increase in number of job places, development of local entrepreneurship and tourist and gastronomy infrastructure Integration and increase in activity of inhabitants.	„Dinosaurs support Bałtów”
2.	<i>Bielskie Artist Association</i> (1999) established: - <i>Grodzki Theatre</i> - Workshops for the disabled ¹⁹ (Occupational Therapy Workshops) (2004) - Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled, (running business activity), (2004) Bielsko Biala, Poland	Social and professional/vocational activation among the disabled.	“ <i>Grodzki Theatre</i> - to overcome disability “
3.	Low Silesia Association <i>Blue Umbrella</i> , public benefit organization, running business activity, (2001), <i>Blue Umbrella – Health Care Unit</i> ²⁰ (Niepubliczny Zakład Opieki Zdrowotnej –NZOZ) run by the Association LOWER SILESIA CARE AND HEALTH CENTRE Chojnów, Poland	Improvement of personal activity and life independence among the disabled; helping families in their care of the ill family members, improvement of health care quality for long term ill people and the disabled, prevention of disability related illnesses	“ <i>Blue umbrella</i> – better life for the healthy and the ill”
4.	Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship Development <i>Be together</i> (running business activity, public benefit organization), (2007) Set by the Association for Mutual Support <i>Be together</i> (1996) Cieszyn, Poland	Social and vocational activation among the people endangered by exclusion and marginalization – the unemployed, the disabled, the homeless	“Social Entrepreneurship – how do you do it in Cieszyn”
5	Association for Mutual Support <i>Be Together</i>, (1996) (please see above) Cieszyn, Poland	Social and vocational activation among the homeless and long term unemployed	“Social Entrepreneurship – how do you do it in Cieszyn”
6	<i>Grudziądz Caritas Centre</i> – church	Support and vocational and	“ <i>Grudziądz Caritas Centre</i> ”

¹⁹ Workshops for the disabled, developing their everyday skills, social and vocational skills

²⁰ Health Care Provision unit provides healthcare day services for patients, it is not a separate legal form, but is a part of the establishing organization. It works as an intermediary for public healthcare provision in Poland. It needs to win contracts from National Health Service to provide services for the patients as part of their health insurance

	organization, (running business activity) (1998), -Healthcare unit (NZOZ) Grudziądz, Poland	vocational activation among the requiring groups (the unemployed)	–help – in what way?”
7	Association for Mutual Support <i>Flandria</i> , (running business activity) (1997) -Healthcare unit (NZOZ) run by Foundation for Mutual Support Inowrocław, Poland	Healthcare for association members, improving access to medical service, healthcare and care services availability	„Plaster for Healthcare – <i>Flandria</i> Association”
8	Bread of Life Foundation , public benefit organization, (2003) roots in: -religious community <i>Bread of Life</i> (1990) following idea from France (1976) Jankowice, Poland	Social and vocational reintegration for the groups endangered by social exclusion; manufacturing high quality furniture and textiles, manufacturing grocery and farmers' products	“The factory of Faith in People”
9	Polish Unit of Association for People with Mental Disabilities (before 2010) establish: -Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled (2010) -Workshops for the disabled Jarosław, Poland	Creation of job places for people with different disabilities	“Jarosław – franchising for fire lightening”
10	Association for Families <i>Mental Health</i> and Association for Psychiatry Development, both established (2000) -Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled – small hotel <i>Mr Cogito</i> , (2003) - <i>The Lab of Mr Cogito</i> , Limited company, non-profit (2005) Cracow, Poland	Social and vocational activation for the mentally ill people through work activity	„Recover with <i>Mr Cogito</i> ”
11	Glass world Social Cooperative , (natural persons cooperative) (2009) Krośnice, Poland	Creation of workplaces for the people endangered with long term unemployment, giving the people opportunity to work in their profession without changing qualifications	„Glass Houses in Krośnice”
12	The land of tales Social Cooperative (natural persons cooperative) (2010) Leżajsk, Poland	Securing daycare for children not attending kindergarten and giving them opportunity to acquire basic social skills . Giving parents from the local area better opportunities for work-life balance	„ <i>The land of tales</i> – Fun for children, comfort for parents”
13	Emaus Social Cooperative , (legal persons cooperative) (2010) established by - <i>Lublin Emaus</i> Association (1995) and <i>Among us</i> Foundation (1989) also -shop (1995) -Occupational Therapy Workshops (1989) Lublin, Poland	Social and vocational integration and help to the people endangered by social exclusion, through life in a commune and working together	“Help oneself – <i>Emaus</i> Commune in Krężnica Jara”
14	-Lutolska Social Cooperative Elevator (legal persons	Support for Foster Care children in gaining independence through	“Lutol way to work and independence”

	cooperative), (2010) set by <i>Our house</i> Foundation (1990) and Association for Foster Care (year unknown) -Shop established by the Foundation (2005) set by <i>Our house</i> Foundation (1990) Lutol Mokry, Poland	work	
15	<i>Muszynianka</i> (workers' cooperative, (1951) (in 1975 started mineral water production) Krynica Zdrój, Poland	Keeping the workers' cooperative economically stable, efficient, securing employment for local citizens	na
16	Secret Garden Social Cooperative , (natural persons cooperative) (2007) initiated by <i>Etap</i> Association (2008) and social integration centre <i>Piątkowo</i> (2006) Also Centre for Social Integration Poznań, Poland	Work activation for inhabitants from large blocks of flats, who were not able to pay the rent because of their long term unemployment, low wages, or difficult personal situation	"Green blocks of flats – <i>Secret Garden</i> Social Cooperative"
17	Swallow Inn Ltd. (nonprofit) (2007) established by <i>Mutual Help</i> Association, (1994) Radom, Poland	Business activity for achieving social aims such as employment and rehabilitation in social and vocational dimension among mentally ill people Shaping attitudes towards mentally ill people.	"First Swallow, and makes a summer"
18	Tyczyn (telephone cooperative), (1991) Tyczyn, Poland	Securing common landline phone communication services in rural and other excluded areas	"How did it work with Communal Optical Fibre Subcarpatian Model of Cooperative"
19	<i>Solidarni Plus</i> Association, (1992) and Healthcare Unit NZOZ (1996) Both constitute a centre for their beneficiaries: ECO SCHOOL OF LIFE Wandzin, Poland	Social adaptation of the people with addiction, HIV infected, AIDS ill, the homeless, the unemployed through work, therapy and training	"Learn to Live again in Wandzin"
20	Our little house Social Cooperative, (natural persons cooperative) (2011) Warsaw, Poland	Securing children with best environment for development	na
21	<i>Help for those in need</i> Foundation, (public benefit organization), (2002) -Healthcare Unit, NZOZ - two care centres Warsaw, Poland	Supporting people endangered by social exclusion, the elderly, the lonely, the ill, the prisoners	"Warsaw. Care Centers run by Foundation <i>Help for Those in Need</i> "
22	Social Cooperative Warsaw , (natural persons cooperative) (2011) running <i>Emma</i> hostel Warsaw, Poland	Vocational Activation of the unemployed, promoting business activity in Social Cooperative form, promoting ecological lifestyle, promoting fairtrade and ecological tourism	"Ecological cooperative members"
23	<i>Wąbrzeskie Association Helping Children with Special Care Requirements</i> , (1995) established business activity as: -Mango Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled , bowling place, (2007) -Workshop for the disabled (WTZ) Wąbrzeźno, Poland	Providing opportunities for work and rehabilitation for the disabled	"Disability and bowling"
24	<i>Synapsis</i> Foundation, 1989 Established business activity as:	Social and vocational activation for adults with autism	" <i>Synapsis</i> : artists with autism"

	-Vocational Enterprise for the Disabled, (2008) Wilcza Góra, Poland		
25	Panato Social Cooperative, (natural persons cooperative) (2012) Wrocław, Poland	Social enterprise combining creative industries with business, for the local development, artist movement, ecological manufacturing.	"Multiple activity <i>Panato</i> Social Cooperative - harmonious and creative team"

work in progress