

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Stamm, Ingo; Matthies, Aila-Leena; Hirvilammi, Tuuli; Närhi, Kati

**Title:** Combining labour market and unemployment policies with environmental sustainability? : A cross-national study on ecosocial innovations

**Year:** 2020

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © 2020 Cambridge University Press

**Rights:** CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

**Rights url:** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

**Please cite the original version:**

Stamm, I., Matthies, A.-L., Hirvilammi, T., & Närhi, K. (2020). Combining labour market and unemployment policies with environmental sustainability? : A cross-national study on ecosocial innovations. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 36(1), 42-56.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/ics.2020.4>

## **Manuscript, 05.04.19:**

[Stamm, I., Matthies, A.-L., Hirvilammi, T., & Närhi, K. \(2020\). Combining labour market and unemployment policies with environmental sustainability? : A cross-national study on ecosocial innovations. \*Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy\*, 36\(1\), 42-56.](#)  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/ics.2020.4>

### **1. Introduction**

What does it mean to shape labour market and unemployment policies towards sustainability? How can social rights and social justice be secured for present and future generations in a way that respects the principle of ecological sustainability at the same time? This paper examines the understudied linkages between the challenge of unemployment and ecological sustainability. It contributes to the general discussion on eco-welfare states (Gough, 2013, 2017) or green welfare systems (Fitzpatrick, 2011) and the emergence of new eco-social policies. The field of labour market and unemployment policies encompasses financial allowances for unemployed people, but also other benefits such as services, e.g. employment promotion and activation programmes.

In this article, we approach the interlinkages between unemployment policies and ecological sustainability with the help of empirical data based on a cross-national case study on ecosocial innovations (ESI) in four European countries – Finland, Germany, Belgium and Italy (cf. Stamm, Hirvilammi, Matthies, & Närhi, 2017; Matthies, Stamm, Hirvilammi, & Närhi, 2019). We define ESIs as small-scale associations, cooperatives, projects or organizations that create new integrative practices combining both social and environmental goals in the field of social and solidarity economy (SSE) (see e.g. Wallimann, 2014; Utting, 2015). The concept of ESI developed for this cross-national study draws on theories and concepts on social innovation

(e.g. Mehmood & Parra, 2013; Moulaert, MacCallum, Mehmood, & Hamdouch, 2013). As attributed to social innovations in general, ESIs are fulfilling individual and collective needs at the same time. However, they combine new social practices with environmental goals, both in their own activities (as in a repair café or vegan social kitchen) and in their outcomes, services or products (as in bike rental or by selling organic vegetables) (see also Johanisová & Fraňková, 2013; Science Communication Unit, 2014). The ESIs all have in common that a vast amount of “man- or womanpower” is needed for initiating, establishing and strengthening the social practices of the innovative organizations. But this does not necessarily mean paid or gainful employment. Their foundation is rather a creative and sometimes chaotic mix of work, employment and volunteering (Stamm et al., 2017, p. 209).

Many ESIs face the problematic fact that labour market and unemployment policies are still widely unaffected by any discussion of an integrative sustainability or eco-social transformation in Europe. Sustainability in this context mainly refers to financial or fiscal sustainability, leaving the social and ecological dimension completely out. This tremendous gap applies to most social security branches so far and is further reflected in the absence of research in this field. Only rather slowly, and yet far from mainstream discussions, this situation is changing in social policy or social work research, which this study is based on (e.g. Gough et al., 2008; Cook, Smith, & Utting, 2012; Gough, 2013, 2017; Wallimann, 2013; Fitzpatrick, 2011, 2014a, 2014b; Matthies & Närhi, 2017).

This is the gateway for the main research question of this article: how are labour market and unemployment policies connected to ecosocial innovations in various countries and what lessons for developing new eco-social policies can be learned from this connection? The originality of the article is its foundation in empirical data on small-scale community based ESIs that can inform labour market and unemployment policies from a bottom-up perspective. The article begins with an overview of the research discussions on eco-social policies, in

which the natural environmental and unemployment are interlinked. It will be shown how scarcely the link is discussed, and that even in the slowly growing but still limited body of work on climate change, social policy and sustainability, social security and the specific realm of labour market and unemployment policies play a marginal role. In the second section, we focus on ESIs and their connections with social security systems and unemployment policies. We conclude by discussing the policy implications and prospects of new eco-social policies.

## **2. Labour market and unemployment policies towards sustainability**

A common phenomena in social policy research or policy papers on the future of social security over the last 20 years is that sustainability is only discussed as fiscal, financial or monetary sustainability (e.g. Cooley & Soares, 1999; Brugiavini & Galasso, 2004; Euzby, 2012). Fitzpatrick (2002) and Cahill (2002) were among the first to stipulate a social policy shift towards ecological sustainability. Later the issues were brought up by Gough et al. (2008), for example, when displaying the multiple consequences of climate change and other ecological problems. Climate change, as the most visible ecological challenge, was seen as a new all-encompassing social risk, which is of a global nature and threatens the human welfare of current and future generations (Gough, 2013, pp. 186–187).

The alarming ecological threats have proposed to cause a whole series of “new social risks” for the welfare state (cf. Schaffrin, 2014; Johansson, Khan, & Hildingsson, 2016). In order to address these new risks, Gough (2013, p. 198) sees that “social policy would need to combine with environmentalism to forge a unified eco-social policy that can achieve ecologically beneficial and socially just impacts...”. As a strategy for integrating social policy with climate change policy he describes three measures: compensation, co-benefits, and integrated eco-social policies (Gough, 2013, p. 196; see also Gough & Meadowcroft, 2011). The latter he

defines at another point as “policies that simultaneously and explicitly pursue both equity/justice and sustainability/sufficiency goals” (Gough, 2017, p. 161). These kinds of eco-social policies would help to provide all human beings with “a safe and just space” as proposed by Raworth (2017) in her “doughnut model”. Eco-social policies would enhance and “combine sustainable livelihoods with human wellbeing” (Gough, 2017, p. 2). Another quite close concept is the framework of new social settlements (Coote, 2015). These settlements would have three goals: “social justice, environmental sustainability, and a more equal distribution of power” (Coote, 2015, p. 8). Similar to Gough (2017) and other authors, Coote identifies work time reduction as one of the key measures for building new social settlements and achieving a “greener” society. Further eco-social policies, like alternative food production and sharing groups, play a significant role in this development.

In studies on the future of work and employment the link to the natural environment is usually only examined from the perspective of the green economy and green jobs, without focusing on the other side of the coin, unemployment and employment promotion (see e.g. Angelov & Johansson, 2011; Cook et al., 2012; Jackson & Victor, 2013). The narrow focus on paid work is also present in the literature on social policy and environment when questioning the “work and spend cycle” and envisioning how to overcome it (e.g. Cahill, 2002, p. 133). This critique is often linked to a new awareness of different forms of work – gainful employment, volunteering, care work, work for subsistence – and a feminist critic on the dominance of the male, full-time employment model (e.g. Graham-Gibson, Cameron, & Healy, 2013). A number of authors discuss social policy and social sustainability but limited to a certain city or a region (e.g. Holden, 2010; Guillen-Royo, Guardiola, & Garcia-Quero, 2017) or they connect it to need theories and the concept of sustainable welfare (e.g. Hirvilammi & Helne, 2014; Koch & Mont, 2016). Discussions on basic income and sustainability (e.g. Fitzpatrick, 2002; Anderson, 2009) are also relevant in this context but usually do not give detailed

examples for new instruments for existing social security systems. Very few authors have so far sketched new eco-social policies in detail related to labour market and unemployment policies. An exception is the concept of “green corps”, which is described simply as training programmes for unemployed people combining an environmental agenda with the overall goal of qualifying people for the labour market (cf. Forstater, 2003, 2006).

To sum up, all mentioned studies and concepts have one thing in common: they do not examine labour market and unemployment policies in detail as part of current social security systems in relation to ecological sustainability. Clear gaps within the emerging debate on social policy and the environment become visible.

### **3. Case studies: Materials and methods**

The concept of ESI was developed for this cross-national study. Nevertheless, it is connected in various ways to other concepts: for example, innovations for sustainability (cf. Hargreaves, Longhurst, & Seyfang, 2012), sustainable innovations to eco-social enterprises (Johanisová & Fraňková, 2013) as well as grassroots or niche innovations (for sustainable development) (cf. Seyfang & Smith, 2007). The field that ESIs are embedded in partly overlaps with what Jackson calls the “Cinderella economy” (2009, p. 131), which aims to reduce the use of resources and is set as an alternative to a consumption based economy. Some ESIs are built as classical non-profit organizations, with a clear bottom-up character and as an alternative to the market or public sector; others define themselves as social enterprises (cf. Defourny & Nyssens, 2013; Clark & Johansson, 2016), sometimes with close ties to the market or public institutions.

Our empirical data of the cross-national case study is based on an initial mapping phase conducted in five European countries, leading to 50 ESIs as examples which best fulfilled the

criteria of a local, innovative organization with a social and ecological agenda<sup>1</sup>. In the end, six cases were selected for a more in-depth case study. Three cases in Finland (due to the location of the research project) and one each in Germany, Italy and Belgium. Despite their different histories and path dependencies in their welfare state development, all four countries provide an elaborated set of labour market policies, including employment promotion or activation programmes combined with financial benefits such as unemployment allowances and subsidized work schemes (cf. Schubert, de Villota, & Kuhlmann, 2016). They all followed the neoliberal activation turn, emphasizing, more than in the past, the duties of unemployed people (see e.g. Kenworthy, 2010; Knotz, 2018), even though this was less influential in Italy than in the other countries (Agostini & Natali, 2016, p. 411). Finland and Italy were hit hardest by the major economic crisis of 2008 and faced significant social policy reforms during the last 5 to 10 years (cf. Saari, 2016; Agostini & Natali, 2016; Kokkonen, Närhi, & Matthies, 2018; Minas et al., 2018). Germany had already conducted their significant reforms regarding unemployment benefits at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – the so-called Hartz-reforms – and the economic crisis had surprisingly few effects on its unemployment policies (cf. Zohlnhöfer, 2011; Blum & Kuhlmann, 2016). Belgium on the other hand was partly forced to stay inactive due to a long phase of government crisis (cf. Marx & Schuerman, 2016).

In Finland the innovations chosen consisted of an organic food cooperative based on the concept of community supported agriculture (*Oma maa*, Helsinki area), a non-profit association defining itself as an open space for arts and culture (*Hirvitalo*, Tampere) as well as a centre of sustainable well-being, education and cultural activities (*Lapinlahden\_Lähde*, Helsinki). In the other three countries the case studies were conducted with an association

---

<sup>1</sup> For further details on the search criteria, the methods used for conducting the case studies and detailed descriptions of the ecosocial innovations and their social practices see Stamm et al. (2017).

collecting, storing and up-scaling diverse second-hand and waste material (*Kunst-Stoffe*, Berlin/Germany), a social cooperative producing organic vegetables (*Vinterra*, Mals in South Tyrol/Italy) and a social enterprise providing training for young unemployed and promoting bike culture (*VELO*, Leuven/Belgium). The central part of the case study data consist of 28 semi-structured individual interviews as well as 2 group interviews with narrative elements. The interviewees were founders and coordinators of the ESIs as well as participants and users of their activities.

#### **4. Results**

One central result gained from previous analyses on these six cases was that they could all only be developed, established and maintained by a mix of different forms of employment, volunteering and publicly subsidized work (Stamm et al., 2017, p. 11). The following table provides an overview of the labour market instruments and unemployment benefits, services and financial benefits, used by ESIs (see table 1).

The list demonstrates how strongly interlinked all ESIs are with public programmes and benefits, and therefore also with regional and national public institutions related to unemployment. The labour market instruments and unemployment benefits, financial benefits as well as services like activation and employment programmes, but also volunteering programmes, play a significant role in keeping the activities of the innovations running. This became clear in all the interviews with founders and coordinators. The following summaries for each country will describe how the work of ESIs is connected to labour market and unemployment policies. These results serve as a basis for the concluding discussion on how these interlinkages could lead to new eco-social policies, and what similarities and differences between the four countries involved could be identified.



#### ***4.1. Finland***

The Finnish cases Oma maa, Hirvitalo and Lapinlahden lähde varied in terms of their organizational status, funding structure and field of activities. The smallest case, Hirvitalo ([www.hirvikatu10.net](http://www.hirvikatu10.net)), had no paid workers but they could keep the art gallery open with the help of an unemployed person who conducted his/her work trial period or was entitled to wage assistance by the employment office. The activities in Oma maa ([www.omamaa.fi](http://www.omamaa.fi)) were mainly based on voluntary work by people who were officially unemployed or self-employed, whereas Lapinlahden lähde ([www.lapinlahdenlahde.fi](http://www.lapinlahdenlahde.fi)) relied on small number of paid workers and volunteering. These various practices are partly explained by the deliberative differences in their connections with labour market and unemployment policies.

In Finland, all unemployed jobseekers have to register themselves in a local employment office and thereafter they can receive unemployment benefits from the unemployment fund by trade unions or from the Social Insurance Institute, Kela. According to Kela, unemployment benefits can be paid to unemployed jobseekers between 17 and 64 years of age who are resident in Finland and “who are fit for work, are available to the labour market, look for a full-time job and are in need of financial assistance”. In addition to earnings-related unemployment allowances paid by the unemployment funds of trade unions, there are two different benefits that are paid by Kela: basic unemployment allowance and labour market subsidy. The former is paid to jobseekers who meet certain work requirements, whereas the latter means-tested benefit is directed to unemployed persons with no previous work experience or who have reached the maximum payment period of earnings-related or basic allowances. In 2018, the amount of labour market subsidy that was most in use among the participants in ESIs was 32.40 euros per day for 20 days per month, which makes 648 euros per month ([www.kela.fi/web/en/unemployment](http://www.kela.fi/web/en/unemployment)).

Many of the active participants who we interviewed in the Finnish ESIs Hirvitalo, Oma maa and Lapinlahden lähde, were recipients of different social benefits, mostly unemployment benefits plus additional housing benefits and last-resort social assistance. They lived in a paradoxical situation since they were fully occupied in creating the activities in ESIs, but in the eyes of the welfare institutions, they were categorized as unemployed or marginalized poor people.

In Finland, all unemployed people are objects of activation measures: they have to report to the employment office, actively seek jobs and accept work offers. Since 2001, the recipients of unemployed social assistance have been obliged to have an activation plan in which officers from the Public Employment Service and social workers, together with the job seeker, agree to the most efficient pathways towards employment (see Minas et al., 2018).

The most recent reform, the so-called activation model, introduced new activity requirements that are met if a person has been in salaried employment for at least 18 hours, has earned an income of at least 245.64 euros from self-employment or has participated in 5 days of some employment-promoting activity during the payment period of 65 days. Even though the Finnish constitution guarantees social protection for all, the minimum level, last-resort social assistance is conditional so that Kela has the right to reduce the level of social assistance by 20% if a recipient refuses to participate in an offered activation measure, and 40% on the second refusal.

The main target of the Finnish welfare state is that all job seekers should participate in formal activation programmes rather than do informal volunteering. However, because officials cannot control all jobseekers, the social security system leaves room for unemployed people to be active in various associations. This can be interpreted as a certain concept of an active social citizen in Finland that might differ from other European countries with a different welfare state history (cf. Eggers, Grages, & Pfau-Effinger, 2019). Our interviews show that

labour market subsidy and social assistance can be used for quite a long time without any disturbance, which enables people to be active in ESIs, but only informally. If they inform unemployment offices that they are active in co-operatives such as Oma maa, they could be categorized as an entrepreneur: i.e. a person who owns a company and is therefore not entitled to unemployment benefit. This rule can significantly reduce the incentives to be active in building ESIs.

The Finnish welfare systems aim to encourage unemployed people and social assistance recipients to seek routes to employment with the help of various activation programmes, such as Rehabilitating Work Experience, work trial and wage allowances. When taking part in these programmes, the unemployed person is entitled to unemployment benefit and a small daily allowance (9 euros per day). Among our cases, Lapinlahden lähde is the most established organization with an extensive use of various activation programmes. Due to the significant funding from European Social Fund, Lapinlahden lähde has been able to employ 3 to 4 full-time workers. In addition, there are people who work with the help of the wage allowance. In the Finnish welfare state, an association can be entitled to a wage allowance measure, in which the state supports the association to employ a worker. First the employment office has to agree with the length of the wage allowance period. With this system, both Lapinlahden lähde and Hirvitalo have been able to hire workers. In case of Hirvitalo, some of the active members of the cultural association have been able to make their living by working there.

In addition, unemployed people with mental health problems and work disability have agreed to conduct their Rehabilitating Work Experience in Lapinlahden lähde. Within the Rehabilitating Work Experience scheme an unemployed person can work according to his/her abilities, for example for only four hours per day or three days a week. When taking part in

the programme, the unemployed person is entitled both to the unemployment benefit and to a small daily allowance (9 euros per day).

All cases had experiences of providing work trials for unemployed people. In practice, people who are officially unemployed can subscribe/apply to employment officials to officially accept the work trial period in public, private or third sector organizations. In most cases, the jobseeker can choose the place and request that officials accept the proposal. This was the case with Hirvitalo and Oma maa as well, and they both emphasized that they did not want to accept people who were involuntarily posted there, or sent from the employment office without any previous knowledge of the organization and their mission.

#### **4.2. Germany**

In the German case Kunst-Stoffe ([www.kunst-stoffe-berlin.de](http://www.kunst-stoffe-berlin.de)), a registered association, a variety of different forms of subsidized employment, sometimes combined with financial unemployment benefits, as well as volunteering programmes, could be identified. The “standard” unemployment scheme is the *Arbeitslosengeld* (unemployment money) (ALG) II laid down in the German Social Code Book II. The benefits, as well as the system as a whole, is called Hartz IV by the majority of Germans, named after the far-reaching reforms of the early 2000s and one of the experts who envisioned them (see Seeleib-Kaiser & Fleckenstein, 2007; Adamy, 2012). Unemployed people are entitled to receive the financial benefit of ALG II if they are not, or no longer, entitled to the insurance based ALG I. The financial benefit is paid monthly and currently amounts to 409 euros for a single person. Costs for housing and energy, and a few extra allowances are paid additionally. When someone receives ALG II and proves they are “actively” seeking employment they are also allowed to volunteer at the same time, if it does not hinder the job seeking process (see also Stamm, 2015, 2017).

Many unemployed people receiving ALG II also work in so-called work opportunities with additional expenditure compensation. They are often called one-euro-jobs since unemployed people get an extra benefit of one to two euros per working hour. The one-euro-jobs are mostly offered to people who face long-term unemployment, and sometimes they are forced to take one of these work opportunities. Since this should not get in the way of real employment, they are mostly offered by the non-profit sector, including social work organisations. This is why an association like Kunst-Stoffe could be a suitable organization for unemployed people who want to or have to take a work opportunity. The interview partners emphasized several times that they would not accept anybody who had been forced to work there since this would not make sense for both parties.

Another model described by one of the interviewees was a certain form of state-subsidized employment. It was based on a combined state-regional programme and partly financed by the European Social Fund. It ended in 2012. In the case of Kunst-Stoffe, the programme was especially targeted at the cultural sector of Berlin. The programme was in use, for example, with one freelancing artist who had been given a three-year contract with Kunst-Stoffe. The salary was partly paid by the national programme and partly by the Federal state Berlin-Brandenburg. During the employment phase the artist was responsible for several educational projects with children and youngsters, and established the concept of repair-café within Kunst-Stoffe, which even up to today is one of the main successful projects of the association in several districts of Berlin. After the period of subsidized employment the artist became self-employed and received financial assistance from the BA (Federal Employment Agency) – another form of unemployment benefit especially for people trying to set themselves up as self-employed.

Two further German volunteering programmes were very important for Kunst-Stoffe: the Voluntary Ecological Year and the Federal Volunteer Service. The first is an educational year

that gives young people between the ages of 16 and 27 the possibility to become active in environmental protection. The programme has existed since 1986. It is often also taken as a gap year between school and studying or vocational training. The usual time period is 12 months of full-time work, and all participants are fully insured in the social insurance system and receive a “pocket money” of up to 330 euros per month. It is important to note that the programme is not part of the German social code and therefore not officially be part of unemployment policies. It is laid down in the Law on Youth Volunteering Services, which comes under the responsibility of the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth ([www.foej.de](http://www.foej.de)). The ministry is also politically responsible for the Federal Volunteer Service. It has only existed since 2011 and is open to all adults older than 27 years of age. The main sectors where volunteers can do volunteering work are the social, environmental and cultural sectors. The programme has been praised as a great success and the demand for participation is high. It is also possible to combine participation in the programme with the receipt of ALG II ([www.bundesfreiwilligendienst.de](http://www.bundesfreiwilligendienst.de)).

In the eco-social activities of Kunst-Stoffe the work of volunteers coming from one of these two programmes is crucial. The official volunteers take on responsible tasks and also learn a great deal, as the coordinators as well as the volunteers asserted in the interviews. An essential pre-condition is a genuine interest and high motivation for the main goals and activities of the association. The outline shows how strongly interlinked Kunst-Stoffe is with various public employment and volunteering programmes, often combined with unemployment allowances.

### ***4.3. Belgium***

The Belgian social enterprise, VELO ([www.velo.be](http://www.velo.be)), located in Leuven, part of the northern Dutch-speaking Belgian region of Flanders, has the most employees among the cases involved. In total, around 120 people are active within the organization, with approximately

55 full-time equivalents gainfully employed. In that sense, it is a very well established employer in Leuven's social economy sector. Nevertheless, VELO also cooperates with and strongly depends on the provision of unemployment benefits and employment programmes. It has established close working relations with the local social service OCMW (Openbaar Centrum voor Maatschappelijk Welzijn – Public Centre for Social Welfare, part of the Belgian system of social security) and the public employment service (VDAB) in Leuven.

The Belgian welfare state is known for having one of the most generous systems of unemployment benefits. Insurance based unemployment benefits are still paid without a time limit. This is also the main reason why the number of social assistance recipients is comparatively low. Belgium has a comprehensive minimum income system, established in 1960s and 70s. Unemployed people who are not entitled to insurance based unemployment benefits (because they do not qualify yet or have ceased to qualify) have either a right to social integration or to social assistance, regulated in two different legal acts. Both include financial benefits as well as employment promotion or active labour market programmes, which are often obligatory.

The Belgian welfare state has a multi-layered governance structure, in which the federal government plays only one role next to regional and local governments and administration (cf. Marx, 2009; Marx & Schuerman, 2016; Leibetseder et al., 2017). Non-EU-citizens after 5 years of residence, as well as recognized refugees, are entitled to support under the social protection act. The costs are partly covered by the federal state. Expenditures for the right to social assistance are fully refunded by the federal state to the municipalities. The allowances and services are granted and handled by the OCMW (cf. Carpentier, Neels, & van de Bosch, 2017; EU, 2018). During the last 20 years the activation turn has also shaped the Belgian system of unemployment policies, leading to numerous new programmes and somewhat stricter obligations combined with possible sanctions for unemployed people. Due to the

above mentioned multi-layered governance structure, strong regional differences are prevalent.

VELO is, among other projects, offering training for young unemployed people. Nowadays many of these young people (mostly men) are former refugees. Some of them are not yet officially registered as job seekers due to a lack of skills; first and foremost many of them do not have sufficient language skills in Dutch. One important programme is the so-called article 60 measure (part of social assistance). People who are supported under this provision are not officially employed by VELO but are given a contract with the local social services and are sent to VELO for training in metal work and welding, mostly practiced for fixing bikes; but also, equally importantly, they receive language training, training in basic mathematics and technical knowledge. Moreover, they all receive social work support depending on their needs. Under the umbrella of the article 60 measure they usually have a contract for one year. They receive social assistance or social integration based benefits and get an extra benefit of one euro per hour when they work for VELO. During the time the interviews were conducted for the case study (September 2017) the subsidized period of training for the second group was shortened to only three months due to a policy decision at Flanders' regional level, which, according to the social worker interviewed for the case study, made the accomplishment of the programme goals even harder. There is also a group undertaking work placements in another social economy organization but who receive training at VELO as well. The long-term goal for these trainees is to find meaningful, gainful employment. Some of them can be officially registered as a job-seekers after the training and therefore receive services from the public employment office VDAB. In some cases, this means they have already achieved a level of success given the severe problems that had faced them in entering the job market. Furthermore, the VDAB itself sends unemployed people to VELO. Some of these are long-term unemployed for a variety of reasons.



#### 4.4. Italy

The Italian case Vinterra ([www.vinterra.it](http://www.vinterra.it)) and its relation to labour market and unemployment policies can only be understood by first looking at its legal status. Vinterra is a social cooperative, which is a very common form in Italy, particularly in the social sector (cf. Elsen, 2017, 2019). Overall, the role of the non-profit sector in Italy, or, in other words, of actors of social and solidarity economies, has increased during the last 25 years (Natali, 2009; Ranci & Montagnini, 2010; Agostini & Natali, 2016). Vinterra is more precisely a social cooperative type B. These social cooperatives could be called social enterprises with a specific task. They follow the aim of supporting and re-integrating marginalized, deprived or socially underprivileged people. This group of people, in German *sozial Benachteiligte*, is defined in detail in a national law on cooperatives. Social cooperatives type B must have at least 30% of their employees belonging to this group. The employees or workers are supposed to become members of the cooperative as well, depending on their capabilities.

In Italy, minimum income schemes as well as labour market policies are organized much more on the regional level than in the other three countries involved in the cross-national study (cf. Aurich-Berheide, Catalano, Graziano, & Zimmermann, 2015). There is still no nationwide system of minimum income protection and in scope the regional differences are huge (cf. Madama, 2013; Jessoula, Kubisa, Madama, & Zielenska, 2014). The Autonomous Province of Bolzano was one of the first regions in the early 1990s to introduce a regional, means-tested minimum income scheme (cf. Natali, 2018, p. 120). In South Tyrol, due to its economic strength, the minimum income system is one of the most established systems in Italy. Even though the number of recipients is still quite low it has increased significantly during the last 10 years, partly caused by the economic crisis that hit the whole of Italy severely. Unemployment rates are still much lower than the national average (4.4% in 2014) but are also on the rise (cf. Freie Universität Bozen, 2015).

Vinterra was partly founded by social workers working with people with mental impairments. According to the Italian law mentioned above, this group belongs to the labour market group of underprivileged people. One of the founding members of the cooperative has a professional background both as a social worker and as a farmer, and is therefore gainfully employed in Vinterra, for which he is mainly responsible for the farming. Unemployment benefits and subsidized work play a smaller role in Vinterra than in the other cases. The coordinators interviewed for the case study emphasized nevertheless their good relationship with the local unemployment office.

Vinterra mainly used one regional employment promotion instrument for underprivileged people: in this case, people with disabilities. With the so-called *Anvertrauensabkommen*, people with disabilities, in the case of Vinterra mainly people mental impairments, could start working in the cooperative for a period up to three years. This work integration instrument is meant to enable people with disabilities to get to know a certain kind of work and the cooperative they are working in. In Vinterra they are mainly responsible for growing, harvesting and selling the organic vegetables. It can be seen as a form of apprenticeship. Furthermore, it is a form of subsidized employment because the unemployment office pays the salary. The contract is like any private employment contract embodied with social insurance contributions, which was valued by the workers we interviewed. The measurement is a successful instrument in South Tyrol that has existed for many years. The number of recipients is nevertheless rather small. In 2017 roughly 400 people with disabilities were supported by the programme (Abteilung Soziales, 2017).

After the initial phase of the social cooperative, Vinterra was able to gainfully employ a number of people who started to work, subsidized by the unemployment office. The biggest challenge regarding the labour costs for Vinterra is the seasonal character of farm work. In winter months they created smaller side projects in order to provide their employees with

reasonable work. During the harvest time on the other hand, more workers than employed are needed. In this case, as some of the coordinators reported in the interviews, recognized refugees, who are in general facing multiple difficulties in the Italian labour market (cf. Fullin & Reyneri, 2010), were hired for a limited period.

#### *4.5. Summary*

The previous chapters draw a clear picture: the ESIs in all four countries are closely connected, or in other words, depend on labour market and unemployment policies. The results also show that often an interdependency has been established between the ESIs and public institutions such as employment offices, job centres or social administration. These institutions also rely on the training opportunities and professional work of some of the ESI (mostly VELO, Vinterra). Yet, regarding the programmes, instruments or allowances, nothing could be found specifically targeted at environmental goals and that could therefore be called eco-social policies. All countries in a similar way lack any direct connection between the social policy field and ecological sustainability. Only the German “voluntary ecological year” for young people up to age 27 combines social and ecological goals. The programme combines its environmental agenda with social goals such as educating, qualifying and including young people in society. But, as described, it is not officially part of labour market policies or even of social policy (German Code of Social Law) in general.

Nevertheless, there are lessons to be learnt from the institutional arrangements of all ESI. All of the innovations are using available labour market and unemployment policies for their missions. In practice, the ESIs are only functioning through the already mentioned creative, sometimes also chaotic, and often complex mix of employment, volunteering, subsidized employment and self-employment. This mix is only possible with public support, even though the support systems are sometimes unreliable or fragile. As the interview material revealed,

successful and even essential programmes – for the ESI and their clients and workers – are the target of cutback measures (see VELO) or meaningful regional employment promotion programmes are discontinued, as in the case of Kunst-Stoffe.

Regarding the various links between unemployment policies and ESIs in the respective countries of Finland, Germany, Belgium and Italy, it seems that all innovations have found a way to cope within the national context. The differences in the structure of activation programmes and the regulation of social benefits do influence the way that ESIs organize their activities. Various social benefits and programmes to mitigate unemployment make it possible for ESIs to maintain their activities because they enable, on one hand, the participants to get some form of income and, on the other, the organisations to recruit a labour force.

One similarity of the countries involved is that they all offer at least some discretion for creatively using their instruments in the context of ESIs. Finland seems to permit unemployed people the most freedom to choose their way of volunteering or doing subsidized work while they are receiving unemployment allowances. This degree of freedom varies though, depending on the age of the beneficiary, their educational level and the duration of unemployment. In Belgium, the unemployment support system is quite generous, but this counts mostly for the unemployment insurance allowances. The social integration and social assistance systems are less generous and, as the example of the article 60 measure in the case of VELO has shown, certain instruments under the legal umbrella of these systems are at risk. Germany and Italy are somewhat stricter regarding sanctions, and a creative way of using available time for unemployed people is limited. In the interviews it also became clear that increasing pressure and control of unemployed people does not serve their needs in many cases, particularly regarding their engagement in ESIs. This became most visible in the German case Kunst-Stoffe and in Hirvitalo in Finland, in which interviewees reported that

certain volunteers could not continue their volunteering because the local job centre did not recognize it as a meaningful work while they were receiving unemployment allowances.

In general, the countries show certain idiosyncrasies, have particular special instruments or programmes which are unique, but these could be adopted by other countries in order to turn them into new eco-social policies. In Belgium it is the article 60 measure, which would have to be combined with an ecological component. In Italy it is the special role of cooperatives, which are not yet closely linked to sustainability goals. In Finland it could be the work trial or Rehabilitating Work Experience, which is already often connected to eco-social practices but only as a side effect (e.g. by establishing a gardening project or using second-hand material for workshops), whereas in Germany the volunteering programmes could be used as a model and extended to other groups in need of work and qualifications.

## **5. Discussion and concluding remarks**

The results of the cross-national case study can be combined into three main lessons or recommendations on how to reach new eco-social policies in the field of labour market and unemployment policies. These concluding remarks are based on the results, but can also be considered as preliminary policy recommendations towards an eco-social welfare state (Gough, 2013, 2017). The lessons can be applied to three levels – the sectoral level, the organizational level and the individual level. All are strongly interlinked but for analytical reasons are divided here.

The first lesson or recommendation has its foundation mainly in the Belgium and Italian cases. The examples show how important public support is for certain sectors of SSE (social and solidarity economy) and civil society actors (Kunst-Stoffe and Hirvitalo). In the case of VELO the city has been promoting the local social economy for a considerable time and therefore helped organisations like VELO and others to flourish, for example in the field of

waste reduction and second-hand use. The case study of Vinterra demonstrates the importance of public support for the cooperative sector (see also Elsen, 2018). This is a distinct national trait of Italy but the sector is further promoted by regional instruments in South Tyrol. Without the support, for example in form of tax refunds and employment programs, cooperatives such as Vinterra could not exist and compete in the market (in the case of Vinterra, against conventional farmers). What is lacking here is a clear connection with sustainability goals. In conclusion, the examples show that policy-makers would not necessarily have to invent new eco-social policies, such as new programmes or instruments, for unemployed people. By supporting whole sectors, SSE and further civil society actors, many effective eco-social ideas and programmes, which are for example visible in the work of ESIs, could automatically find their way into practice (e.g. Utting, 2018).

The second lesson to be learned is quite obvious and rather simple. The overall project this cross-national research is based on has, first, proven that numerous ESIs exist across Europe and (see Matthies et al., 2019), second, how creatively and successfully they have implemented their ideas. Yet, despite the described interdependency between ESIs and public institutions in the field of labour market and unemployment policies the work of ESIs is not valued enough. In most cases, time, money and public acknowledgement are scarce or largely missing. So, what would be needed on the organizational level is a policy programme to promote sustainable organisations such as the ESIs. The environmental goals of the ESIs could be obligatorily merged with social and economic goals, such as social security, a minimum income, education as well as inclusion in cultural activities. The ESIs themselves or their practices could be scaled-up, further developed and in some cases even become a standard in every city, for example the re-use concept of Kunst-Stoffe in Berlin. These processes could be closely connected to unemployment support programmes. Furthermore, currently existing social enterprises or other associations that offer training, qualifications and

work opportunities for unemployed people, not yet open to environmental goals, could learn from ESIs. The final goal would be that integrating ecological sustainability in their services and programmes could become a legal requirement for all organisations in the field.

The third lesson or recommendation refers to the individual level, but also includes programmes and measures for unemployed support. As the country-specific accounts show, a clear connection between labour market and unemployment policies and the environment is missing in mostly all four countries, except for the German ecological volunteering programme where a connection does exist. This also means in the situation where an unemployed person would like to do a training or qualification programme that is targeted at environmental goals, public employment services could not systematically fulfil such requests. One solution is to give unemployed people enough freedom to search for and undertake volunteering work, for example in ESIs, while they are receiving unemployment allowances. It could also give them enough time to do subsistence work on an individual level, growing their own food for example. The Finnish employment offices seem to give the most “leeway” to unemployed people in this sense, possibly due to a different concept of active social citizens (cf. Eggers et al., 2019). The problem remains that opportunities for unemployed people might not be available, if organisations such as ESIs are not supported in a systematic way. Furthermore, clear legal regulations would mean more security for unemployed people. At the moment, they would still fear the threat of sanctions if they do not actively search for gainful employment and instead work as volunteers. In Germany the option to volunteer and receive unemployment allowances is only possible through participation in the Federal Volunteer Service.

A better and, in regard to the long-term, more sustainable solution would be to create specific new programmes with a clear eco-social approach. These programmes could be quite similar to what Forstater (2003, 2006) introduced as green corps. Sustainable solutions could also be

subsidized work programmes such as the national-regional programme in the case of Kunst-Stoffe or the *Anvertrauensabkommen* in South Tyrol, connected with environmental goals. A precondition would certainly be to have organisations offering places to conduct such programmes. This depends on the realization of recommendations two and three.

Furthermore, suggested eco-social policies such as work time reduction (e.g. Coote, 2015; Gough 2017) are linked to the individual level, in the form of work contracts, but certainly would eventually need collective agreements including unions, employers' organisations and the state. Even a basic income scheme, connected with ecological sustainability (cf. Andersson, 2009) could be part of lesson three, but would certainly mean a much bigger restructuring of the current (welfare) state and the relationship between the state and individuals.

No matter what, work and employment, and therefore also labour market and unemployment policies, are decisive for a sustainable future. They have always followed an economic and social agenda both for the individual and society; in times of climate change and other ecological threats, the goal of ecological sustainability needs to be added to this field (see also Koch & Mont, 2016). Labour market and unemployment policies will have to change concertedly with a changing economy and shift towards an understanding of the social as always connected to the natural environment. The role of community-based systems, commons and co-production will become more important (cf. Coote, 2015). However, as Gough (2017) states, an eco-social transition will not happen in a constructive way by accident but will require design (p. 192) and an active state. Social policy research is slowly opening up to sustainability but as the case study material proves, the process of policy-change has not yet begun in the field of labour market and unemployment policies. It is very likely that local partners, such as the ESIs presented here, will play a more significant role in the future.



## **Acknowledgements**

We wish to acknowledge the Academy of Finland (no. 285868) for funding the research project. We also appreciate our colleagues in the networks and the participants in the ESIs who provided us with access to the field and data. We also wish to acknowledge Sarah Metcalf for helping us proofread the text.

## References

- Abteilung Soziales (2017). *Sozialstatistik 2017. Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol*.
- Adamy, W. (2012). Hartz IV – Achillesferse der Arbeits- und Sozialhilfepolitik. In R. Bispinck, G. Bosch, K. Hofemann, & G. Naegele (Eds.), *Sozialpolitik und Sozialstaat. Festschrift für Gerhard Bäcker* (pp. 257–291). Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Agostini, C., & Natali, D. (2016). Italian Welfare Reforms: Missed Opportunities for a Paradigmatic Change? In K. Schubert, P. de Villota, & J. Kuhlmann (Eds.), *Challenges to European Welfare Systems* (pp. 37–57). New York: Springer.
- Andersson, J. O. (2009). Basic Income From an Ecological Perspective. *Basic Income Studies*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.2202/1932-0183.1180>
- Angelov, N., & Johansson, M. V. (2011). Green jobs. In T. Fitzpatrick, (Ed.), *Understanding the Environment and Social Policy* (pp. 245–269). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Aurich-Beerheide, P., Catalano, S. L., Graziano, P. R., & Zimmermann, K. (2015). Stakeholder participation and policy integration in local social and employment policies: Germany and Italy compared. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 25(4), 379–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928715594543>
- Baglioni, S., & Giugni, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Civil Society Organizations, Unemployment, and Precarity in Europe : Between Service and Policy*. Palgrave.
- Blum, S., & Kuhlmann, J. (2016). Crisis? What Crisis? Restructuring the German Welfare System in Times of Unexpected Prosperity. In K. Schubert, P. de Vilotta, & J. Kuhlmann (Eds.), *Challenges to European welfare systems* (pp. 133–158). New York: Springer.
- Brugiavini, A., & Galasso, V. (2004). The social security reform process in Italy: where do we stand? *Journal of Pension Economics & Finance; Cambridge*, 3(2), 165–195.
- Cahill, M. (2002). *The Environment and Social Policy*. London: Routledge.

- Carpentier, S., Neels, K., & Van de Bosch, K. (2017). Exit from and re-entry into social assistance benefit in Belgium among people with migration background and the native-born. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 26, 366–383.  
<https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1111/ijsw.12270>
- Clark, E., & Johansson, H. (2016). Social economy and green social enterprises. Production for sustainable welfare? In M. Koch & O. Mont (Eds.), *Sustainability and the Political Economy of Welfare* (pp. 158–170). Routledge.
- Cook, S., Smith, K., & Utting, P. (2012). *Green economy or green society? contestation and policies for a fair transition*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Cooley, T. F., & Soares, J. (1999). Privatizing Social Security. *Review on Economic Dynamics*, 2(3), 731–755. <https://doi.org/10.1006/redy.1999.0069>
- Coote, A. (2015). People, Planet, Power. Toward a New Social Settlement. *International Journal of Social Quality*, 5(1), 8–34. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3167/IJSQ.2015.050102>
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2013). Social Innovation, social economy and social enterprise: what can the European debate tell us? In F. Moulaert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch (Eds.), *The International Handbook on Social Innovation. Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research* (pp. 40–52).
- Eggers, T., Grages, C., & Pfau-Effinger, B. (2019). Self-Responsibility of the “Active Social Citizen”: Different Types of the Policy Concept of “Active Social Citizenship” in Different Types of Welfare States. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 63(1), 43–64.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218816803>
- Elsen, S. (2017). Community-based economy and ecosocial transition. In A.-L. Matthies & K. Närhi (Eds.), *The ecosocial transition of societies. The contribution of social work and social policy* (pp. 54–70). Oxford: Routledge.
- Elsen, S. (2018). Solidarische Ökonomie. *Blätter Der Wohlfahrtspflege*, 165(6), 206–210.

<https://doi.org/DOI: 10.5771/0340-8574-2018-6-206>

Elsen, S. (2019). *Eco-Social Transformation and Community-Based Economy*. London and New York: Routledge.

European Union. (2018). *Your social security rights in Belgium*.

Euzéby, C. (n.d.). Social protection to achieve sustainable inclusion: A European imperative in the current economic crisis. *International Social Security Review*, 65(4), 69–88.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-246X.2012.01442.x>

Fitzpatrick, T. (2002). With no strings attached? In T. Fitzpatrick, & M. Cahill (Eds.),

*Environment and welfare: towards a green social policy* (pp. 138–154). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Fitzpatrick, T. (Ed.). (2011). *Understanding the Environment and Social Policy*. Bristol:

Policy Press.

Fitzpatrick, T. (2014a). *Climate Change and Poverty. A new agenda for developed nations*.

Policy Press: Bristol.

Fitzpatrick, T. (Ed.). (2014b). *International Handbook on Social Policy and the Environment*.

Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Forstater, M. (2003). Public employment and environmental sustainability. *Journal of Post*

*Keynesian Economics*, 25(3), 385–406.

Forstater, M. (2006). Green Jobs: Public Service Employment and Environmental

Sustainability. *Challenge*, 49(4), 58–72. <https://doi.org/10.2753/CHA0577-5132490405>

Freie Universität Bozen. (2015). *Sozialbericht 2015, Autonome Provinz Bozen - Südtirol*.

Fullin, G., & Reyneri, E. (2010). Low Unemployment and Bad Jobs for New Immigrants in

Italy. *International Migration*, 49(1). <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00594.x>

- Gibson-Graham, J. K., Cameron, J., & Healy, S. (2013). *Take back the economy. An ethical guide for transforming our communities*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Press.
- Gismondi, M. A., Roseland, M., Connelly, S., Markey, S. P., & Beckie, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Scaling up: the convergence of social economy and sustainability*. Edmonton, AB: AU Press.
- Gough, I. (2013). Climate change, social policy, and global governance. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 29(3), 185–203.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21699763.2013.852128>
- Gough, I. (2017). *Heat, Greed and Human Need: Climate Change, Capitalism and Sustainable Wellbeing*. Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Gough, I., & Meadowcroft, J. (2011). Decarbonizing the welfare state. In J. S. Dryzek, R. B. Norgaard, & D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society* (pp. 490–503). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gough, I., Meadowcroft, J., Dryzek, J., Gerhards, J., Lengfeld, H., Markandya, A., & Ortiz, R. (2008). JESP symposium: Climate change and social policy. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18(4), 325–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928708094890>
- Guillen-Royo, M., Guardiola, J., & Garcia-Quero, F. (2017). Sustainable development in times of economic crisis: A needs-based illustration from Granada (Spain). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 150, 267–276.  
<https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.008>
- Hargreaves, T., Longhurst, N., & Seyfang, G. (2013). Up, Down, round and round: Connecting Regimes and Practices in Innovation for Sustainability. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(2), 402–420. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a45124>
- Haxeltine, A., Avelino, F., Wittmayer, J., Kemp, R., Weaver, P., Backhaus, J., & O’Riordan, T. (2013). Transformative social innovations: A sustainability transition perspective

on social innovation, 19.

- Hirvilammi, T., & Helne, T. (2014). Changing Paradigms: A Sketch for Sustainable Wellbeing and Ecosocial Policy. *Sustainability*, 6, 2160–2175.  
<https://doi.org/doi:10.3390/su6042160>
- Holden, M. (2012). Urban Policy Engagement with Social Sustainability in Metro Vancouver. *Urban Studies*, 49(3), 527–542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098011403015>
- Jackson, T. (2009). *Prosperity Without Growth. Economics for a Finite Planet*. London: Earthscan.
- Jackson, T., & Victor, P. A. (2013). *Green Economy at Community Scale* (p. 70). Toronto: George Cedric Metcalf Charitable Foundation.
- Jessoula, M., Kubisa, J., Madama, I., & Zielenska, M. (2014). Understanding convergence and divergence: old and new cleavages in the politics of minimum income schemes in Italy and Poland. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 30(2), 128–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21699763.2014.936024>
- Johanisová, N., & Fraňková, E. (2013). Eco-social enterprises in practice and theory – A radical versus mainstream view. In M. Anastasiadis (Ed.), *ECO-WISE - Social Enterprises as Sustainable Actors. Concepts, Performances, Impacts* (pp. 110–129). Bremen: EHV.
- Johansson, H., Khan, J., & Hildingsson, R. (2016). Climate change and the welfare state. Do we see a new generation of social risks emerging? In M. Koch & O. Mont (Eds.), *Sustainability and the Political Economy of Welfare* (pp. 94–108).
- Kenworthy, L. (2010). Labour Market Activation. In F. G. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, & C. Pierson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State* (pp. 435–447). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Knotz, C. M. (2018). A rising workfare state? Unemployment benefit conditionality in 21

- OECD countries, 1980–2012. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 34(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21699763.2018.1472136>
- Koch, M., & Mont, O. (2016). Introduction: Research On Sustainable Welfare: State of the Art and Outline of the Volume. In M. Koch & O. Mont (Eds.), *Sustainability and the Political Economy of Welfare* (pp. 1–12). New York: Routledge.
- Kokkonen, T., Närhi, K., & Matthies, A.-L. (2018). Transformation of the Finnish welfare state. In M. Kamali & J. H. Jönsson (Eds.), *Neoliberalism, Nordic Welfare States and Social Work. Current and Future Challenges* (pp. 35–45). London and New York: Routledge.
- Leibetseder, B., Gubrium, E., Dierckx, D., Fluder, R., Hauri, R., & Raeymaeckers, P. (2017). Subsidiarity and social citizenship: Social assistance schemes in Austria, Belgium, Switzerland and Norway. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 26, 353–365. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1111/ijsw.12241>
- Madama, I. (2013). Beyond continuity? Italian social assistance policies between institutional opportunities and agency. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22, 58–68. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2397.2011.00835.x>
- Marx, I. (2009). Belgium. The quest for sustainability, legitimacy and a way out of 'welfare without work'. In K. Schubert, S. Hegelich, & U. Bazant (Eds.), *The Handbook of European Welfare Systems* (pp. 49–64). Routledge.
- Marx, I., & Schuerman, N. (2016). Belgium, or How Inertia Can Have Unexpected Benefits in Times of Crisis. In K. Schubert, P. de Villota, & J. Kuhlmann (Eds.), *Challenges to European Welfare Systems* (pp. 395–418). New York: Springer.
- Matthies, A.-L., & Närhi, K. (Eds.). (2017). *The Ecosocial Transition of Societies. The contribution of social work and social policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Matthies, A.-L., Stamm, I., Hirvilammi, T., & Närhi, K. (2019). Ecosocial innovations and

their capacity to integrate ecological, economic and social sustainability transition.

*Manuscript submitted for publication.*

- Meadowcroft, J. (2007). Building the environmental state: what the history of social welfare tells us about the future of environmental policy. *Alternatives Journal*, 33(1), 11–17.
- Mehmood, A., & Parra, C. (n.d.). Social Innovation in an unsustainable world. In F. Moulaert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch (Eds.), *The International Handbook on Social Innovation: Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research* (pp. 53–66). Edward Elgar.
- Minas, R., Jakobsen, V., Kauppinen, T., Korpi, T., & Lorentzen, T. (2018). The governance of poverty: Welfare reform, activation policies, and social assistance benefits and caseloads in Nordic countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 28(5), 487–500. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928717753591>
- Moulaert, F., MacCallum, D., Mehmood, A., & Hamdouch, A. (Eds.). (2013). *The International Handbook on Social Innovation. Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*. Edward Elgar.
- Natali, D. (2009). The Italian welfare state (still) in transition. The progressive recalibration of social programmes and greater flexibility of labour market policies. In K. Schubert, S. Hegelich, & U. Bazant (Eds.), *The Handbook of European Welfare Systems* (pp. 277–293). Routledge.
- Natili, M. (2018). Explaining different trajectories of minimum income schemes: Groups, parties and political exchange in Italy and Spain. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 28(2), 116–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928717707272>
- Raeymaeckers, P., & Dierckx, D. (2013). To Work or Not to Work? The Role of the Organisational Context for Social Workers' Perceptions on Activation. *British Journal of Social Work*, 43(6), 1170–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcs048>



- Ranci, C., & Montagnini, E. (2010). The Impact of the Commodification of Social Care on the Role and Identity of the Third Sector in Italy. In A. Evers & A. Zimmer (Eds.), *Third Sector Organizations Facing Turbulent Environments*. (pp. 107–123). Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut Economics. Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. London: Random House.
- Saari, J. (2016). Was It Too Good to Be True? Post-2008 Crisis Welfare State in Finland. In K. Schubert, P. de Villota, & J. Kuhlmann (Eds.), *Challenges to European Welfare Systems* (pp. 223–245). New York: Springer.
- Schaffrin, A. (2014). The new social risks and opportunities of climate change. In T. Fitzpatrick, (Ed.), *International Handbook on Social Policy and the Environment* (pp. 3–61). Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Schubert, K., Villota, P. de, & Kuhlmann, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Challenges to European Welfare Systems*. New York: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from [//www.springer.com/de/book/9783319076799](http://www.springer.com/de/book/9783319076799)
- Science Communication Unit, University of the West of England, Bristol. (2014). *Science for Environment Policy In-depth Report: Social Innovation and the Environment. Report produced for the European Commission DG Environment*. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/IR10\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/IR10_en.pdf)
- Seeleib-Kaiser, M., & Fleckenstein, T. (2007). Discourse, Learning and Welfare State Change: The Case of German Labour Market Reforms. *Social Policy & Administration*, 41(5), 427–448.
- Seyfang, G., & Smith, A. (2007). Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda. *Environmental Politics*, 16(4), 584–603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644010701419121>

- Stamm, I. (2015). *Das Menschenrecht auf soziale Sicherheit. Sozialpolitisches Handeln am Beispiel Deutschlands und Finnlands*. Konstanz/München: UVK.
- Stamm, I. (2017). The Human Right to Social Security and Its Impact on Socio-Political Action in Germany and Finland. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work*, 2(1–2), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41134-017-0030-7>
- Stamm, I. P., Hirvilammi, T., Matthies, A.-L., & Närhi, K. (2017). Ecosocial innovations as part of social and solidarity economy: local models for a sustainable development. *RISUS - Journal on Innovation and Sustainability*, 8(4), 200–218. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.24212/2179-3565.2017v8i4p200-218>
- Utting, P. (Ed.). (2015). *Social and Solidarity Economy : Beyond the Fringe*. Zed Books.
- Utting, P. (2018). *Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals through Social and Solidarity Economy: Incremental versus Transformative Change* (KNOWLEDGE HUB WORKING PAPER). Geneva: United Nations Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy. Retrieved from [http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpAuxPages%29/DCE7DAC6D248B0C1C1258279004DE587/\\$file/UNTFSSSE---WP-KH-SSE-SDGs-Utting-April2018.pdf](http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpAuxPages%29/DCE7DAC6D248B0C1C1258279004DE587/$file/UNTFSSSE---WP-KH-SSE-SDGs-Utting-April2018.pdf)
- Wallimann, I. (2013). *Environmental policy is social policy – Social policy is environmental policy: Toward Sustainability Policy*. New York: Springer.
- Wallimann, I. (2014). Social and solidarity economy for sustainable development: its premises – and the Social Economy Basel example of practice. *International Review of Sociology*, 24(1), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2014.894345>
- Zohlhöfer, R. (2011). Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The Grand Coalition’s Response to the Economic Crisis. *German Politics*, 20(2), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2011.582100>