

CALL FOR PAPERS
MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL

**Between Tradition and Change: The Social Economy in Europe since the 2008 Economic
Crisis**

Co-Editors

Didier Chabanet – IDRAC Business School (France)

Simone Baglioni – Glasgow Caledonian University (Scotland)

Frédéric Royall – University of Limerick (Ireland)

Political and economic decision-makers of the European Union (EU) member-states have regularly sought to promote the social economy, especially since the 2008 economic crisis (Monzón Campos and Chaves, 2012; Zikou, Gatzioufa and Sarri, 2012; Bouchard and Rousselière, 2010). Some EU countries have even proposed framework legislation in this area, such as in the case of Spain in 2011 (Cadic, 2013), of Greece in 2011 (Cadic, 2014) or of France in 2014 (Chabanet, 2016). In Belgium, legislation on the social economy was adopted in three regions in 2012 (Chorum, 2014). Although not officially enacted into law, various initiatives undertaken by national and regional public authorities as well as by civil society actors or by social ‘entrepreneurs’ indicate the increasing interest given to themes related to the ‘social economy’, to the ‘solidarity-based economy’ or to ‘social entrepreneurship’ – the terms vary from country to country¹ (Stokkink and Perard, 2016; Perard, 2015; Defourny and Nyssens, 2010).

International organisations, and notably the EU as such, have also sought to promote the social economy (Pezzini and Pflüger, 2013). In 2011 for instance, the European Commission

¹ The term ‘social economy’ will be used below even if we accept that other terms are used more commonly in many countries.

launched its ‘Social Business Initiative’,² organised around three main objectives: to promote social enterprises, to facilitate their access to finance, and to improve their regulatory framework (Rosenblatt, 2013). Equally important, the social economy is now considered to be a mainstay of the ‘Europe 2020’ initiative whose objective is to ensure full employment, to promote economic growth, and to work towards a sustainable and inclusive economy. Developments in Europe are similar to what is taking place in other parts of the world. The United Nations, for example, recently indicated that the social economy was of vital importance as a means by which to ensure sustainable economic development (Masquelin, 2014). A G8 Task Force was also established in June 2013 with a view to focusing on the social impact of investments. It would appear therefore that in the EU as well as further afield, a pattern seems to be emerging in support of the social economy.

Despite the fact that EU countries are nowadays very well inter-connected in terms of their social, economic and political priorities,, the social economy of one country may well be quite different to that of its neighbour. This is because all countries have specific historical, economic, political and/or institutional characteristics (Laville, Young and Eynaud, 2015). In one country, the social economy could be regulated by specific judicial frameworks, whereas in another the social economy and even its statutes may be ill-defined, non-existent or be a matter of controversy. For example, in some countries such as France, a good portion of the country’s wealth depends on the social economy and the social economy employs a considerable number of people, whereas in other countries it is only of minor interest and impact, as in the case of most East European countries (Ramadani and Schneider, 2013; Nikula and Tchalakov, 2013).

In a few short years and despite contrasting experiences, the social economy has become a key area of priority for a number of European countries and, to a lesser extent, for the EU. It goes without saying that the scale of the 2008 economic crisis has obliged national and EU authorities to focus attention on the social economy as a means by which to create (or to save jobs), especially for marginalised and vulnerable groups (Demoustier and Colletis, 2012). But job-creation is not the social economy’s only and main objective. In most countries the social economy also seeks to promote a wide range of initiatives such as facilitating viable economic development, fighting

² http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publications/docs/sbi-brochure/sbi-brochure-web_fr.pdf

against discriminations, promoting the inclusion of people with disabilities, or playing a key role in sectors such as culture, education, or even health (Osborne, 2014).

The objective of this special issue of *Management International* is to understand better the social economy's role in the various EU countries and, more specifically, to understand the nature and the importance of the changes at play in the social economy since the 2008 economic crisis. From a theoretical point of view, the social sciences offer a range of approaches that enable us to identify these changes and to characterise their relevance. In our view, the neo-institutionalist approach seems to be particularly apt since it focuses on the ways that institutions – and notably public authorities – structure key issues and influence the constraints and the resources that relevant actors have at their disposal (March and Olsen, 1989; Hall, 1993; Hall, 1997). For instance, in a well-known comparative study of the French and British political economies, Peter Hall (1986) distinguished three hierarchically-set levels of change. He argues that public policy is always set according to specific objectives and instruments. A first level of change relates to the ways that prior instruments are used. A second and more important level of change deals with the setting up of new instruments without undermining basic principles. The third and most important level of change deals with action paradigms, that is to say with public policies' very principles, logic, and objectives. When applied to the issue of the social economy, Hall's framework of analysis is obviously very useful but other frameworks may also be possible and quite relevant, in particular if close attention is paid to the subtle changes that may have major impacts, such as changes in the structure of the network of actors who are involved in a particular issue (Fontaine and Hassenteufel, 2002).

Change is important but it should not be over-estimated. A significant body of literature has shown how and why public policies are bound by historical and institutional continuity. Such continuity often brings about stability and even inertia rather than major and/or rapid change (Pierson, 1993; Pierson, 2000). The notion of *path dependency* thus accounts for the slow and long processes that mitigate, hinder and, in certain cases, resist change.

Contributors are asked therefore to refer to specific analytical frameworks so as to make objective assessments of the dynamics of change in the social economy that may have taken place

since 2008. All forms of case studies are welcome, provided they relate to one or several EU member states. Multi-country comparative analyses are strongly encouraged. Single-country analyses are accepted provided they refer to the wider European or international contexts³. Submissions of national case studies are most welcome. These may take the form of single-country case studies or of comparative case studies, provided that submissions deal with one or several EU member-states. Submissions may also deal with the role of European or of international institutions, as long as the analysis focuses on developments of the social economy within the EU. The following themes may be of use to prospective authors:

- A key hypothesis in the specialised literature is that the increasing recognition of the social economy leads to a rising entrepreneurial conception of what constitutes the social economy: the priority given to leadership values and to the ‘entrepreneur’ as opposed to collective modes of governance; the increasing role of private funding to the detriment of public financing; the tendency to assess the usefulness and impact of social enterprises based on market-led techniques and objectives, etc. (Petrella et Richez-Battesti, 2014). It would be interesting to see in what ways these observations correspond (or not) to developments in EU countries and to assess the implication that such developments may have for the people who work in the social economy, on the one hand, and on target audiences, on the other.

- How are social economies organized? What are their management structures? Certain authors point to the sector’s uniqueness – be it related to its social or humanist values, to its limited pursuit of profit, or to its inclusive system of governance. As a result the sector has relatively distinct management practices (Cuénoud, Moreau and Mertens, 2013). However, other authors refer to the fact that there seems to be a blurring of lines with socially responsible companies based on the Capitalist model (Persais, 2012). Does the tendency to professionalize the social economy, to use management procedures taken from the private sector, and to bring about changes to public funding mechanisms (characterized by contract-based arrangements and quasi-market competitions) have an impact on management procedures – and if yes – how does this tendency manifest itself (Persais,

³ In addition, the articles will be contrasted in the overall conclusion so as to reinforce the special issue’s comparative perspective.

2013)? Particular attention should be paid to the changing effects of various phenomena which often disrupt set management demarcation lines (public/private, market/non-market, collective interest/private interest, etc.) (Bayle and Dupuis, 2012). In the face of such changes, does the social economy lead to management innovations that are specific to itself (Valéau and Annette, 2012)?

- Do prospective changes show that the traditional Welfare State model (Esping-Andersen, 1995) is regressing, strengthening or evolving in a significant way?

- Do the public policy initiatives in favour of social economy actors lead to institutional isomorphism for the organisations concerned? In other words, do the initiatives lead to ‘constraining processes that force individuals to resemble one another’ (Di Maggio, Powell, 1983, p.150)? Are all social economy participants affected to the same degree and, if so, why?

- What are the main political and economic arguments that are put forward to promote the social economy? The social economy seeks to promote a range of values and to put forward a number of claims (to reduce inequalities, to defend company democracy, to save the environment, to promote a better inter-generational understanding or a better understanding between the rich and the poor, to fight against unemployment, etc.). How and why do policy-makers accept some key issues while they reject others?

- What are the public or private institutions that promote the social economy the most? With respect to political institutions, proposals should focus in particular whether it is the central or local public authorities that are the main drivers of the social economy and, accordingly, the consequences that this may have for all involved.

- Is a new generation of social entrepreneurs with specific characteristics and patterns of behaviour emerging?

Prospective authors are invited to link theoretical considerations and empirical research. Submissions – and all inquiries – should be sent electronically (WORD format) to didierchabanet@hotmail.com **no later than 31 March 2018**. Contributors are required to adhere

to the *Management International* house-style (See <http://www.managementinternational.ca/section-des-auteurs/politique-redactionnelle/>). All papers will be peer-reviewed according to international standards (at minimum two anonymous referees). The special issue is scheduled for publication in 2019.

References

- Bayle, E. et Dupuis, J. (2012). *Management des entreprises de l'économie sociale et solidaire: Identités plurielles et spécificités*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Supérieur.
- Bouchard M. and Rousselière D. eds. (2015). *The Weight of the Social Economy: An International Perspective* / CIRIEC. Brussels: PIE Peter Lang.
- Cadic, P. (2013). *L'économie sociale en Espagne: un bilan de la législation nationale et régionale*. Think Tank européen Pour la Solidarité, 23 pages http://www.pourlasolidarite.eu/sites/default/files/publications/files/7es_essenespagne_bilanlegislationnationaleetregionale.pdf
- Cadic, P. (2014). *L'économie sociale en Grèce*. Think Tank européen Pour la Solidarité, 24 pages http://www.pourlasolidarite.eu/sites/default/files/publications/files/2014_05_economie_sociale_grece.pdf
- Chabanet, D. (2016). "The Social Economy Sector and the Welfare State in France: Towards a Takeover of the Market?", in *Voluntas*, 27 (6), pp. 3-25.
- Chorum - Note d'actualité (2014). *La législation relative à l'économie sociale et solidaire : analyse comparée France / Europe*, 24 pages http://rtes.fr/IMG/pdf/2014-04_Note_d_actu_4_Legislation_ESS.pdf
- Defourny, J. and Nyssens, M. eds. (2010). "Conceptions of Social enterprise and Social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences", in *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1 (1), pp. 32-53.
- Demoustier, D. and Colletis, G. (2012). « L'économie sociale et solidaire face à la crise: simple résistance ou participation au changement », in *Revue internationale de l'économie sociale*, 325, pp. 21-33.
- Di Maggio P.J. and Powell W.W. (1983). "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields", in *American Sociological Review*, 48, pp. 147-160.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fontaine, J. and Hassenteufel, P. (2002). « Quelle sociologie du changement dans l'action publique ? Retour au terrain et « refroidissement » théorique », in J. Fontaine and P. Hassenteufel (eds.), *To change or not to change : les changements de l'action publique à l'épreuve du terrain*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, pp. 9-29.

- Gire, H. (2014). *L'économie sociale au Portugal*. Think Tank européen Pour la Solidarité, 21 pages http://www.pourlasolidarite.eu/sites/default/files/publications/files/wp2014_1_es_ess_portugal.pdf
- Hall, P. A. (1986). *Governing the Economy: The Politics of State Intervention in Britain and France*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, P. A. (1993). "Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the state: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain", in *Comparative politics*, 25 (3), pp. 275-296.
- Hall, P. A. and Taylor, R. (1997). « La science politique et les trois néo-institutionnalismes », in *Revue française de science politique*, 47 (3-4), pp. 469-495.
- Laville, J.-L., Young, D. R. and Eynaud, P. eds. (2015). *Civil Society, the Third Sector and Social Enterprise*. Routledge: London and New York.
- March, J. and Olsen, J. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organisational Basis of Politics*. New York, Free Press, London, Collier Macmillan.
- Masquelin, A. (2014). *Economie sociale et solidaire et Nations-Unies. Un rapprochement récent*. Think Tank européen Pour la Solidarité, 24 pages http://www.pourlasolidarite.eu/sites/default/files/publications/files/na-2014-ess-onu_0.pdf
- Monzón Campos J.L. and Chaves, R. (2012). *The Social Economy in the European Union*. Brussels: European Economic and Social Committee.
- Nikula, J. and Tchalakov, Ivan (2013). *Innovations and Entrepreneurs in Socialist and Post-Socialist Societies*. Newcastle. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Osborne, S. P. (2014). *The Third Sector in Europe: Prospects and Challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Perard, P. (2015). *L'économie sociale et solidaire au Luxembourg. Bilan et perspectives*. Think Tank européen Pour la Solidarité, 18 pages <http://www.pourlasolidarite.eu/sites/default/files/publications/files/na-2015-ess-luxembourg.pdf>
- Persais, E. (2012). « Entreprises sociale et sociétalement responsable : le fossé est-il si grand ? », in *Management international*, 164, pp. 41–56.
- Persais, E. (2014). « Capital sociétal et gouvernance d'entreprise. Le cas d'entreprise de l'Économie Sociale et Solidaire », in *Management international*, 174, pp. 145–162.
- Petrella, F. and Richez-Battesti, N. (2014). "Social Entrepreneur, Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise: Semantics and Controversies", in *Journal of Innovation Economics & Management*, 2 (14), pp. 143-156.
- Pezzini, E. and Pflüger, K. (2013). « Economie sociale et politiques publiques européennes. Un long parcours inachevé, des visions plurielles », in D. Demoustier and R. Chaves (eds.). *L'émergence de l'Economie sociale dans les politiques publiques*. Brussels, Peter Lang, pp. 73- 110.
- Pierson, P. (1993). "When Effects become Cause. Policy Feedback and Political Change", in *World Politics*, 45 (4), pp. 595-628.
- Pierson, P. (2000). "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence and the Study of Politics", in *American Political Science Review*, 94 (2), pp. 251-267.

- Ramadani, V. et Schneider, R. (2013). *Entrepreneurship in the Balkans. Diversity, Support and Prospects*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Rosenblatt, C. (2013). *Quelle place pour l'économie sociale en Europe ?* Think Tank européen Pour la Solidarité, 29 pages <http://base.socioeco.org/docs/wpesseurope-2.pdf>
- Stokkink, D. and Perard, P. (2016). *L'économie sociale et solidaire en Europe*. Think Tank européen Pour la Solidarité, 28 pages <http://www.pourlasolidarite.eu/sites/default/files/publications/files/na-2016-ess-europe.pdf>
- Valéau, P. and Annette, F. (2012). « La gestion des « déviances » des associations par les pouvoirs publics : une autonomie conditionnelle », in *Management international*, 163, pp. 139-152.
- Zikou, E., Gatzoufa, P. and Sarri, A. (2012). “Social Entrepreneurship in Times of Economic Austerity: A Sparkle of Light for the Economies in Crisis?”, in *Scientific Bulletin – Economic Sciences*, 11 (1), pp. 53-65.