

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND SOCIAL INNOVATION - THE CASE OF EMMAUS SOCIAL FOUNDATION

ASIER ARCOS-ALONSO

University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU
Nazioarteko Elkartasuna-Solidaridad Internacional.

Abstract:

The aim of this research is to analyse the social innovation nature of the Spanish organisation Emmaus Social Foundation, based on the criteria of governance, plural economy and co-construction and co-production of public policies.. The research methodology is qualitative, and the method used is the case study. The work was carried out in four phases. The data production techniques were the documentary analysis, participant observation, field notes, informal interviews and questionnaires, based on CRISES and adapted to the context of the entity.

As a general conclusion, it can be stated that Emmaus Social Foundation has potential as an agent of social innovation. These are main conclusions: a) its commitment to the sale and marketing of new innovative products, b) its recognition as a social benchmark and its links to the territory, c) its potential to work together with different public and private social agents and, d) a formal commitment to work towards more equitable power relations between men and women. However, based on the criteria established by the validated model, it would need to advance in its financial autonomy and in increasing the levels of social participation. We believe, however, that in order to assess the innovative nature of Solidarity Economy organisations in the Basque Country, a contextualised instrument should be developed.

Index terms: Social Innovation, Solidarity Economy, Transformation, Governance, Plural Economy, Concentration, Co-construction and Co-production, policies, social inclusion, insertion.

INTRODUCTION

Social innovation as a concept has been widely used for a couple of decades now by scholars, social research centres, public or semi-public agencies. There are organisations dedicated to the theoretical development of various areas of study related to social innovation, such as models for the generation of social value, social innovation business models, environmental and governmental schemes. Social innovation has been defined by many well-known authors in the world of business, politics and economics. There are also a large number of organisations worldwide that are dedicated to social innovation actions such as programmes, workshops, field work and consultancy to large companies, with the aim of making this concept more robust and applying it to generate social value. It has been given different meanings based on the discipline from which each author started or based on the study

interests of the different agencies and organisations. Thus, it can be Emmaus Social Foundation that the range of meanings for the same term is wide and varied.

However, even so, common elements can be found in all the meanings of the term. These are based on the more generic term innovation, which is linked to the socio-economic sphere. There are different currents, generally coming from the academic field of economics and sociology (European Commission, 2010). The references are Max Webber (who defined the relationship between social order and innovation insofar as behaviours initially considered abnormal have an impact on social change), and Emile Dhurkheim (who maintained that social regulation was important to take into account for the development of the division of labour that accompanies technical change). In the 20th century, on the other hand, Joseph Schumpeter (1939) in his "theory of innovations", establishes another point of reference, in which he defines innovation as the establishment of a new production function. The economy and society change when factors of production are combined in a novel way. He suggests that inventions and innovations are the key to economic growth, and those who implement that change in a practical way are the entrepreneurs. Hence, the concept is transferred to different thematic areas such as technical, service, technological, cultural and social innovation.

Thus, we find different definitions of what would be considered a social innovation in a broad sense. The most relevant ones for our study are listed below.

Social Innovation consists of finding new ways of satisfying social needs that are not adequately covered by the market or the public sector, or of producing the behavioural changes necessary to solve society's major challenges by empowering citizens and generating new social relations and new models of collaboration. They are therefore both innovative in themselves and useful in enabling society to innovate (European Union, 2010).

Edwards-Schachter' Mattiand Alcántara (2012) collect various definitions of Social Innovation that can help to complete the complex conceptual picture of this term. The following are selected from these definitions:

SIE group (Social Innovation Europe) 'a new law, organisation or procedure that changes the ways in which people relate to each other, both individually and collectively'. When a 'social' invention expands its transformative action in society we are in the presence of a social innovation.

Chambon, David and Devevey wrote *Les Innovations Sociales* in 1982. In it they define social innovation as those 'practices that more or less directly enable an individual or a group to respond to an unmet social need or set of needs'.

For Moulaert (2010), the keys to social innovation lie in understanding the role of the community and social groups in development in the broad sense, where there is a dialogical relationship between economic institutions and the dynamics of governance, society, territorial development models and territorial planning. Social innovation lies on two pillars: institutional innovation, which includes innovations in social relations, empowerment of people and governance, and innovation in the sense of the social economy, as the satisfaction of needs that occur in local communities.

For Hubert (2011) social innovations must be social in both their means and their ends and are defined as new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously respond to social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations, generating well-being in society and at the same time improving its capacity to act.

Mulgan. (2007) states that social innovation comprises 'innovative activities and services that emerge with the aim of meeting some social need and that are developed and disseminated predominantly by organisations whose primary purposes are social'. Social innovation is not only done by the non-profit sector, it can also be promoted by politicians and governments (new models of public health), markets (free software, organic food), movements (fair trade, time banks), as well as by social enterprises, individuals and a 'mix' between for-profit and not-for-profit entities. This has given rise to a hybrid space of public-private collaboration called the fourth sector.

For Howaldt and Schwarch(2010), social innovation stems from the need to reconfigure social practices as a consequence of the changes we are experiencing as we move from an industrial society to one based on knowledge and services, a situation that implies a paradigm shift in innovation systems. Apart from typically technological innovations, technologies can be instruments for social cohesion and inclusion, i.e. they can be mediators in social innovation processes.

Hochgerner (2011) and the ZSI centre (Zentrum Für Soziale Innovation) believe that Social Innovations are new concepts and measures to solve social problems that are accepted and used by the social groups concerned.

Echevarria (2009) and Gurrutxaga (2011) understand that the concept of social innovation goes beyond the field of social sciences and penetrates other disciplines. It is a transdisciplinary concept that challenges us to investigate the phenomenon from different perspectives, especially in terms of its ethical connotations. In their own words: innovation is a value and the various types of innovation can be distinguished on the basis of axiological criteria.

Rodríguez Herrera and Alvarado Ugarte (2008) present their perspective from the Latin American reality in the book *Claves de la Innovación Social en América Latina y el Caribe* published by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) in November 2008. This document shows a multitude of experiences where it becomes clear that innovations in the social field tend to emerge where the market or the public sector has not offered any alternative to respond to people's needs and demands. This has given rise to a bottom-up movement made up of initiatives that come from the very people or groups that generate these responses. In this sense, for these authors, social innovation emerges as part of learning processes and knowledge-generating practices that take place in groups, where diverse ways of knowing the world that reinforce or generate new competences in people are linked and articulated. Here we come up against the paradox of diffusion: what should be the scope of an innovation of these characteristics? It is often difficult for these innovations to spread beyond the local sphere in which they originate, or for the number of beneficiaries to multiply.

These authors also take up the definition of Benoît Lévesque, founder with Paul R. Bélanger of the Centre de Recherche sur les Innovations Sociales (CRISES) in 1986 in Canada, social innovation is seen as social changes that occur in three complementary areas: the territory, the quality of life of its inhabitants, and the conditions of work and employment.

In short, what they mean is that it is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, a social innovation arises as a response to a problem or shortcoming detected by society and to which there is no adequate response from the public authorities or the private sector (both in a broad sense). Thus, starting from a social basis in the sense that these responses are not usually given individually, but are of a collective nature, an initiative arises, which seeks to respond to the problems of society, and which over time becomes an element of innovation, which can in turn, depending on its characteristics, be instrumentalised in social economy initiatives and social entrepreneurship, NGO activities, social enterprises and Corporate Social Responsibility initiatives, open Innovation and crowdfunding, to a multiplicity of creative and cultural practices that arise from social movements and groups or collective movements. The transformative character is intrinsic to social innovation, as it contributes to transforming the current reality at different levels.

At the micro level, Social Innovation has: direct implications on the people who are part of the movements and organisations, as it involves changes that directly affect the functioning of the human factor; it also involves changes related to new organisational and management forms. Social and solidarity economy organisations have traditionally stood out in the application of the Social Innovation for various reasons and characteristic elements that in some way have given them a competitive advantage over other public and private entities. Among others, these are some of the characteristic elements:

It is a feature to have as objectives:

- the socio-occupational insertion of people (in situation/at risk of exclusion)
- environmental protection and respect for the environment through sustainable growth.
- gender empowerment and the struggle for equity.
- the development of solidarity-based initiatives in southern countries and social transformation initiatives in northern countries
- provide an understanding of the social environment and socio-economic dynamics that are sometimes far removed from mainstream thinking.

And, adding these objectives to elements such as a **strong link with the territory** and a **strong social** and grassroots **vocation**(Etxezarreta, Etxezarreta, Zurbano and Estensoro, 2014, 2015, they have been carrying out Social Innovation actions per se over the last few years. Today, on the other hand, they are facing challenges that force them to develop new Social Innovation systems in order to continue to differentiate themselves.

Social and Solidarity Economy

The SSE proposes a refocusing of the economic act, placing the person and work at the centre from a humanistic view of the economy (Pérez de Mendiguren, Etxezarreta, Guridi, 2009; Askunze 2013). It represents an alternative vision of the economy to the conventional one (Laville 2004, Laville and Gaiger, 2009; Coraggio 2011), in addition, the SSE is linked to the generation of capacities, as an economic dimension of Local Human Development (Guridi and Pérez de Mendiguren, 2014). In Spain there is a Network of Alternative and Solidarity Economy Networks, -REAS- made up of more than five hundred entities that are grouped into territorial and sectoral networks. It is present at the international level through RIPPES (Intercontinental Network for the Promotion of the Social and Solidarity Economy). The main aim of REAS is to make this other way of approaching and managing the economy possible, by promoting, supporting and coordinating associative, entrepreneurial, economic and financial initiatives that are committed to the six main principles of the Solidarity Charter. These are the following:

1. Principle of Equity, which introduces an ethical principle or principle of justice in equality, recognises all people as subjects of equal dignity and advocates for a fairer society.
2. Principle of work, placing the conception of work in a broad social and institutional context of participation in the economy and in the community, and in particular advocating for quality and care work.
3. Principle of environmental sustainability, allying with nature as a subject of rights, integrating environmental sustainability in all socio-economic actions, assessing the environmental impact to reduce the ecological footprint.
4. Principle of cooperation, which seeks to favour cooperation rather than competition, within and outside the organisations linked to the Network, building fair business relationships of equality, trust, co-responsibility, transparency, respect and encouraging learning and cooperative work between people and organisations.
5. Non-profit" principle, which aims at the integral, collective and individual development of people, and as a means, the efficient management of economically viable, sustainable and integrally profitable projects. All this taking into account not only the economic aspects, but also the human, social, environmental, cultural and participatory aspects.
6. Principle of Commitment to the environment, which deals with the importance of the entities of the network participating in the sustainable local and community development of the territory in which they operate, i.e. the importance of involvement as an agent of development in the geographical territory, without forgetting the perspective of being present in the local to transform the global.

These principles therefore permeate the praxis of SSE entities, and are those that must be transferred to students when teaching economics at universities. The ultimate goal would be to empower students as economic subjects, giving them a

global, intersectional and alternative perspective of reality, of their role in the economic sphere and linking it to social, environmental and cultural needs.

So, a question arises: Is the SSE capable of generating Social Innovation? Is it an alternative for working on the economic dimension of the entities that generate Social Innovation? Is it a socio-economic proposal that is close to the territory and the social reality?

Social and Solidarity Economy and Social Innovation

The Centre de Recherche sur les Innovations Sociales (CRISES), based in Montreal (Canada), is an inter-university and multidisciplinary centre that has been studying and analysing Social Innovations since 1986 from 3 fundamental axes for their understanding: territory, living conditions and work and employment. From these contexts, it analyses the SI through 3 indicators (Klein et al., 2012): governance (referring to the forms of participation of social actors); co-production (production of services -organisational level- and co-construction (participation in public policies - institutional level-), and plural economy (plurality of forms of development and economy). Through this analysis, CRISES identifies four types of innovation (production, consumption, inter-firm relations and spatial configuration of social relations).

It is in this context that the relationship with the social economy is established, insofar as it has a non-profit nature and attempts to democratise spaces. The social economy is a different way of understanding the role of the economy and economic processes in today's society (Pérez de Mediguren, Etxezarreta and Guridi, 2009). It is understood that the economy must be at the service of personal and community development, which makes it a transformative practice (Askunze, 2007). There is a key element on which the different existing currents coincide, which is the link with the territory and the emphasis on the development of social transformation processes. The social economy entities existing in the Basque Autonomous Community seek innovative and creative solutions to the issues that society poses as problems and which it has to face, always respecting the principle of equity and equal opportunities for fair work that allows human development.

It is therefore innovation an important element for the development of social entities.

Thus, the initiatives that, on a practical level, are identified with the Social and Solidarity Economy are manifested in all areas of the economic process. These initiatives are developed at the organisational level in such a way that the processes of production of goods and services respond to a different logic of economic activity. They operate on the basis of principles based on solidarity, trust, cooperation and collective work, and prioritise people and their individual and collective well-being over the simple search for economic profitability.

If, as we mentioned before, the transformative character is intrinsic to Social Innovation, it contributes to transforming the current reality at different levels, and has obvious elements of convergence with the postulates of the solidarity economy. They share the ultimate goal of doing something to contribute to a change that affects society. As the Network of Alternative and Solidarity Economy -REAS- states: "REAS Euskadi is a network created in 1997 that brings together more than 50

companies and social entities that promote an economy at the service of people and their environment. Based on its commitment to the 6 principles of the Charter of Solidarity¹ (REAS, 2011) it aims to strengthen - from the perspective of sustainable human development - collective proposals that seek to transform society and, in particular, the economy in its different facets: financing, production, marketing and consumption". This can make solidarity economy entities stand out as agents of Social Innovation by responding to social demands that are not met by the public or private sectors and by implementing initiatives that respond to them (Etxezarreta et Al., 2014, 2015). In fact, traditionally, solidarity economy (and social) organisations have played an important role in Social Innovation in our society. Usually, these types of entities have responded to demands that were either not economically profitable and, therefore, were left out of the offer, or that the public sector, for various reasons (delay in response, lack of flexibility, stagnation and excessive bureaucracy, disparity of political priorities, etc.) did not manage to meet. And not only that. Solidarity economy organisations have tackled, with originality and effectiveness, problems affecting extremely vulnerable groups that would otherwise have aggravated their risk of social exclusion. Remote care services for the elderly or people with reduced mobility, retraining and recruitment services for people at risk of exclusion or in the process of inclusion, non-profit companies focused on improving employability, companies manufacturing high added value components for the automotive auxiliary industry that employ people with Down's Syndrome, even banking and financial services or the creation of start-ups. In all these cases, solidarity economy companies and organisations have shown that they are capable of innovating and offering alternatives that respond flexibly to the demands of society.

In addition, another factor to take into account is the strong link that social and solidarity economy organisations have with their territory of origin. As Guridi and Pérez de Mendiguren (2014) states:

The social and solidarity economy is closely linked to local development, because it emerges from the territory, from its people and its organisations, it is rooted in the territory, it uses endogenous resources and promotes local capacities for the creation of an innovative environment in the territory. It tends to respond to the needs of communities, to be at the service of community development, has a special potential to engage with other areas of society and a greater propensity to reinvest profits in the same territory where they are generated, promoting accumulation processes at the local level; it has a strong capacity to create and spread entrepreneurial culture and business fabric, both in the economic and social spheres. (p 45, 46)

One of the most widespread key elements for overcoming difficulties and crisis situations is the organisation's close links with the community and its territory, as well as external support, i.e. links with social, political and economic actors.

This imbrication in the territory is not only important from a purely innovative point of view, as the authors express, it also creates an environment of innovation, where

¹ It is possible to download the letter of solidarity from the REAS Euskadi website, at the following address:
http://www.economiasolidaria.org/redes/reas_euskadi

local capacities are reinforced and where capital and experience are accumulated, giving rise to dynamics of a synergetic nature that help to articulate the territory around practices and a different "way of doing".(Guridi and Pérez de Mendiguren, 2014)

It is therefore necessary to highlight the strengths that support this type of solidarity economy experiences. Many of these are directly related to the link with the environment, the territory and the people who live there in terms of exchange and reciprocity.

Thus, it can be Emmaus Social Foundationd that a process of mutual co-construction is generated which must be taken into account as a strength, and which on the other hand is a strategic element as far as the sustainability of the entities is concerned, as this identification of the people with the environment, the company or entity and the social reality at a local level, results in greater resilience in the face of changes derived from internal and external crises (for example, in the face of dangers such as the relocation of companies).

In general terms, it can be affirmed that previous militancy in the local community (most of these experiences are born from grassroots social movements that try to respond to local needs), confers strength to the entrepreneurial development of this type of initiatives, as it gives support and legitimacy to the present and future development of these initiatives.(Etxezarreta et Al.,, 2014, 2015)

It should also be Emmaus Social Foundationd that solidarity economy organisations are located in the socio-economic environment in a position that makes them particularly prone to seek innovative solutions to problems or shortcomings detected. The very logic of the dynamics in which these entities are involved on a day-to-day basis, the disparity and heterogeneity of the agents that make them up and with whom they work, means that they live in a continuous and sustained state of creative search for ideas that at the same time continue to give them legitimacy in relation to their bases and the maintenance of their values, while seeking greater efficiency and effectiveness in economic terms for the development of their mission as a social agent.(Etxezarreta et Al., 2014, 2015)

With regard to gender equality, it is expressly mentioned in the Charter of Solidarity in several principles, the principle of equity being representative (principle number 1 of the Charter of Solidarity), which states: "We consider that equity introduces an ethical principle or principle of justice in equality. It is a value that recognises all people as subjects of equal dignity, and protects their right not to be subjected to relations based on domination regardless of their social condition, gender, age, ethnicity, origin, capacity, etc. This has the following implications: For equal opportunities it is not enough the issue of parity in positions, but it is necessary to promote the development of the capacities of all people in an equitable manner. This means developing actions that compensate for the diversity of social disadvantages so that many people really do have the same opportunities. A basic element is economic parity: equal pay for equal work. And in another remark: For participation it is necessary to promote access to all people involved in the organisation, providing all the means and creating accessibility channels that motivate responsibility and the process of empowerment".

On the other hand, the principle of work (principle number 2 of the solidarity charter) quotes:

We consider that work is a key element in the quality of life of individuals, of the community and of economic relations between citizens, peoples and states. Therefore, at REAS we place the concept of work in a broad social and institutional context of participation in the economy and in the community.

Within this social dimension, it should be stressed that, without the contribution of the work carried out in the area of care, fundamentally by women, our society would not be able to sustain itself. This work is still not sufficiently recognised by society, nor is it distributed equitably".

Thus, we can affirm that from the perspective of the solidarity economy, equal opportunities between people in general and between men and women in particular are of great importance in the search for a just and equitable society. The provision of a certain type of work, and the guarantee of a truly equitable and effective participation within solidarity economy organisations, plays a central role in this quest, and is necessary in order to transform society.

Due to all these elements, this type of initiative is capable of seeking innovative ideas that respond in an agile and efficient way to local and global problems. In short, they seek to transform the social and economic environment in terms of individual and collective improvement.

METHODOLOGY

Objectives of the study.

General Objective -G.O-:

To analyse Emmaus Social Foundation's character as a social innovation agent, as a social economy organisation, based on the three axes developed by CRISES (Centre de recherche sur les Innovations sociales), which are Governance, Plural economy and Co-construction and co-production of public policies. (Klein et Al., 2012)

Specific objectives -S.O

Specific Objective 1: To analyse the Emmaus Social Foundation, taking into account the following key aspects: the organisation's areas of work, spatial location, networks, services offered and volume of activity.

Specific Objective 2: To identify the characteristic elements of an entity that is an agent of Social Innovation.

Specific Objective 3 :Design and implement the information collection tools necessary to develop the case study.

Methodology:

The methodology used is qualitative. For Taylor and Bogdan (1996), qualitative research in a broad sense is research that produces descriptive data, from people's words, both spoken and written, and observable behaviour. It has several characteristics, such as being inductive, holistic, understanding people within their frame of reference, using humanistic methods and taking into account that all people and settings are worthy of study. These characteristics are important in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the case in question, which is why it is an appropriate methodology for this study.

Method:

The method chosen is the case study. Stake (1988 p.11) defines the case study as "the study of the particularity and complexity of a singular case, in order to understand its activity in important circumstances". Rodríguez(2011) add other basic characteristics of case studies, which differentiate them from other study methods: The researcher has to try to observe reality with a profound vision and, likewise, has to try to offer a total vision of the phenomenon under study, reflecting the complexity of the same; their approach in it is hypothetical. If you observe, if you draw conclusions and report on them. If they focus on relationships and interactions, and therefore require the researcher's participation in the unfolding of the case. They study contemporary phenomena by analysing an aspect of interest in them, requiring the researcher to remain in the field for a prolonged period of time. They involve processes of negotiation between the researcher and the participants on an ongoing basis. Case studies incorporate multiple sources of data and their analysis has to be carried out in a global and interrelated way.

It is therefore a suitable method for the study for the following reasons:

- Be in line with and easily applicable to the methodology proposed by CRISES (Centre de recherche sur les Innovations sociales).
- It is a method that corresponds to the qualitative research approach and allows for the description, analysis and in-depth understanding of a given phenomenon or process within a particular reality. It is characterised by being particularistic, descriptive, heuristic and inductive (Bisquerra, 2012).
- To be located within the ideographic approach, which aims to understand in depth a social or educational reality -individual, group, institution (Emmaus Social Foundation)-, highlighting the most significant aspects, variables or relationships, and to be able to extract these variables and compare them with the criteria of Social Innovation.

Phases:

Considering the stages of research design, we can describe these phases:

Phase 1. Approach to the study context and entry negotiation process.

Prior contact was made with the staff of Emmaus' education for social transformation department. During the interview, the possibility of carrying out qualitative research into Emmaus Social Foundation and its ultimate aim was discussed.

Phase 2. Elaboration of the information collection instruments.

Firstly, field notes were recorded on the basis of a script based on the study's objectives and basic questions about social innovation. The process was open-ended, in search of indicators that would help to better understand the Emmaus Foundation's reality. The data production technique was participant observation, as will be explained in the next point of this section. These notes took into account the questions arising from the research objectives. This instrument was used in the visit sessions to the different Emmaus Social Foundation centres in Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa. At the same time, the theoretical framework underpinning the research was drawn up.

The standard questionnaire was adapted to the needs and characteristics detected over the previous two months during the work experience period. The questionnaires were adapted to Emmaus' different functional areas and variables relating to gender and horizontal participation in the organisation's internal decision-making process were included. These questionnaires were checked with Emmaus employees, with the person who supervised the work experience placement at Emmaus and with the university tutor. The profile of the people to whom the questionnaire was addressed was as follows

Phase 3. Collection and production of information:

As mentioned in the previous section, the collection of information through participant observation (and some informal interviews).

Phase 4. Analysis of information and preparation of report:

Once the information had been collected, the information gathered in the field notes, formal and informal interviews was coded, categorised and analysed. The categorical system used was structured on the basis of the three axes proposed in the methodology applied by CRISES and in relation to the theoretical framework. Finally, the final report was drawn up, taking into account the methodological section, results and discussion.

Data production techniques:

Throughout the study, different analytical techniques were applied, several of which have been mentioned above. Specifically, the following techniques were applied throughout the process:

a) Documentary analysis:

Document analysis was the first technique used. The following sources of information were used, from which data and relevant information were extracted and systematised for use in the study. Types of sources:

Secondary sources: collected from databases (Hegoa Institute, Dialnet; Google Scholar, JCR), we worked with reports, scientific articles, governmental documentation and memoirs.

Primary sources: These include websites, reports, by-laws, balance sheets, strategic plans of the organisation.

b) Participant observation:

The possibility of developing the practices in the organisation itself was a key factor in developing this technique in depth. This is an information-gathering technique, derived from anthropological studies, which consists of observing while participating in the activities of the group under investigation. In order to plan the observation, the following questions were taken into account: what exactly to investigate, how to observe and be aware of it, where to observe (formal, informal spaces, project implementation activities, etc.), what to observe, when to observe, how to record, how to analyse, how to record and what to analyse.

Field notes were taken as communications and interactions between them unfolded, so as not to interfere with the dialogue. Occasionally, notes were taken at another time that was not too distant from the observed event.

c) Informal interviews:

A total of seven informal interviews were conducted and later collected in the form of field notes. The script focused on key elements of the entity, such as its genesis, management, organisation, from the perspective of the subjects. Once they had been systematised, they were analysed and included in the final report.

d) Questionnaires:

A total of five model questionnaires were prepared, one per analysis axis and two different ones were prepared for the Co-Production and Co-Construction of public policies axis (Vaillancourt, 2013). One with an institutional approach and the other with an Emmaus functional area approach. Finally, a plan was drawn up to pass them on to the organisation's staff.

Questionnaire plan:

Table 1: Questionnaire Plan.

1. CO-CONSTRUCTION :

Responsible for the area of solidarity economy and former head, responsible for the area of Social Inclusion and General Management.

2. CO-CONSTRUCTION:

Responsible for the area of Solidarity Economy, responsible for Social Inclusion and responsible for Communication and Advocacy.

3. PLURAL ECONOMY:

Responsible for the area of solidarity economy and former head.

4. GOVERNANCE:

Head of Research, Development and Social Innovation and General Management.

Source: Own elaboration.

The evaluative nature of the research is therefore eminently qualitative. Although the information collected was systematised, the processing of the information is qualitative. A total of 11 responses to the questionnaires were obtained.

The first axis, on the degree of co-construction, to propose a list of indicators that measure the nature of the relationship between public administrations and social and solidarity economy organisations, based on the model proposed by Savard and Proulx (2011) and adapted by Estensoro (2012). Thus, the four original sub-axes of analysis in this questionnaire have been maintained: Openness to institutional pluralism, Intensity of relations, Degree of formalism of relations, Symmetry in power relations. For their part, the Plural Economy and Governance axes have been analysed using a qualitative methodology, without quantitative indicators.

On the co-production and co-construction axis, the results are homogeneous and fairly consistent, and it was decided to apply the CRISES model by modifying and adapting it to the needs of the study. According to the original survey model, adjustments were made in coherence with the proposed data collection objectives. Specifically, the adjustments were as follows.

- It was decided to develop an additional questionnaire. Thus, there are two questionnaires for the axis; a first questionnaire of a general nature and another one of a more particular nature, specifically for the area of work. This questionnaire is almost the same as the Co-Construction and Co-Production questionnaire with the only difference being the approach to which the answers should be given. The reason for elaborating a more open questionnaire was that it would allow for different answers that could give more richness to the analysis. In order to understand this methodological choice, it is important to bear in mind the diversity of Emmaus' work areas and the variety of work dynamics that can (and do) arise within the organisation and that the work strategies of one area and another can sometimes be far removed from each other.
- *The four original sub-axes of analysis in this questionnaire have been maintained; Openness to institutional pluralism, Intensity of relations, Degree of formalism of relations, Symmetry in power relations.* These have been retained and the object of analysis of each sub-axis has been maintained.

In this way, and taking the previous weighting as a model, two questionnaires have been drawn up:

- Questionnaire 1: General Co-construction and Co-production. It consists of a total of 29 questions. Broken down by sub-axes:
 - a. Openness to institutional pluralism; 7 questions.
 - b. The intensity of relationships; 7 questions.
 - c. The degree of formalism of relationships; 7 questions.
 - d. Symmetry in power relations; 8 questions.
- Questionnaire 1: Co-Construction and Co-Production Areas of EMMAUS SOCIAL FOUNDATION work. It consists of a total of 29 questions. Broken down by sub-axes:

- a. Openness to institutional pluralism; 7 questions.
- b. The intensity of relationships; 7 questions.
- c. The degree of formalism of relationships; 8 questions.
- d. Symmetry in power relations; 7 questions.

For each sub-axis, the following weightings have been maintained following a proportionality criterion with respect to the original model:

- a. Openness to institutional pluralism. The weighting per question ranges from a value of "0" to a value of "5"; therefore, a maximum total of 35 points can be scored. If the total sum total is between 0 and 15 points, we are talking about a *weak openness*, if it is between 16 and 26 points, we are talking about a *moderate openness*, while if the sum total is between 27 and 35 points, we are talking about a *high openness*.
- b. The intensity of the relationships. The weighting per question ranges from a value of "0" to a value of "5"; therefore, a maximum total of 35 points can be scored. If the sum total is in the range between 0 and 15 points, we are talking about a *low intensity*, if it is in the range between 16 and 26 points, we are talking about a *moderate intensity*, while if the sum total is between 27 and 35 points, we are talking about a *high intensity*.
- c. The degree of formalism of the relationships; 8 questions. The weighting per question ranges from "0" to "5". In this case the maximum total is 40 points. In addition, this sub-axis includes 2 questions focused on analysing the degree of women's participation in decision-making spaces. It was considered key to be able to see whether or not women's participation in these spaces is effective and its intensity, because however formal and extensive the spaces for consultation between public authorities and social economy entities may be, without participation, at least representative of the female gender, it would be difficult to consider valid an analysis that would conclude, for example, that there is a real model of co-construction. Thus, the ranges would be as follows: Between 0 and 20 a weak formality, between 21 and 32 a moderate formality, and between 33 and 40 points a high formality.
- d. Symmetry in power relations. The weighting per question ranges from a value of "0" to a value of "5"; therefore, a total of a maximum of 35 points could be scored. If the sum total is in the range between 0 and 15 points, we would be talking about asymmetrical power relations, if it is in the range between 16 and 26 points, we would be considering *collaborative power relations*, while if the sum total is between 27 and 35 points, we would be considering *symmetrical power relations*.

Finally, after adding up the four blocks, and obtaining the interpretations for each of them, the degree of co-construction between these two actors is theorised within the framework of 6 types of relationship: i) competitive; ii) sub-contracting; iii) third sector; iv) co-existence; v) supplementary; vi) co-construction.

The following table of values summarises the criteria used for the analysis:

Table 2: Values and criteria

Degree of co-construction and co-production between two actors (Emmaus Social Foundation's and PPPs) within the framework of the type of relationship.	Sum value of the four sub-axes (Points brackets)	Additional criteria
Competitive	Between 0 and 40	
Sub-contractor	Between 41 and 60	
Third sector	Between 61 and 80	At least 35% of women in decision-making spaces.
Co-existence	Between 81 and 100	At least 50% of women in decision-making spaces.
Supplementary	Between 101 and 120	At least 50% of women in decision-making spaces. No "weak" rating on any sub-axis
Co-construction	Between 121 and 155	At least 50% of women in decision-making spaces. No "weak" rating on any sub-axis
	Total possible: 155 points	

Source: Own elaboration based on Savard and Proulx (2011).

This would be the breakdown for a single questionnaire. As there is more than one, the average will be averaged and applied to this scale for the analysis.

Additional assessment criteria have been applied. In this case, it is considered that if one of them is not fulfilled, despite having scored the necessary points, the Emmaus Social Foundation's consideration in terms of the Co-construction and Co-production axis would drop one grade. In other words, even if it scored, for example, 150 total points, if there was no participation of women in equal decision-making spaces, or if it was "weak" in the considerations of any of the three sub-axes, Emmaus Social Foundation would automatically be evaluated as a *supplementary entity (not of co-construction and co-production)* from the point of view of solidarity and democratic co-construction and co-production of public policies.

For their part, the Governance and Plural Economy axes will be analysed from a qualitative work perspective, which seeks to understand the case in depth. This is characteristic of interpretative qualitative analysis. In this way, interpretations will be made based mainly on the theoretical framework.

The structure of both questionnaires has been maintained, adding elements that enrich the qualitative analysis. In the Governance questionnaire, the added elements refer to equitable power relations between genders, networking, the link that EFS has with the territory (Guridi and Pérez de Mendiguren, 2014) and the type of leadership that is developed internally in EFS. Specifically, we analyse the composition Emmaus Social Foundation workers by gender, their degree of participation and influence in strategic decision-making, the importance given to gender policies at the institutional level and the resources allocated to it, the number of networks in which the Emmaus Social Foundation works and, finally, the degree of internal importance given to the fact that the Emmaus Social Foundation has a strong link with the territory and the social mass (the territory of action is understood).

Finally, with regard to the questionnaire on the plural economy, the original structure has basically been maintained, keeping the four sub-axes of analysis (*financing, value chain, positioning and relationship with other companies*). The only element of aggregate analysis corresponds to the degree of cooperation in the market of solidarity-based companies and its actual materialisation.

Content analysis:

The content analysis aims to convert "raw" information from field notes, interviews, printed or digital news, and bibliographic documents into data that can be processed scientifically. For the content analysis, a categorical system was developed based on the three CRISES axes and the scientific literature.

Table 3: Categorical system used:

Categorical Axis	Category	Definition
Governance: the value of generating new social and powerful relations between community actors	Relationships between actors and types of alliance	Refers to whether the relationship with government or other entities is one of exchange, cooperation, collaboration, subsidiarity or none of these.
	Position	The aim is to look at Emmaus Social Foundation's position on two levels: one, at the level of Emmaus Social Foundation's influence in the field of work, and the other in relation to the role of other actors in Emmaus Social Foundations

		decision-making.
	Agents (who)	The aim is to identify the profiles of the agents with whom the entity works.
	Management of internal relations	The aim is to see the degree of real participation on the part of the people involved at all levels within the entity.
	Equal decision-making (men and women)	This refers to how decisions are made. On an equal basis between men and women and whether it is shared or not.
	Shared leadership	The question here is whether there is shared leadership, charismatic or otherwise.
	Link with the territory	It tries to identify the degree of importance given to the link with the territory of the entity in terms of institutional strength and sustainability.
Plural Economy: Economic democracy and the participation of agents, entities and social movements in production, distribution and social and economic reproduction.	Funding	It tries to see the diversification of funding sources, as well as the planning to obtain them and the dependence on them. It also looks at the degree of autonomy of Emmaus Social Foundation's in economic terms.
	Value chain	It tries to see the space that the entity occupies in the market and with whom it shares it, the plurality of agents.
	Positioning	The aim is to look at the positioning of Emmaus Social Foundation in the value chain market.

Solidarity-based and democratic co-construction and co-production of public policies	Relationship with other companies	It is a question of what kind of relationships are maintained with other entities sharing the value chain and the type of relationships in the key of the value chain.
	Organisational plan organisation of products and services	Openness to institutional pluralism degree of knowledge and recognition by public administrations of the entities that manage the services
	Institutional level the setting of general orientations and founding elements of policy	Relationship intensity measures the quantity, quality and frequency of formal and informal activities that the entity has with the public administration.
		Formalism of relations, the existence (or not) of consultation structures, collaboration mechanisms, agreements, contracts or protocols that may be more or less permanent between the two parties.
		Symmetry in power relations, the ability of each party to influence and determine the nature and direction of the services offered

Source: Adapted from CRISES, Estensoro (2012) and Savard and Proulx (2011).

When analysing the information, it has been taken into account that, except in the case of co-construction and solidarity co-production of public policies, there is no defined index or weighting mechanism. These three axes have been used in a few case studies in Quebec and the results obtained are of a more qualitative and evaluative nature.

CASE STUDY: EMMAUS SOCIAL FOUNDATION

Characterisation of the entity.

History of the Emmaus movement

The Emmaus movement was founded in France by Abbé Pierre. It was born in two stages: first in 1947, when Abbé Pierre rented a dilapidated house in Neuilly-Plaisance, 14km east of Paris. He rebuilt it and opened an international youth hostel to which he gave the name "Emmaus" as a symbol of renewed hope. The second step took place in 1949, when he invited Georges Legay to build accommodation for homeless families.

Although Emmaus was created by a Catholic priest, from the outset it wanted to be a movement open to all nationalities and ethnic origins, without any distinction based on the political, spiritual or religious convictions of the people it welcomes.

Emmaus was initially funded by Abbé Pierre's salary as a member of parliament but he resigned his seat in 1951. When the money ran out, Abbé Pierre began to beg in the streets of Paris. The other members of the group then proposed that they should all go scavenging in order to recover and sell anything that would be useful.

When, in the harsh French winter of 1954, people began to die in the streets, Abbé Pierre launched his famous appeal on Radio Luxembourg: "Friends, a call for help. A woman has just frozen to death this evening on the pavement of the Boulevard Sebastopol, and in her hands she was holding the eviction papers for her home. Thus began the Insurrection of Kindness, and in the days that followed, more than two thousand tons of donations were collected.

The name rag-pickers of Emmaus, as the movement is called in many Hispanic countries, recalls this origin of waste pickers.

During the 1950s, communities started to emerge in different countries that imitated Abbé Pierre's example and followed him as a model. In 1969, in Bern, Switzerland, 70 groups from 20 countries adopted the "Universal Manifesto of the Emmaus Movement" (see appendix) and decided to set up an international liaison secretariat. The aim of the movement is "to work so that every human being, every society and every nation can live, affirm and fulfil itself through exchange and sharing".

The different Emmaus groups

Emmaus International is a decentralised organisation, which means that part of the work is carried out in the four regions on which the groups depend (Africa, America, Asia and Europe). It operates in three areas: member groups, delegates and employees.

Nowadays there are about 337 groups in 36 countries. Every four years they meet at the World Assembly. Their daily work consists mainly of helping those who suffer most. The groups carry out different activities, depending on their local environment. They also fund the international movement and elect their representatives, the "Emmaus International councillors".

Emmaus International's activities are funded by the day-to-day work of its 336 member groups in 36 countries, organised into four regions (Africa, America, Asia and Europe)

Emmaus in Spain

At national level, the Emmaus movement consists of seven different groups whose headquarters are located in 5 autonomous communities in 7 different provinces (Bilbao, Granada, Murcia, Navarra, Sabadell, San Sebastian and Vitoria) and are present in 2 other autonomous communities such as Asturias and Galicia.

In 2006, all the above-mentioned groups, on the basis of the convictions and ideological foundations that drive their commitments, agreed to sign a Declaration of Common Identity consisting of 8 principles (see appendix). What is remarkable about this declaration is that it sets out a series of shared ideological principles that are respected by all the groups and that mark the daily work of all of them. To highlight some of them:

1.- Our name comes from the initiative of Abbé Pierre in France, founder of the Emmaus Movement, which has developed all over the world and whose action is based on "priority service to those who suffer the most" in the formulation:

"In the face of any human suffering, as far as you are able, endeavour not only to solve it in the act, but also to destroy its causes. Not only to destroy its causes, but also to solve it in the act".

3.- We recognise ourselves as equal persons with different peculiarities without distinction of origin, race, sex, culture or religion and diversity as a value.

Lastly, it should be noted that there is a national consultation forum but that its organic impact at the level of the organisation is limited. (Emmaus Social Foundation, 2021).

Emmaus Social Foundation.

Legal form:

Emmaus Social Foundation Group, as its name suggests, is a group of entities, in this case insertion companies, which adopt the legal form of a single-person limited company, which in turn revolve around the Emmaus Social Foundation.

Foundations are governed on the basis of the law of the Basque Parliament 12/1994 of 17 June 1994 on Foundations, and are non-profit organisations, which, by the will of their creators, allocate their assets to the achievement of general interest purposes on a lasting basis.

The purpose of the foundation must be lawful, serve a general interest, and benefit non-individually determined persons.

On the other hand, sole proprietorships are trading companies with a single shareholder whose characteristic is that they limit the shareholder's liability only to the capital contributed (and to the assets of the limited company).

In the group, therefore, the determining figure is the foundation. As the following graph shows, the supreme management body is the board of trustees, which

