

Chronopoulos, Vasilis I.; Pierrakos, George

## Article

Economic and social performance evaluation of the two types of work integration social enterprises (WISEs) in Greece : mental health sector's WISEs versus social entrepreneurs' WISEs

JEOD

## Provided in Cooperation with:

ZBW OAS

*Reference:* Chronopoulos, Vasilis I./Pierrakos, George (2024). Economic and social performance evaluation of the two types of work integration social enterprises (WISEs) in Greece : mental health sector's WISEs versus social entrepreneurs' WISEs. In: JEOD 13 (1), S. 84 - 108.  
<https://jeodonline.com/wp-content/themes/jeod/download.php?pid=12986>.  
doi:10.5947/jeod.2024.004.

This Version is available at:  
<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/654516>

## Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics  
Düsternbrooker Weg 120  
24105 Kiel (Germany)  
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)  
<https://www.zbw.eu/>

## Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte. Alle auf diesem Vorblatt angegebenen Informationen einschließlich der Rechteinformationen (z.B. Nennung einer Creative Commons Lizenz) wurden automatisch generiert und müssen durch Nutzer:innen vor einer Nachnutzung sorgfältig überprüft werden. Die Lizenzangaben stammen aus Publikationsmetadaten und können Fehler oder Ungenauigkeiten enthalten.

## Terms of use:

*This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence. All information provided on this publication cover sheet, including copyright details (e.g. indication of a Creative Commons license), was automatically generated and must be carefully reviewed by users prior to reuse. The license information is derived from publication metadata and may contain errors or inaccuracies.*



<https://savearchive.zbw.eu/terms-of-use>

**VASILIS I. CHRONOPOULOS**

Department of Business Administration,  
University of West Attica (Athens, Greece)  
vasilis.chronopoulos@hotmail.com

**GEORGE PIERRAKOS**

Department of Business Administration,  
University of West Attica (Athens, Greece)  
gpier127@gmail.com

# Economic and Social Performance Evaluation of the Two Types of Work Integration Social Enterprises (WISEs) in Greece: Mental Health Sector's WISEs Versus Social Entrepreneurs' WISEs

## ABSTRACT

The main objective of the present study was to explore the differences in the economic and social performance of the two institutional types of work integration social enterprises (WISEs) in Greece. The social performance of Greek WISEs was linked with their ability to create job positions that are sufficient to keep the employees above the monetary poverty line and away from the concept of low work intensity as defined in the European Union. Primary data were collected from 51.47% of the population of Greek WISEs. Descriptive statistics, non-parametric tests, and ordinal regression analysis were used for the exploration of the differences between the two types of WISEs considering economic and social performance. Despite the significant differences in most of the economic measures, the social performance of both institutional types of WISEs in Greece in tackling poverty is almost identical and unfortunately low. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study comparing the social performance of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs. Our information, analysis, and suggestions could be important to policymakers, stakeholders, managers and professionals. Locating the paths and the methods that lead WISEs to the creation of job positions that are close to the concept of full-time and are also fairly well paid, can only be positively related to their goal of promoting the financial independence of users of mental health services along others vulnerable and special social groups.

## KEY-WORDS

WORK INTEGRATION SOCIAL ENTERPRISE (WISE), SOCIAL PERFORMANCE, POVERTY ALLEVIATION

**Acknowledgments**

We would like to extend our appreciation to all WISEs for allowing us access to write this article.

**JEL Classification:** M10, M14, M20, M21 | **DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.5947/jeod.2024.004>

## 1. Introduction

Work integration social enterprises (WISEs) aim to support unemployed people who are almost permanently excluded from the labour market to integrate into society through a productive activity (Defourny, 2006). The social performance of Greek WISEs was linked with their ability to create job positions that are sufficient to keep the employees above the monetary poverty line and away from the concept of low work intensity as defined in the European Union (EU). The two institutional types of Greek WISEs that do fulfil the EU operational criteria, are the limited liability social cooperatives that focus on the socio-economic and occupational integration of people with serious psychosocial problems and the social cooperative integration enterprises that focus on people from other vulnerable and special social groups. The importance of the topic comes from the fact that poverty while in employment could be considered a new form of social exclusion and that the ability of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs to create full-time, well-paid jobs has been questioned.

Measuring the performance of social enterprises (SEs) is an important part of their evaluation. A single framework that fits the vast range of SEs does not seem to exist. Outcome measurements concern the changes a SE brings to the lives of individuals. Outcome-based approaches are less common and more difficult because outcomes are often regulated by the reality outside the organization.

The method used in this study to measure the performance of WISEs falls into the category of outcome-based approaches. Results are quantified to show what has been achieved. We argue that in order to measure the social performance of WISEs, it is not enough to count the job positions in the WISE itself, nor to count the beneficiaries placed in job positions outside the WISE. We measure the social performance of Greek WISEs by attempting to capture the changes a WISE brings to the life of the worker considering poverty alleviation. Our method explores the following questions: are the jobs created in the WISE sufficient to (1) keep the workers above the monetary poverty line and (2) keep the workers away from the concept of low work intensity?

Other dimensions of resocialisation such as the therapeutic impact of WISEs that focus on people with serious psychosocial problems should not be omitted. However, our study focuses on the dimensions of employment and wages as indicators of the financial independence of users of mental health services that are very conducive to their resocialisation.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study comparing the social performance of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs. Our study tries to bring the focus back to the main objective of WISEs, that emblematic scheme of the SE universe. Our analysis and information are important to policymakers, stakeholders, managers and professionals. Their interest in improving the performance of WISEs is closely related to their goal of promoting the reintegration of people from marginalized social groups into the labour market and, in turn, back into society. Therefore, they are not interested in creating any kind of job positions but instead seek to locate the paths and methods leading to the creation of job positions that are close to the concept of full-time and are also fairly well paid.

Primary data were collected from 51.47% of the population of Greek WISEs. Descriptive statistics were used for the exploration of the differences between the two types of WISEs. The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether the differences in the variables that measure the economic output and the social outcome between the two types of Greek WISEs are significant. This way the two hypotheses concerning the social performance of the WISE were tested. The hypothesis concerning monetary poverty was further tested through ordinal regression analysis.

The structure of this paper is as follows: after the introduction, section 2 presents the research framework reflecting on the specific Greek context. Section 3 provides an analytic presentation of the methodology applied; section 4 presents the empirical findings; section 5 explains the meaning of the results; and finally, section 6 further reflects on the results and their implications.

## **2. Literature review**

### *2.1. The concept of WISE in the European Union*

The European approach to the concept of social enterprise is closely connected with the EMES European Research Network approach of a developed set of nine criteria. A social enterprise is an initiative launched by a group of citizens with the explicit aim of benefiting the community. There is a high degree of autonomy and a participatory nature that involves the various parties affected. The decision-making power is not based on capital ownership, and there is a limited profit distribution. A continuous productive activity, characterized by a significant level of economic risk, results in a minimum amount of paid work (Davister, Defourny and Gregoire, 2004).

The conceptualization of social enterprise was initially based on two schools of thought (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010). The first school of thought discusses how non-profit organisations use their commercial endeavours to further their missions. Dees and Anderson (2006) proposed that the first school be called the “social enterprise” school of thought, but Defourny and Nyssens (2010) preferred to call it the “earned income” school of thought. Within this school of thought, they made a distinction between an earlier version, focusing on non-profits, which they called the “commercial non-profit approach”, and a broader version, embracing all forms of business initiatives, which they named the “mission-driven business approach” (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010).

Dees and Anderson (2006) named the second school of thought, the “social innovation” school of thought, emphasizing the concept of social entrepreneurs in the Schumpeterian sense of the term. Social entrepreneurs are defined as change-makers who accomplish new combinations in one or more of the following domains: novel services, novel service quality, novel production factors, novel production techniques, novel organisational structures, or novel markets. Social entrepreneurship in this context can be seen more as a matter of outcome and societal influence as opposed to one of income.

The concept of social enterprise in Europe emerged from the third sector of the economy in 1990 following the dynamics of the Italian context that were closely connected with the cooperative movement and the process of mental health deinstitutionalization. The strong cooperative tradition of Italy, along with the vision of the closure of the psychiatric hospitals and the process of deinstitutionalization, set the ground for the development of new cooperative initiatives in the late 1980s aiming to respond to unmet social needs, particularly regarding work integration. They differed from traditional cooperatives in two ways: they were serving a broader community promoting the general interest along with the members' interests, and they were not single stakeholder organizations since they combined different types of stakeholders as members.

Since 1990, the concept of social enterprise was promoted through the journal *Impresa Sociale* which described these new forms of cooperatives for which the Italian Parliament developed the legal form of social cooperative in 1991. Since then, various European countries have passed new laws to promote SE development (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010). The leading type of SE in Europe during the 1990s was the emblematic WISE, which aims to help unemployed people who are almost permanently excluded from the labour market to integrate into society through a productive activity (Defourny, 2006).

## 2.2. WISEs in contemporary Greece

The roots of contemporary Greek SEs can be found in: (1) the orthodox church and charity foundations, (2) cooperatives, (3) associations and non-profit organisations, (4) early forms of collaboration associated with local administrations, and (5) solidarity projects. The way SEs are involved and institutionalized in contemporary Greece is influenced by specific social events and time periods of social turmoil like the Second World War, Greece's military regime in the 1960s and 1970s, and the economic debt crisis. Law 4019/2011, which was the first law concerning the general field of social economy and social entrepreneurship, along with the social mobilizations of that time period led, to a rapid increase in the number of Greek SEs (European Commission, 2019). Prior to Law 4019/2011, most economic activities that could be characterized as socially oriented were unfortunately placed somewhere in the spectrum of the atypical and illegal economy (Nasioulas, 2012). Chronologically the emergence of WISEs in Greece can be divided into three time periods: (1) 1984-1998: development of cooperative initiatives supported by European policies and funding that paved the way for the legal recognition of WISEs; (2) 1999-2010: development of WISEs in the mental health sector; and (3) 2011-2019: broadening of the concept of vulnerability beyond mental and physical health by the addition of socio-economic criteria (Douvitsa, 2020).

The EU operational definition of SEs and the Greek law embrace the same social, economic and inclusive governance criteria. The Greek regulative and regulatory records favour the utilization of the expression "social and solidarity economy organization" over "social enterprise". Nonetheless, "social enterprise" is a term that is generally used by experts and stakeholders. Law 4430/2016 which replaced former Law 4019/2011, recognizes three distinct legal structures that implicitly

define the Greek social and solidarity economy sector. Two of these fulfil the EU operational criteria: the social cooperative enterprises (SCEs) and the limited liability social cooperatives (LLSCs) (European Commission, 2019). The EMES approach to social enterprise seems to fit fairly well both institutional types of Greek WISEs, namely the LLSCs and a distinct category of SCEs—the social cooperative integration enterprises (SCIEs)—, as regards their legal context (Douvitsa, 2020). All nine criteria set by the EMES network seem to be embedded in the Greek law concerning LLSCs (Hellenic Republic, 1999) and SCIEs (Hellenic Republic, 2011; 2016).

The emblematic—of the Greek setting—LLSCs were the first institutional form of SEs in Greece, and were also the first institutional form of WISEs. Introduced by Law 2716/1999 on the development and modernization of mental health services, they focused on the socio-economic and occupational integration of people with serious psychosocial problems (Hellenic Republic, 1999).

The second institutional form of WISEs in Greece was the SCIE which represents a small subtotal of SCEs. Law 4019/2011 opened the framework for the establishment of WISEs by identifying SCIEs and also by adding the concept of other vulnerable social groups besides those with mental disability (Hellenic Republic, 2011). Subsequently, Law 4430/2016 identified two types of SCIEs: those that focus on people from vulnerable social groups (people living with disabilities, people with substance abuse problems or addicts, minors with delinquent behaviour, imprisoned and released prisoners) and those that focus on people from special social groups (victims of domestic violence, victims of trafficking, homeless people, people living in poverty, economic migrants, refugees, and asylum applicants for as long as the asylum application is pending, heads of single-parent families, people with cultural distinctiveness, and long-term unemployed who are under twenty-five and over fifty years old) (Hellenic Republic, 2016).

### *2.3. The two institutional types of Greek WISEs and their relevance to the dichotomy of the French setting*

Petrella and Richez-Battesti (2016) proposed to distinguish and characterize two models of WISEs in contemporary France. The first can be viewed as an expansion of the social economy. The second highlights the role of social entrepreneurs along with their skills and legitimacy. In the following paragraphs, by exploring the characteristics of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs, the LLSCs and SCIEs, we argue that this dichotomy could be quite relevant to the contemporary Greek setting of WISEs. Moreover, the real difference between the two Greek institutional types of WISEs can be found in two concepts: (1) the major conceptualization of SE and social entrepreneurship that defines the two schools of thought proposed by Dees and Anderson (2006) and which was later enriched by Defourny and Nyssens (2010); and (2) in the WISE's market reliance and resource mix.

LLSCs seem to be strongly rooted in the public sector, mainly because these entities emerged as a result of a top-down pressure to step up the procedure of psychiatric reform (Adam, 2014). A licence of expediency must be issued by the Minister of Health and Welfare for the establishment of a LLSC. The ministry examines the statute and the ability of the existing mental health units

along with the prospects for development of the region of location. Moreover, the law determines that only one LLSC can be founded in each regional mental health sector of Greece. Each LLSC is considered to be a mental health unit that belongs to the specific regional mental health sector (Hellenic Republic, 1999). The Panhellenic Federation of LLSC was founded in 2011. It promotes the interests of the LLSCs, represents the LLSCs to the state and the national and international bodies, tries to understand and highlight the issues that LLSCs face and provides information to its members.

LLSCs—the mental health sector's WISEs—can be viewed as an expansion of the social economy. Most of them are parent launched organizations as they are closely connected with a mental health services provider. The process for establishing an LLSC is strict, demanding, and closely regulated by the Ministry of Health and Welfare. All this has led LLSCs to be state-oriented, to develop an institutional character, and to perform ethical lobbying that has helped them to secure a substantial amount of public procurements. Their culture, their level of market reliance, and their resource mix have been significantly influenced by all these dynamics. Finally, we can see hints of the “earned income” school of thought as the parent organizations have indirectly employed commercial activities to back their mission, through supporting the development of a cooperative.

SCIEs, on the other hand, can be characterized as social entrepreneurs' WISEs. The law does not limit the number of SCIEs that can be established, and the process is administratively and bureaucratically easy. There is a simple establishment process, a lack of limitation regarding the number of SCIEs that can be established, and there are many different groups of beneficiaries. All this has resulted in SCIEs being less state-oriented and more focused on the open market. Finally, we can see hints of the “social innovation” school of thought, as their development emphasizes the concept of social entrepreneurs in a more Schumpeterian way, since, by default, the founders of SCIEs accomplish new combinations by adopting a new form of organization, that focuses more on social impact than on income.

#### *2.4. Measuring the performance of social enterprises*

Measuring the performance of SEs is an important part of their evaluation. This process helps them to improve their performance and long-term viability, and to assess to what extent their activity has contributed to the well-being of the beneficiaries and the local society (Bagnoli and Megali, 2011). The importance of metrics to foster the growth of the social business sector is widely accepted (Bengo et al., 2016).

Social entrepreneurship is based on two axes: business activities and social purpose (Peredo and McLean, 2006). An SE aims to generate profits, just like conventional enterprises. The difference is that financial profit is not its primary goal, rather it is the basic means for promoting the social purpose, namely promoting a solution to a specific social problem faced by a particular community (Chell, 2007). The individuality between the social mission and commercial success in SEs has been disputed (Battilana et al., 2012). Low financial performance will, at the very least, hinder the

promotion of the social mission and, on the other hand, financial success can only be relevant if a well-formed social mission is embedded in the SE.

Inside an SE there are opposing interests and expectations that should not be overlooked when measuring the performance of the organization (Bagnoli and Megali, 2011). Since the SE's performance is primarily related to their social results, merely measuring their financial performance is insufficient. The importance of using both financial and nonfinancial procedures to assess the performance of SEs is critical (Epstein and McFarlan, 2011). The evaluation of their outcome must be linked to the corresponding social purpose adjusted to the specific socio-economic environment in which they are active (Arvidson, 2009; Harlock, 2013). A key feature of an SE is the definition of the goals derived from the social purpose, together with the identification of specific ways to measure them (Yunus, Moingeon and Lehmann-Ortega, 2010).

A single framework that fits the vast range of SEs does not seem to exist (Holt and Littlewood, 2015). After an extensive review of more than 20 methods of assessing the social impact of WISEs, Leung et al. (2019) concluded that there are three basic approaches: (1) outcome-based approach, (2) structure-based approach and (3) process-based approach. The basic difficulty in outcome measurement derives from the fact that outcome measurements are usually less common and more difficult to perform because outcomes are often regulated by the reality outside the organisation (Ebrahim and Rangan, 2014). "Outcome" is not the same as "output". In SEs, output displays the results of actions such as the number of beneficiaries affected, while outcome regards the changes a SE brings to the lives of individuals. Outcome relates to the advantages individuals gain from the SE, such as improved living conditions or alleviation of their social problem (Salavou and Cohen, 2021).

Using data from French WISEs, Battilana et al. (2015) tested and validated through regression analysis the positive impact of economic productivity and social imprinting on the social performance of WISEs. Building on Scott (1977), Battilana et al. (2015) defined social performance as the degree to which an organization is effective in producing positive social outcomes. The consensus within the WISE field is that social performance can be assessed by the percentage of recipients who find a typical job at the end of their occupation with the WISE. Battilana et al. (2015) measured a WISE's social performance as the percentage of beneficiaries completing their term at the WISE in a given year who found a regular job with a contract lasting more than six months. They used two independent variables, economic productivity and social imprinting. They measured the economic productivity of a French WISE as the ratio of total annual sales to the number of employees, including both permanent staff and beneficiaries. The founding team's early emphasis on achieving the organization's social mission is referred to as social imprinting. In France, at the hour of consolidation, WISE's pioneers are expected to document an assertion portraying the association's motivation and area of action. In the French study, social imprinting was not confirmed if the WISE had an industry-specific code. Social imprinting was confirmed if the WISE had a social code.



## 2.5. Performance of Greek WISEs

The most recent studies on the performance of Greek SEs are very meaningful and of high academic value. While they include data from WISEs, they do not exclusively focus on WISEs. Salavou and Kohen (2021) measured the performance of Greek SEs using a multi-item 7-point Likert-type scale that they developed to capture the multiple dimensions of performance based on impact, output, and outcome. Based upon a sample of 61 Greek SEs, the authors showed that the group of impact maximisers performed at a higher level than the group of social missionaries. Graikioti, Sdrali and Klimi Kaminari (2022), by using data from SCEs, explored the factors that contribute to the sustainability of Greek SEs, as perceived by the social entrepreneurs themselves. Integrated support was considered the most important factor of sustainability. Networking, awareness raising and publicity were also considered to be of high importance.

All Greek WISEs are founded by default to pursue the social mission of the social and economic reintegration of people from vulnerable and special social groups (Hellenic Republic, 1999; 2011; 2016). Research on Greek WISEs shows that although they have far more social objectives than merely workers' integration (Adam, 2014; Douvitsa, 2016), the ability of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs to create full-time, well-paid jobs for the target group has been questioned. LLSCs seem to face difficulties in succeeding in their primary goal, that is to create full-time, well-paid jobs for the target group (Adam, 2014). The majority of SCEs tend to have a limited economic activity, and make a relatively small contribution to the creation of well-paid, full-time jobs (Douvitsa, 2016; Temple et al., 2018).

## 2.6. How this study measures the performance of WISEs: an output/outcome approach

The method proposed in this study falls into the category of outcome-based approaches. Results are quantified and social impact is determined through a results-based approach that demonstrates what has been achieved (Arvidson et al., 2010). The main advantage of this approach is the immediate determination of what the WISE has accomplished.

Our study tries to bring the focus back to the main objective of WISEs, that emblematic scheme of the SE universe. That is, "to reintegrate the disabled and other disadvantaged groups, including the long-term unemployed, into the labour market and society through a productive activity" (Cooney et al., 2016: 416). The modes of integration are: (1) transitional occupation, in order to provide work experience or on-the-job training that will hopefully lead to integration into the open labour market; (2) creation of permanent self-financed jobs; (3) professional integration with permanent subsidies (for the most disadvantaged groups); and (4) socialisation through a productive activity (in this case the basic aim is not the professional integration but rather the resocialisation—Davister, Defourny and Gregoire, 2004).

We argue that in order to measure the social performance of WISEs, it is not enough to count the job positions in the WISE itself, nor to count the beneficiaries who after their vocational training in

the WISE were placed in job positions outside the WISE. Such an output approach is not sufficient to measure the social performance of the WISE. Although it displays the results of the actions of the WISE, and serves the rationale of public policies at the national and European levels, it fails to capture the outcome, meaning the changes a SE brings to the lives of individuals. In our study, we measure the social performance of Greek WISEs by attempting to capture the changes a WISE brings to the life of the worker considering poverty alleviation. Our method explores the following questions: are the jobs created in the WISE sufficient to (1) keep the workers above the monetary poverty line and (2) keep the workers away from the concept of low work intensity?

There is an underlying belief that employment is in itself a sufficient means for social inclusion. Work-first welfare ideology supports that any paid job is likely to lead to better jobs over time (Mead, 1993). Sometimes, employment is considered to be a certain road to social inclusion (Levitas, 2005). Indeed, employment is a source of income that can reduce the risk of poverty and social exclusion by raising the living standards of the employee (Patrick, 2012). The social role and identity that the employee acquires raises the level of self-respect, creates opportunities, and reduces isolation thus resulting in a higher level of well-being for those living with health problems (Waddell and Burton, 2006). Unfortunately, employment is not a magic bullet against poverty and social exclusion, because an employee may have an income so low or so heavily fluctuating that the employee remains in poverty (Bailey, 2017).

The difficulty that WISEs face in offering full-time employment has been linked to the seasonal nature of their business or periods of reduced business activity (Morrow et al., 2009), the temporary nature of subsidies, and the fact that the majority of the job positions that they create fall into the category of low-skilled jobs, which are characterized by low pay and an unstable work schedule (Cooney, 2011).

Our study measures and compares the performance of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs with an output/outcome approach. The economic performance is measured by the economic output and the social performance is measured by the social outcome. The economic output is measured by the results of the actions of the WISE such as the number of its employees and the amount of its monetary resources, while the social outcome is measured by the change the WISE brings to the lives of the employees, in particular the sufficiency the WISE has in keeping the employees above the poverty lines.

In our study, social performance of WISEs is measured in two ways: (1) by the percentage of people who worked in the WISE and had a total annual income derived solely from the WISE that is sufficient to keep them above the poverty line, compared to the total number of people that worked in the WISE; and (2) by the percentage of people who worked in the WISE for enough hours to keep them above the concept of low work intensity, compared to the total number of people that worked in the WISE.

Based on the above argumentation, this study focuses on the comparison of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs in terms of performance differences. Specifically, this study empirically explores two research questions: (1) do Greek WISEs create job positions that are sufficient to bring

a positive change to the lives of the employees by keeping them above the poverty lines? (2) Are there differences in the performance of the two types of WISEs?

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study comparing the social performance of the two types of institutional WISEs in Greece. We will test the following two hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1. Mental health sector's WISEs have significantly higher social performance against monetary poverty than social entrepreneurs' WISEs.*

*Hypothesis 2. Mental health sector's WISEs have significantly higher social performance against low work intensity than social entrepreneurs' WISEs.*

### 3. Research method

#### 3.1. Population, sample and questionnaire

The population of this study is the total of institutional WISEs in Greece, that is the sum of LLSCs and SCIEs. According to the General Register of Social and Solidarity Economy Bodies (2021), on 19 January 2021 the population of LLSCs was 29 and the population of SCIEs was 38. During the attempt to communicate with the WISEs, one LLSC was identified which, although active, was not registered with the General Register. Thus, the population of WISEs in Greece—which constitutes the population of the present study—was 68, that is 30 LLSCs and 38 SCIEs. We communicated with all 30 LLSCs. The response rate was 70.00% (21 out of 30). We managed to contact 26 out of the total 38 SCIEs, whose response rate was 53.85% (14 out of 26). The response rate for the total of WISEs was 62.50% (35 out of 56). Therefore, our study used data from 51.47% of the population of WISEs in Greece (35 out of 68).

Using a semi-structured questionnaire that was developed specifically for the needs of the present study, data were collected for the financial years 2018, 2019 and 2020 from the two institutional types of WISEs in Greece. The contact details (telephone and/or email) for each WISE were initially identified from the General Register of Social and Solidarity Economy Bodies (2021) that was available on the Internet until 19 January 2021. In some cases, it was necessary to search for further contact information through the Internet.

#### 3.2. Variables and measures

##### 3.2.1 Output measures

*Employees:* number of persons that had an active job contract with the WISE in the year of reference.

*Employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00:* number of persons that had an

active job contract with the WISE in the year of reference and earned over EUR 4,917.00 from the WISE in that year.

*Employees that worked more than 422 hours:* number of persons that had an active job contract with the WISE in the year of reference and worked more than 422 hours in the WISE in that year.

*Beneficiaries:* number of persons who received vocational training or counselling services from the WISE in the year of reference.

*Job placements:* number of persons who were placed in a job position outside the WISE in the year of reference.

*Monetary resources:* total of monetary resources of the WISE for the year of reference.

*Monetary resources derived from the open market:* monetary resources of the WISE that were derived from the sale of goods and/or services in the open market (not under contract to public authorities, i.e., public procurements).

*Open market resources analogy (OMRA):* ratio of the annual monetary resources of the WISE that are derived from the sale of goods and/or the provision of services in the open market (not under contract to public authorities, i.e., public procurements) to the total annual monetary resources of the WISE. The variable expresses a percentage and is a continuous variable as it is assigned values from .00 to 1.00, that is .00%-100.00%. An observation that has an OMRA of .00 (0.00%) comes from a WISE none of whose monetary resources derived from the open market in that specific year. At the opposite extreme, an observation that has an OMRA of 1.00 (100.00%) comes from a WISE all of whose monetary resources derived from the open market in that specific year. The variable is measured in percentage points.

*Public procurement:* annual monetary resources of the WISE derived from the sale of goods and/or provision of services under contract to public authorities for the year of reference.

*The analogy of public procurements:* ratio of the annual monetary resources of the WISE derived from the sale of goods and/or the provision of services under contract to public authorities to the total annual monetary resources of the WISE for the year of reference.

*Economic productivity:* is the ratio of the total annual monetary resources of the WISE to the number of employees of the WISE, including both employees who have a contract with the WISE and those who are seconded to the WISE from another organization when this is valid. The variable is continuous and is measured in thousands of EUR.

### 3.2.2 Outcome measures

*Social performance against monetary poverty:* percentage of people who worked in the WISE (for a specific year) with a total annual income derived solely from the WISE that is sufficient to keep them above the poverty line as defined for a single-person household, that is over EUR 4,917.00 (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2020), compared to the total number of people that worked in the WISE in that specific year. The variable is measured in percentage points.

*Level of social performance against monetary poverty:* from the variable social performance against monetary poverty, the ordinal variable “level of social performance against monetary poverty” was computed and entered in the analysis of ordinal regression. The variable “level of social performance against monetary poverty” is assigned value 1 when the variable social performance against monetary poverty ranges between .00 and .33 (low performance of the WISE in creating job positions that provide income above the poverty line), value 2 when the variable social performance against monetary poverty ranges between .34 and .66 (moderate performance), and value 3 when the variable social performance against monetary poverty ranges from .67 to 1.00 (high performance).

*Social performance against low work intensity:* percentage of people who in that specific year worked in the WISE for over 422 hours, compared to the total number of people that worked in the WISE. The variable is measured in percentage points.

### 3.2.3 WISE's characteristics

*Social imprinting:* to measure social imprinting in Greek WISEs we developed a dichotomous nominal variable. Social imprinting is confirmed, therefore the variable is assigned value 1, when three conditions are met: (1) the WISE's founders acknowledge the existence of a close relationship, during the first three years of the WISE's establishment, with an organization that provides social services to the specific target group of beneficiaries on which the WISE focuses; (2) the WISE's founders and management team identify as their main target group people with disabilities of any form (physical, mental, sensory) and not another vulnerable or special social groups; and (3) the WISE has seconded employees from another organization, usually the service provider that it is related to. If one or more of these three conditions are not met, social imprinting is not confirmed, therefore the variable is assigned value 0.

*Type of WISE:* mental health sector's WISEs or social entrepreneurs' WISEs. LLCs represent the WISEs that emerged from the mental health sector and SCIEs represent the WISEs that were developed by social entrepreneurs.

*Attica or province:* identifies if the WISE is active in Attica or in a province.

### 3.3. Method

In our study, the social performance of WISEs was linked to their performance in tackling poverty and social exclusion in the context of the European Union's mixed indicator “at risk of poverty or social exclusion” (European Commission, 2017).

The monetary poverty indicator is measured by the indicator “people at risk of poverty” after social transfers (European Commission, 2017). It measures the proportion of people below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold. This is set at 60% of the national income. For Greece, the income and living conditions survey of the year 2019 defined the poverty line at EUR 4,917.00 per year for single-person households (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2020).

The number of people between the ages of 0 and 59 living in households where adults worked less than 20% of their potential in the previous year is known as very low work intensity (European Commission, 2017). We accept a full-time job as the potential of all people. According to Greek law, a full-time employee works eight hours a day for five days a week. A year has between 52 and 53 weeks. Following this line of reasoning, full-time employment for a single person corresponds to something between 2,080-2,120 hours per year. Therefore, 20% of a full-time job lies somewhere between 416-424 working hours per year. We set the final limit to 422 working hours per year. Everything below that leads to low work intensity for a single-person household.

We measured a WISE's social performance against poverty in two ways: (1) the percentage of the WISE's employees with a total annual income derived from the WISE that is over EUR 4,917.00, compared to the total number of the WISE's employees; and (2) the percentage of the WISE's employees who work over 422 hours per year, compared to the total number of the WISEs employees.

Descriptive statistics were used for the exploration of the differences between the two types of WISEs. We used several economic variables to measure the output of the WISE, aimed at capturing the results of the actions of the WISE. The variables social performance against monetary poverty and social performance against low work intensity were used to measure the outcome of the WISE, meaning the changes the WISE brings to the lives of individuals, and to test our two hypotheses. Tests of normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Shapiro-Wilk Test) were used to see which descriptive measure—the median or the mean—would be more suitable. The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether the differences in the variables that measure the output and the outcome of the WISE between social entrepreneurs' WISEs and mental health sector's WISEs are significant, thus testing the two hypotheses concerning the social performance of the WISE.

The first hypothesis, which considers the WISE's performance against monetary poverty was further tested through ordinal regression analysis. Correlations between all variables that were entered in the ordinal regression analysis were explored with the nonparametric Spearman test. Ordinal regression was applied to the dependent variable level of social performance against monetary poverty. The model included three predictor variables as drivers of the social performance of WISEs—economic productivity and social imprinting (Battilana et al., 2015) and the newly proposed term open market resources analogy—and two control variables—geographic area and type of WISE.

We defined open market resources analogy as the ratio of the annual monetary resources of the WISE derived from sales in the open market (not under contract to public authorities) to the total annual monetary resources of the WISE. To measure social imprinting in Greek WISEs we developed a dichotomous nominal variable. Social imprinting is confirmed when three conditions are met: (1) the WISE's founders acknowledge the existence of a close relationship between the WISE and an organization that provides social services, during the first three years of the WISE's establishment; (2) the WISE's founders and management team identify people with disabilities of

any form (physical, mental, sensory) as their main target group; and (3) the WISE has seconded employees from another organization, usually the service provider that it is related to.

The statistical methodology we used was relatively simple. Descriptive statistics alone would not, of course, be enough to test the two hypotheses. They were used initially to describe the differences as simply as possible. Subsequently, evaluation was made of the most suitable descriptive measure for each variable according to the relevant results of two normality tests that were conducted. The significance of the differences found in all measures was tested with the same non-parametric test. Our initial thought was to further test both hypotheses with the development of two regression models that would have different dependent variables (the two outcome measures) and the same independent variables. Unfortunately, we were able to develop just one model, so only the first hypothesis, the one considering monetary poverty was further tested by regression analysis. We used ordinal regression instead of linear regression because the basic assumptions of linear regression were not met.

#### **4. Results**

Tests of normality are presented in Table 1. Both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Shapiro-Wilk Test showed that all continuous variables are not normally distributed except for social performance against low work intensity. Therefore, we focus on the median rather than the mean as our initial descriptive measure for all variables except social performance against low work intensity.

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 2. The value of  $N$  is smaller than 35 for social entrepreneurs' WISEs and smaller than 63 for mental health sector's WISEs due to missing data. By comparing the median of the social entrepreneurs' WISEs with the median of the mental health sector's WISEs for each variable (except the variable social performance against low work intensity for which the mean is a better measure) we can gain an initial idea of the differences between the two types of WISEs.

Social entrepreneurs' WISEs compared to mental health sector's WISEs had far fewer employees, fewer employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00, fewer employees that had worked more than 422 hours for that specific year, fewer beneficiaries, fewer monetary resources, fewer monetary resources derived from the open market, fewer public procurements and a much lower analogy of public procurements.

These differences are not found at all in the social performance of the two types of WISEs. Social entrepreneurs' WISEs and mental health sector's WISEs had almost equal average scores for both social performance against monetary poverty and social performance against low work intensity. It is interesting to note that economic productivity along with OMRA was on average higher for the social entrepreneurs' WISEs compared with the mental health sector's WISEs. Both types seem to be very low on job placements outside the WISE.

Table 1. Tests of normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Employees	.314	46	.000	.678	46	.000
Employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00	.302	46	.000	.535	46	.000
Employees that worked more than 422 hours	.303	46	.000	.586	46	.000
Beneficiaries	.322	46	.000	.665	46	.000
Job placements	.329	46	.000	.740	46	.000
Monetary resources	.291	46	.000	.542	46	.000
Monetary resources derived from the open market	.385	46	.000	.452	46	.000
OMRA	.138	46	.029	.879	46	.000
Public procurements	.297	46	.000	.621	46	.000
Analogy of public procurements	.135	46	.036	.876	46	.000
Economic productivity	.217	46	.000	.737	46	.000
Social performance against monetary poverty	.159	46	.005	.837	46	.000
Social performance against low work intensity	.076	46	.200*	.972	46	.332

Notes:

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors significance correction.



**Table 2. Descriptive statistics of continuous variables**

	N	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Variance
<b>1. Social entrepreneurs' WISEs: SCIEs</b>					
Employees	35	4.54	2.00	5.40	29.20
Employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00	32	0.94	0.00	1.48	2.19
Employees that worked more than 422 hours	32	2.28	0.00	3.47	12.02
Beneficiaries	35	3.46	0.00	6.16	37.96
Job placements	35	0.37	0.00	0.94	0.89
Monetary resources	35	46132.69	13267.70	73995.41	5475320818.74
Monetary resources derived from the open market	35	28907.65	5996.66	46187.80	2133313125.36
OMRA	28	0.66	0.78	0.37	0.14
Public procurements	35	11339.51	0.00	35414.51	1254187799.94
Analogy of public procurements	28	0.13	0.00	0.29	0.09
Economic productivity	25	12.51	5.54	17.92	321.07
Social performance against monetary poverty	22	0.30	0.17	0.36	0.13
Social performance against low work intensity	22	0.53	0.71	0.44	0.19
<b>2. Mental health sector's WISEs: LLSCs</b>					
Employees	62	35.79	19.00	36.96	1366.00
Employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00	56	7.80	3.00	14.31	204.78
Employees that worked more than 422 hours	53	19.77	9.00	29.87	892.33
Beneficiaries	62	19.24	4.00	33.36	1113.07
Job placements	62	0.48	0.00	0.82	0.68
Monetary resources	62	288974.64	127108.78	429363.59	184353091205.82
Monetary resources derived from the open market	59	108383.65	24736.42	243723.80	59401289586.90
OMRA	58	0.36	0.26	0.33	0.11
Public procurements	59	140526.85	35379.62	216150.25	46720931229.01
Analogy of public procurements	58	0.56	0.60	0.33	0.11
Economic productivity	62	6.20	5.06	4.86	23.60
Social performance against monetary poverty	55	0.22	0.17	0.23	0.05
Social performance against low work intensity	53	0.52	0.53	0.26	0.07

The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether the differences between social entrepreneurs' WISEs and mental health sector's WISEs are significant. The results are given in Table 3. The results indicate significance in all variables in which the social entrepreneurs' WISEs had a lower median than the mental health sector's WISEs (see Table 2), that is employees, employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00, employees that worked more than 422 hours, beneficiaries, monetary resources, monetary resources derived from the open market, public procurements and analogy of public procurements. The Mann-Whitney U test, also indicated significance in the variable in which the social entrepreneurs' WISEs scored higher, that is the OMRA. No significance was found in differences in economic productivity nor in job placements.

On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the social performance of the two types of WISEs, that is for both social performance against monetary poverty and social performance against low work intensity. Therefore Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 were not supported.

**Table 3. Test statistics (grouping variable: type of WISE)**

	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)	Exact sig. (2-tailed)	Exact sig. (1-tailed)	Point probability
Employees	163.500	793.500	-6.931	.000	.000	.000	.000
Employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00	431.000	959.000	-4.145	.000	.000	.000	.000
Employees that worked more than 422 hours	225.500	753.500	-5.686	.000	.000	.000	.000
Beneficiaries	639.500	1269.500	-3.454	.001	.000	.000	.000
Job placements	942.500	1572.500	-1.377	.168	.168	.085	.001
Monetary resources	402.500	1032.500	-5.128	.000	.000	.000	.000
Monetary resources derived from the open market	733.000	1363.000	-2.360	.018	.018	.009	.000
OMRA	459.000	2170.000	-3.264	.001	.001	.000	.000
Public procurements	171.500	801.500	-6.846	.000	.000	.000	.000
Analogy of public procurements	195.000	601.000	-5.740	.000	.000	.000	.000
Economic productivity	727.000	2680.000	-.450	.653	.658	.329	.003
Social performance against monetary poverty	593.500	2133.500	-.131	.896	.899	.449	.002
Social performance against low work intensity	553.000	1984.000	-.350	.727	.731	.365	.002

Correlations between all variables that were entered in the ordinal regression analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 shows that the level of social performance against monetary poverty is significantly correlated OMRA, economic productivity, and social imprinting. Values between 0 and 0.3 indicate a weak positive relationship, values between 0.3 and 0.7 indicate a moderate positive relationship, while values between 0.7 and 1.0 indicate a strong positive relationship. The correlation coefficient of economic productivity (.374) indicates a moderate positive relationship, while the correlation coefficients of OMRA (.244) and social imprinting (.237), indicate a weak positive relationship.

Ordinal regression was applied on the dependent variable level of social performance against monetary poverty (Table 5). The model included three predictor variables: economic productivity, OMRA and social imprinting, along with two control variables: geographic area and type of WISE. Fitting information shows a high level of significance ( $p < .001$ ).

The assumption of proportional odds was tested by the test of parallel lines. P value is greater than .05 ( $p = .127$ ), so the main assumption of ordinal regression is checked. As can be seen in Table 5, none of the VIF values for the predictor variables is greater than 5 and they are all close to 1, which indicates that multicollinearity is not a problem in the regression model.

Economic productivity, OMRA and social imprinting significantly positively affected the level of social performance against monetary poverty. The geographic area and type of WISE had no significant effect on the level of social performance against monetary poverty.

The ordered log-odds estimate for a one unit increase in economic productivity is .058. The odds ratio is 1.059. A EUR 1,000.00 increase in economic productivity (the ratio of the total annual monetary resources of the WISE to the number of the employees of the WISE), will increase the odds of the WISE resulting in a higher level of social performance against monetary poverty by 1.059 while the other variables in the model are held constant.

The ordered log-odds estimate for a one unit increase in OMRA is 1.951. The odds ratio is 7.035. A 1.00% increase in OMRA, will increase the odds of the WISE resulting in a higher level of social performance against monetary poverty by 7.035, while the other variables in the model are held constant.

The ordered log-odds estimate of comparing social imprinting WISEs to non-social imprinting WISEs, is -2.554. The odds ratio is 0.077. This indicates that non-social imprinting WISEs are far less likely to result in a higher level of social performance against monetary poverty than social imprinting WISEs when the other variables in the model are held constant.

The control variable type of WISE had no significant effect on the level of social performance against monetary poverty. In other words, whether the WISE is a social entrepreneurs' WISE (SCIE) or a mental health sector's WISE (LLSC) was not significant. Therefore, H1 was not supported by the results of ordinal regression analysis either.

Table 4. Correlations between variables

		Level of social performance against monetary poverty	OMRA	Economic productivity	Type of WISE	Social imprinting	Geographical area
Level of social performance against monetary poverty	Correlation Coefficient	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.					
	N	77					
OMRA	Correlation Coefficient	.244*	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.035	.				
	N	75	86				
Economic productivity	Correlation Coefficient	.374**	0.107	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	0.344	.			
	N	77	81	87			
Type of WISE	Correlation Coefficient	-0.14	-.354**	-0.049	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.224	0.001	0.655	.		
	N	77	86	87	97		
Social imprinting	Correlation Coefficient	.237*	-0.101	.243*	.540**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.038	0.355	0.023	0	.	
	N	77	86	87	97	97	
Geographic area	Correlation Coefficient	0.085	0.067	0.055	-.249*	-0.087	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.461	0.543	0.611	0.014	0.395	.
	N	77	86	87	97	97	97

Notes: Coefficient of nonparametric correlations – Spearman's  $\rho$ .

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

. Means there is no need for "sig." since it relates to correlation "1" between two identical variables.

**Table 5. Ordinal regression (PLUM) on the dependent variable level of social performance against monetary poverty (N=75)**

	Estimate	Std. error	Wald	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
Economic productivity	.058	.025	5.301	.021	.818	1.222
OMRA	1.951	.966	4.079	.043	.780	1.282
Social imprinting not confirmed	-2.554	1.113	5.268	.022	.723	1.383
Type of WISE	1.447	1.319	1.203	.273	.457	2.186
Geographical area	-.528	.758	.486	.486	.800	1.250
Model fitting info (final $\chi^2$ )	22.612			.000		
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup> (Nagelkerke)	.333					
Goodness of fit (Pearson $\chi^2$ )	111.714			.975		
Test of parallel lines (Pearson $\chi^2$ )	8.573			.127		

*Note:* Link function: logit.

**5. Discussion**

Our results indicate that when considering only the output of the WISEs, LLSCs (mental health sector's WISEs) compared to SCIEs (social entrepreneurs' WISEs) had significant positive differences. The LLSCs had significantly far more employees, more employees with total net annual earnings over EUR 4,917.00, meaning sufficient earnings to keep the employee above the poverty line, more employees that worked more than 422 hours for that specific year, meaning enough working hours to keep them above the concept of low work intensity, more beneficiaries, more monetary resources, more monetary resources derived from the open market and more public procurements.

These differences were not found at all when considering the outcome of the WISE. The outcome concerns the changes the WISE brings to the lives of individuals. In our study, this relates to how sufficient the WISE is in creating job positions that keep the employees above the poverty lines as defined in the European Union. Social entrepreneurs' WISEs and mental health sector's WISEs had almost equal average scores for both social performance against monetary poverty and social performance against low work intensity. Although the mental health sector's WISEs create more job positions than the social entrepreneurs' WISEs, the proportion of those jobs that are relatively well paid, and the proportion of those jobs that are relatively close to the concept of a full-time job are identical in both types of WISEs.

Despite the significant differences in most of the economic measures, the social performance of both institutional types of WISEs in Greece in tackling poverty is almost identical. Results for social

performance against monetary poverty show that on average only 17% of the job positions created in any of the two types of WISEs offer the employee earnings that are sufficient to keep the employee above the poverty line for that specific year. Results for social performance against low work intensity for both types of WISEs are much better, but once again there was no difference between the two types of WISEs. On average 53% of the job positions created by social entrepreneurs' WISEs and 52% of job positions created by mental health sector's WISEs are sufficient to keep the employee above the concept of low work intensity for that specific year.

No significance was found for differences in economic productivity between the two types of WISEs, but OMRA on average was significantly higher for the social entrepreneurs' WISEs compared with the mental health sector's WISEs. On average social entrepreneurs' WISEs derive 78% of their monetary resources from the sale of goods and/or services in the open market (meaning not under contract to public authorities) compared to a 26% average for the mental health sector's WISEs.

Mental health sector's WISEs on average derive 60% of their total monetary resources from public procurements, that is from the sale of goods and/or services under contract to public authorities. On the other hand, social entrepreneurs' WISEs on average had no public procurements, as the median of public procurements for the social entrepreneurs' WISEs is .00, the same as the median of analogy of public procurements for the social entrepreneurs' WISEs.

Ordinal regression was applied on the dependent variable level of social performance against monetary poverty, including three predictor variables: economic productivity, OMRA and social imprinting, along with two control variables: geographic area and type of WISE. Economic productivity, OMRA and social imprinting significantly positively affected the level of social performance against monetary poverty. The most significant results of ordinal regression were: (1) the type of WISE was not significant in the WISEs ability to create well-paid job positions; (2) the close connection of the WISE with a service provider was significant; and (3) the concept of OMRA was highly significant. A 1.00% increase in OMRA will increase the odds of the WISE resulting in a higher level of social performance against monetary poverty by 7.035 while the other variables in the model are held constant.

## **6. Conclusions**

The EMES approach to social enterprise seems to fit both institutional types of WISEs in Greece, meaning the LLSCs and SCIEs (Douvitsa, 2020). Research on the two institutional types of Greek WISEs, while showing that they have far more social objectives than merely workers' integration, nevertheless questions their ability to succeed in their core goal as WISEs, namely, to create well-paid, full-time jobs (Adam, 2014; Douvitsa, 2016; Temple et al., 2018).

In our study, an outcome-based approach was developed in order to measure the social performance of WISEs and compare the two institutional types of Greek WISEs. Starting with the economic output of Greek WISEs, we displayed the results of the actions of the two types of Greek WISEs after which we focused on the social outcome of the WISEs, meaning the changes

they bring to the lives of their employees. We used the concept of poverty as defined in the EU, to capture the social performance of WISEs. The more capable a WISE is in creating job positions that are sufficient to keep the employees above the poverty lines as set by the EU the better the WISE's social outcome is and, of course, the higher its social performance.

We found that LLSCs had significant positive differences compared with SCIEs as regards their economic output that was measured with several variables. The social outcome of the two types of WISEs was almost identical. While it is true that LLSCs do create more job positions than SCIEs, the percentage of those positions that are relatively well-paid and closer to the concept of a full-time job is the same. The social outcome, the social performance is the same.

SCIEs, characterized in our study as social entrepreneurs' WISEs, focus far more on the open market than LLCs. SCIEs derive 78% of their monetary resources from the sale of goods and/or services in the open market (meaning not under contract to public authorities) compared to a 26% average for the mental health sector's WISEs.

Regression analysis showed that OMRA was the most significant contributor to the ability of WISEs to create well-paid jobs. A 1.00% increase in OMRA would increase the odds of the WISE resulting in a higher level of social performance against monetary poverty by 7.035.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study comparing the social performance of the two institutional types of Greek WISEs. Our findings could be important both for policymakers, when developing and implementing policies and programs supporting Greek WISEs, and for the WISEs themselves. The analogy between the monetary resources derived from the open market and the total monetary resources of the WISE seems to have a significant positive impact on the WISE's primary goal. Although financial support programs do help social enterprises in their early stages, relying on government funding could be a restraint in the development and implementation of a long-term sustainability plan (Jang and Bahn, 2010). New research on WISEs shows that an entrepreneurial orientation and less dependency on donations leads to economic success (Erpf, Gmuer and Baumann-Fuchs, 2020). The state must consider reinforcing the entrepreneurial orientation of LLSCs without of course limiting the amount of public procurements towards them. Establishing a respectable minimum level of OMRA could be an initial goal. That goal could be connected with the amount of public procurements that they acquire, at least after an initial period of the LLSCs' establishment. SCIEs, by being active almost exclusively in the open market, seem to have been led by reality to develop a strong entrepreneurial character. WISEs must consider how to reclaim the use of their innovative spirit and also place emphasis on how to expand the diversity of their resource mix in order to meet the current challenges (Cooney et al., 2016).

SCIEs should be further encouraged and supported by the state to access a part of public procurements in the way LLSCs have been supported for years. This would lead to an expansion in the diversity of their resources. The state should consider supporting the development of a federation for SCIEs based on the positive experience of the successful venture of the Panhellenic Federation of LLSCs. Finally, SCIEs should be encouraged to connect and cooperate with organizations that provide services to the specific target group of the SCIE, as this kind of relationship seems to strengthen the social output of the WISE.

Someone could argue that LLSCs, by focusing on people with serious psychosocial problems, face different difficulties and needs compared to SCIEs that focus on other vulnerable and special social groups. Also, the former type, being a part of the de-institutionalization process, does support the de-stigmatization by allowing people to believe that they could be active and productive members of the economy and society, when otherwise they would have been isolated. In any case, a well-paid job that is close to the concept of a full-time job is a very sufficient way of promoting both the socio-economic integration and the professional integration of people with serious psychosocial problems contributing to their economic self-sufficiency, the same way it is for every other person.

Our study included data only from Greek WISEs, therefore we do not know how generalizable our results may be to other national settings, or even inside the European Union. The statistical results presented in this paper reflect a limited number of organizations, but the sample represents a large part of the population. We were unable to develop a second ordinal regression model to further test the hypothesis considering the performance of the WISEs against low work intensity. The new—in the field of WISEs—concept of OMRA could be further explored and tested in other national settings using both quantitative and qualitative methodology.

## References

- Adam, S. (2014). Social exclusion and work integration: Social cooperatives for people with mental health problems in Greece, *CIRIEC Working Paper*, n. 2014/08. Liège: CIRIEC - Université de Liège.
- Arvidson, M. (2009). Impact and Evaluation in the UK Third Sector: Reviewing literature and exploring ideas, *Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper*, n. 27. University of Birmingham.
- Arvidson, M., Lyon, F., McKay, S. & Moro, D. (2010). The Ambitions and challenges of SROI, *Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper*, n. 49. University of Birmingham.
- Bagnoli, L. & Megali, C. (2011). Measuring Performance in Social Enterprises, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(1): 149-165. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009351111>
- Bailey, N. (2017). Employment, poverty and social exclusion. In: G. Bramley & N. Bailey (Eds.), *Poverty and social exclusion in the UK: volume 2 - the dimensions of disadvantage*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 159-178. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46692/9781447334262.008>
- Battilana, J., Lee, M., Walker, J. & Dorsey, C. (2012). In Search of the Hybrid Ideal, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 10(3): 51-55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48558/WF5M-8Q69>
- Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A.-C. & Model, J. (2015). Harnessing Productive Tensions in Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Work Integration Social Enterprises, *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6): 1658-1685. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0903>
- Bengo, I., Arena, M., Azzone, G., A. & Calderini, M. (2016). Indicators and Metrics for Social Business: A Review of Current Approaches, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 7(1): 1-24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2015.1049286>
- Chell, E. (2007). Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: Towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneur process, *International Small Business Journal*, 25(1): 5-26. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0266242607071779>
- Cooney, K. (2011). The Business of Job Creation: An Examination of the Social Enterprise Approach to Workforce Development, *Journal of Poverty*, 15(1): 88-107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875549.2011.539505>



- Cooney, K., Nyssens, M., O'Shaughnessy, M. & Defourny, J. (2016), Public Policies and Work Integration Social Enterprises: The Challenge of Institutionalization in a Neoliberal Era, *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 7(4): 415-433. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2016-0028>
- Davister, C., Defourny, J. & Gregoire, O. (2004). Work integration social enterprises in the European Union: An overview of existing models. *EMES Working Paper*, n. 04/04. Liège: EMES European Research Network. Available at: [https://orbi.uliege.be/bitstream/2268/90492/1/Work%20Integration%20Social%20Enterprises%20in%20the%20European%20Union\\_An%20overview%20of%20existing%20models.pdf](https://orbi.uliege.be/bitstream/2268/90492/1/Work%20Integration%20Social%20Enterprises%20in%20the%20European%20Union_An%20overview%20of%20existing%20models.pdf) [Accessed: 13 March 2023]
- Dees, J. G. & Anderson, B. B. (2006). Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: building on two schools of practice and thought, *Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) Occasional Working Paper Series*, 1(3): 39-66.
- Defourny, J. (2006). Multiple Goals and Multiple Stakeholder Structure: The Governance of Social Enterprises. In: M. Nyssens (Ed.), *Social enterprise. At the crossroads of market, public policies and civil society*. London: Routledge, pp. 27-108.
- Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1): 32-53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420670903442053>
- Douvitsa, I. (2016). Greek cooperative legislation during the post-crisis years: Between companization and socialization. Paper presented at the *ICA Research International Conference*, Almeria (Spain), 24-27 May 2016.
- Douvitsa, I. (2020). The work integration social enterprises in Greece, *Revista Jurídica de Economía Social y Cooperativa*, 36: 195-219. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7203/CIRIEC-JUR.36.17289>
- Ebrahim, A. & Rangan V. K. (2014). What Impact? A Framework for Measuring the Scale and Scope of Social Performance, *California Management Review*, 56(3): 118-141. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2014.56.3.118>
- Epstein, M. J. & McFarlan, F. W. (2011). Measuring the Efficiency and Effectiveness of a Nonprofit's Performance, *Strategic Finance*, 10: 27-34.
- Erpf, P., Gmuier, M. & Baumann-Fuchs, J. (2020). Does the Business Suit Fit? An Economic Perspective on Social Ventures' Success, *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2020(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2020.12481abstract>
- European Commission (2017). *Archive: Europe 2020 indicators - poverty and social exclusion*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Archive:Europe\\_2020\\_indicators\\_-\\_poverty\\_and\\_social\\_exclusion&oldid=298497#The\\_three\\_dimensions\\_of\\_poverty](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Archive:Europe_2020_indicators_-_poverty_and_social_exclusion&oldid=298497#The_three_dimensions_of_poverty) [Accessed: 13 March 2023]
- European Commission (2019). *Social enterprises and their ecosystems in Europe. Updated country report: Greece*. Authors: Varvarousis, A. & Tsitsirigkos, G. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Available at: <https://europa.eu/!Qq64ny> [Accessed: 13 March 2023]
- European Commission (2011). *Communication from the commission to the European parliament, the council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions Social Business Initiative Creating a favourable climate for social enterprises, key stakeholders in the social economy and innovation*. Available at: <https://www.eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j9vvik7m1c3gyxp/viudahf8fzz0> [Accessed: 13 March 2023]
- General Register of Social and Solidarity Economy Bodies (2021). Registrations of General Register of Social and Solidarity Economy Bodies (*In Greek: Εγγραφές Γενικού Μητρώου Φορέων Κ.Αλ.Ο*). Available at: [https://kalo.yeka.gr/\(Szzdwzaukwqd0i1mqafnz4bq\)\)/login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2f](https://kalo.yeka.gr/(Szzdwzaukwqd0i1mqafnz4bq))/login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2f) [Accessed: 19 January 2021]
- Graikioti, S., Sdrali, D. & Klimi Kaminari, O. (2022). Factors Determining the Sustainability of Social Cooperative Enterprises in the Greek Context, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 13(2): 183-204. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2020.1758197>
- Harlock, J. (2013). Impact Measurement Practice in the UK Third Sector: A Review of Emerging Evidence, *Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper*, n. 106. University of Birmingham.
- Hellenic Republic (1999). Law 2716/1999 Development and modernization of mental health services and other provisions (*In Greek: Νόμος 2716/1999 Ανάπτυξη και εκσυγχρονισμός των υπηρεσιών ψυχικής υγείας και άλλες διατάξεις*). Available at: <https://www.et.gr/> [Accessed: 13 March 2023]

- Hellenic Republic (2011). Law 4019/2011 social economy and social entrepreneurship and other provisions (*In Greek: Νόμος 4019/2011 κοινωνική οικονομία και κοινωνική επιχειρηματικότητα και λοιπές διατάξεις*). Available at: <https://www.et.gr/> [Accessed: 13 March 2023]
- Hellenic Republic (2016). Law 4430/2016 social and solidarity economy and development of its agencies and other provisions (*In Greek: Νόμος 4430/2016 Κοινωνική και αλληλέγγυα οικονομία και ανάπτυξη των φορέων της και άλλες διατάξεις*). Available at: <https://www.et.gr/> [Accessed: 13 March 2023]
- Hellenic Statistical Authority (2020). Press release risk of poverty household income and living conditions survey: year 2019 - income reference period: Year 2018 (*In Greek: Δελτίο τύπου κίνδυνος φτώχειας έρευνα εισοδήματος και συνθηκών διαβίωσης των νοικοκυριών: έτος 2019 - περίοδος αναφοράς εισοδήματος: Έτος 2018*). Available at: <https://www.statistics.gr/documents/20181/14632616/Κίνδυνος+Φτώχειας+%28+2019+%29.pdf/30f0529c-ba53-e260-f1dc-cd35d6b6530a> [Accessed: 13 March 2023]
- Holt, D. & Littlewood, D. (2015). Identifying, Mapping, and Monitoring the Impact of Hybrid Firms, *California Management Review*, 57(3): 107-125. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2015.57.3.107>
- Jang, S.-H. & Bahn, S.-S. (2010). The Effects of Entrepreneurial Orientation and Market Orientation on the Economic and Social Performance of a Social Enterprise, *Korean Journal of Business Administration*, 23(6): 3479-3496.
- Leung, Z. C. S., Ho, A. P. Y., Tjia, L. Y. N., Tam, R. K. Y., Chan, K. T. & Lai, M. K. W. (2019). Social Impacts of Work Integration Social Enterprise in Hong Kong – Workfare and Beyond, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 10(2): 159-176. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1541007>
- Levitas, R. (2005). *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and New Labour*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511552>
- Mead, L. M. (1993). *The New Politics of Poverty: The Nonworking Poor in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Morrow, M., Wasik, A., Cohen, M. & Perry, K. M. E. (2009). Removing Barriers to Work: Building Economic Security for People with Psychiatric Disabilities, *Critical Social Policy*, 29(4): 655-676. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018309341904>
- Nasioulas, I. (2012). Social Cooperatives in Greece. Introducing New Forms of Social Economy and Entrepreneurship, *International Review of Social Research*, 2(2): 141-161. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/irsr-2012-0022>
- Patrick, R. (2012). Work as the primary 'duty' of the responsible citizen: a critique of this work-centric approach, *People, Place and Policy Online*, 6(1): 5-16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3351/ppp.0006.0001.0002>
- Peredo, A. M. & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: a critical review of the concept, *Journal of World Business*, 41(1): 56-65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007>
- Petrella, F. & Richez-Battesti, N. (2016). Patterns of evolutions of social enterprises in France: a focus on work integration social enterprises, *International Review of Sociology*, 26(2): 234-246. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2016.1181390>
- Salavou H. & Cohen S. (2021). Towards a Typology of Social Enterprises Based on Performance: Some New Evidence, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 12(3): 380-398. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2020.1718743>
- Scott, W. R. (1977). Effectiveness of Organizational Effectiveness Studies. In: P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 63-95.
- Temple, N., Varvarousis, A., Galanos, C., Tsitsirigos, G. & Bekridaki, G. (2018). *Greece Social and Solidarity Economy Report*. Athens: British Council.
- Waddell, G. & Burton, A. K. (2006). *Is work good for your health and well-being?* London: The Stationery Office.
- Yunus, M., Moingeon, B. & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010). Building social business models: lessons from the Grameen experience, *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3): 308-325. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.12.005>