

EFFECTIVE MANAGING SOCIAL CO-OPERATIVES AS A FORM OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISE: THE CASE OF POLAND

Antoni Kożuch , Jan Žukovskis***

Abstract

Background. Social economy fosters professional and social integration among persons who are at risk of social marginalization, creation of employment, provision of public social services.

Research aims. The purpose of this paper is to identify the essence of social co-operatives as forms of social enterprises and the characteristics of their management.

Method. This paper analyses or discusses chosen research previously published by others authors and also statements from official documents of co-operative movement units. Based on the desk research an attempt of explanation and assessment of specificity of effective social enterprises management are made.

Key findings. As a result of research and analysis, the main features of social co-operatives as a form of social enterprise were identified and the characteristics of their management were revealed. The paper adds a new value to understanding of continuity of co-operative principles in the context of new challenges in the framework of social economy.

Keywords: Social co-operatives, Social enterprise, Social objectives, Democratic management

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental principle of a social economy is to prevent social exclusion which specifically affects the long-term unemployed, homeless, addicts and the isolated. The key idea underpinning the operations carried out by social economy entities is the priority given to efforts for its citizens' benefits over maximization of profits. Social economy based on solidarity, participation and autonomy reinforces the process of building a civic society.

Social economy entities may take on diverse forms. Basically, social co-operatives tend to be the most widespread form, specifically advocated and enacted in the act of 20 April 2004 on promotion of employment and on labour market institutions.

A social cooperative as a type of labour cooperative rests on the principle of personal work performed by its members. They are comprised of persons who are at risk of social exclusion due to unemployment, disability or mental illness, or who encounter difficulties in finding the job. A social cooperative as an enterprise serves the needs of its members who both own

* Prof. dr hab. Antoni Kożuch Gen. Tadeusz Kościuszko Military Academy of Land Forces in Wrocław

** Dr Jan Žukovskis, University of A. Stulginskis, Kaunas.



it and exercise control over it. In their efforts to accomplish their social mission, they need to generate profits which are not an overriding goal but rather an essential tool for achievement of social aims.

Today, the impact of the tradition of co-operative movement is not appreciated. The prevailing approach rather focused on comparing social cooperatives with commercial enterprises.

The purpose of this paper is to identify the essence of social co-operatives as forms of social enterprises and the characteristics of their management in the light of main principles of this movement.

REVIEW

Social Economy – Essence and Scope

Social economy is one of the factors contributing to advance of participatory democracy. Currently definitions agree on the fact that social economy deals with fulfilling the needs unlikely to be met by other sectors, namely social cohesion and commitment to generating employment, encouragement to entrepreneurial activities, building a pluralist, participatory, democratic society grounded on solidarity (Borzaga & Defourny 1992; Kwaśnicki 2005, p. 16) Broadly speaking, economy may be defined as a set of a variety of entities which are characterised by specific traits and principles of operation. Their activity creates a sense of mission and social justice, and determines the actions in favour of their members, beneficiaries and clients.

Social economy is a sphere of civic activities, which, through its economic operations and public benefits, fosters: professional and social integration among persons who are at risk of social marginalization, creation of employment, provision of public social services (Herbst, 2013, p. 14).

Social economy may be regarded as a section of business operations falling into the triangle whose sides indicate: market economy, civic society and democratic state (Hausner, 2007, p. 9). Therefore, the foregoing implies that, in principle, it should help reconcile to contrary rationalities attributed to the market (allocation rationality), to the state (distribution rationality) and to the society (rationality of solidarity) (Kwaśnicki 2005, p. 12).

Social economy is principally connected with civic society organizations (third sector), however it also includes specific activities of the public sector (e.g. employment policy, policy of social integration) and private sector (e.g. corporate social responsibility) (Rymsza 2005, p. 4).

Social economy occurs at the intersection of three sectors: public, enterprises and non-governmental organizations. In essence, it falls into the sphere of economy and it is a particular form of entrepreneurship, and thus it must possess elementary attributes typical to the enterprise sector.



The major distinction between private economy and social economy mostly lies in the fact that its entities are not focused on generating profits but on delivering social goals where the utmost significance is given to prevention of social exclusion whereas social economy differs from public economy in that its entities are not controlled by public administration, but by citizens and civic organizations, and they principally fail to offer available public goods and services to all citizens, but goods and services that directly or indirectly (income allocated for social goals) produce benefits to a specific group of beneficiaries who generally represent those disadvantaged. The specifics of social economy lie in the fact that the course of action pursued by its entities and mechanisms deployed for control of operations are social (Hausner, 2007, p. 18).

A core function of social economy is to prevent social exclusion. Overall, social economy entities particularly regard the following as groups at risk of social exclusion: the long-term unemployed, homeless, addicted and isolated. By activating them and reintegrating them into the market economy, they contribute to enhancing social cohesion in those marginalized areas where public administration falls short.

Traditional social policy is also dedicated to preventing social exclusion. Yet, its successes in this domain are limited. Thus, social economy proposes a completely different approach to tackle the problem. This difference is precisely identified by Sadowski (2005) who argues that from the perspective of the traditional assistance model, beneficiaries are viewed as passive recipients of benefits and services provided by specific groups of specialists. In essence, this model frequently does not involve active participation of those concerned in reintegration, and it largely relies on funds from the budget and other donors.

Social economy entities are, in principle, committed to social integration through professional activation and facilitating independence among excluded persons. To be able to attain these aims autonomously, they must generate income.

However, it should be highlighted that social economy performs a variety of additional functions encouraging development, namely (Woolcock, 1998; Defourny, Michel, & Sophie, 2002; Social, 2002):

1. Creates material base for operations by civic organizations,
2. Promotes alternative credit forms,
3. Enhances social capital,
4. Revives local public space,
5. Fosters accomplishment of civic ideas,
6. Advocates reform of public services sector.

The above functions of social economy are performed by entities commonly defined, though not too precisely, as the third sector, as opposed to the private (business) and public (state and local government)



sectors. Hence, the third sector – civic – embraces non-governmental organizations conducting non-profit operations. Nevertheless, they may be entities active in all three sectors, and compared to other organizations they stand out in terms of their objectives and specific business form entailing risk as well (Szopa, 2007, p. 17). Typically this suggests activities bordering on private and public sectors. Social economy, means business operations where market instruments are used for social purposes, whereas a man and his work completed are more important than capital and maximization of company's profits (Rybka, 2007, p. 27).

Social economy is a specific method deployed for operations, a particular type of economy. Its entities carry out business operations alongside using economic instruments, taking economic risk and pursuing profitability. Meanwhile, they are not propelled by generating profit, but they set specifically defined social goals. In effect, it is a sense of mission and justice, activities aimed at their members, beneficiaries and clients appear as a hallmark of their activities (Hausner, Kwiecińska, & Pacut, 2006, pp. 5-6).

The purpose of organized business operations is to receive a sufficiently high return from capital invested. The profit is siphoned from the company. If return is insufficient, the business is closed down. On the whole, the traditional social economy may be typified as activities focused on members involved in the venture.

Given its type, the aim is to fulfil specific needs: (a) work and remuneration, (b) decreased costs of living (borderline survival), (c) collaboration and exchange of services (reciprocity) with other community members (in a similar situation).

Involvement in the project as a legitimate entity gives its members an opportunity to restore their dignity through activity and independence. (Herbst, 2013, pp. 9-10)

Social economy through its complementarity, that is mutual complementing, assumes the process of flexibly adjusting to the reality conditioned, both in the macro scale (state regime, economic cycle) as well as micro scale (specific, formal and informal local structures). Accordingly, this triggers: flexible response/adjustment to the needs of social groups, environments or specific persons, diversity of initiatives, spontaneity, innovativeness, thinking outside the box.

From the traditional perspective social economy occurs in the following forms (Herbst, 2013, p. 12; Kochanowicz, Topińska, 1992, pp. 41-48; ADRECEMA, 1992, p. 40):

1. Cooperatives – organizations centred on activation (incorporating) a closed group of members; capable of playing a competitive game on the market.
2. Cooperative banks.



3. Consumer cooperatives – enabling minor consumers to acquire control over prices and quality of goods and services purchased. A group of consumers plays in accordance with free market rules, and basically does not need particular support forms (due to the specifics of that form, though a classical housing cooperative may be an exception).
4. Self-help/mutual help organizations – uniting individuals likely to offer their work (skills, time) in order to provide help to their members.
5. Loan and guarantee fund, mutual insurance institutions – not seeking profit.

Today social economy entities, including four primary groups, operate in the sphere of social economy. They are as follows (Herbst, 2013, pp. 14-15):

1. Social enterprises being at the heart of social economy,
2. Reintegrating entities aimed at social and professional reintegration among persons at risk of social exclusion, i.e. Vocational Development Centre, Occupational Therapy Workshops, Social Integration Centres, Social Integration Clubs; these forms will be, under no circumstances, social enterprise, but they may provide training designed to run or work in a social enterprise or may be led as service aimed at local community or as a social enterprise.
3. Public benefit entities which carry out business activities, employ personnel, though their operations are not based on economic profits; these are non-governmental organizations running activities for payment as well as free-of-charge for public benefit; these entities may become social enterprises if they begin business operations in a specific time, while also assuming statutory obligations with regard to profit distribution,
4. Economic entities set up in connection with accomplishing a social purpose, or for which a social purpose lying in the common interest is a backbone for commercial activities; these are entities which fall short of compliance with all characteristics and requirements attributed to operations by social enterprises; these entities may be divided into three sub-groups: (a) non-governmental organizations carrying out business activities where surpluses shore up delivery of statutory goals, (b) cooperatives aimed at employment, (c) remaining cooperatives being consumer-based and reciprocal in their character.

Social enterprises, accordingly to European Commission, as fundamental units of social economy are operators whose main objectives are to have a social impact instead of making a profit for their founders. They operate by providing goods and services for the market in an entrepreneurial and often innovative way and use their surpluses primarily to



achieve social objectives. They are managed in an open and responsible manner involving employees, consumers and stakeholders affected by their commercial activities (European Commission, 2011, p. 2).

For managing social enterprises it has characteristic specific features, i.e., primacy of individuals and social objectives over capital, voluntary and open membership, democratic control held by members, community of members' and users' interests with general interests, solidarity and responsibility principles applied in practice, independence from public institutions mirrored in self-government and allocation of some surpluses on reinforcing continual development of the enterprise or development of services for members (Roelants & Sanchez Bajo, 2002; Hausner, 2007, p. 15). As can be seen from the foregoing, these are the attributes that prove to be convergent with traditional and current cooperative principles and values.

The above attributes should be expanded by a trait of local location and activities aimed at a local community. This experience results from British and other countries experiences (Leadbeater, 1967, p. 65; Novkovic & Holm, 2012).

The attributes outlined above clearly specify the context for social enterprises management (Defourny, 2012, pp. 12-15):

1. Social objective – relations between a social economy organization and beneficiaries of its activities based on social utility;
2. Autonomous management – suggests that none of stakeholders can exert influence on the statutory objective of social economy organization;
3. Democratic decision-making – each participant of the social economy organization may have influence on its functioning;
4. Work ahead of capital – surplus generated helps to achieve a social objective and cannot be allotted to other purposes;
5. Local anchoring – social economy organization operates within and for the local community.

Based on the foregoing, the following definition of social economy may be adopted: this is a sector of economy where organizations are committed to social utility and surpluses generated further accomplishment of a social objective (Hausner, 2007, pp. 14-15).

Contemporary Dimension of Co-operative Principles in the Practice of Social Co-operatives

Cooperative activities are sometimes defined as a crucial pillar of social economy and as an element of building a civic society. Such views are often voiced by cooperative members themselves or by scientists investigating the issues related to the third sector or social economy (Ridley-Duff, 2009). At the same time though, in numerous official documents addressing



an advance of social economy, civic society as well as social awareness, the presence of cooperative activities is marginal or it is simply denied.

The definition of cooperative activities resembles what researchers label as a bimodal model of cooperatives. All in all, this means that a cooperative is both an association as well as an enterprise. It initially emerges as an association of individuals having certain specific needs: providing consumption products to themselves, financial services, housing, assistance in management of farms, workshop, jobs and so forth. However, to be able to meet these needs, it needs to carry out business activities, and thus to establish an “overlapping” association-enterprise, which should be capable of surviving and sustaining on a competitive market (Boczar, 1991, p. 23).

A cooperative is a specific enterprise whose objective is to satisfy the needs and aspirations of its members through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise.

As revealed in the Report on cooperatives prepared by the Interdepartmental Team comprising representatives of the government and the National Cooperative Council, in Poland currently there are about 9,000 cooperative enterprises which comprise over 8 million members and employ around 400,000 employees (KRS, 2010, p.1). Taken together, cooperatives continue to have an impact on lives of several million citizens and they employ a substantial number of persons.

Cooperatives employ three times more disabled people than the whole national economy (11.6% and 3.6%), and an average percentage of women employed in cooperatives totalled 59%, compared to 45% in the whole economy. Cooperatives maintain long-term employment of persons in immobile productive age or retirement age (the percentage of these employees in cooperatives accounts for 53%, whereas in the whole economy it stands at merely 36%). Cooperatives also employ more persons with low and medium level education (basic vocational, secondary and post-secondary education) than the whole economy (78% and 68.3% respectively). At least 38% of cooperatives tend to be an important local employer (KRS, 2010, p. 22).

When comparing the context for management of cooperatives and other enterprises (Castelini, 2012; Paton, 2003; Cornforth, 1995; Cook, 1994) the emphasis should be placed on the similarities, namely: acting in the same market, labour and capital conditions, being subject to the same tax and credit regimes, labour law and other regulations. Furthermore, they have to face the domestic and international competition.

The differences, however, refer to relationships between the owners and their enterprise as well as the manner in which they approach profits generated and its division. In non-cooperative enterprises decisions on these matters are made by persons who have invested capital for profit. Owners strive to generate maximum profit and split it proportionally to



the capital invested. Whereas in cooperatives decisions are taken in line with the principle “one person – one voice”, irrespective the number of shares held. Moreover, members and users of the cooperative expect certain benefits from the cooperative, e.g. lower prices while buying goods, so-called refund from shopping, trainings, advising, cultural and social activities, etc. Benefits and potential profits are divided proportionally to the turnover. A cooperative tends to be an association of persons, while a company as an association of capital. Cooperatives arose from the need for self-defence of more economically vulnerable classes (Boguta, 2006, pp. 50-51). Therefore, the ownership form and the manner in which a cooperative is managed prove to be the most distinct difference, contrasting a cooperative with other types of enterprise.

The essence of cooperatives manifests itself in fulfilling common principles by their members; where these principles rely on formulating cooperatives' objectives in a different way than those set by private entities, as on utilizing specific instruments for their accomplishment. After all, this difference stems from the fact that a cooperative is a voluntary and entrenched in democratic standards association of persons running business for its members' benefit. Cooperatives are a form of collective activities among a local community. Cooperative's operations create the conditions for business and social efforts (World standards, 2011; World Declaration, 2005).

These organizations perform various functions having a self-help, social and welfare character. Cooperative activities may, thus, alleviate social problems and income inequalities occurring in a market economy. (Brown, 2006; Dyka & Grzegorzewski, 2000, pp. 10-14; Major, 1998; Kożuch, 2010, pp. 72-83)

The International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) at the 22nd Congress in Vienna in 1966 adopted seven common cooperative principles. This first principle pertains to voluntary and open membership perceived as conferring of certain rights and duties on members, such as: use of benefits provided by the cooperative and fulfilling duties connected with membership. The second principle of democratic member control clearly regulates the members' role in management of the cooperative. The third principle relates to members' economic participation and their shared responsibility implying that members contribute shares and democratically manage the cooperative's assets. Another principle suggests that cooperatives are self-governed, self-help organizations controlled by their members; it is called the principle of autonomy and independence. The principle of education, training and information is concerned with improving members' professional qualifications and their awareness as well as with increasing members' competences for fair performing control functions within a democratic intra-cooperative system. Another principle puts a spotlight on coopera-



tion through local, national and international structures so that cooperatives may undertake joint initiatives and, thus, resist monopolistic practices. The seventh and final principle places emphasis on concern for a local community. It should be underlined that these principles are universal and refer to all types of cooperatives. (Dyka S., Grzegorzewski P., 2000, pp. 10-14; Kożuch A., 2010, No. 3, pp. 72-83) The growth of the cooperative movement over years led to revision of these principles by the ICA which in 1996 enacted the Statement on the Cooperative Identity (Manchester declaration). The Declaration (Henry, 2005, pp. 5-6) were structured into two categories: those constituting cooperatives (principles 1-4), if entities fail to comply with them, they cannot be described as “cooperative” as well as those fostering development. The document adopted in this form is an element of the international cooperative law.

Social Co-operatives as Forms of Social Enterprises – Context of Democratic Management

Social cooperative as an institution was implemented into Polish legislature at the start of 2006 as a result of enactment of the law on social cooperatives as an instrument likely to be used in situations where active methods intended to tackle unemployment problems fail to yield satisfactory effects. Principally, inspiration came from Italian measures with regard to social cooperatives type B which supported local communities in mitigating social exclusion among vulnerable persons such as: disabled, long-term unemployed, those making use of social benefits and supported employment, those getting out of homelessness and those put on re-adaptation programme as emigrants (Matoga, 2007, p. 6).

These solutions were copied in the Polish territory directly referring to social employment or vocational and social rehabilitation of disabled persons. This also applies to duality of the organization’s objectives related to social and occupational reintegration which existed previously in the definition of cooperative law, and only recently were adequately defined in detail (Dziubińska-Michalewicz, 2003, p. 4)

However, the necessity to transfer funds acquired for statutory purposes is the cause of the difference between a social cooperative and a typical work cooperative. In contrast to a typical cooperative where dividends are, through a decision passed by the General Meeting, freely allocated for different purposes, such an activity by a social cooperative is subject to legal constraints. This is a beneficial solution, because it guarantees that funds are not squandered, but assigned for development of the specific institution, and thus the whole social cooperative movement (Pałys, 2005, p. 18).

Hence, a social cooperative is a specific form of the social enterprise. Essentially, it is formed by persons vulnerable to marginalization due to unemployment, disability or mental illness who experience difficulties in



finding work. Working in social cooperatives gives them a chance for social and vocational activation, social reintegration and improvement of their qualifications (Cornforth, 1995).

A social cooperative was designed as a social economy entity, that is as an institution which carries out activities by combining business and social aims. The law on social cooperatives (Journal of Laws, of 2006 N. 94, item 651 as amended) provides legal foundations for running a collective enterprise by persons susceptible to social exclusion, who would particularly face obstacles when starting and running business operations individually. Members of the social cooperative create jobs for themselves, and thus ensure income for themselves and their families, and through joint efforts they transform themselves and the environment where they live, thereby creating something that becomes a common asset for which they assume responsibility. To this aim they have to cooperate while learning how to nurture interpersonal relationships and identifying their social roles. They also develop capabilities allowing them for professional independency in the future.

Taken together, three basic types of social cooperatives may be distinguished (Juszczuk, Mierzejewski, & Ołdak, 2009, pp. 12-13):

1. Social cooperatives of individuals established by no fewer than 5 and no more than 50 persons, where minimum 50% should include persons being at risk of social exclusion or those excluded;
2. Social cooperatives of legal persons set up by at least two legal entities and employing a minimum of 50% of persons being at risk of social exclusion or those excluded;
3. Social cooperatives of mixed persons, i.e. set up collectively by individuals and legal persons.

Social cooperative emerges and operates for two fundamental purposes. The first purpose is to collectively run the enterprise and the other is to incorporate cooperative members into social and professional life, to restore their skills of establishing and maintaining relationships at work as well as in the family and local community.

A specific character of the social cooperative and its demographic management is driven by: (a) type of persons that may set up a cooperative, (b) personal members' work as a mainstay of cooperative activities, (c) social objectives, i.e. social and professional reintegration of members (defined by Art. 2(2) of the law on social cooperatives as "restoring and maintaining capabilities of participating in local community and performing social roles at workplace, settling or staying and restoring and maintaining skills of individually performing work on the labour market").

Enquiries made allow for the ascertainment that a social cooperative is an association of persons largely vulnerable to social exclusion who collectively run the enterprise and accomplish social objectives due to their



personal work and professional reintegration. A social cooperative as a form of business operations is subject to the same laws as an enterprise, among others: labour law, accounting act, tax law, etc. Importantly, it carries out business activities based on cost-benefit analysis and has unlimited liability.

Social cooperatives such as work cooperatives as well as any other cooperative forms are enterprises which previously was often ignored by both the individuals setting up them as well as those supporting their establishment. The law of 27 April 2006 on social cooperatives clearly specifies that the objective of activities by a social cooperative is to run a joint enterprise resting on its members' personal work. The accomplishment of the purpose for which it is appointed, that is social and professional reintegration of persons involved, requires their employment. To make it effective, economic engagement of cooperative members and a sense of co-responsibility for its economic success as an imperative for social success are critical (Brzozowska, 2007, p. 39).

The studies conducted in 2010 by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy as part of the project "Monitoring of social cooperatives" showed a relatively rapid surge in the number of cooperatives. In total, their number grew from 276 to 492, i.e. an increase by 78.3% over 2007-2010. This suggests a quite high interest in this form of activities.

Moreover, these studies also reveal that at the centre of the successful cooperative operations is their effective management, including adequate specification of the object of activities which primarily relies on members' education and skills (28.3% of population surveyed) and appropriate recognition of market needs (26.7%).

Polish social cooperatives are typically involved in providing services. In the population surveyed the major businesses included services with regard to: house and garden (43.05), construction (33.3%) and catering (27.9%). From the cognitive perspective an important issue referred to the fact that individuals (37.0%), private companies (23.0) and public administration institutions (22.0%) were major recipients of products and services. Cooperation between cooperatives and private companies is based on business relations, thereby encouraging achievement of social and economic goals.

The findings of the surveys demonstrate that the majority of cooperatives strive to extend the scope of their business operations (80.4%) using resources and experiences possessed. Though only about half of the cooperatives surveyed devised their expansion strategy and thus it may be concluded that social cooperatives, to a large extent, operate by following informal plans and arrangements. On the one hand it enhances the cooperative's flexibility in adjusting to the market, but on the other hand it implies no structured actions in the years ahead. The community of cooperative members tends to be active in shaping a social environment. The



number of social and cultural initiatives in cooperatives researched on average stood at 4.1. In effect, these initiatives are aimed at a narrow group of recipients, as 86.0% of cooperatives surveyed carried out cultural and educational activities for their members, compared to 67.1 of respondents for their environment.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it should be highlighted that the practical use of a platform for sharing experience such as a social cooperative has high potential for expansion – it may be a source for transfer of competences between cooperative members as well as between a cooperative and local government administration and entrepreneurs.

Regarding the administration, it allows for accomplishment of the highest objective which is cutting in structural unemployment in the situation when other forms counteracting this phenomenon appear to be ineffective, and spending for social purposes through passive methods such as lifetime or designated benefits from social welfare are soaring rapidly.

Entrepreneurs, particularly those operating on a local market, should see a social cooperative as a subcontractor to forge lasting business relationships rather than as a competitor. Therefore, their product strengthens its competitiveness. In the same way, the company benefits from the image as an entity taking a pro-social stand. This has profound implications for clients coming from a local community. Thus, social cooperative activities should be promoted as beneficial not only for its members but, above all, for a social and business local community.

Overall, the democratic rules are observed while managing cooperatives, though the bulk of them are managed in an intuitive manner, which is proved by the paucity of strategic management. The consequence is insufficient accomplishment of all objectives aimed at putting cooperative principles, enshrined in social economy, into practice.

REFERENCES

- ADRECMA. (1992). Dossier Europe centrale et orientale: Mutation économique et Économie sociale. *Revue des Etudes Cooperatives, Mutualistes est Associatives*, 41.
- Brown, J. (2006). Designing Equity Finance for Social Enterprises. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 2(1).
- Boczar, K. (1991). *Zasady spółdzielcze*. Warszawa: Rocznik Spółdzielczego Instytutu Badawczego.
- Boguta, W. (2006). Przedsiębiorstwo spółdzielcze a spółka kapitałowa – różnice, przewagi, wady i problemy, specyfika zarządzania. In *Odmienność podmiotów spółdzielczych od spółek prawa handlowego*, conference materials, II Spółdzielcze Forum Społeczno-Ekonomiczne. Warszawa: Krajowa Rada Spółdzielcza.
- Borzaga, C., & Defourny, J. (eds). (1992). *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*, London: Routledge.
- Brzozowska, J. (2007). Spółdzielnia jako podmiot ekonomii społecznej. *Ekonomia społeczna*, 1(39).
- Castellini, M., Maran, L. (2012). An Overview of Management Systems in the Cooperative Sector. *Journal of Co-Operative Accounting and Reporting*, 1(1).



- Cook, M.L. (1994). The role of management behavior in agricultural co-operatives. *Journal of Agricultural Cooperation*, 9.
- Cornforth, C. (1995). Patterns of Cooperative Management. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 16.
- Defourny, J., Michel, S., & Sophie, A. (2002). *The Co-Operative Movement in Belgium: perspectives and Prospects*. Editions Luc Pire..
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. *The EMES approach of social enterprise in a comparative perspective*. EMES Working Papers Series 2012, no. 3, Retrieved from: http://www.emes.net/uploads/media/EMES-WP-12-03_Defourny-Nyssens.pdf
- Dyjka, S., & Grzegorzewski, P. (2000). *Zarządzanie spółdzielnią*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Dziubińska-Michalewicz, M. (2003). *Przedsiębiorstwa społeczne jako jedna z form zatrudnienia socjalnego. Doświadczenia wybranych krajów - Włoch, Finlandii i Francji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo MPiPS.
- European Commission Social Business Initiative. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions*. Brussels 2011, p. 2. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/social_business/docs/COM2011_682_en.pdf.
- Hausner, J. (2007). Ekonomia społeczna jako sektor gospodarki. *Ekonomia społeczna*, 1.
- Hausner, J., & Kwiecińska, D., & Pacut, A. (2006). Europejski model społeczny. *Nowe Życie Gospodarcze*, 11.
- Henrijm, H. (2005). *Guidelines for Cooperative legislation*. Second revised edition. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Herbst, K. (2013). Perspektywy ekonomii społecznej. *Ekonomia społeczna*, 1.
- Information about functioning of social cooperatives operating on the basis of the act of 27 April 2006 on social cooperatives over 2010-2011*. MPiPS, Warsaw 2010.
- Izdebski, H. (2007). Czym jest ekonomia społeczna? *Ekonomia Społeczna*, 1.
- Juszczak, M., Miżejewski, C., & Ołdak, M. (2009). *Tworzenie i działalność spółdzielni socjalnej*. Szczecin: Zachodniopomorskie Centrum Wspierania Procesów Ekonomii Społecznej.
- Kochanowicz, J., & Topińska, I. (1992). Memoire d'Économies sociales en Pologne : des 'traditions un peu oubliées'. *Revue des Etudes Cooperatives, Mutualistes est Associatives*, 41.
- Kozuch, A. (2010). Specyfika spółdzielczego systemu zarządzania. *Współczesne Zarządzanie*, 3.
- Kwaśnicki, W. (2005). Gospodarka społeczna z perspektywy ekonomii liberalnej. *Trzeci Sektor*, 2.
- Leadbeater, Ch. (1997). *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*. London: Demos.
- Major, G. (1998). The Need for NOVARS (Non-voting Value Added Sharing Renewable Shares). *Journal of Cooperative Studies*, 31(2).
- Matoga, B. (2007). Włoskie spółdzielnie socjalne realizują wiele usług komunalnych. *Gazeta Samorządu i Administracji, (Monitor Gospodarczy)*, 25.
- Monitor Spółdzielczy. (1999). Monitor Spółdzielczy No. 1 (28 February) (Polish version of the Statement on Cooperative Identity).
- Novkovic, S., & Holm, W. (2012). Co-operative networks as a source of organizational innovation. *International Journal of Co-operative Management*, 6(11).
- Pałys, E. (2005). Przedsiębiorstwa społeczne wzmacniają rozwój. *Gazeta Samorządu i Administracji*, 17.
- Paton, R. (2003). *Managing and Measuring Social Enterprises*. London: Sage Publications.
- Raport o spółdzielczości polskiej*. (2010). Warszawa: Krajowa Rada Spółdzielcza.
- Ridley-Duff, R. (2009). Cooperative social enterprises: company rules, access to finance and management practice. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 5(1).
- Roelants, B., & Sanchez Bajo, C. (2002). Un aperçu général de l'économie sociale. In B. Roelants (ed.), *Un essai d'introduction à l'économie sociale en Europe*. Praha.
- Rybka, I. (2007). System pomocy społecznej w Polsce wobec nowej fali ekonomii społecznej: szanse i bariery. *Trzeci Sektor*, 9.
- Rymsza, M. (2005). Stara i nowa ekonomia społeczna. Polska na tle doświadczeń europejskich. *Trzeci Sektor*, 2.
- Sadowski, T. (2005). *Ekonomia społeczna w Polsce - nowe perspektywy w przeciwdziałaniu wykluczeniu społecznemu*. Retrieved from: <http://es.net.pl/images/stories/files/ekonomia%20spoleczna%20w%20polsce.pdf>.
- Szopa, B. (2007). Ekonomia społeczna z perspektywy ekonomii tradycyjnej. *Ekonomia społeczna*, 1.



World Declaration on Worker Cooperatives, Approved by the ICA General Assembly in Cartagena, Columbia, 23rd September 2005. Retrieved from http://www.cicopa.coop/IMG/pdf/Declaration_approved_by_ICA_EN-2.pdf

World Standards of Social Cooperatives, CICOPA, ICA 2011.

Woolcock, M. (1998). Social Capital and Economic Development: Towards a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework. *Theory and Society*, 27.

EFEKTYWNE ZARZĄDZANIE SPÓŁDZIELNIAMI SOCJALNYMI BĘDĄCYMI FORMĄ PRZEDSIĘBIORSTW SPOŁECZNYCH: PRZYPADEK POLSKI

Abstrakt

Tło badań. Ekonomia społeczna sprzyja integracji zawodowej i społecznej wśród osób, które są narażone na ryzyko marginalizacji społecznej, tworzeniu miejsc pracy, oraz świadczeniu publicznych usług społecznych.

Cel badań: Celem artykułu jest określenie istoty spółdzielni socjalnych jako form przedsiębiorstw społecznych oraz cech charakterystycznych dla ich zarządzania.

Metodyka: Niniejszy artykuł analizuje lub omawia badania dotychczas publikowane przez innych autorów oraz oświadczenia zawarte w oficjalnych dokumentach jednostek ruch spółdzielczego. W oparciu o badania wtórne została podjęta próba wyjaśnienia oraz oceny specyfiki efektywnego zarządzania spółdzielniami socjalnymi.

Kluczowe wnioski: W wyniku badań i analiz zostały zidentyfikowane główne cechy spółdzielni socjalnych jako form przedsiębiorstw społecznych oraz zostały wskazane cechy charakterystyczne dla ich zarządzania. Artykuł oferuje nową wartość dla zrozumienia ciągłości zasad leżących u podstaw spółdzielni w kontekście nowych wyznań dla ekonomii społecznej.

Słowa kluczowe: spółdzielnie socjalne, przedsiębiorstwa społeczne, społeczne cele, demokratyczne zarządzanie

