

Country selection for the ITSSOIN project

Deliverable 2.4 of the project:
“Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation” (ITSSOIN),
European Commission – 7th Framework Programme

28 February 2015



Suggested citation

Anheier, H. K.; Krlev, G.; Mildenerger, G., & Preuss, S.; (2015). Country selection for the ITSSOIN project. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our partners within the EU-sponsored project 'ITSSOIN – Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' for their expertise and extensive support in preparing this report. The partner network consists of the University of Heidelberg for Germany, VU University Amsterdam and the Netherlands Institute for Social Research for the Netherlands, London School of Economics and Political Science for the UK, Università Commerciale Luigi Bocconi for Italy, Copenhagen Business School for Denmark, ESSEC Business School for France, Masaryk University for the Czech Republic, Universidade da Coruña and Universidad de Oviedo for Spain and the Stockholm School of Economics for Sweden.

Author contributions for each country

The Czech Republic: Hyánek, V., Navrátil, J., Pejcal, J., Vyskočil, M., Arnerová, Z., & Škarabelová, S.

Denmark: Figueroa, M., Brink Lund, A., & Lilleør, A.

UK: Bauer, A., Adelaja, B., & Wistow, G.

France: Lallemand-Stempak, N., Drujon D'Astros, C., & André, K.

Germany: Preuss, S., Bongertz, U., Krlev, G., & Mildenerger, G.

Italy: Ricciuti, E., & Turrini, A.

The Netherlands: Mensink, W. (NLNA)

Spain: Rey-García, M., & Felgueiras, A. (UDC)

Sweden: Flening, E., & Einarsson, T.

ITSSOIN

ITSSOIN is a research project funded under the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme initiated in response to a call to investigate 'The impact of the third sector on socio-economic development in Europe'. The project represents a research collaboration between 11 European institutions, is led by the University of Heidelberg and runs from 2014-2017.

28 February 2015

Date:

ITSSOIN deliverable: No. 2.4

Authors: Preuss, S.; Krlev, G.; Mildenerger, G.; Anheier, H. K.;

Lead partner: UHEI

Participating partners: Empirical descriptions of country fields from all partners

Contact person: Georg Mildenerger

Centre for Social Investment, Heidelberg University

georg.mildenerger@csi.uni-heidelberg.de

+49 – (0)6221 - 54119-59

Content

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Methodology	4
2.1.	Theoretical considerations.....	4
2.2.	Country selection procedure.....	6
3.	Country selection in the empirical fields	7
3.1.	Arts & culture.....	9
3.2.	Social services.....	14
3.3.	Health care	18
3.4.	Environmental sustainability	21
3.5.	Consumer protection in finance	25
3.6.	Work integration	28
3.7.	Community development.....	33
4.	Theoretical reflections	38
4.1.	Theoretical estimations of sector roles on country-level	39
4.1.1.	Social Origins approach	39
4.1.2.	Welfare Regimes	40
4.1.3.	Varieties of Capitalism	42
4.2.	Theoretical reflection of country field combination	44
4.2.1.	Arts & Culture.....	45
4.2.2.	Social Services	47
4.2.3.	Health care.....	49
4.2.4.	Environmental sustainability	52
4.2.5.	Consumer protection in finance	55
4.2.6.	Work integration.....	57
4.2.7.	Community development.....	60
5.	Conclusion	62
6.	Annex	64
6.1.	Guideline for country vignettes	64
6.2.	Template country vignettes.....	66
7.	Summary Country Vignettes	68
7.1.	WP 4 Arts & Culture	68
7.2.	WP 5 Social Services	69
7.3.	WP 5 Health	71
7.4.	WP 6 Environmental sustainability	72
7.5.	WP 6 Consumer protection in finance	73
7.6.	WP 7 Work integration	74
7.7.	WP 7 Community development.....	76
8.	Overview Theoretical consideration – country field selection	78
8.1.	Country field selection in reflection of the Social Origins approach	78
8.2.	Country field selection in reflection of the Welfare Regimes.....	79
8.3.	Country field selection in reflection of the Varieties of Capitalism	80
9.	References.....	81

1. Introduction

This document presents the selection of country field combinations for the case studies that will be conducted within the framework of the ITSSOIN project. Based on empirical field descriptions provided for each country by ‘vignettes’ an evaluation of the best country field combinations was performed. The empirical descriptions are informed by preknowledge from the policy analysis and the media analysis that were conducted in parallel to the empirical field descriptions. Further theoretical considerations informed the methodology which underlies the field vignettes. Thus, not only brief and insightful descriptions of the empirical fields in the respective countries but also comparable results will be possible.

The following field selection is presented in accordance with the procedure. Firstly, the methodology underlying the vignettes is illustrated. Central insights from the vignettes were summarised in short descriptions of the seven ITSSOIN fields. These descriptions will be displayed in a second step, together with the empirical criteria for the field selection that result from the summary and rationales for the resulting selection. The reflections on the theoretical frameworks are helpful to estimate the expectations as to the innovative capacity in each country field combination in regard to already formulated ITSSOIN hypotheses. This allows, in combination with the results from the policy and media analysis, for a final conclusion on the empirical insights from the case studies that will be conducted in the second project year.

2. Methodology

In order to make a decision as to the country selection, an overview on the specifics of the seven examined fields of activity across all of the countries included in the ITSSOIN project was necessary. To create this overview, all partners searched for structural data for their respective country and provided descriptions on central subjects, the actors in the fields, and significant changes occurring over time. This information was provided in country vignettes, whereby one vignette for each field for each country was compiled. The aim of the field selection is to decide which country to include in the case studies on social innovations. Therefore, the focus on the described field specifics (subjects, actors, and changes over time) is based on theoretical frameworks underlying the ITSSOIN.

Accordingly, this methodology section offers a brief description of theoretical considerations the ITSSOIN project refers to. These considerations were central for the development of guidelines and the template on which the country vignettes are based. Further, the country selection procedure resulting from the empirical data in the vignettes is presented.

2.1. Theoretical considerations

Theoretical considerations have to be reflected on two levels. Firstly, the deliverable ‘Theoretical and empirical capturing of the third sector at the macro level’ reflects on theoretical frameworks that consider the Social Origins theory, Welfare Regimes, and the Varieties of Capitalism approach on a macro level (Anheier, Krlev, Preuss, Mildenerger, & Einarsson, 2014c). These theoretical frameworks will allow for a cross-country comparison of case studies on social innovations on a macro level at the end of the project. All approaches develop typifications of context conditions on the national level that allow for an evaluation of the innovative capacity in the respective countries. The Social Origins theory is referred to, in order to reflect on the specific role of the third sector in regard to social innovations (Anheier, 2005, Anheier, 2010; Salamon & Anheier, 1998). Welfare Regimes consider the impact of state

involvement on the national level, thus enabling an estimation of the innovative capacity of a country in regard to state activities (Arts & Gelissen, 2002; Esping-Andersen, 1990). Lastly, the Varieties of Capitalism approach reflects on types of market economies in reference to the intensity of innovations to be expected (Hall & Soskice, 2001; Schneider & Paunescu, 2012). Drawing on these insights the role of the third sector, the market, and the state is of special interest for the empirical field descriptions. Accordingly, an explicit differentiation of actors from these sectors has to be considered when the country selection is conducted. At the moment these theoretical frameworks will not be discussed in more detail. A brief description of the implementation of the approaches is given in section 4, in which the country selection is reflected theoretically.

This framing on the macro level is complemented with case studies that will be conducted on the micro and meso level. The case studies will focus on social innovations in the respective field and are thus based on a qualitative research approach. Consequently, a theoretical framework is required that allows for a data analysis on the micro and meso level but is also of assistance to relate these results to the macro level. As these reflections had already been made in the deliverable ‘Theoretical and empirical capturing of the third sector at the macro level’ (Anheier et al., 2014c), the framework of strategic action fields was selected. This field-theoretical approach allows for the construction of fields on all levels and reflects systematically on the connection between different fields and field levels (Fligstein & McAdam, 2012). It thus has to be deliberated on in some more detail when defining empirical criteria that will be considered for the country selection. Thereby, only the central aspects of the framework relevant for the country selection will be considered here.¹

To construct the empirical fields in the countries in accordance with the field theory, first of all the object of interest has to be identified (Bourdieu, 1992; Fligstein & McAdam, 2011). Accordingly, the relevant subjects for the respective field in each country are of interest. Based on this, the broad understanding of the field may become more focused. For the field of consumer protection this focus was predefined by relating it explicitly to consumer protection in finance. Further, in the field of community development a broad range of subjects can be studied, which has been reduced to the topic integration of asylum seekers, refugees and unauthorised immigrants in communities. An example for a more precise field description resulting from comparisons of fields across countries based on the country vignettes is the field of environmental sustainability. The field of environmental sustainability corresponds to a broad range of subareas interacting within diverse geographical levels. The vignettes showed that the ITSSOIN countries have for the most part examples of innovations taking place in urban contexts. Therefore, to gain focus in this field the topic of sustainable cities will be utilised as the field’s umbrella concept in advancing the subsequent case work.

The next step for a field construction in accordance with the field theory is the identification of actors relating to the selected subject (Bourdieu, 1985). Consequently, the vignettes should reflect on the actors engaged in regard to the subject as well as on the form these actors’

¹ More details on the usage of field theory as well as on the above described theories on the macro level can be found in the deliverable ‘Theoretical and empirical capturing of the third sector at the macro level’ Anheier, Krlev, Preuss, Mildemberger, and Einarsson (2014c).

engagement takes and on what interests this engagement is based on. To account for the theoretical frameworks that allow for comparisons on the macro level, the description of actors additionally reflects on their affiliation to the state, the market, or the third sector.

Further, actors relate to the described subjects in given context conditions, theoretically understood as field structures (Bourdieu, 1992; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). To account for this, central regulations, for example legislations, are described.

Lastly, from a theoretical perspective fields are considered to be changing over time (Bourdieu, 2001; Fligstein, 2001). To account for these changes it was asked whether significant dynamics have occurred in the last 10 years, even though the focus was predominantly on the current state of the field.

These considerations as to the most important elements necessary for a field construction provide an empirically open but nevertheless comparable description of similarities and differences of each empirical field across countries and they allow for a description of actor patterns and their variety, with a special focus on the involvement and interplay of market, state and third sector entities. Further, key regulative characteristics of the field can be described, and the dynamism of the field, rendered visible e.g. through major reforms, conflicts in the field, or the entry of new actors, becomes apparent. This procedure ensures a great openness of field vignettes that can reflect on outstanding changes in the field which are of special interest for the analysis of social innovations. At the same time surprising consistencies in the field context can be pointed out, which are equally important. They allow for the selection of countries where social innovations are absent. From an analytical perspective this can lead to important insights on factors that prevent social innovations.

2.2. Country selection procedure

Based on the theoretical considerations a guideline has been developed that reflects on the aim of the field vignettes and indicates helpful sources for research to the partners. In addition, a template for the country vignettes has been provided ensure a similar form of the field description. Both documents can be found in the Annex (cf. section 6.1 and 6.2).

Partner's compiled seven country vignettes (one for each field) that were summarised by the CSI in Heidelberg in brief field descriptions. Drawing on these summaries, empirical criteria for the country selection were established and shared with all partners. An insight into the country vignettes is provided in the Annex by tables for each field that describe the main subject, the most important actor and central changes in the field for all analysed countries (cf. section 7). This enables all consortium members and especially work package leaders for the case studies to reflect on the suggested field description. The feedback of the work package leaders was especially important at this point, as they have been entrusted with this task according to their expertise in the respective field. The thus reflected summaries were used as a basis for the discussion on the country selection including the whole consortium. The final, joint decision on the country selection has been elaborated on in a rationale on the country selection for each field.

Drawing on this procedure the seven ITSSOIN fields and the country selection for the fields are presented in the following.

3. Country selection in the empirical fields

Based on the above described field vignettes a brief description of each field is given in the following, reflection on similarities and differences across countries. These qualitative descriptions are further informed by results of the media analysis (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). The media analysis is based on the evaluation of 8463 articles (from 2013) from 36 national and regional newspapers in the nine ITSSOIN countries. By searching these articles using keywords related to the third sector, tendencies of the perception of the third sector are evaluated. Although only about half of the articles (4187) refer to the seven empirical fields, receptions of the fields in the public across countries can be described as results. The presence of the field in the media can be detected in articles that refer to the respective country-field, and the relevance of the third sector is reflected on. Further, the innovative capacity ascribed to the third sector is accounted for. The innovative capacity is higher when the third sector is related to an empirical field. Even though the third sector is mostly described as neutral in regard to innovations for all fields (between 69 % and 81 % of the codes), differences between fields can and will be described. Last, the role of the third sector in the field as advocate, service provider, co-producer, and self-actualiser will be described to show how the fields are perceived in the public (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). What also contributes to the field description is the policy analysis which draws on the analysis of 53 policy documents on innovation policies from 2001 to 2014 for all countries. In all countries almost all fields are referred to in policies but in some countries specific target fields are especially focused on (Anheier et al., 2015). This knowledge on specific interests of policies as well as on the public perception of the fields can add to the general field description given on the basis of the country vignettes.

Based on these field descriptions, selection criteria that elaborate on advantages and disadvantages for the selection of each country are identified for each field. Then, a rationale for the final country selection is provided. To provide a first overview on the country selection the following table was generated:

Table 1. Overview country selection for empirical case studies in accordance with country vignettes

	Field							Sum of case studies allocated
	WP4	WP5		WP6		WP7		
	Culture and arts	Social services	Healthcare	Environmental sustainability	Consumer protection	Work integration	Community development	
Czech Republic			1	1	1	1	1	
Denmark			1	1	1			
France	1		1			1		
Germany				1		1		
Italy	1	1		1			1	
The Netherlands	1						1	
Spain	1	1			1	1		
Sweden		1						
UK		1	1				1	
Sum of Cases	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	27
Sum of cases per WP	4	8		7		8		

3.1. Arts & culture

The main issue in the field of arts & culture across all the surveyed countries is related to the need of economisation and higher market orientation by art institutions. Decades of cuts in public funding (on which providers of arts & culture often depend) and struggles for the distribution of public funds have driven public sector organisations in the arts to be exposed to alternative forms of funding. Another sign of this change is the overall reorganisation of public art institutions. In many cases New Public Management 'formulas' have been adopted: the change of the art institutions' legal status (from public institution to non-profit private organisations), the introduction of governance mechanisms aiming at involving private actors and their funding, the adoption of management tools, and practices in order to increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of art institutions operations, are common trends in this field across countries.

Adjusting the offer of cultural events to the interests of the general public has therefore been a necessity for art and cultural organisation. In some countries this change has raised some concerns about the legitimacy of state support in the arts & culture field. Especially in Spain and in the UK the need to legitimise the societal function of arts & culture has been heavily pointed out (Foro Cultura y Buenas Prácticas, 2015). As a direct consequence of this turmoil central and local governments have started directing their funding to programmes 'using' arts as a tool for social inclusion (such as, for instance, some innovative initiatives like 'theatre in jails' in Italy Valenti, 2004) or even health improvement initiatives (such as, for instance, health-related programmes in the UK)

The described delegitimisation of arts & culture has also affected national regulations. In Spain and Sweden, for example, tax regulations do not favour the growth of the arts field. In Sweden, actors in the field claim that private donations are difficult because rules allowing and incentivising donations are complicated (Gustavsson, 2012). In Spain consumption is discouraged by a recent increase on the VAT on cultural goods and services from 8 % to 21 % (SGAE, 2014). Organisations in the field are paying increased attention to the use of ICTs, in particular the internet, and to governance innovations, in particular evaluation and transparency practices, as means to attract funding, users and to ensure social legitimacy (Foro Cultura y Buenas Prácticas, 2015; Rey García & Álvarez González, 2011; Rey-García, 2012). These developments put even more pressure on the field. In Italy and the Netherlands a contrary situation can be described. Here, tax regulations that support investments in arts & culture are implemented by new government reforms (Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali, 2014; Staatsblad, 2011).

The given description affected especially the area of mainly public funded institutions of the fine arts like museums, theatres, or operas. Some differences might be found in more business-oriented areas of the field typically labelled as creative or culture industries, including publishing, film, music, and TV companies. In these areas the selling or distribution of replicas of cultural artifacts (e.g. books, films, music albums) is the norm. But technological advancement in digitalisation and the extraordinary spread of the internet and social networking have produced big turmoils in these industries resulting in high financial losses and an illegal distribution of different forms of art products in the internet. In France, for example, this led to the establishment of a state agency monitoring illegal activities in the internet to protect artists (Gouvernement français, 2009). Even more important is the fact that technological changes such as the spread of digital media usage have fostered the distribution

of self-produced art (e.g. music) and the internet has become a vehicle for new ways of funding, like crowdfunding, micro-patronage, or online fundraising. This is also taken up partly in the area of the fine arts.

Turning to the description of actors emerging from the vignettes, the state remains the main actor providing support to public cultural institutions such as museums and theatres, even if these institutions have recently adopted a private legal status. From this perspective the special situation in the Czech Republic and in the UK is of importance. In the Czech Republic state regulations are still subject to a transformation process in the context of the transition from a post-socialist system into a capitalist system. The function of the state is not yet defined, public funding is not provided on a reliable basis, and the status of art institutions is discussed. The question as to how the independence of organisations operating in the field of arts & culture can be ensured is particularly present. In the UK sciences are prioritised over arts & culture; an example for this is the recommendation issued by the minister of education suggesting that not arts but sciences should be elected as a subject of study (Department for Education & Department for Culture Media & Sport, 2013; Hutchinson, 2014).

Beside the state, municipalities play a special role in the provision of public funding of arts & culture on the local level (Denmark, the Netherlands, Spain and Italy) (Hjorth-Andersen, 2013). In the Netherlands municipalities invest comparatively more funds in this field than the state, albeit in different types of culture- and arts-related issues (e.g. music education or amateur art) (van den Broek, 2013). In Italy the focus of local governments is on projects aiming at improving social inclusion or enhancing social capital (Turrini, 2009). Similarly, in Spain arts & culture are especially important for three autonomous communities that have an own language, different from Spanish, and a distinct cultural characteristics. These communities provide art institutions for these cultures (e.g. museums, theatres) on a similar level as the national government.

Some special art projects (frequently aiming at providing extra funding) are often developed by third sector organisations. The vignettes highlight the extreme differentiation of third sector organisations operating in the arts field. Third sector organisations in arts & culture range from highly institutionalised organisation to social movements such as alliances. Grant-making cultural foundations typically provide funding to art projects (especially in the protection of the heritage). Association might play an advocacy function (above all if they are created by artists) or they may be comparatively more engaged in innovating the visual and performing arts field, or they might be heavily engaged in projects of inclusion or education, such as those described above. Across different countries and at the local level new forms of social movements are operating in the arts field. Typically, social movements focus on specific local issues and operate on the border of legality. This is the case of Italy where social movements start occupying buildings for their projects obtaining legal recognition afterwards (Giardini, Mattei, & Spregelburd, 2012). Another example for those movements is street art. This form of art that at the beginning was aiming at redesigning public space can now, quite contradictory, be found in art museums. Generally speaking, all these projects are stemmed as especially innovative in all the country vignettes.

Business-oriented actors are less often described in vignettes: the described privatisation makes donations from business firms, which are necessary to fill the financial gap resulting from public funding cuts, more and more important.

As to the perception of arts & culture in the public, is highly represented in media. However, it is not perceived as especially innovative (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). This perspective seems to apply to policy makers as well. The policy analysis showed that even though most fields discussed here are addressed in the analysed policies, the arts & culture field is ignored in policies in Spain, the UK, and on the EU level. Further, it is not mentioned as a special target field in any country. Consequently, it is broadly ignored by policy makers who reflect on innovations in general or social innovations in particular (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection

The description of the arts & culture field shows great similarities across countries. To be able to select countries in which case studies should be conducted, specific developments described in the countries have to be highlighted. First of all, to determine the central actor in the field is of help. Only the three countries Italy, Spain, and the UK see the third sector as an emerging central actor in the field. All other countries describe a state dominance in the field of arts & culture. The countries can accordingly be separated in two groups.

Group 1: Third sector as emerging actor (Italy, Spain, UK)

Italy is, like Spain, especially affected by financial cuts of public funding, which is due to the financial crisis. The most outstanding development in Italy is the strong development of new organisational forms in arts & culture, especially in the third sector. Social movements that are initiating cultural projects can be predicted as innovators in the field. This strengthening of the third sector seems to be supported also by the local and central governments. Even though public cuts are undertaken, tax benefits for investments in culture have been recently established. (Bodo, Spada, & Da Milano, 2004; Grossi, Napolitano, Delrio, & Giovannini, 2013; Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali, 2014).

Even though the dire financial situation in Spain is similar to the situation in Italy, the reactions of the state and the population are quite different in these two countries. In Spain organisations operating in the field of arts & culture face the pressure to justify their relevance in a context of economic crisis, reduced public funding, and high VAT on cultural goods and services. The need for alternative ways of funding and of delivery of cultural activities and projects is accompanied by the search for new and better ways to communicate their social role, to increase transparency and to improve internal governance (Foro Cultura y Buenas Prácticas, 2015; Rey García & Álvarez González, 2011; Rey-García, 2012; SGAE, 2014). As in Italy, this is taken up by third sector organisations that are forging new ways of funding (Campanini & Negri, 2011). The comparison of the cases Italy and Spain could consequently provide insights in innovative processes in the field of arts & culture that are initiated by the third sector but supported by the state in Italy; in contrast, in Spain these processes are opposed or ignored by the state, as the decrease in taxes and the disregard in policy documents clearly show.

In the UK cuts in public funding are also legitimised by the financial crisis and the pressure to legitimise societal benefits of arts & culture is high (Gilmore, 2014). This change of perspective further results in a commercialisation of the sector. The situation is accordingly very similar to Spain and again third sector organisations intervene. In contrast to Spain, in the UK societal projects of social inclusion and a strong engagement of third sector organisations in musical education of children is described. Third sector organisations accordingly have a strong advocacy function to show the societal impact of arts & culture. If, as the background of

innovative processes, the legitimacy of the third sector is of special interest, a comparison of the cases Spain and UK could reveal how different strong third sector organisations reactions are in these countries. In Spain new ways of funding and civic engagement are focused on, whereas in the UK third sector organisations especially focus on the advocacy for societal benefits of culture.

However, the most interesting case in this group is the relatively free development of the third sector in the field of arts & culture in Italy, which is motivated by a difficult financial situation, but supported indirectly through improved tax regulations by the state. Accordingly, the selection of countries that are dominated by government intervention as cases for comparison to Italy will be discussed in the following.

Group 2: Government as main actor (Sweden, France, Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany, the Czech Republic)

Government dominance can be described as especially strong for the following group of countries: France, Sweden, and Denmark.

In France numerous support structures for arts & culture exist. The media have to broadcast a fixed percentage of French music and film productions (Gouvernement français, 1990); there are also fixed prices for print media and 1 % of the costs of public buildings have to be invested in art (Service de la coordination des politiques culturelles et de l'innovation, 2013). Sweden and Denmark also heavily depend on public funding but additional support structures, like in France, do not exist (Hjorth-Andersen, 2013). In all countries cuts in public funding lead to the search for new sources for financing arts & culture. In all countries market actors are more and more in focus as donors. In France and Denmark the third sector activity seems to be relatively low, whereas in Sweden especially innovative activities of the third sector are observed.

All countries could accordingly serve as cases that provide contrasting comparisons to Italy. Selecting Sweden, the question is if innovative activities in a state-dependent field can be compared to Italy, where the third sector is increasing its importance in the field and is similarly innovative. More extreme differences will probably be found in France and Denmark. Innovative ways of financing can be detected there, but the innovative actors do not necessarily come from the third sector, as it is now the case in Italy. Both countries could serve as good examples to provide an analysis of fields which may contradict the main ITSSOIN hypothesis that the third sector has an especially innovative capacity.

The Netherlands can be described as a country where the state-centred field of arts & culture experiences the above described changes of privatisation. In comparison to extreme cases such as Sweden, Denmark, and France, the Netherlands are not such an extremely state-centred country and could therefore be a promising 'normal case' of a state-centred field of arts & culture in contrast to Italy where the field is particularly influenced by third sector activity. This could provide insights into innovative processes in a state-centred field where the influence of is decreasing opposed to a field where third sector organisations are increasingly important, as it is the case in Italy.

Germany is an interesting case, since the dominant state actor supports the economisation of the field to a great extent. The ministry responsible for economy affairs – not the ministry dealing with culture issues – initiated a programme that has the objective to develop the

creative industry (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie, 2014; Graf Strachwitz, 2010). The aim is to provide support to artists so that they can work in a self-employed way or establish a business firm. The initiative is driven by the understanding of the field of arts & culture as a growing economic sector with special innovative capacity of artists as market actors. The selection of Germany could accordingly provide insights into innovative processes in a field where the decrease in public engagement is not compensated by third sector activity but by business-oriented actors.

Another country that differs to a considerable extent from most countries is the Czech Republic, since the transformation of this formerly socialist country has not yet been completed. Consequently, the field of arts & culture has not yet been constituted. One indicator for this is the fact that the institutionalisation of cultural institutions is still discussed. This process is already mixed with the economisation of the field that can also be observed in all other countries. Consequently, the selection of the Czech Republic would offer the opportunity to observe innovation processes in a field which is subject to two distinct transformation processes. This situation of enormous turmoil makes an estimation of important actors utterly difficult but also very interesting. The question as to which sector initiates most innovative processes and, even more important, which innovations prevail, can be pursued.

Country selection – rationale

The main target country for the investigation of the field is **Italy** where the third sector is strengthening and thereby finds itself being supported by the state. Further, in Italy the field of arts & culture is featured by major shifts and supposedly highly innovative developments on many levels.

As a second country **France** was jointly chosen, since strong support structures for arts & culture by the state can be observed (Département des études de la prospective et des statistiques, 2014); this offers the chance to investigate a case which, in comparison with Italy, is very different.

As a third case study, it was agreed to investigate the field in **Spain**, where the situation is similar to Italy in regard to cuts in public spending resulting from the financial crisis. However, the resulting developments in these two countries are quite different. In Spain, instead of a state support the field experiences a strong pressure to legitimise its societal function, and the ignorance of the sector's innovative capacity amongst policy makers predominates. In this context links to the topic of a growing creative economy are established.

Finally, the **Netherlands** will be the object a fourth case study: Since in the Netherlands the field of arts & culture is undergoing a gradual privatisation process and is at the same time a quite 'normal case' as to the level of state influence, this choice met with a general consensus; this case study will thus be helpful as a contrasting example in comparison with France, which is extremely state-centred, and with Spain and Italy. These countries are strongly influenced by the third sector but there is a positive and supportive perspective on the field in Italy. In contrast, in Spain the legitimisation of the field is connected with a stronger understanding of arts & culture as creative economy.

3.2. Social services

Germany's social care and social security system is under pressure, mainly due to demographic change (Bäcker, Naegele, Bispnick, Hofemann, & Neubauer, 2010). This results in cost pressures, which the state tries to resolve by focusing on cost effectiveness of social service provision (Evers, Heinze, & Olk, 2011; Lamping, Schridde, Plafß, & Blanke, 2002). This enhances the plurality of actors and relativises the dominance of the state in comparison with private or third sector providers. This eventuates in an increased criticism of an economisation resulting from this trend by some actors, while others call this shift 'activation' (Lamping et al., 2002). In addition to this pressure on the social care and social security system, which is due to demographic change, changing lifestyles and necessities arising as a result thereof (more flexible work-life models and childcare) and the inclusion agenda in the field of disability are currently the main pillars of interest (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2011).

In Italy, shifts resulting from the demographic change are similarly challenging as in Germany. In the case of Italy, however, two specific characteristics come in addition: First, a historical north-south divide which is aggravated by the strains on public budgets and necessary changes in the provision of social care for immigrants. Although this is also of relevance in Germany, in Italy it seems to be perceived as a concrete challenge with regard to the standard social service provision (Fosti, 2014). The second characteristic is the establishment of an informal system of care provision that forms a complement to the families' dominant role in this field (Fosti G. & Notarnicola E., 2014). This trait of informality in Italy is quite in contrast to the more professionalised (and supposedly) commercialised care provision in Germany. In addition to the informal character of care provision, in Italy provider networks are formed and perceived as an innovation in a formerly fragmented or formally underdeveloped system.

Similarly to Germany, in Spain too there is also a pronounced trend towards an economisation of social services, however, with a higher degree of contextual severity in view of the effects of the financial crisis. The latter is also the reason why long-term unemployment and ways to resolve the problem are of much higher priority in Spain than in other countries. The economic crisis has also generally fortified the role that third sector organisations but also for-profit private providers play. Network formation is an issue similar to Italy (Fosti, 2014). However, the public-private partnerships and networks in Spain have a more formalised and indeed a cluster character, whereby some regions play a much more pronounced role than others. The 'NGO Social Action Platform' is ascribed a particular function as a broker between different (cross-sector) entities. One of the most outstanding regions, both in terms of actor networks and of an explicit focus on social innovation, is the Spanish Basque region, and in a similar way also Barcelona. Interestingly, Spain is the only country where corporate social responsibility activities have explicitly been mentioned with regard to social services (Edis, 2012; Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2013; Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2014; Plataforma de ONG de Acción Social, 2012a; Plataforma de ONG de Acción Social, 2012b; Sanzo Pérez, Álvarez González L. I., Rey-García, & García Rodríguez, 2014; Sanzo Pérez, Álvarez González, & Rey-García, 2014).

In contrast to Germany, in Denmark municipalities and the state in general are less prone to outsource service provision to private actors (Petersen, Petersen, & Christiansen, 2010); the state tries to preserve a state-directed social security system while developing 'civil society strategies'. At the same time, there are attempts to encourage mainly informal alliances involving third sector actors and specifically volunteers (Fridberg & Skov Henriksen, 2014). In

this regard the strategy of action might be compared to that in Italy, however, the socio-political and socio-economic contexts are fundamentally different. Just as in the other countries, elderly care and the integration of immigrants, in particular refugees, are high on the agenda.

As in Denmark, the Swedish state traditionally has a strong position in social services, not only as to their regulation but also their provision. Where public procurement laws permitted third party engagement, the result has been that commercial rather than third sector providers have expanded rapidly (Forum, 2013). This situation persists despite an initiative founded in 2008 and has since been promoted by the government ('Överenskommelsen'); the latter initiative aims at greater involvement of the third sector and civil society in social service provision.

An important problem in the Czech Republic is the underdeveloped state of the market for social service provision. This is combined with a lack of appropriate quality standards or rather a lack of uniform and transparent implementation as well as explicit incorporation in service contracts. Public agencies have a privileged position as compared to third sector or commercial providers. In this context municipalities can have competencies that are steadily transferred from the national to the regional levels. Like in Sweden, it seems hard to identify specific topics that are debated in the Czech Republic. The focus seems to be on structural shifts: In addition to the transfer of responsibilities to the local level, these shift lie in the (partly revised) attempt of centralising the registration of the social benefits received by citizens.

The Netherlands seem to be the country where the shift in social services from professional work to self-help, informality, and volunteering is most pronounced (Mensink, Klerk, Boer, Feijten, & Vonk, 2014). Social services, partly independent of the specific subject, receive a community character. Lately, several reforms or reform themes have been adopted which have initiated or supported this trend. This was associated with budget cuts in public expenditures. What is more, in parallel to the Czech Republic, in the Netherlands responsibilities are reallocated from the national to the lower level, however, municipalities, rather than regions, are at the centre of this shift (Mensink et al., 2014). Third sector organisations play a much bigger role in social services than commercial providers, with the exception of homecare that is often organised in the market. Funding comes almost exclusively from the government.

As in the Netherlands, in the UK too the aspect of self-help is equally pronounced and actively fostered, with the difference that in the UK the agenda is bound to several efforts to enable individuals to help themselves ('reablement' and 'prevention' are two important terms in this regard). Part of this approach to self-help is the support of community initiatives that form communal help networks (Department of Health, 2012). Such initiatives range from child to elderly care. The focus on the individual is accompanied by a strengthening of community budgets, from which the funding of more targeted social interventions is expected. The setup of social impact bonds is a specific social outcomes-oriented funding mechanism. The UK has a pioneering role in this domain. Furthermore, an administrative shift is taking place regarding the combination of competencies in the health and social care field, so that necessities arising from complex multiple conditions (the 'dementia challenge' is one such initiative) can be met. This shift seems to be more pronounced in the UK than in other countries. All of this is reflected in the recent Care Act 2014 that promotes more personalised and 'informal' forms of health and social care (Care Act 2014, 2014). A core concept of this act is the concept of 'personal budgets' which individuals can spend according to their needs. Traditionally, in the UK the third sector has always had and continues to have a strong position in social services.

In France, the most pressing problem with regard to social services is the increasing homelessness and poverty (Observatoire des inégalités, 2014). Other issues that are high on the field's agenda are the standards in old age care homes and homes for people with disabilities as well as the lack of child care facilities; these problems exist despite the fact that the system is fairly well advanced in comparison to other countries. Third sector organisations are dominating in providing home care or care facilities, but the competition on the part of commercial providers is increasing. Not so much in elderly care but especially in childcare commercial providers become significantly more important. In parallel, third sector associations are formed which represent an umbrella structure for social service providers. As in the UK, in France too performance-based assessments are becoming more important. (ANAP, 2015).

The public perception of the field in the media is very present in relation to third sector activity. However, is not perceived as especially innovative, as the media analysis showed (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). The field is further an issue for policy makers in all countries. The policy analysis reveals that particularly in Spain, the UK, and the Czech Republic a focus on social services can be observed in innovation policies (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection

Group 1: Pronounced role of the state (Denmark and Sweden)

These countries have in common that the strongly pronounced role of the state is largely maintained, even against the austerity policy as to public budgets that affects all countries of the EU in a similar way (Petersen et al., 2010). At the same time in Denmark and Sweden the 'periphery' of the state is defined in different ways. Denmark focuses more on aspects of informality (in parallel with Italy or the Netherlands), whereas Sweden rather focuses commercialisation (in parallel with Germany and partly France) (Boje & Ibsen, 2006).

Group 2: Search for strategies to increase performance (Netherlands, Germany, UK, France, Spain)

While there are many variations in the welfare traditions and the debates currently affecting these countries' social service sectors, all of them share one commonality, which is to find a strategy to increase the performance of their fairly well equipped and developed social service systems (or to foster related regional structures, as in Spain). The way in which performance is addressed and effectiveness enhanced is, however, interpreted very differently. A common theme in the UK and Germany is the activation of the individual (Sozialpolitik aktuell, 2014), for instance through the introduction of 'personal budgets'. In Germany, this 'activation', as it is argued in the national (policy) discourses, is perceived as an economisation, whereas in the UK it is seen as a strengthening of community-oriented interventions (Glendinning et al.). In France, the increase of performance mostly focuses on the organisational level, namely on diversifying provider structures, increasing commercial influence (as in Germany), and on explicit and new 'performance tools' (in parallel with the UK) (La direction générale de la cohésion sociale, 2013). Network formation on an organisational level involving actors from the public, the private for-profit, and non-profit sectors is also an important issue in Spain, as it becomes visible in the policy analysis that was conducted within the framework of the ITSSOIN project (Anheier et al., 2015; Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013a; Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013b; Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad, 2013; Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad, 2014). In Spain, this

development takes place on the level of particular regions or municipalities rather than on the national level because of the existing political and administrative structures, some of which stand out due to an explicit emphasis of social innovation. In Spain and the UK the focus of innovation policies is generally on the field of social services. By contrast, the Netherlands concentrate on different issues. Here, networks are understood as structures strengthening informal community ties. The agenda is thus more collectively than individually or organisationally oriented, including more recognition of and trust in self-regulating civil society networks.

Group 3: Sector of social services with underdeveloped character (Czech Republic and Italy)

The Czech Republic and Italy both have to cope with an underdeveloped social service sector. In Italy, the present situation is predominantly due to the fact that as to the provision of social care traditionally family structures are relied on; however, now a shift to a professionalised service provision can be observed (Fosti, 2014). This is supposedly why these former structures are gradually replaced by informal kinds of service provision, which are complemented by more formal network structures between provider organisation. In the Czech Republic, current debates rather seem to focus on quality standards of service provision and the shift of responsibilities from the national to the regional level (Straková & Čermáková, 2008). As the ITSSOIN policy analysis showed, this debate on social services is also influenced by policies on innovations (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection - rationale

As to the field of social services, **Spain** is the country which has already been selected. In Spain, attempts are currently undertaken to increase the effectiveness of the social service system, mostly by means of inter-sector networks and partnerships on the regional and local level. Sweden, the UK, and Italy will be included in the case studies, since they offer interesting characteristics for a cross-country comparison.

Similarly to Spain, the **UK** also concentrates on the improvement of social services. Since in the UK individual as well as community-oriented interventions are enhanced, the social services field in this country is characterised by a high level of cross-sectoral activities and thereby offers auspicious possibilities of research on intersectoral processes under the influence of a central government.

By contrast, in Sweden and Denmark the field is state-centred. The situation in **Sweden** is influenced by a very strong state, equally active in the regulation and provision of social services. Existing initiatives try to enhance a greater involvement of the third sector and of the civil society. Further, in Sweden a trend of commercialisation in the field can be observed. In Denmark, on the contrary, there is less willingness to involve private actors; this characteristic represents an interesting contrast to Sweden, although the overall situation is similar in both countries.

In **Italy**, the system of social services is quite underdeveloped due to the former primacy of families in the provision of care. The same applies to the Czech Republic. Therefore Italy and the Czech Republic would have been very suitable to be compared with the other involved countries. As the formalisation of the formerly family-dominated provision of care seems to be of special interest for the evaluation of innovation processes influenced by civic engagement, Italy has been selected to be included in the analysis.

3.3. Health care

In the Danish health care system a trend towards greater user/patient involvement can be detected. A shift towards patients as significant actors in healthcare provision is further exemplified by the a growing number of NGOs, which are less important in the service provision itself, but serve as important advocates for specific patient groups. On account of their direct relation to service provision, nurses and doctors' associations are altogether still more significant third sector groups than those organisations which represent patients (Møller Pedersen, 2012). A recent law aims at strengthening the healthcare sector by allocating a substantial amount of money to it, specifically in order to foster preventative efforts, for instance in the treatment of emerging long-term conditions, or to increase the quality of care in terms of care capacities (Danish Government, 2015). This might be partly seen as a result of third sector advocacy efforts. Overall, and despite initial plans by the government, little privatisation has occurred. Instead, civil society is called upon to fill the existing gaps in the health service provision. However, none of this seems to have led to many socially innovative initiatives. Interestingly, and in contrast to most other countries, a centralisation of healthcare (for instance to 5 'super-hospitals') has occurred in Denmark (Møller Pedersen, 2012).

Commercial providers are becoming ever more important in the Italian healthcare landscape. Because of the lack of a uniform quality framework significant discrepancies can be detected among regions. In some regions this results in cross-border healthcare consumption (as it is the case with France or Slovenia, for instance). Technological innovations (in particular electronic or online applications) are much more pronounced than social innovation as a means to enhance the effectiveness in healthcare provision. Third sector actors are involved in healthcare provision and specifically in research, but they are less important than commercial providers. The mix between commercial and public healthcare provision differs substantially from region to region.

France has one of the highest health expenditures as a share of GDP and is in this respect only superseded by the Netherlands (of all relevant ITSSOIN countries) (INSEE, 2012). However, capacities are currently decreasing and there is a shift from inpatient care to homecare. Furthermore, the state seeks to promote the formation of networks between public institutions, providers, and professional associations to increase the effectiveness of service provision. Like in Denmark, in France patient associations play an important role in shaping the healthcare landscape. While third sector providers form a significant share of the field, commercial providers are generally more important, and public institutions remain primary providers. As in many other countries (Denmark or Italy), competencies have been transferred from the national authorities to regional ones (Cergas Bocconi, 2014). In 2004 a 'price per activity' system was introduced in hospitals, a system similar to the 'budget per patient' principle in Germany. It is argued that the reforms favour commercial over third sector providers (mutual societies), which have decreased in effect. In commonality with other countries (for instance Denmark) cancer and dementia research and care are currently the top priority in the field.

Budget cuts resulting from the economic crisis have affected Spain more than other countries. Innovation is called upon in the 'National action plan for social inclusion' to cope with social challenges related to demographic change and wellbeing (Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2013). Despite the fact that healthcare is inarguably more dominated by services than advocacy, groups that increasingly promote the rights of specific patient groups are forming. In parallel, commercial contracting and public-private partnerships are commonly

used to increase efficiency of service provision. Uninsured people or undocumented immigrants suffer most from the switch performed from a universal care model to an insurance-based one.

Similarly to Spain, in the Czech Republic there is a pronounced debate about basic healthcare provision and contribution-based provision. Additional patient out-of-pocket payments are feared to affect weaker social groups, for instance families with young children or retired people, and have become a heavily contested symbol of austerity policies in healthcare (Valterová, 2010). The continuing process of commercialisation has brought mixed results and launched debates about its effects on the quality and accessibility of healthcare for the entire population (Bryndová et al., 2009). Similarly to other countries, the Czech system has become decentralised and is further marked by the efforts to individualise/personalise the healthcare provision (transition from patients to clients) (Kinkorová & Topolčan, 2012).

Although it is a strongly state-dominated system, Sweden has experienced increasing influence by commercial actors. Against initial expectations the introduction of market principles into the healthcare field has not lead to a plurality of providers but to a concentration and thus the dominance of a few large commercial actors (Johansson, 2011). As in Italy, in Sweden technological innovation is focused on in order to increase healthcare effectiveness (Cergas Bocconi, 2014). There have been political initiatives to limit or push back commercial influences, however, with little success. Although third sector actors play a certain role in the Swedish system, its structures more strongly benefit commercial providers and their lobbyists.

Budget cuts have also affected the Dutch healthcare system but the result has been a shift to self-help and informal activities. Also home-based care is becoming more important. In contrast to Sweden many small providers have recently emerged in the field. Decentralisation is a very pronounced principle and thus contrasts with, for instance the situation in Denmark, although the Danish system is also said to be characterised by an increasing recognition of the patients' needs. The more citizen-based notions are complemented by the introduction of market structures by strengthening the position of health insurers.

In the UK a strong focus has been put on the involvement of patients and members of the public in the healthcare provision, at least in a consultative role in the last decade (House of Commons Health Committee, 2007). Devolution of power within the system is sought by policy makers and has been initiated by granting greater financial independence to hospitals, for instance, part of which was accompanied by a move towards mutual and cooperative structures (of decision making). However, the eventual effects of such shifts have been limited. 'Personal health budgets' and thus greater choices for patients have been introduced following the example of previous social service reforms in the UK. The influence of civil society (promoting community engagement or co-production) is even more limited than that of commercial providers, both of which is due to the hierarchical structure of the National Health Service (NHS). More 'liberal' and thus potentially more open to innovation are fields such as the field of mental health or disability. The system generally finds itself in a struggle between promoting greater competition, integrated care, which is more likely ensured by concentration, or network formation, and quality standards. The detected incompatibilities of imperatives in the system and thus limits to promoting social innovation are recognised by the NHS, however, with yet unclear consequences.

In Germany, the basic care provision and regulation are quite centralised and the responsibility for 'additional' health service lies with the municipalities. Health insurances along with

professional associations play an important role in the system. Healthcare provision is performed by free welfare associations and commercial providers alike (following the principles of 'subsidiarity' and quasi-markets). The German system remains predominantly a universal one and only part of the services are provided on a charge-for-service basis (Bäcker et al., 2010). 'Prepaid capitations' have been introduced to limit the amount spent per patient, which has been interpreted as one of the most significant shifts towards an economisation of the system (Gretsch, 2011). Similarly to the UK, in Germany integrated interventions are increasingly sought (Amelung, Hildebrand, & Wolf, 2012). Chronic diseases are a top priority on the healthcare agenda. E-Health and other technological developments are discussed as primary sources of innovation (Bäcker et al., 2010).

There is only little attention in the media with regard to healthcare and if it is referred to at all, only in Italy connections to the third sector can be found (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). Policy makers are more interested in healthcare. As most empirical fields this field is addressed at least in one innovation policy of each country. Further, for the Czech Republic, Denmark, and the UK a special focus on this field can be found (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection

Group 1: Danger of exclusion from healthcare (Spain and Czech Republic)

These countries are most strongly characterised by a precarious position of people with limited financial resources who therefore are or may be excluded from service provision due to a lack of financial capacity in an insurance-based system. In both countries a marketisation is taking place, which in the Czech Republic is met with stronger criticism than in Spain.

Group 2: Strong patient involvement (Denmark, Netherlands, UK)

All of these countries are marked by a focus on patient involvement; however, the way it is interpreted and realised, is quite different. The most 'genuine' form of a focus on civic capacities, individual responsibility, and community help is found in the Netherlands (in reaction to the formerly most strongly state-financed healthcare sector; expenditures seen as share of GDP) (TK, 2012/2013). In Denmark patients have more possibilities for involvement at a more general advocacy level, with patient associations promoting the needs of specific groups (Møller Pedersen, 2012). In contrast to the Netherlands, this is achieved by centralisation rather than decentralisation. The UK probably represents the most 'in-between' case with regard to reform principles and is struggling to reconcile the objective of strengthening the communities and of reinforcing market principles at the same time; in addition, the structure of the NHS is traditionally of a very hierarchical nature.

Group 3: Focus on commercial service provision (Sweden, France, Italy, Germany)

Although very different in setup and character, these four systems are most strongly dominated by (a shift towards) commercial service provision. Another common trait is the focus on technological innovation or administrative reforms as sources of increased effectiveness. At the same time differences in the way civic involvement or advocacy is embedded in the service field are detectable; in comparison with the other countries, in France civic involvement and advocacy play a more (newly) pronounced role (Thouvenin & Delcey, 2013).

Country selection – rationale

The first country which has already been selected for investigation in the field of health services is the **UK**. The trend of increasing involvement of patients and members of the public in healthcare as well as the ongoing trend towards co-production, various forms of community engagement, and increased competition, are probably the most outstanding development that can be observed. This makes the UK a very interesting case, being torn between the trends of strengthening communities and of enhancing market principles at the same time. Cross-sectoral activities and overlaps with the field of social services are another reason why the UK has been included in the case studies concerning this field. Since this above mentioned process is also focused on by policy makers concerned with innovations, the selection of the UK is even more interesting.

The second case study will be carried out by **France**. This country is characterised by increased commercialisation and the tendency to focus on technical innovations in the field of health (Or & Renaud, 2009). France reveals a strongly advocative third sector and civic involvement seems to be particularly pronounced here (Allodocteurs.fr, 2010; Thouvenin & Delcey, 2013).

As a third country the **Czech Republic** has been chosen. It is interesting for the case studies because of its underdeveloped market of healthcare provision and it offers an opportunity to investigate the ways the country is coping with this situation. The trend of commercialisation is heatedly discussed, especially regarding its consequences for weak social groups. The fact that this discussion is taken up by innovation policies that relate especially to this field also supports the inclusion of the Czech Republic in the analysis.

Another country where policy makers reflect especially on innovation in health care is Denmark. This is visible by enhanced funding of the sector by the new laws. Partly this can be explained by the strengthening of patients associations, a growing part of NGOs in the field. This strong involvement of government and third sector in the field is similar to the UK, but third sector activities take a different form. Instead of civic engagement in service provision, as it is the case in the UK, in Denmark advocacy is stronger, also visible by especially strong professional associations, meaning stronger and longer existent than patients associations. In consequence not innovations, but centralisation is the current development. The comparison to the UK could thus be interesting, as similar aims are pursued with very different means and outcomes.

3.4. Environmental sustainability

Climate change and sustainable development are the main subjects discussed in the field of environmental sustainability. Subjects of specific interest in most of the ITSSOIN countries are defined in urban contexts and are associated with the reduction of greenhouse emissions, energy management (sometimes connected with the issue of nuclear energy), waste management, transportation, and the implementation of a sustainable economy.

Many of these subjects are connected to international conventions such as the Kyoto Protocol which relates to greenhouse gas emissions and several EU-norms. State activities such as tax regulations, on the one hand, and the implementation of various projects that support the desired development, on the other, aim at meeting politically set norms. Prominent examples are unfolding under the umbrella of sustainable cities. One example is that of projects implementing sustainable urban planning which can affect transportation or energy matters. In

addition to the state, in all countries third sector organisations are active in the field of environmental sustainability. They may be international NGOs or associations and foundations acting on national or local levels. International and national organisations often address multiple aspects of environmental sustainability, while local third sector organisations are more likely to intervene on behalf of specific subjects. Market actors in the field are engaged in Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Spain. Yet market actors seem to take a disparate role in the field. The engagement of market actors in Italy and Spain takes the form of CSR-activities (CES, 2012; ENEA Agency Italy, 2000). Even though this shows that the recognition of environmental protection is an important issue in Italy and Spain, in contrast to Germany no equally strong interest in solving ecological problems can be observed. In Germany companies are funded to sell products which help to solve ecological problems (Löschel, Erdmann, Staiß, & Ziesing, 2014; Presse und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, 2004). On the other hand, it can be observed that businesses in Germany merely follow regulations aiming at environmental sustainability, but they do not enforce them willingly (Löschel et al., 2014). Similar observations were made in the UK where market actors and lobby organisations are rejecting activities of environmental sustainability. They are suspected to speak in favour of oil companies or other industries that build on resources or techniques that contradict current aims of environmental sustainability (e.g. operators of nuclear power stations).

Differences in the interaction of actors of the three sectors state, market, and third sector help to identify three groups of countries: The first group includes countries in which actors in environmental sustainability engage, in progressive stages, with the third sector that plays a forerunner role and is independent, to a certain degree, from the other sectors. In the second group of countries, cross-sectoral activities can be observed. Thirdly, Germany will be described as a country where the field of environmental sustainability reveals cooperative structures (Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit, 2012).

In most countries actors from different sectors work independently from each other. This applies to state and third sector actors in the Czech Republic, Denmark, the UK, and the Netherlands (Soukopová, 2011; Vráblíková, 2010). Also in the Netherlands where market actors in the field also participate to a certain degree, these actors keep to themselves. Interestingly, the activities of the third sector are described as increasing in three of these four countries (Czech Republic, the UK, and the Netherlands); in Denmark the third sector plays a forerunner for state and market.

In Sweden, Spain, France, and Italy the activities of actors in the environmental sustainability field lead to isolated cross-sectoral activities. Municipalities in Italy are offering economic services such as bike sharing and carpooling (Burlando & Mastretta, 2007; ISPRA, 2014). In France, local administrations are especially active in implementing environmentally sustainable projects in public-private partnerships (Ministère de l'écologie de développement durable transports et logement, 2009). Swedish NGOs (as for example the Stockholm Environment Institute), on the other hand, offer counselling services for ministries and business firms. Also in all the countries market actors engage in environmental sustainability. In Italy and Spain, the engagement of market actors can be more precisely described as CSR activity, i.e. a form of engagement that in Spain is supported by associations for environmental sustainability (Grasseni, 2013). As CSR activities often include a cooperation between third sector organisations and market actors, Spain belongs to the group of countries with cross-sectoral activities (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013a; Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013b; Rey García & Álvarez González, 2011).

Finally, Germany can be described as a country that supports the development of networks across sectors. Even though in Germany the state is of similar importance in establishing regulative structures as in all other countries, the cooperation between state, third sector, and market actors is supported by means of several projects (Krimmer & Priemer, 2013; Presse und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, 2004).

In addition to the level of interaction the level of activity in the field is of interest. In Germany, civic engagement in the field of environmental sustainability is particularly supported by the nation state (Krimmer & Priemer, 2013) - a development also visible in the UK, Denmark, France, and Italy focus on the local level (ISPRA, 2014). As to environmental sustainability issues in these countries policies assign related responsibilities to local municipalities. This observation is especially interesting because cooperative structures, as they can be observed in Germany, do exist in Denmark only in isolated cases on the local level. Even though the Danish efforts considering the share of public investment addressing environmental sustainability have, in general, remained at the same low level during the last decade (Statistics Denmark, 2014). Further, Spain has to be pointed out as a country that has very elaborated regulations of state competencies on the national, regional, and local level. As a consequence, the field regulations and the fields themselves are very numerous. Differences in thematic subjects add to this variety. In France, it is often local authorities and NGOs that initiate projects focusing on environmental protection (Garnier, 2008). Interestingly, projects of both actor groups (mostly emerging independently of one another) are often opposed by the state (Woods, 2012).

Media across Europe only rarely refer to the field of environmental sustainability and if they do at all, only a weak connection to the third sector is established. The role ascribed to the third sector is mainly that of an advocate, but in Italy and Spain it is also described as service provider. In this respect Germany is particular interest, since German media describe the third sector as a co-producer (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). This, in turn, is interesting, because Germany is the only country where environmental sustainability is the most relevant target field for innovation policies (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection

To begin with, three groups of countries are identified, which helps selecting the case studies.

Group 1: Independent sectors (Czech Republic, Denmark, the UK, and the Netherlands)

In accordance with the project proposal, Denmark proves to be an especially interesting case. It allows for evaluating the third sector because here the third sector is relatively independent from state and market and regularly plays a pioneering role in terms of novel ideas. Further, in Denmark the field of environmental sustainability is rather constant, with little changes in third sector activity and little significant activity on the part of the state and market (Statistics Denmark, 2014). Additionally it can reveal the function of the third sector as a driving force in a field. Denmark is also interesting because these observations seem to apply only to the national level. On the local level, on the other hand, an increasing state activity can be observed. This allows for a comparison between third sector activity as the sole driving force and third sector activity as a driving force in face of state activity on the local level in one country.

In this group another country might be selected in order to compare fields with independent sector activity and changes in the degree of activity. This is particularly interesting for revealing the function as service provider and advocate of state, market, and third sector

independently from each other. In all of these countries significant state activities in the field of environmental sustainability are described. If in addition to state activities reasons and consequences of the growth of the third sector in environmental sustainability are of special interest, the Czech Republic would be an interesting case (Vráblíková, 2010). If increasing third sector and market activities are to be compared with one another, the Netherlands could be selected. If an increasing third sector activity in face of conflicting market actors' activities seems more promising, the UK would be the second interesting case in this field.

Group 2: Cross-sectoral activities (Sweden, Spain, France, and Italy)

It is, however, suggested that the field of environmental sustainability in Denmark be used for the comparison with a second field where more cross-sectoral activities are observed; thus the function of the third sector as a driving force could possibly be revealed. Depending on the interest in interdependencies between sectors, Sweden, Spain, France, or Italy can be selected. Sweden is an interesting case that allows to find out how third sector organisations can create connections across sectors, for example in the form of NGO's offering counselling services. To find out what motivates the state to provide market activities, Italy is worthy of evaluation. The cooperation between state and market actors can be best observed in France where public-private partnerships are initiated at the local government level (Ministère de l'écologie de développement durable transports et logement, 2009). Cooperations between the market and the third sector are probably to be observed particularly in Spain where CSR activities of NGOs and business firms are common. Spain is also interesting because strong differences on different levels in the field can possibly be observed, as state actors and state regulations differ regarding the national, regional, and local level.

Germany is also a particularly interesting case as regards the field of environmental sustainability, since it is a country with a cooperative field structure. Here, cooperation between all three sectors (third sector, market, and state) can be observed. Thus, the particular function of actors in each sector can be investigated. This is especially interesting in comparison to the majority of the countries where actors get involved independently of each other. Important questions in this context are: Does the function of advocacy and service provision remain the same or are there differences to be detected? Does the strong engagement of the state on a national level affect this field's structure? The strong engagement of the German state on a national level reveals another contrast to Denmark: there state activity in the field on national level is low, however, it stronger on the local level.

Country selection – rationale

In the field of environmental sustainability the first case study will be carried out on **Denmark**. The third sector in this field is particularly strong and seems to be the driving force, thereby involving the state and the market as it evolves in strength. On a local level we can find some cooperation between the third sector and the two other sectors.

However, in Denmark the extent of cooperation is not as strong as it is in **Germany**, where networking among the different actors is politically promoted and practiced in various ways. The most prominent example of such cooperation is probably the one of energy cooperatives, which is a topic that draws considerable attention across other EU-countries (Löschel et al., 2014). Germany was therefore consentaneously selected for the second case study in the field.

Thirdly, the situation in **Italy** will be investigated. Here, attempts by the state are made to activate both citizens and business companies to increase their engagement in the field of environmental sustainability (Grasseni, 2013), whereby the formal third sector organisations seem to be ignored. The investigation on Italy will constitute an interesting counterfactual case study.

Finally, the project partners agreed upon including a fourth case: the **Czech Republic**, which allows for analysing the reasons and consequences of the increasing impact of the third sector in the field of environmental sustainability (Vráblíková, 2010).

3.5. Consumer protection in finance

The field of consumer protection in finance is affected in all countries by two major developments: the financial crisis and the implementation of EU regulations. It is always the state which tries to implement new regulations on consumer protection. The aim is the supervision and control of the financial market to enhance its transparency, whereby in each country a different focus can be observed; this aim can be achieved by means of product tests conducted by market independent actors, i.e. the state or third sector organisations. Further, offers of counselling and education services in the area of finances are implemented or supported. The approaches to achieving the aforementioned objective are similar across countries too. In all countries new legal regulations are being implemented. It has been described that in Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK a centralisation of the supervising state institutions on the financial market has taken place (BaFin, 2012). In addition to these nationwide developments, nearly all states offer support offices for financial questions on a local level. Exceptions are Spain and Italy where such offices are not mentioned (Censis, 2013).

The main differences across countries can be detected regarding the actors implementing these aims. Mostly, the driving force of these changes is the state. In doing so, the state can act on its own and find support from actors of the third sector or the market.

In the Netherlands, Spain, and Denmark (the first group) the state does not cooperate with other actors. For Denmark and the Netherlands an increasing engagement in consumer protection by market actors has been described (Møller & Nielsen, 2009); an example for this in the Netherlands is the insurance company 'Independer N.V.'. In Denmark it is especially interesting that the third sector does not show a great degree of activity in this field. In the Netherlands and Spain activities of third sector organisations in consumer protection are strong. These organisations act as 'traditional' consumer associations in the area of finance, offering (similar to the state) counselling services and giving voice to the interests of consumers. In Spain, third sector organisations additionally offer their own financial products as an alternative to products of the market in which customers lost their trust (ADICAE, 2014; AUSBANC Consumo, 2015; Economía Solidaria, 2015; FACUA Consumidores en Acción, 2015).

Consumer protection in finance in these three countries can be described as a field that is affected by competition between sectors. In Spain and the Netherlands the state and the third sector both offer services and provide an advocacy function. In Spain third sector organisations additionally enter the market and the state competes against the market in comparison with consumer protection in Denmark and the Netherlands.

The Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, and Sweden represent the second group. In these countries state and third sector organisations cooperate by offering counselling and education services or information centres on a local level (Consumers' Forum, 2009; Verbraucherzentrale, 2014). In Sweden, this development is very new and the implementation is planned for 2015 (Konsumentverket, 2014). In the Czech Republic, Germany, and Italy this development had been triggered by the financial crisis and the implementation of EU regulations (BaFin, 2012; Bundesbank, 2015; Censis, 2013). The activity of third sector organisations in all of these countries is described as strong or even growing. When market actors are described, they are characterised as opponents of consumer protection rather than as supporters. Consequently, the cooperation between third sector actors and the state can be interpreted as a joint effort to control a powerful financial market (Ministerstvo financí, 2007; Ministerstvo financí, 2010; Ministerstvo financí, 2012).

France and the UK constitute the third group. In these countries the state cooperates with the market to implement the described mechanism of control, but it does not cooperate with third sector organisations. Interestingly, in these countries the motivation as well as the third sector cooperation is different. In the UK, the central motivation of the field seems to be to provide people with information so that they can make informed decisions. This strong support of a liberal market system is accompanied by a strong engagement of the third sector. Such a strong engagement is not observable in France, even though cooperation between state, market, and third sector institutions does exist, they cannot be described as central to the field. In France this cooperation is executed by the Institute for Public Financial Education (IEFP) which is headed by a board of public actors, third sector actors, and private for-profit organisations. At the same time the focus of state and market actors is not on supporting households, as it is the case in the UK. Rather, these actors intend to influence and control the decisions of households on the financial market; the fact that the implementation of micro-credits is impeded is also a clear sign of this intention. This leads to the assumption that in the UK the third sector has a control function with regard to the state and market, whereas in France this control is missing. (Salon-Michel, 2010).

The field of consumer protection in finance receives little attention from the public. It is only rarely mentioned in media articles referring to the third sector (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015) and policy discourses on innovation do not mention it as a special target field. However, it appears as a general subject in the policies of six out of the nine examined countries. In the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden the field is neglected in innovation policies (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection

The given description of the field in different countries can be useful in making a first selection of countries. Having identified three groups of countries according to their actor constellations, the selection of one country per groups is suggested as follows:

Group 1: Competition between sectors (The Netherlands, Spain, and Denmark)

When analysing the fields which are characterised by competition, Spain and the Netherlands are especially interesting, as in these countries third sector organisations engage with state and market actors. By exercising their advocacy function with regard to consumer protection they try to influence state regulations, and as service providers they offer financial products in competition with the market. On the other hand, Denmark is an interesting case too, as the

third sector in this country is of very little importance to the field. In this country, consumer protection is being enforced by state and market only (Møller & Nielsen, 2009). Thus, the advocacy function is exercised by state and the service provision function by the market. Denmark is hence a country that can be understood as counterfactual to the ITSSOIN hypothesis that the third sector has an especially innovative capacity.

Group 2: Cooperation between the state and the third sector against the market (The Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, and Sweden)

As already described in the project proposal, the Czech Republic is a country of particular interest as regards the cooperation between the state and the third sector. The Czech Republic has, similarly to Germany, a long history of third sector engagement in this field. In Sweden, on the contrary, third sector engagement is only just emerging. Furthermore, the Czech Republic has an increasing number of third sector organisations. A similar tendency can be observed in Italy. In the Czech Republic the increased attention towards third sector organisations can be evaluated in a field that is already well established. Compared to the other countries in this group, the Czech Republic is a relatively new member of the EU. Because of this fact it is, in addition, possible to observe the country's integration process in the EU (Ministerstvo financí, 2007; Ministerstvo financí, 2010; Ministerstvo financí, 2012). In this context two questions are of interest: Does this process support third sector organisations and can it even explain their growth? Or is their growth only a result of the financial crisis and even hindered by EU regulations?

Group 3: Cooperation between the state and the market without the third sector (France and the UK)

The decision as to which country, France or the UK, should be selected as a case study in the field of consumer protection in finance depends on the question that will be treated: Should the focus be on the question as to how the third sector is executing control (UK)? Or are the opportunities for participation (e.g. implementation of innovations) in a context of weak third sector activity of more interest (France)?

Country selection - rationale

Firstly, as regards the cooperation between the third sector and the state, the field 'consumer protection in finance' has a long history in the **Czech Republic** (Ministerstvo financí, 2007; Ministerstvo financí, 2010; Ministerstvo financí, 2012). Given the recent decrease in third sector activity resulting from the financial crisis, this country is particularly interesting as a case study.

Secondly, it was agreed to include **Spain** in the case study. In Spain, not least as a result of the financial crisis, there is a lot of activity in the field. The third sector in Spain acts as an advocate in relation to state and market actors and will thus serve as a good complementary case when analysing the structures of cooperation in the Czech Republic.

These structures will be contrasted with those in **Denmark** as a third case study. Denmark is a country where, in contrast to the Czech Republic, the third sector does not engage in the field of consumer protection in finance at all. The only actors engaged in this field are state and market actors. A case study on Denmark will provide counterfactual evidence by means of which the ITSSOIN project hypothesis suggesting an innovative capacity of the third sector can

be assessed. Surveying the possibility of innovation in a country with particularly low third sector activity will be a valuable contribution to the project.

3.6. Work integration

In almost all countries the integration of unemployed people is discussed with emphasis on the integration of particularly disadvantaged actors. Depending on the specific situation in the respective country this group includes the long-term unemployed, people with mental illnesses or disabilities, single parents, people with migration background, or young people. In addition, the reduction of jobs and resulting difficulties for work integration are described in France and Spain. As regards France, this is described as a consequence of the financial crisis (ONPES, 2012). In Spain, these high unemployment rates are in contrast to the fact that work flexibility, part-time employment, and salary reduction have been promoted in order to avoid additional job destruction (Plataforma de ONG de Acción Social, 2012b). In Germany and the UK flexible working hours are discussed as a means to encourage work at older ages, which is a response to an aging society – a problem existing all over Europe. As a result, a skill shortage is predicted in the long term.

Further, an enhancement of the obligation to work can be detected in the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK. In Germany and Italy, the obligation to accept a job offer or take part in trainings is an indicator for this development (Bäcker et al., 2010). In the UK, personalised support services are offered by private providers, which are, in turn, measured by their success; here, the obligation to work is implemented by third organisations. In the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, and Sweden this obligation is enforced directly when compulsory services for specific groups of unemployed are implemented (Česká televize, 2013; Staatsblad, 2014).

Tools at reducing the unemployment are flexible work organisation, monetary state support, and education. To facilitate a flexible work organisation part-time work is supported, so that single parents or older people, for example, have the opportunity to work, even if it is not possible for them to work full time. Further, temporary employment agencies can offer short-term job opportunities that are regarded as a possibility of integration in the job market, especially for young well-educated persons in search for a first job. Jobs for unemployed persons that cannot work full time because of health issues (disability, mental health problems) are financially supported by the state and education opportunities are offered by various providers to prepare those actors for work that matches their competences. These tools are described in the vignettes for the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, and the UK (Aghová, 2011; Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí, 2014a; Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí, 2014b; Sirovátka & Šimíková, 2013).

The implementation of these measures comes within the responsibility of the state that is active in all countries on the national level. In Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain the regional and local state administrations have special tasks and competencies as well (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2013; Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2013; Sorcioni, 2014; Staatsblad, 2014).

The central dynamism in the field of work integration is the restructuring of the field. This can be described, on the one hand, with regard to the structure itself and, on the other hand, with reference to the actors that take part in the field.

The structures that determine work integration are discussed in France, Italy, Sweden, and the Netherlands. In France, measures have recently been introduced to support this field regarded as not effective enough (Damon, 2008; Fillion, Danon, Pelosse, & Claudon, 2013); the related reform of 2014 has the aim to distribute benefits according to 'real needs' and to improve return-to-work rates (Du Ministère Travail, 2014). In Italy and the Netherlands a decentralisation of the public administration has been conducted, in the Netherlands only for parts of the work integration field (Staatsblad, 2014). For Italy the failing of several reforms in the past has to be mentioned, as this influences the prognosis for this last reform (Sorcioni, 2014). Lastly, in 2007 Sweden implemented compulsory work places for the long-term unemployed. This met much critique (Socialdemokraterna, 2014) and the new government has promised to dismantle the 'Phase3-Project'.

A discourse on the actors that are allowed to participate in the field as service providers takes place in the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Italy, and Spain (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2014). In Germany and Italy, non-state organisations were not permitted to act in the field of work integration until the end of the 1990s. Since then market as well as third sector organisations have been established in the field. The discussion as to which type of organisations should be allowed in the field is still on in the Czech Republic. In Denmark and Spain a decision has been made to support social enterprises in the field (CEPES, 2015; FEACEM, 2015). In consequence, in Denmark other providers of work integration services are disadvantaged in comparison to social enterprises (Thuesen et al., 2013).

In Denmark, France, and the Netherlands, the restructuring of the field is accompanied by public funding cuts, affecting especially unemployment benefits (van Echteld & Josten, 2013).

Third sector and market actors both offer services in the area of work integration. Employment agencies are the most common form of market actors that are active in all countries except for the UK. Third sector actors are more diverse. Associations and charities offer counselling and education services for the unemployed. Further, sheltered workshops exist that offer occupation for those who cannot find employment on the first labour market. Associations for employers and employees have also to be mentioned, as they are important actors with an advocacy function in work integration policy. Even though these actors are not mentioned in all field vignettes explicitly, it can be assumed that they are active in all countries. In Spain, new actors and governance schemes have emerged in response to the new unemployment profiles resulting from the economic crisis. They are promoted through public-private, non-profit-business partnerships of self-employment, entrepreneurship and social economy schemes as drivers for work integration and employment alternatives, in particular to the youth and those facing long-term unemployment and (risking) social exclusion (accenture.com, 2015; Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013a; Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013b; ONCE, 2015)

As to actor activity and cooperation between sectors it is striking that in almost all countries actors of state, market, and the third sector are described as important participants, and cooperation across sectors seems to be the norm. Only in Italy no cooperation between state, market and the third sector are described. Actors from these sectors seem to operate independently of each other. In all other countries various forms of cooperation can be found. In the Netherlands and Denmark sheltered workshops, foundations and work integration social enterprises 'WISEs' operate with the support of public funding. In the Czech Republic, the

non-profit network 'TESSEA' executes an advocacy function for the third sector in cooperation with the responsible ministry (TESSEA, 2014).

Even more often the market is partner of cooperation with actors from other sectors. Spain reports CSR activities of business firms in the field in cooperation with foundations. In Germany, Sweden, and the UK cooperation between state and market are observable (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2014a). In Germany and the UK, private service providers of the market offer services that are financed by public funding (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2014b). In Sweden, the state calls for services both by market providers and non-profit WISEs. The state has also called for an action plan with the goal of making the rules easier for WISEs (Näringsdepartementet, 2010). At the same time the state executes cross-sectoral activities by offering own services on the market.

Lastly, cooperation between all three sectors can be observed in two countries. In France, the 'Conseil national pour l'insertion par l'activité économique (CNIAE)' represents actors from all sectors and executes an advocacy function in the field (Gouvernement français, 1991). In Spain, partnerships between all sectors have been established to find different ways to foster employment possibilities.

In the media the field of work integration is not very often referred to, and only rarely in relation to the third sector, except for France, the UK and, to a lesser degree, the Netherlands. However, it is perceived as more innovative than other fields and if the third sector is mentioned, then in the role of a service provider, self-actualiser, and advocate (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). The perception of the field as relatively innovative can be found in policy. Policy documents mention work integration in all countries, and in Denmark, Spain, and Sweden innovation policies focus especially on this field (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection

In all countries the field seems to have a cooperative structure. Even though only in two countries cooperation between all sectors are described, the vignettes give the impression that all kinds of cooperation are possible in all countries. Accordingly, a selection of countries in reference to actor cooperation is difficult. It is more promising to take a closer look at WISEs and their special role in the field. This goes back to the country vignettes that draw often special attention to this organisational form. WISEs are third sector organisations, even though they do work for profit because their main goal is the integration of disadvantaged groups in the labour market. This relatively new form is supported by the EU as an innovative approach to work integration. Accordingly, to focus on WISEs is interesting for the evaluation of the innovative capacity of the field of work integration across countries. By bringing this perspective together with the assessment of the most important actors in the field conducted by the partners of the ITSSOIN project, it is possible to divide the countries in three groups.

WISEs are especially important in France, the UK, Spain, and Italy. In France and the UK, WISEs are very present in the field and innovative projects in work integration are described as having the organisational form of WISEs (Davister, Defourny, & Gregoire, 2004). In Italy, these developments started with the decentralisation of the field in 1997, and in Spain WISEs are supported by the state. Especially interesting is the observation that third sector organisations are stated to be the most important actor in the field of these countries (Defourny & Nyssens, 2008). This is reflected, at least for some countries, in the public perception, as it is the case in France and the UK, where third sector organisations and the field are quite often related to in

the media (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). As a consequence, these four countries make up one group.

Group 1: Third sector as main actor and WISEs important (France, the UK, Spain, and Italy)

If one country is to be selected from this group for a case study, France would be the most interesting case. In this country the third sector is not the only most important actor. WISEs are also mentioned as important actors that implement innovative projects in work integration (Davister et al., 2004; Eme & Gardin, 2002). This happens in a field whose whole structure is in question (Damon, 2008). This context can allow for many changes and may also be especially open for innovative projects. Spain is a country that is relatively similar to France in regard to work integration. However, the emergence of pilot experiences through public-third sector-businesses partnerships that aim at fostering employment creation and work integration in connection with entrepreneurship, ICTs and the social economy should be mentioned (accenture.com, 2015; CERMI, 2015; ONCE, 2015). The discourse on the integration of activities from all sectors implies structural changes that may allow for innovations to a special degree. This development is similar to France, but the direction of changes differs. Comparing innovations in both countries is expected to provide insights in differences of innovation processes in relatively similar contexts. innovations can be expected, Comparing these two countries, Another interesting case for comparison with France in this group could be the UK, as it is similar to France in regard to the centrality and innovativeness of WISEs but has not recently experienced structural changes. It would allow for a comparison of integrative processes in a changing (France) and in a constant (the UK) context. Italy is an interesting case for comparison, because it is only since 1997 that the field has been opened for other actors other than the state (Sorcioni, 2014). Accordingly, the establishment of third sector organisations and market actors in the field in addition to the state is relatively new. The question as to how the third sector can become the most important actor in a previously state-dominated field is an interesting issue as regards innovation.

More interesting is a comparison of community development in France with a country from another group. This second group comprises countries that describe WISEs as important organisations or as organisational forms just emerging in the field but see the state as a central actor. These countries are the Netherlands, Denmark, and the Czech Republic. Sweden and Germany also belong to this group, even though WISEs are less important here.

Group 2: State as main actor and WISEs important (the Netherlands, Denmark, the Czech Republic, Sweden, and Germany)

The Netherlands name sheltered workshops as important providers of work integration services, even though this importance is decreasing now that many of them are being closed (van Echteld & Josten, 2013). In Denmark and the Czech Republic a discourse is currently taking place as to whether WISEs can be admitted or supported as new actor in the field of work integration. In Denmark, this is explicitly embedded in the idea to support innovation in the field (Thuesen et al., 2013), which also explains the special attention the field is increasingly receiving in Danish innovations policies (Anheier et al., 2015). In the Czech Republic a network of WISEs has been established that executes advocacy in face of the state (TESSEA, 2014). The question arises as to whether in these state-centred countries innovations such as the implementation of WISEs are only possible with the support of the state.

A comparison between the field of work integration in France and this field in a country from this group can provide insights on differences in the establishment of WISEs in third sector- and state-dominated contexts. For example, a comparison with the Netherlands could be interesting. Although the Netherlands are state-centred, WISEs play an important role, even though they face serious budget cuts. Another interesting aspect of the country is a reinforced decentralisation (as from 2015) of the system for long-term unemployment support. Similarly to France, in the Netherlands the field is in turmoil (Damon, 2008; Fillion et al., 2013). Differences regarding innovative processes such as the implementation of WISEs could therefore be observed in a state-centred (the Netherlands) and in a third sector-dominated field (France). In Denmark and the Czech Republic, WISEs are discussed as an opportunity for the future (Fiala, 2014; Thuesen et al., 2013). Therefore, the content and the process of this discussion form an interesting object of investigation.

In Sweden and Germany the importance of WISEs cannot be observed to exist in the same degree. In Sweden it is stated that WISEs only represent a relatively small part of work integration. In Germany, third sector and market actors have been approved, as in Italy, since the end of the 1990s (Borzaga & Paini, 2011; Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2014; Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2014b). This led to an increased number of actors in the field, however, in contrast to Italy, the state dominance remains unaffected. Instead, the German Federal Employment Agency remains dominant, as it is the central actor to distribute funding for work integration activities.

The selection of one of these countries would allow for an analysis of innovation processes in state-centred countries that show little activities in regard to the implementation of WISEs. The question is why this organisational form that is perceived as especially innovative is of such little relevance. This is especially the case in Sweden, where WISEs make up a relatively small part of the field of work integration. Sweden would accordingly be a good selection to provide a counterfactual. In Germany, the question as to how innovations occur in a context where third sector and market actors compete in order to receive state funding is interesting, because the state is the provider of the resources in the field. Connecting this fact to WISEs the question arises as to how this state-centred resource distribution prevents the development of WISEs?

Country selection - rationale

The field of work integration in **France** is perceived as providing insights for innovative processes, because at the moment the complete structure of the field is in question and WISEs as a new organisational form play an important role as an innovator in a context that is strongly influenced by third sector organisations (Anheier et al., 2015). On account of this turmoil in the field innovative procedures can be expected.

For this reason **Spain** that experiences similar changes is selected as second case. Here the focus is more on network structures across sectors than on the third sector like in France. Expecting social innovations in both countries the comparison of the innovation processes due to different focusses in similar contexts is expected to be especially insightful.

The **Czech Republic** agreed to conduct another case study in the field. This country is currently discussing the implementation of WISEs as well as the question as to what organisations should or should not get access to the field of work integration. The topicality of these developments makes the Czech Republic a very interesting case.

Fourth, **Germany** was selected as a case study, because in this country WISEs as already established organisations of the third sector compete with market actors for public funding. This strong competition in a state- centred field structure that has recently not experienced extreme changes is of special interest. This stable situation in Germany makes the country a suitable case for comparison with France and the Czech Republic.

3.7. Community development

In the examined countries the field of community development is addressed from different perspectives. In most countries (the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Spain, Italy) the integration of disadvantaged groups in society are focused by the field. The field description for these countries will concentrated on asylum seekers, refugees, and unauthorised immigrants. Other countries (Germany, the UK, and France) focus more on the implementation of structural instruments on the local level that can be applied differently in each community.

Structural instruments for community development are local development or urban development. In France, these instruments are implemented in response to riots in the suburbs of big cities in fall 2005 (Gouvernement français, 2006). In Germany and the UK, they are implemented on the basis of the political idea of giving responsibility to local actors (Enste, Neumann, & Schare, 2012). Instead of adhering to central steering mechanisms local actors should be encouraged to involve actors from different sectors of the community in the shaping of communal live as well as its social infrastructure, (i.e. privately organised) social and health services as well as education institutions and sport facilities (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2011). In all three countries this is complemented by policies that strongly support civic engagement (Bibisidis & Fuchs, 2012; Ministerium für Familie Kinder Jugend Kultur und Sport des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2013). A development that can also be found in Spain, but the focus is less central here. In Spain, the emergence of digital platforms facilitating civic and volunteer mobilisation, donation-based crowdfunding, and volunteer-based solutions aiming at social inclusion and clearly linking social and technological innovations, can be observed (EAPN, 2015; Edis, 2012; Plataforma de ONG de Acción Social, 2012a; Plataforma de ONG de Acción Social, 2012b; redinclusiónsocial.org, 2015). A hope that is connected with this above mentioned change in community life is that the development of innovative ideas can be stimulated by involving as many actors as possible in finding solutions to social problems occurring in the local context.

The provision of support in issues related to housing, health, and social services, is discussed and applied with reference to refugees, since they are usually excluded from the social security system. In regard to immigrants who do not come to a country in as asylum seekers but as regular immigrants, the integration by means of work integration is focused on.

The specific problems of refugees came into public awareness as a result of reports on shipwrecked refugees in the Mediterranean Sea. This especially affects Italy as the country where most of the refugees arrive. The problems in Italy to manage this rush of refugees provoked a discussion on shared responsibility of the EU member states as regards this issue, and accordingly discussions on the respective national levels (Benvenuti, 2011). Further, refugees escaping civil wars increase the number of refugees and also draw public attention to the topic, as it is the case, for instance, with reference to the rising number of refugees from Syria in Sweden and Germany.

The main problem that is described in this context in the Czech Republic, Denmark, and Italy is a lack of coordination between institutions responsible for the support of refugees (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2014). In the Czech Republic the decentralised asylum regulations are regarded to be the cause of the problem (Mikeszová & Lux; Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí, 2014a). In Italy, it is the high number of refugees that makes providing support to all refugees is almost impossible (AA.VV., 2014).

One action that is undertaken to change the situation on the national level is the implementation of EU and international regulations. In the Czech Republic, this is a first step towards an unification of regulations. In the Netherlands, national regulations are contested, as recent discussions on refugees brought the discrepancy between these regulations and human rights into light (Amnesty International Nederland, 2013). The awareness of this situation led to broad discussions.

Support structures can be described for Denmark, Sweden, and the Netherlands. In Denmark, work opportunities for refugees are discussed. A provision that is also relevant in Sweden. This support for refugees contrasts with Denmark and the Netherlands where in the course of the recent years a more restrictive practice in immigration procedures has been implemented. In the Netherlands, additionally, it can be observed that undocumented people (often refugees) are engaged in advocacy activities themselves. (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2014).

The description of the field has to be complemented by a closer look on the field actors. The description of the state actor has to differentiate between the national and the local level, as competencies are divided between both levels. The responsibility for the general steering of the provision of support structures is with the ministries on the national level, whereas the municipalities have to provide accommodation and make sure that all kinds of support are actually given to the people in need (e.g. health and social services). On the national level community development is further a theme that often relates to subjects under the supervision of different ministries. This is especially visible in the Czech Republic and Spain. In Denmark and the Netherlands, a negative attitude towards refugees can be observed on this level. In France, Germany, and the UK national governments concentrate, as described above, on national guidelines that allocate responsibilities to the local authorities and can accordingly be implemented in reference to local circumstances (Bibisidis & Fuchs, 2012; Ministère de ville de jeunesse et sports; Zimmer & Backhaus-Maul, 2012). Community integration of refugees takes place within the framework of these structures. These processes of decentralisation are not described for other countries, but in the Czech Republic and Denmark differences in regard to the provided support are observed in dependence of the respective municipality (Danish Government, 2015). Especially interesting is the case of the Netherlands where municipalities that wish to provide better support for refugees come into conflict with the present state secretary who practices a restrictive refugee policy (TK, 2014/2015).

On the national level third sector activity in the field of community development mainly takes the form of advocacy. On the local level third sector organisations and churches provide services for refugees and immigrants. For the Netherlands it is stated that these organisations are in part publicly funded. Especially interesting is the initiative of families in Italy who also provide accommodations for refugees in their private homes (AA.VV., 2014).

The market is only rarely mentioned as an actor participating in community development. Only in Sweden a rising participation of market actors in the provision of housing can be observed. This has been regarded as an unsustainable solution in the long run and a report on homelessness, including refugees (Stockholms Stadsmission, 2013), argues that neither the National Board of Health and Welfare or the third sector can achieve sustainable long-term results in combating homelessness for the simple fact that they cannot change the availability and allocation of housing in municipalities.

In accordance with the main activity of sector participation in the field, actor cooperations can mainly be found between the state and the third sector. In the Netherlands, Sweden, Spain, and Italy the support of third sector organisations by means of public funding is described; these organisations offer support for refugees and immigrants or other vulnerable social groups (SERVIZIO CENTRALE SPRAR, 2012). The funding is granted for the services these organisations provide and rather than for the organisations as places where different forms of engagement take place that can lead to service provision in several areas. In this context Italy has to be highlighted, since a stronger cooperation between municipalities and third sector organisations has recently been described as the only solution to provide help for the high number of refugees (SERVIZIO CENTRALE SPRAR, 2012).

Cooperations between all sectors are only rarely described. In Sweden, cooperation between the state and the market are dedicated to providing housing for refugees. While the state also cooperates with the third sector, there is no cooperation between the third sector and the market in this respect.

The perception of community development in the media and in policy was evaluated before it was decided to focus on refugees issues. Accordingly, the results presented here refer to community development in general. In France and the Czech Republic, this subject receives extensive attention in the media, especially in connection with third sector activities. Fewer relations between third sector and the field can be found in Spain, Sweden, and the UK. As regards the innovative capacity in comparison with other fields, the field of community development is described as the most innovative one. Although 66 % coded for neutral, a little less than 30 % of all articles on the third sector describe community development as very or somewhat innovative (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015). Innovative policies reflect on community developments in almost all countries. Particularly policies in the Netherlands and France focused on this field (Anheier et al., 2015).

Country selection

To select cases for the analysis of the field of community development, two groups of countries can be distinguished. Germany, France, and the UK make up one group, as these countries implement policies that strengthen the responsibilities of municipalities and local actors from third sector and market in community development; in this context no references on refugees are reported. All other countries, where community development focuses on the support of excluded groups in the population, namely refugees and immigrants, make up the second group. Overall, market actors play a minor role in the field; this is why the selection of countries in both groups will concentrate on relations between the state and the third sector.

Group 1: Decentralisation from state to network structure (Germany, France, and the UK)

Countries belonging to this group are in a constant process of turning the state-centred field of community development in a field that is shaped by different network structures on the local level. These structures can already be observed, as cooperation between all sectors are present in all three countries. The described change can be understood as especially interesting for the observation of innovative processes, since radical changes and actor cooperation are expected to stimulate innovations.

The selection of one of these countries has to take differences between them into consideration. In France, a more detailed description of the field is difficult, since sources are not easy to find. This is especially interesting in regard to the relatively high attention which the field receives in French media in connection to third sector organisations (Brink Lund & Lilleor, 2015) and the focus in innovation policies on this subject (Anheier et al., 2015). This can be explained by the discrepancy between the notion 'community' and the understanding of the French Republic. In consequence, community development in France relates more to 'communitarianism'. This difference in comparison with the other countries speaks against selecting France.

Differences between Germany and the UK can be made out in regard to the public founding of community development activities. In the UK, third sector organisations object to cuts in founding. This gives the impression that decentralisation is connected with a decoupling of community development activities from public founding. This can be understood as an implementation of an economic logic in the field. In Germany, the establishment of third sector organisations that provide an 'infrastructure' of engagement is highly important. In Germany, the idea that this support through various forms of engagement makes community development possible is of central importance. Consequently, decentralisation does not imply the implementation of a liberal policy but only changes in the steering mechanism of a still state-centred field.

As community development with reference to subject of refugees is embedded in these contexts in both countries, the selection of the UK can consequently provide insights in innovation structures that result from a withdrawal of state influence. However, Germany should be selected if innovations through changes in governmental steering processes are of interest in the field.

Group 2: Focus on support of excluded groups in population (the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Spain, Italy)

In this group the state provides general structures on the national level and the municipalities are responsible for the support of the vulnerable groups. Third sector organisations execute advocacy on the national level and provide services on the local level. General differences between the above mentioned countries can be found as regards the identified most important actor: in Denmark, Sweden, the Czech Republic this actor is the state, which is also the case on the local level in Italy. The third sector is stated to be the main actor in Italy (in general), the Netherlands, and Spain.

A more detailed examination of the countries shows that in Denmark the state is known to implement a restrictive policy in regard to refugees - an observation that also applies to the

Netherlands (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2014). A comparison between these countries that are similar in field structure and political orientation but differ as to the most important actor can be interesting. It can provide insights in the differences in innovation processes in a field that is mainly shaped by the state (Denmark) and a field that is mainly shaped by the third sector (the Netherlands). In Sweden, state and market actors cooperate in regard to housing, while there is no such cooperation between market and third sector actors; an impression of an inactive field arises, where these two groups of actors appear to perceive themselves as living in different worlds with discourses that generally do not facilitate cooperation. Sweden could be selected if there is an interest in innovation processes in a state-centred cooperation context. In the Netherlands, conflicts between the national government and municipalities are described. The question as to whether conflicts between state actors on different levels can support innovative collaborations between third sector and state on the local level (in the Netherlands) can be of particular interest. With reference to this question the selection of Italy would be even more interesting. Italy is a country where community development is generally shaped by third sector activity, but where the state dominates on the local level. This results from the fact that the service provision comes within the responsibility of the municipalities. Selecting the Netherlands and Italy would allow comparing a field where in both countries on the local level the state is the central actor. The Netherlands experience intensive internal discussions, also between different state levels, on the correct handling of refugees. In Italy, this is also an important issue however, it is currently superimposed by practical problems resulting from the immense number of refugees this country has to deal with at the moment. This forces municipalities to cooperate strongly with third sector organisations. Do these cooperations generate innovative processes? And what differences can be detected in comparison with the Netherlands where discourses on support for refugees are strong but the pressure to become active is less urgent?

For the state-centred field in the Czech Republic and the third sector-dominated field in Spain no specific constellation can be described. Both countries could be selected to evaluate a 'normal case', with the state or the third sector as central actors in the field of community development.

Country selection - rationale

Concerning 'community development' the **Netherlands** have been selected as a country in which advocacy for refugees is developing and where municipalities show different standpoints in comparison to national authorities. In the Netherlands the field is influenced by the third sector to a great extent, which makes it interesting to examine how this domestic conflict influences the cooperation between the state and third sector.

This question is especially valuable in comparison to **Italy** where the dominance of field actors differs in regard to the level of activity. Generally, the third sector is described as the central actor, but on the local level municipalities are the dominant actors. In this context of the changing role of state and third sector cooperations between the state and the third sector on the local level are very strong. This is due to the very high number of refugees that forces all actors to cooperate. In regard to innovations one can ask whether a situation in which a field's service provision function is subject to strains (in this case a high number of refugees) leads to more or less or different kinds of innovation in comparison to a field shaped by strong advocacy for refugees.

Thirdly, from the countries where local development is fostered as a means of community development the **UK** was selected. In the UK local development is promoted within the framework of a process of decentralisation that includes budget cuts; in this context innovative solutions to meet these new conditions can be expected. It will be interesting to evaluate the ways support is provided for refugees in the country. As mentioned before, this focus is not very strong, because refugees are seen as part of the community and to them the same programmes of community development apply as for all other vulnerable groups. Comparing this approach to the effects of the policies on community development with the type and extent of innovations in the Netherlands promises to be interesting.

Finally, the **Czech Republic** will conduct a fourth case in the field. This will serve as a “normal” case in terms of state and third sector involvement. At the same time, the country displays peculiarities in terms of coordination between institutions, asylum regulations, and advocacy functions. Being a transition country since the 1990s and increasingly also a destination for refugees (especially after its EU accession), the Czech Republic has been experiencing big changes regarding organisations, public activities, and innovative actions concerning the topic of flight and refuge.

4. Theoretical reflections

The presented selection is already theoretically reflected in so far as the empirical description for the fields in each country in the vignettes is conducted in accordance with the field theory. As described above (cf. chapter 2), this theoretical framework will be important for the construction of case studies. More detailed theoretical reflections on the basis of field theory are not possible yet, as more empirical data would be necessary.

However, we can reflect the classifications of country types on the macro level provided by Social Origins theory, the Welfare Regimes approach, and the Varieties of Capitalism. When determining the theoretical grounding of our project we argued that these frameworks typify national settings as macro structures which make the implementation of social innovations more or less likely (Anheier et al., 2014c). Indicators of factors that influence the evolution of social innovations have been described further in the ITSSOIN Hypotheses (Anheier, Krlev, Preuss, & Mildemberger, 2014a). The hypotheses will be tested in detail on basis of case studies on social innovations in the selected country-field combinations. The case studies on specific social innovations in different fields and countries can, when compared against each other, reveal insights into the innovative capacity of different fields, on the one hand, and the innovative capacity of different countries, on the other. When preparing the described empirical investigation by means of this country selection, at present we rather refer to the above mentioned classification in order to assess whether this country selection is appropriate and to evaluate the theoretically expectable innovative capacity for each field in the respective country.

Regarding the empirical fields the question arises as to whether the classification on country level accords with the field description. As the fields represent only one subsection of a country, this is probable but may not inevitably be the case. In consequence, it will be examined with reference to the selected country in each field if the classification for the macro-level approaches is adequate. In contrast to the theoretical frameworks the evaluations on the field level do not draw on structural data. This is due to the fact that not for all fields structural data could be provided, and the provided data are often not comparable. In fact, it will be

evaluated how strong the innovative capacity of the respective field can be expected to be in regard to the role of state, market, and the third sector described in the vignettes.

To be able to do so, first the three approaches and the expectations in regard to social innovations resulting from them will be briefly outlined and the resulting hypotheses we plan to test will be named (cf. 4.1). Then, the country selection will be reflected on these theoretical considerations and qualitative field descriptions. Differences between classifications on the country and field level will be also discussed and considered in regard to the impact on the innovative capacity in the respective field (cf. 4.2).

4.1. Theoretical estimations of sector roles on country-level

4.1.1. Social Origins approach

The Social Origins theory establishes an estimation of the relation between government social spending and third sector activity to account for variations in the function of the third sector as service provider and advocate. Relating the size of the third sector to government social spending Anheier and Salamon distinguish four types of non-profit regimes: liberal, social-democratic, corporatist, and statist (Anheier, 2005, Anheier, 2010; Salamon & Anheier, 1998). Being more interested in the activity of the third sector in relation to civic engagement as an important third sector activity, we adapted this classification by replacing government social spending with civic engagement.

Having searched for the most recent data on third sector size and importance of civic engagement, we updated the classification for the participating ITSSOIN countries. Based on this, the result is the following classification:

Table 2. Scale of third sector – Civic engagement

	<i>Importance of civic engagement</i> SMALL	<i>Importance of civic engagement</i> LARGE
<i>Scale of third sector</i> Small²	Czech Republic, Spain, Italy (1998)	Sweden, Denmark
<i>Scale of third sector</i> Large	Germany, France, Italy (2010)	Netherlands, United Kingdom

(Based on Anheier, 2010; Hodgkinson, 2003;3 cf. Anheier et al., 2014c)

In accordance with the Social Origins theory, within the framework of the ITSSOIN project we hold the view that that this relation allows for estimating the innovative capacity of the third sector. This is based on the understanding that a low civic engagement implies a relatively low level of new ideas and that a small non-profit sector offers little opportunities to implement

² Not for all countries data with regard to third sector size were available; however, figures on volunteering were available for all countries.

³ Figures on volunteering as percentage of adult population. We will use the share of volunteers in relation to paid workforce in third sector organisations later on. Volunteering figures for the Netherlands are very close to the median of compared countries with a tendency towards large.

new ideas in practice; this combination is perceived as a context condition where the innovative capacity of the third sector is smallest. In contrast, a large importance of civic engagement makes the development of new ideas more probable, just as in countries with a large scale of third sector innovative activities are more supposable. Thus, countries with a large importance of civic engagement and a large scale of the third sector are expected to have the highest innovative capacity. Countries that are in between, having either a large third sector or high civic engagement in combination with a respectively small importance of civic engagement or a small scale of the third sector, are consequently understood to be medium innovative.

Focusing the ITSSOIN project on successful social innovations, the hypothesis we derive from this framework and will test empirically is:

'H3.1: The larger a nation's third sector and the higher its degree of volunteering, the larger its social innovativeness.' (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 16)

When applying this hypothesis to the country selection, expectations as to the social innovativeness of the selected country-field combinations in regard to the role of the third sector will be formulated (cf. 4.2). An overview of the selected country-field combinations in relation to resulting expectations regarding social innovations following the Social Origins approach can be found in the Annex (cf. 7.3).

By this qualitative estimation of the influence of the third sector a major critique on the approach by Anheier is met. According to Anheier it is difficult to empirically test power relations in a country on a macro basis. Further, the developed 'types' might not exist in a pure form but mixed types can be more common (Anheier, 2005). To account for power relations especially the evaluations of policy environments in a country are suggested as an important background to advance the classification (Anheier, 2010). Such a policy analysis has already been conducted as part of the ITSSOIN project (Anheier et al., 2015) and is reflected on in the qualitative field descriptions presented above.

This first consideration of the theoretical insights on the case selection can hence not only show how the Social Origins approach can enhance the understanding of the innovative capacity of the third sector. It can also reflect on the more qualitative application of the approach and provide insights in ways that can meet the formulated critique in more detail.

4.1.2. Welfare Regimes

The typology of welfare states by Gøsta Esping-Andersen (Esping-Andersen, 1990) reflects on the relation between state, economy, and Welfare Regimes in nation -states. Based on the differentiation of the logic of organisation, stratification, and societal integration in an historical and political context for each state, Esping-Andersen identifies three welfare-state logics: liberal, conservative, and social-democratic (Arts & Gelissen, 2002; Baum-Ceisig, Busch, Hacker, & Nospickel, 2008; Esping-Andersen, 1990). Measuring the factors class mobilisation, class political action, and historical legacy of regime institutionalisation, he accounts for the 'degree of decommodification' and the dimension of 'stratification' as the two differentiation criteria. The 'degree of decommodification' is understood as 'the degree to which individuals or families can uphold a socially acceptable standard of living independently of market participation' (Esping-Andersen, 1990, p. 37). 'Stratification' is conceived as '[...] the

articulation of social solidarity, divisions of class, and status differentiation’ (Esping-Andersen, 1990, p. 55).

Following this reference to ideal types, the ITSSOIN project draws on Esping-Andersen’s typology. However, we add to this typification of the liberal, conservative, and social-democratic states the type of ‘post-socialist’ regimes in accordance to Baum-Ceisig et. al. (Baum-Ceisig et al., 2008) in order to account for the specific situation of the Czech Republic as a post-socialist state, which otherwise would not be reflected on in the typification. For the ITSSOIN countries the following table results:

Table 3. Decommodification and stratification⁴

	<i>Decommodification</i> Low	<i>Decommodification</i> High
<i>Stratification</i> Low	Conservative Italy, France, Germany, <i>(Spain)</i>	Social-democratic Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden
<i>Stratification</i> High	Liberal United Kingdom	<i>(Post-socialist)</i> <i>(Czech Republic)</i>

(Based on Arts & Gelissen, 2002; Baum-Ceisig et al., 2008; Esping-Andersen, 1990; cf. Anheier et al., 2014c)

The types of Welfare Regimes can be useful for evaluating social innovations, as they can be understood as measures for the influence of market forces in relation to third sector involvement. Decommodification can be translated as influence of market forces. If decommodification is low, the influence of market forces is high; in contrast, if decommodification is high, market forces are low. The same applies to stratification that is understood as a proxy for solidarity or third sector involvement. Thus, a low stratification indicates high solidarity, whereas high stratification means low solidarity (Anheier et al., 2014c).

The combination of stratification and decommodification can thus provide estimations of the innovative capacity of one country in regard to market and third sector activity. If decommodification and stratification are both high this can result from strong overall influence of the state that moderates the impact of both, third sector involvement as well as free market activity. The innovativeness of those countries, described as post-socialist, is expected to be low.

For all other combinations of high and low decommodification and stratification the innovative capacity is suggested to be moderate. In social-democratic regimes, high third sector involvement and low market influence are perceived. In these countries a lack of market influence results from a strong state influences that hinders innovative developments. In countries where decommodification and stratification are low, civic engagement and market influences are high. These countries described as conservative regimes are medium innovative, as market pressures can hinder the implementation of innovations through the third sector.

⁴ There was no data available on the countries in brackets. There, the allocation is therefore an approximation.

The dominance of the market over the third sector is already observable in liberal regimes where low decommodification is combined with high stratification.

From this perspective, especially innovative are those countries that are in between social-democratic and conservative regimes and have strong third sector involvement (low stratification) but moderate decommodification, i.e. market influences are restrained by the state but not so much that new developments are hindered. Again, the hypothesis we want to test empirically refers to these especially innovative context conditions:

'H3.2: National social innovativeness will be highest, where stratification is low and decommodification is moderate.' (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 17)

The estimation of the social innovative capacity in regard to Welfare Regimes for the selected ITSSOIN countries per field can be found in the Annex (cf. 7.4).

4.1.3. Varieties of Capitalism

Hall and Soskice are interested in coordination problems firms have to face when acting across spheres, as they relate to industrial relations, vocational training and education, corporate governance, inter-firm relationships, and employee recruitment and management. Since they are especially interested in systematic comparisons of framework conditions that influence these coordination problems, Hall and Soskice reflect on cross-national conditions in which firms operate. When analysing different countries, they find patterns of similarities and differences in solving these problems, which results in their typology of 'Varieties of Capitalism' (VoC). According to this typology two dominant forms of market economies can be differentiated in nation-states: coordinated (CME) and liberal market economies (LME). Most interesting for the ITSSOIN project is that Hall and Soskice explain the different forms of innovations on the basis of this classification. For them, variations in institutional settings result in differences in solving coordination problems. While business firms in CMEs are more successful if they implement incremental innovations, market actors in LMEs tend to implement radical innovations. This is due to the fact, that government influences in LMEs are relatively low, and this is why institutional hierarchies and market competition are of great importance. In CMEs, by contrast, the strong state control prevents radical innovations. In these countries business firms have to adjust solutions for problems and hence innovations more strongly to state specifications. Consequently, incremental innovations are more promising to be successful in this context (Hall & Soskice, 2001). As third sector organisations operate in the same institutional settings on country level as business firms, similarities in the problem solving and hence in the innovative capacity can be expected for both forms of organisational types in a given 'Variety of Capitalism'. Therefore, the approach can be transferred to the third sector.

Several authors have tested this approach empirically, finding countries in accordance with the classification of LME and CME. However, at the same time deviations from the typification are found that may result from changes in time response (Feldmann, 2007; King, 2007; Mykhnenko, 2007; Schneider & Paunescu, 2012). These are, on the one hand, LME-like countries which are countries similar to LMEs but which reveal government influences that are so strong that they cannot be described as 'ideal-type' (Schneider & Paunescu, 2012). On the other hand, 'hybrids' are found that are experiencing strong changes in their institutional settings. These are, for example, post-socialist countries that are in different stages of

transformation from CME to LME and where the final outcome is still unclear (Feldmann, 2007; King, 2007; Mykhnenko, 2007).

This wider range of typology groups is helpful for the ITSSOIN project. Moreover, the economic crisis has strong effects on all ITSSOIN countries, as the field descriptions have revealed. To account for possible transformations of market economies that might result from this, we refer to the classification of Schneider and Paunescu. The ITSSOIN countries can be typified according to empirical studies already executed as follows:

Table 4. State versus market dominance

State (-dominated)			Market(-dominated)
Incremental Innovation			Radical Innovation
←			→
CME	Hybrids	LME-like	LME
Germany, France	Italy, Czech Republic	Spain, Netherlands, Sweden	Denmark, United Kingdom

(Based on Hall & Soskice, 2001; Schneider & Paunescu, 2012; cf. Anheier et al., 2014c)

In accordance with this typification we empirically test the hypothesis:

'H3.3: CME countries are more likely to foster incremental social innovations, whereas LME countries are more likely to foster radical innovation.' (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 17)

Transferring these insights to the innovative capacity of the third sector we expect in countries identified as LME a third sector that promote radical changes that are supposedly implemented by single players, as argued in regard to the dominance of market involvement, which can in turn have negative effects for civic involvement (Anheier et al., 2014b). Consequently, this context is evaluated as a setting that allows for social innovations to a medium extend. In CMEs, by contrast, state regulations are stronger and therefore trigger incremental innovations. This is an obstacle to fundamental changes and is thus equally understood as a context favouring social innovations in a moderate way. Hybrids, as CME-like countries that are turning into LMEs, lean towards incremental innovations but are more open to radical innovations, since state influence is reduced. However, the turnover of institutional settings creates a situation of great instability and vagueness which is overall seen as an obstacle to social innovations. The countries in which social innovations are especially probable are LME-like countries. In these countries third sector actors have a high freedom of action but state regulation is stronger than in pure LMEs. This prevents the dominance of single (market) actors, which in turn allows for solidary corporate implementations of innovations through third sector organisations. In accordance with these considerations the following hypothesis will be tested empirically:

H3.4: National social innovativeness will be highest in LME-like countries, where state influence and market influence are both at a moderate level. (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 18)

According to the Varieties of Capitalism in a table to the selected country-field selection, an overview of expectations on the innovative capacity can be found in the Annex (7.5).

Drawing on innovation literature we added a fifth hypothesis to the previous ones resulting from theoretical frameworks. Innovation literature showed that disruptions, dynamism and

complexity foster social innovations. To account for these insights on changes in time response we suppose:

'H3.5: In countries that have been subject to disruptive trajectories and thus dynamic change, social innovativeness will be higher than in relatively settled countries.' (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 18)

This hypothesis contradicts the understanding of hybrid countries as economies in turmoil and little open for social innovations to some degree. In the following reflection is has to be discussed if changes lead to unpredictable developments for the whole country? This would hinder innovations as predicted for hybrid countries. If disruptions and changes open up now opportunities for engagement without affecting the context conditions as a whole, H3.5 can be applied.

4.2. Theoretical reflection of country field combination

Having briefly recapitulated the theoretical approaches we will now apply estimations on macro-structural influences on the innovative capacity of the third sector in relation to market and state on the field level. This reflection brings the field selection into accord with the presented hypotheses that will be tested empirically by means of the case studies conducted in the respective fields.

The country-field selection is based on qualitative descriptions of the respective fields in each country. The classification of the countries in the described frameworks is, in contrast, based on structural data on country level. It has to be noted that the empirical fields only represent a subarea of the country. Consequently, the classifications on the country level might not apply to the empirical fields. To account for this, structural data on the field level have been searched for when conducting the field vignettes. Such data were rather not available for all countries and if data were found they were rarely comparable. This resulted in the conclusion that such data collection is too big a task for the field descriptions provided at this stage of the project.

For the moment a data gap between countries and the field level has to be dealt with. As it is not possible to fill this gap, the classifications on the country level will be contrasted with qualitative descriptions of the field in each country. Thereby, an estimation is given regarding the question as to whether the hypotheses developed in accordance with the theory apply to the field level as well. However, for a better readability this evaluation will not be brought into relation explicitly to the hypotheses but to the expected innovative capacity that is expressed in the hypotheses in regard to the respective theoretical approach. In this case the defined hypotheses can be applied on the country and field level. Otherwise, adjustments of the innovative capacity that is expected on field level in comparison to the country level would have to be made. On account of this change of perspective from the macro level to the meso level, the significance of the theoretical predictions on the country level is neglected to some extent. As a result this can further inform the macro perspective, as the empirical investigation on the basis of the case studies can empirically reveal how the interplay of (more or less innovative) macro- and meso-level influences the establishment of social innovations.

This procedure accords with the theoretical approaches in so far as a more qualitative approach for the analysis of Social Origins is called for in order to be able to measure the impact of power relations in more detail (Anheier, 2005). Further, by applying such a research design it is possible to explain changes in time response by means of the description of causal relations. As a starting point this can inform all frameworks by arguing on the basis of classification, since

changes of countries from one classification to another, which is empirically visible in all aforementioned approaches, can thus be explained. This can strengthen the explanatory power of all macro-theoretical frameworks applied in ITSSOIN.

4.2.1. Arts & Culture

The field of arts & culture is in all countries informed by a process of economisation. The state that is strongly influencing the field by public funding and operating cultural and art institutions like museum, theatres, and concert halls, is withdrawing from the sector. Cuts in public funding and the privatisation of public art institutions are the consequence. When comparing countries in this field, one central differentiation criterion is the dominance of the third sector and the dominance of the state in this field.

As countries of special interest for the field of arts & culture, the two countries Italy and Spain have been selected as countries where the third sector is described as a central actor and not the state. As contrasting contexts for the case studies France and the Netherlands have been selected as countries where the state is central for the field.

When reflecting on the classification in the three theoretical frameworks as regards France and the Netherlands, the state dominance is a first important indicator. The Social Origins theory classifies both countries as liberal with low civic engagement and a large third sector. Knowing that the influence of the state is high in this field in both countries, and civic engagement is not mentioned, it can be assumed that civic engagement is indeed low on the field level. At the same time providers of art and culture are often funded by the state. As those providers in the field are mainly third sector and public organisations and not market actors, a large third sector can be detected in both fields. Accordingly, the classification as a liberal country that is moderately innovative applies to both countries on the country as well as on the field level.

When applying this field description to the Welfare Regimes it becomes visible that both countries have a high degree of decommodification, i.e. a relatively low impact of the market. The stratification is low to moderate, as the third sector plays an important role in the field even though a state dominance can be detected. Accordingly, both countries are to be estimated as social-democratic regimes on the field level where the influence of the market is generally of little importance. State dominance in the Netherlands is less strong than in France. Accordingly, the innovative capacity can be expected to be high in the Netherlands, since this gives room for innovative activities in an active third sector. In France, the innovative capacity is, in contrast, medium, as strong state regulations are expected to be an obstacle to innovations. As both countries are classified as especially innovative countries with moderate decommodification and low stratification, this field description applies to the country level for the Netherlands; in France strong state influence might reduce the innovative capacity in the field of arts & culture in comparison to the country level.

Some differences occur when estimating the countries in accordance with the Varieties of Capitalism. As to the country level France is described as CME, which applies for the field of arts & culture as well, given the state dominance in the field. Accordingly, France is not expected to be a country supporting social innovations. In the Netherlands as a LME-like country state dominance can be detected in the field; as the state still gives some room to an active third sector in the field of culture and arts, the Netherlands are to be classified as situated in between the LME-like type that is the described context on the country level and

the CME type. Social innovations are thus of medium probability in France and the Netherlands, with some more hope for innovations in the Netherlands, as the influence of the state is less extensive in the field of arts & culture.

In Italy and Spain, third sector activity and civic engagement are, in contrast, more pronounced. Especially in Italy the development of new forms of organisations based on civic engagement are elaborated on. In accordance with the Social Origins approach these countries are estimated either as statist (Spain) or social-democratic (Italy). These descriptions cannot be transferred to the field of arts & culture which is characterised by important third sector activity and a high degree of civic engagement in both countries. Accordingly, Italy and Spain both provide corporatist contexts that make the development of social innovations highly probable on field level.

This accords with the classification of both countries in the Welfare Regimes. These conservative countries are described as having a low degree of stratification and decommodification; this characterisation applies to the field of arts & culture where a rising market influence can fill the gap resulting from a reduced state engagement. In view of the fact that market influences in the field of arts & culture are generally low, the danger of market pressures as an obstacle to innovations is small. Consequently, social innovations are very likely in the field of arts & culture.

Lastly, the Varieties of Capitalism can be applied to Italy and Spain. The withdrawal of the state is already well advanced in both countries in the field of arts & culture. In Italy, the state applies regulations that aim at supporting the field, e. g. tax regulations in favour of donations to the field. Considering the classification of Italy as a hybrid country this can be interpreted as a transition from CME to LME that is still in progress. Only a more detailed empirical investigation can show whether a reinforcement of field structures has already taken place. If this is the case, Italy provides a field that is relatively liberal but LME-like because of the influence of the state which supports the third sector and thus innovations. In other respect Italy is a hybrid country in which social innovations are unlikely to happen, as the setting is unstable.

The characterisation of Spain as a LME-like country has to be adjusted in view of the qualitative description of the field of arts & culture. In Spain, the societal relevance of the field of arts & culture is questioned altogether and this is why the introduction of market mechanism is strongly supported. The field rather shows traits of a LME (and not LME-like) and thus a medium innovative context.

The qualitative description of the field of arts & culture in the four selected countries shows that in France and in the Netherlands social innovations are of medium probability in the state-dominated fields. As state dominance in the Netherlands is less distinct than in France, social innovations are more likely in the field of arts & culture. In Italy and Spain, in the fields strongly influenced by the third sector, social innovations are of high to medium probability. The positioning of Italy and Spain between hybrid and LME-like (Italy) or LME-like and LME (Spain) in regard to the Varieties of capitalism is particularly interesting for revealing the impact of changes in context conditions on the implementation of social innovations.

Being not only interested in the evolution of social innovations in the field, but in the macro-contexts the question if the shifts relate to the special role of the field in the country or if they are due to more general changes in the country is worth considering.

4.2.2. Social Services

In contrast to the field of arts & culture the field of social services does not show a similar trend of development across countries. Hence, three groups of countries are differentiated that have a similar characteristics or where similar trends can be observed. The first group (Denmark and Sweden) shows a pronounced role of the state. Secondly, in the Netherlands, Germany, the UK, France, and Spain the increased performance of the existent social system is the key subject. The countries in the last group, the Czech Republic and Italy, search for ways to improve the situation in a social system that has an underdeveloped character. From each group at least one country (i.e. Sweden, Spain, the UK, and Italy) has been selected; now the innovative capacity of the field in the respective country can be elaborated on.

Sweden has been selected as a country in which the field of social services is state- dominated. The state does not only provide regulations but also social services. Recently a process of commercialisation has started in which third sector and market actors are supported to enter the field as additional service provider. Market actors are unintentionally structurally incentivised in this context, as opposed to third sector actors.

The classification of Sweden in accordance with the Social Origins approach describes the country as social-democratic with high civic engagement and small third sector. By contrast, high state engagement and the support of market actors as service providers and the fact that civic engagement is not mentioned indicate civic engagement in the field. Accordingly, Sweden is rather described as a statist, not innovative context on the field level. Similarly, as to the country level Sweden is typified as a social-democratic Welfare Regime with low market influences (and thus high decommodification) and high solidarity (meaning low stratification) on the national level. This description has to be adjusted in regard to the field description of social services, as relatively little third sector activity and little civic engagement, in comparison to other countries, indicate low solidarity and consequently high stratification. Again, a strong involvement of the state leads to an estimation of a field, typified as post-socialist, less likely to support social innovations.

From the perspective of the Varieties of Capitalism Sweden is a LME-like country. The qualitative description of the field of social services with its strong state regulation stands in strong contrast to this estimation. Even though recent reforms aim at including market actors as well as third sector actors as service providers, the field is better described as CME moderately to little likely to foster social innovations.

Spain and the UK can be described as countries that try to improve the performance of their social services. Since both have well-equipped systems of social services, their approaches to improvement differ.

Spain focuses on the establishment of networks between state and private providers from third sector as well as from market. Further, civic engagement and corporate social responsibility are promoted. Therefore, the field of social services seems not to comply with the classification of the Social Origins approach according to Spain is a social- democratic country with little third

sector activity and high government spending. Moreover, given the efforts to support third sector activity and a decreasing government involvement, the field seems to be still in a transition towards a corporatist country-type.

From this perspective, the characterisation of a conservative Welfare Regime as having a low degree of decommodification and stratification on the country level is not convincing. The necessity to support market influence indicates, in contrast, high decommodification and hence a field of a social-democratic type. However, the current developments indicate a conservative field. With regard to the framework the innovative capacity is thus medium to low. The observable change might, however, lead to an enhancement of social innovations.

According to the Varieties of Capitalism Spain is a LME-like country. Again, the qualitative description gives the impression that the field of social services is rather similar to that of a CME country. But currently the state activates market and third sector activity that were not participating in the field before, in order to create a more LME-like field context.

Summing up, as to the country level Spain can be described as a more innovative context in contrast to the context suggested for the field of social services in accordance with the qualitative field description. Interestingly, the structure of the field is currently changing in order to become similar to the classification of country level. This development may lead to especially innovative changes on the field level.

In the UK, the third sector has a strong role in social services. The field is, as in Spain, fairly developed and the focus is on improvements of services. To achieve this objective, the influence of the individual and self-help, implying also civic engagement, are strengthened. One approach is that the community budget shall support social innovations. In this process the diversification of provider structures is supported as well.

This description of the social field accords with the classification of the UK in all theoretical frameworks on the country level. In the Social Origins frameworks a strong third sector and high civic engagement indicate a corporatist country and a corporatist context on the field level. Further, a liberal Welfare Regime identified on the country level corresponds to the field description. High stratification, i. e. little solidarity because individuals are responsible for themselves, and a low decommodification with high market influences in an individualised field with a high number of service providers, are described for social services. The Varieties of Capitalism framework also characterises the UK as a LME; regarding the relatively small state influence resulting from a high degree of individual freedom of decision and budget allocation on community level as liberal steering mechanism, this characterisation is true for the field of social services as well. As a consequence, social innovations are expected to be medium likely in reflection of all theoretical frameworks.

In Italy, social services are provided on the basis of family support in view of an underdeveloped institutionalised system. The objective is to institutionalise this system, since families and their ability to provide this support is subject to pressure as a result of demographic changes. This field conforms to the classifications resulting from the theoretical frameworks regarding Italy on country level only in two cases.

The approach of Social Origins describes Italy as a social-democratic country with high civic engagement and a small third sector. This also applies on the field level, since Italy has a small

institutionalised third sector in social services and an underdeveloped (state-based) system of social services. Social services in Italy are consequently to be described as moderately innovative.

The Welfare Regimes find low decommodification and stratification in Italy. The classification as conservative, with high market influence and high solidarity does not apply to the field of social services, where no market structures seem to exist but families are responsible for an important part of the service provision. Further, the underdeveloped system of social services indicates low solidarity. On the field level, as regards social services, Italy is best described as post-socialist and as a non-innovative context with high decommodification and stratification.

Similarly, on the field level it is possible to apply the Varieties of Capitalism classification of Italy as hybrid and as a country in a process of transformation from one system to another, like the Czech Republic. In Italy no real market for services has evolved and families are responsible for the provision of social services; similar to the Czech Republic, where government regulation is strong, these services are provided by NGOs; therefore, this classification on country level also applies to the field of social services. Since in Italy only one characteristic which could allow to classify this country as a medium innovative context and two features suggesting little innovations can be observed, the field of social services in Italy is overall expected to have little innovative capacity.

In Sweden, state dominance is an obstacle to innovations, whereas in Italy the underdeveloped character of the field provides little structures that can support social innovations. In the UK, social innovations are to be expected to a moderate degree. In the UK this accords with the liberal structures on country and field level. Market influences are slightly curbed by government regulations and give at least some room to third sector activities. In Spain, the field of social services is a context not very likely to allow for social innovations at first glance. Comparing this to the more innovative country context, described by theoretical classification, an adaption of the field of social services to the structures found on the country level can be observed. The process of transferring the field from a medium or little innovative context to an especially innovative context that can be observed in Spain at the moment can enhance innovation processes. Overall, the selected countries in the field of social services provide a basis for the comparison between non-innovative, moderately innovative, and highly innovative context conditions.

4.2.3. Health care

For the field of health care three groups have been identified. Spain and the Czech Republic make up the first group as countries where people with limited financial resources might be in danger of exclusion from the health system due to insufficient capacities of the insurance-based system. As this exclusion is one of the dangers with reference to which social innovations are said to be especially helpful in providing solutions, the Czech Republic is selected for further analysis. Secondly, Denmark, the Netherlands, and the UK focus on patient involvement, even though by means of different measures. The UK as a country torn between community support and market principles in a hierarchical health system dominated by the National Health Service (NHS) is most interesting for empirical investigations. Further Denmark thought to be another interesting case, as it is a similar country to the UK in regards to the economisation of the sector, but different concerning the form of civic engagement. In the countries of the third group, Sweden, France, Italy, and Germany, there is a development

towards a commercial service provision in combination with a strong focus on technological innovations and administrative reforms. Since France has especially pronounced civic engagement and advocacy, this country is selected as a fourth country for case studies.

In the Czech Republic a debate about basic health care provision and contribution-based provision is taking place. In this context a commercialisation is proposed which is hotly discussed. The centralised but underdeveloped system in the Czech Republic receives much attention on the part of commercial providers; this is why little attention is given to patient interest.

The Czech Republic is classified by the Social Origins approach as statist country with small third sector and little civic engagement, what accords to the qualitative field description in the field of health. Consequently social innovations are not expected in the Czech Republic.

In regard to Welfare Regimes the Czech Republic is categorised as post-socialist. This contrasting classification does not apply on the field level. The field of health in the Czech Republic is characterised by low solidarity, as poor people may be excluded from the health system. Therefore, high stratification is combined with a state-centred system. The market influence is consequently still relatively low, although it is increasing. Decommodification is thus high, which leads to the classification of the field of health in the Czech Republic as post-socialist-type, where social innovations are unlikely to occur.

This impression of unlikely social innovations is confirmed for the Czech in regard to the Varieties of Capitalism approach. On the country level the Czech Republic is a hybrid country with regulations concerning the market economy which are in a state of flux. This holds on the field level where the commercialisation of the centralised health care system is discussed and where strong interests on the side of commercial providers can be observed. Thus, social innovations are unlikely, as future developments cannot be detected, which in turn is an obstacle to the implementation of social innovations that is a risky undertaking. This expectation of little innovative capacity in the field of health is prevalent from all theoretical perspectives. However, the current focus in innovation policies on the field of health may change this in the future. It will be interesting to consider this issue in the empirical case work (Anheier et al., 2015).

The UK has a health care system that is dominated by the NHS; this is why commercial providers and the third sector have only little influence. Efforts by the state to introduce market-oriented steering mechanism, such as 'personal health budgets', aim at improving patients' choices. Further, a decentralisation of the system in favour of community support through network formation is intended. In this context the interests of patients and the public in health are increasing.

In accordance with the Social Origins approach on the country level the UK is described as corporatist type, with an active third sector as well as high civic engagement. This does not apply to the field of health that is state-centred in view of the NHS and where neither civic engagement nor third sector participation is described. From this perspective the field of health in the UK is statist and not innovative.

Similarly, the perspective of Welfare Regimes suggests a categorisation of the UK as liberal on the country level. On the field level low stratification, meaning a high level of solidarity, is

enacted through the NHS, and high decommodification due to little market influence can be observed. This more social-democratic field context is further influenced by a process of decentralisation. The state currently supports the activity of third sector and market actors and reduces the influence of the state, which indicates a reduction of decommodification and thus an especially innovative context.

Apart from being classified as a liberal Welfare Regime, according to the Varieties of Capitalism the UK is said to be a LME on the country level. This does not hold for the qualitative description of the field of health that is state-centred and struggles to implement steering mechanism oriented towards the market. As a strongly institutionalised health system exists in the UK, the country is not qualified as hybrid, but as an LME-like field context. State regulations favour free participation of market and third sector actors, which makes the establishment of social innovations likely. This holds especially because innovation policies in the UK focus on the field of health (Anheier et al., 2015). Overall, social innovations in the UK are likely to occur in the current field context.

Privatisation is also a goal in health care in Denmark. Here state and third sector actors, namely associations, interact. The state does execute influences, but seems to be influenced by third sector organisations itself as the accordance of funding to third sector organisations described above imply. Market influences seem to be of little relevance in this context.

Having a social democratic appearance on country level, the field of health in Denmark is characterised by strong third sector activity from perspective of the Social Origin approach. Civic engagement is small, knowing that third sector organisations engage mostly as advocates. Accordingly health care in Denmark has to be described in contrast to the country level as liberal, but never the less medium innovative.

Regarding Welfare Regimes Denmark is expected to be especially innovative as it is estimated to be between social democratic and conservative type. On field level the connected low stratification can also be found. High third sector involvement of patients and professional associations indicate this. Decommodification can be described in discrepancy from the country level as low, as market influences are not detected in the field. Being closer to a conservative Welfare Regime, social innovations in the field of health in Denmark can be expected to a moderate degree.

The LME type market economy in Denmark is tamed on level of the field of health by strong state influences. Even though market actors are not mentioned on field level, the possibility to participate for third sector organisations implies that the field is not a pure CME According to the Varieties of Capitalism but LME-like and thus prone to social innovations.

The theoretical reflection of Denmark in the field of health leads to the assumption, that social innovations are moderately likely. Even though the Varieties of Capitalism approach indicates high innovative capacity, the Social Origins and the Welfare Regimes only hint a moderate degree of innovativeness.

The strongest effect of commercialisation is visible in the last selected country: in France. One example is the price-per-activity system that is introduced as a commercial steering mechanism in hospitals. When focusing on technological innovations and administrative changes in general, the network formation between public institutions, providers, and

professional associations is relevant in the field of health. As service providers commercial service providing actors are more important than third sector organisations. Moreover, patients associations gain momentum, as civic engagement and advocacy is more (and newly) pronounced in comparison to other countries.

The fact that France reveals a relatively small third sector and high civic engagement contrasts with the characterisation of France according to the Social Origins approach in the framework of which this country is classified as liberal; the field of health is consequently better described as social-democratic, even though the network formation in the field indicates a change in the field that increasingly gives more relevance to the third sector. However, this does not affect the expectation of a moderate innovative capacity of the field.

The characterisation of France as a highly innovative conservative Welfare Regime on the country level, with high solidarity but only moderate market influences, does not fully apply to its characterisation on the field level. The qualitative field description shows that commercial service providers are important for the field and that solidarity evidenced by civic engagement is high. From the perspective of the Welfare Regimes this low degree of decommodification and stratification in the field of health care reduces the expectation of high innovative capacity from the country level to moderate innovativeness.

The Varieties of Capitalism describe France as a CME on country level. As the described commercialisation gives more room to commercial service providers and third sector organisations in the field of health, this country is better described as a LME-like context. The commercialisation is, however, restricted by state involvement in network formation between the three sectors market, state, and third sector; this distinguishes the field from a pure LME context. For France a moderate to high social innovative capacity can consequently be expected in accordance with all theoretical frameworks.

Altogether, the theoretical frameworks indicate little innovation in the field of health in the Czech Republic, which is due to radical changes in the whole health system. Observable changes in the strongly state-regulated health sector of the UK are, in contrast, expected to foster social innovations to a special degree. In France, a diversification of actor structures makes social innovations also moderately likely. France is especially affected by the commercialisation of the field. To compare the evolution of social innovations, settings assessed as supportive (the UK) or impeding (Czech Republic) contexts can be compared. Denmark and France are countries that might support social innovations, but for very different reasons: in Denmark current changes in the field, favoured by the state, are influenced by advocacy of third sector organisations. In France changes are implemented in regard to a commercialisation of the health system, involving state, market, and third sector actors.

4.2.4. Environmental sustainability

For the field of environmental sustainability actor constellations represented the central criterion for the country selection. In most countries actors from state, market, and third sector engage in the field, either independently from each other, as in the Czech Republic, Denmark, the UK, and the Netherlands, or by means of cross-sectoral activities, as in Sweden, Spain, France, and Italy. One exception is Germany where a cooperative field structure between all sectors is described. Germany is hence selected as a country for further investigation. In addition the Czech Republic and Denmark are selected as countries where sectors act with

partial independence from each other and Italy is selected as an example of cross-sectoral activities.

Only in Italy descriptions of civic engagement or similar activities are given, why an estimation of the Social Origins approach on the field level cannot be made for all other countries. For Denmark, Germany, and the Czech Republic only the country context can be described.

Although Denmark and the Czech Republic are similar in regard to the level of independence of actors across sectors and the increase of third sector activity, they differ in respect to state activity in the field. While the state is active on the national level in the Czech Republic, in Denmark only the third sector seems to engage in environmental sustainability, trying to activate state and market actors. However, on the local level an increasing activity by municipalities can recently be observed.

This strong third sector involvement contradicts both classifications of these countries provided by the Social Origins approach. Neither is the field of environmental sustainability in the Czech Republic statist, nor is the field in Denmark social-democratic, as both characterisations imply a small third sector. If third sector activity is to be regarded as an important factor for innovative activities, without assessing the civic engagement, it can be stated that both countries are expected to be more innovative on the field level than on country level.

The Welfare Regime of the Czech Republic on the country level is post-socialist, whereas in this respect Denmark is described as social-democratic. This description of a social-democratic context accords with the field level for both countries, as only little market involvement and thus high to moderate decommodification can be observed. Stratification as a measure for solidarity in regard to environmental sustainability is low in Denmark, where the third sector but neither the state nor the market engage strongly in the field. In the Czech Republic solidarity is also high, since third sector engagement is strong and even increasing. Consequently, both countries provide especially innovative field contexts.

Similarly, in accordance with the Varieties of Capitalism, on the country level innovative capacities can also be expected for Denmark and the Czech Republic. Denmark as a LME and the Czech Republic as a hybrid are both not especially innovative contexts on the country level. However, on the basis of the fact that the market is not strongly involved on the field level but state and third sector are active in the Czech Republic it can be assumed that state regulations apply to an active third sector. A similar estimation can be made for Denmark where the lack of engagement of state and market indicates liberal opportunities for activities and thus an LME-like especially innovative context. According to the three frameworks, both Denmark and the Czech Republic can be expected to be at least moderately but more often very innovative fields.

Italy is selected as country where cross-sectoral activities can be found. The field of environmental sustainability in Italy has an active third sector. Further, government and market actors are engaged as well. Municipalities offer services like public bike sharing and carpooling, whereas market actors engage in corporate social responsibility activities (CSR).

In Italy, the state aims at the activation of civic engagement. As this does not reveal how strong civic engagement currently is, an estimation in regard to the Social Origins approach is similarly difficult as for all other countries in the field. However, it can be stated that the field

of environmental sustainability in Italy is either medium innovative or very innovative, which is due to the strong third sector in the field. On the country level Italy is, as is Sweden, social-democratic with a small third sector and high civic engagement.

The classification of Italy as a conservative Welfare Regime on the national level does not hold in regard to the qualitative field description. Even though third sector and state engagement indicate high solidarity, the state activity on the market regulates market influence. Thus, a low stratification but a moderate instead of a low decommodification can be detected on the field level. Accordingly, the field can be described as an especially innovative context.

According to the Varieties of Capitalism Italy is a hybrid country. The strong involvement of the state in environmental sustainability in combination with a strong third sector and little market involvement show a similar picture on the field level. State involvement is strong but has the form of market activity and is accompanied by liberal engagement of the third sector. However, it is unclear how (un-)structured this area is. If structures of the field are indeed in turmoil and actors are searching for their role in the field, Italy is to be characterised as a hybrid type. If, on the other hand, specific regulations have been established, the environmental sustainability in Italy is to be described as state-centred. Both descriptions reveal a context unlikely to support social innovations.

Because existing empirical insights do not allow for an estimation in regard to two frameworks, for Italy assumptions on the innovative capacity are difficult to make. As most theories indicate some innovative capacity, a moderate to high innovative capacity is assumed in the field.

The field of environmental sustainability in Germany is a special case, as strong cooperations between state, market, and third sector can be found and are initiated by the state on the national level.

As little information on civic engagement in the field is available, the evaluation as to whether the Social Origins approach applies is again disregarded. On the country level Germany is described as liberal, with low civic engagement and a large third sector. On the field level the third sector is also important, which indicates a higher innovativeness rather than a small third sector.

The cooperative structure of the field implies high solidarity, as responsibility for environmental sustainability is shared and there is a high influence of all sectors. Accordingly, decommodification is moderate, as the influence of the market is restricted by state and third sector involvement. In accordance with the country level the field is again expected to provide an especially innovative context.

In contrast to this estimation, the Varieties of Capitalism indicate little innovative capacity for Germany as a CME country. The initiation of network structures by the state shows that state influence is also strong in the field of environmental sustainability; however, by including actors from the third sector and market a change towards a LME can be detected in the field. Accordingly, the field is better described as LME-like and thus as a very innovative context.

The field of environmental sustainability in Germany is strongly expected to allow for social innovations in regard to most theoretical considerations. For all other countries the

expectations are quite moderate, as a mixed picture of a moderate or strong innovative capacity is given on the field level.

An assessment of the innovative capacity in the field of environmental sustainability for the selected countries shows a very similar picture. This is possible, even though the Social Origins approach cannot be applied because descriptions of civic engagement are missing. In regard to the Welfare Regimes and the Varieties of Capitalism almost all countries can be assumed to be especially innovative. Since they reveal low stratification and moderate decommodification, all countries are characterised as at the boundary between social-democratic and conservative Welfare Regimes. Except for Italy all countries are additionally LME-like and thus supportive contexts for social innovations. Only Italy with a hybrid or CME field is an exception. In contrast to most other fields, this country selection concentrates on the comparison of the different ways social innovations can be implemented in similar context. Since social innovations often depend on specific contexts and sometimes specific individual actors that can be described as charismatic social entrepreneurs, this comparison promises interesting insights into the variations of successful social innovation procedures.

4.2.5. Consumer protection in finance

In the field of consumer protection in finance the state is a central actor across countries and is responsible for the supervision and control in finance. A differentiation between countries has hence been made on the basis of observations as to how the state implements related regulations. It is either the state alone, as in the Netherlands, Spain, and Denmark, or the state in cooperation with the third sector, as in the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, and Sweden. In France and the UK state cooperation with market actors can be detected.

As a field where all actors engage independently from each other is of interest, Spain has been selected as one country from the first group. In the second group the Czech Republic presents an example for longstanding cooperation between the state and the third sector. Lastly, Denmark is selected as counterfactual, as here only state and market actors operate, whereas the third sector does not engage in the field. As the qualitative field description for these countries provides no indication of civic engagement, the Social Origins approach will only be evaluated on the country level, as has already been done for the field of environmental sustainability.

In Spain, consumer protection in finance is a field where the third sector operates in competition with the state and market. Besides the state third sector organisations also offer services for consumers and operate as advocates for consumer interests. Furthermore, they offer financial products that are also offered by actors of the financial market.

In reference to the Social Origins approach, on the country level Spain is described as statist, as it reveals low civic engagement and a small third sector. From this perspective, in the field of consumer protection strong third sector engagement provides a more innovative context.

Spain is classified as a conservative Welfare Regime on the country level with high market influence and high solidarity. The strong involvement of actors (that, however, compete with one another) from all sectors indicates that low stratification holds for the field of consumer protection but that decommodification is moderated; this is why, again, social innovations are very likely.

The same applies to the Varieties of Capitalism approach, in accordance with which Spain is considered LME-like on the country level as well as on the field level, with a state that enacts its supervision function but also a strong third sector and market involvement. All frameworks indicate a strong social innovative capacity for Spain on the field level.

Denmark differs from Spain, as it shows no sign of third sector involvement but state and market actors that offer similar services in competition with each other.

From the perspective of the Social Origins approach Denmark is a social-democratic country, where high civic engagement and a small third sector can be detected. In the field of consumer protection third sector engagement is also low. From this perspective the innovative capacity is either medium, if high civic engagement can be found, or low, if such engagement is not existent.

The characterisation of Denmark as a social-democratic Welfare Regime on the country level with low market influence and high solidarity cannot be upheld. By contrast, the strong state influence indicates high stratification, and decommodification is low, with strong market engagement in the field. In this liberal context innovations are moderate or unlikely to occur.

Lastly, from the perspective of the Varieties of Capitalism state influences in consumer protection detected in Denmark on the country level are like in an LME. Regulation of free market activity by the state can be expected, which is due to strong state involvement on the field level. Nevertheless, the state itself acts in some respect like a market actor by offering his own products of consumer protection. In combination with a lack of third sector activity this indicates a field of LME type in Denmark favouring innovations only moderately. This is concluded from strong competition between state and market actors, which gives little room for the implementation of new ideas. In accordance with the low third sector activity in consumer protection in Denmark, the employed theories indicate little to moderate innovative capacity. Therefore, the empirical assessment of Denmark in the field of consumer protection is of special interest for the ITSSOIN project. Finding many successful social innovations in the field would be counterfactual and would contradict the central ITSSOIN hypothesis. Consequently, the selection of Denmark ensures the theoretical and empirical openness of the ITSSOIN research.

In the Czech Republic, the state and the third sector cooperate in counselling and in providing information on the local level in regard to consumer protection in finance. This has a long history that is based on a strong third sector in this field in the Czech Republic, where the market is perceived as opposing to consumer protection. In addition, as a result of the financial crisis the third sector is even increasing.

From the perspective of the Social Origins approach a strong third sector involvement already indicates some innovative capacity. In strong contrast to the estimation of the Czech Republic on the country level, where it is estimated as statist, social innovations are more likely in this context.

Similarly, little innovative capacity is implied by the characterisation of the Czech Republic as a post-socialist type Welfare Regime on the country level. The understanding of market actors as opponents of the state and the third sector indicates high solidarity but low market influence on the field level. Accordingly, decommodification is high, like on the country level, but

stratification is low. Thus, the field of consumer protection can better be described as social-democratic and a moderately innovative field.

Similarly, from the Varieties of Capitalism approach perspective the impression the field of consumer protection in finance makes in the Czech Republic indicates a hybrid country in a state of transition from a CME dominated by the state to a more open institutional environment open for third sector involvement. This estimation on country level does not accord with the description given, since in the Czech Republic there is a long history of cooperation between the third sector and the state that act in opposition to the market. It is accordingly a CME that gives some room for third sector activity and is hence expected to be moderately innovative. Thus, social innovations are moderately likely in the Czech Republic in accordance with all theoretical frameworks that can be applied. This is surprising, as according to all frameworks the Czech Republic is characterised on country as an especially little innovative context.

By comparing social innovations in Spain and the Czech Republic two cases that are embedded in contexts, which are more innovative on the field level than on the country level can be assessed. Spain is expected to be especially innovative on the field level, whereas in the Czech Republic a moderate innovative capacity on the field level can be regarded as high in relation to the evaluations on the country level. The innovative capacity in Denmark is also moderate, which is interesting, as it is lower than could be expected from descriptions only referring to the country level.

4.2.6. Work integration

The field of work integration is described across all countries as a societal area where cooperation between state, market, and third sector seem to be the norm to provide employment opportunities to those disadvantaged on the labour market. The main differentiation criterion in the assessment of differences between countries is thus not actor participation but actor dominance. The dominant actor is either the state, like in Denmark, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Germany, or the third sector, as in France, the UK, Spain, and Italy. In regard to the third sector a further important development for all EU member states is the introduction of work integration social enterprises (WISEs), as this new type of third sector organisations is supported by the EU. It is introduced as an organisational form that is understood as especially able to successfully implement social innovations in the field. Accordingly, referring ITSSOIN countries to WISEs is of special interest for the empirical investigation of social innovations in the field.

On this basis France is selected as a third sector-dominated field where the establishment of WISEs is emphasised as an innovative change in the field. In Spain changes in the field that is also dominated by third sector organisations, concentrate more on network structures. Comparing Spain and France as relatively similar countries in regard to actor dominance and strong changing processes is hence interesting, as the current developments seem to take different directions. How this influence social innovations will be interesting to assess. The Czech Republic provides interesting comparisons to France, as in this country the implementation of WISEs in a state-centred context is still to be decided. Germany provides a state-centred context that offers funding opportunities for third sector and market actors that are consequently in competition in regard to this funding.

Assessments of the civic engagement are neither given for France and Germany nor for the Czech Republic or Denmark. Accordingly, an evaluation of the Social Origins approach on the field level is only possible to a limited extent, as it is only based on third sector activity. A lack of descriptions of civic engagement can, however, be interpreted as low engagement with some caution, as the qualitative field descriptions reflect on most important developments in the field.

When comparing countries in regard to theoretical frameworks, France and Germany are always allocated to the same type. Drawing on the qualitative field description, it will be interesting to reflect on the question as to whether this also applies on the field level. Overall, the field in France has experienced strong changes, as the whole field structure was judged to be ineffective. Now third sector organisations as WISE networks are important but they cooperate with state institutions. Further, employment agencies engage in the field. In the state-centred German context WISEs are not focused on; they are only one organisational form among a multitude of third sector and market organisations that compete for state funding when offering services of work integration.

Referring to the Social Origins approach, Germany and France are both described as liberal countries with low civic engagement and a large third sector on the country level. This holds at least partly on the field level, as in both countries no reference to civic engagement is made and third sector organisations are responsible for an important part of activity in work integration. In this estimation of an at least moderate and possibly very innovative setting third sector activity is however of more relevance in France than in Germany.

Especially high innovative capacity is ascribed to France and Germany in regards to the Welfare Regimes. On the field level this accords with the moderate market influences through service provision of market actors in Germany and France. In regard to solidarity the offering of integration services by third sector organisations funded by the state indicates low stratification in Germany. Similarly, the strong debate on the necessity of restructuring the field in France illustrates high solidarity. Accordingly, on the field level both countries can be described as in between social-democratic and conservative Welfare Regimes which are expected to be especially innovative, like on country level.

The Varieties of Capitalism approach estimates Germany and France to be CMEs and thus likely to be innovative as long as strong state directedness does not crowd out civic engagement. In Germany, the field of work integration is clearly state-dominated and civic engagement is not referred to. The innovative capacity is moderate, as changes in long democratic processes may occur. In France, state influences seem to disappear, which is in favour of third sector activities. Consequently, the field of work integration seems to be a hybrid market economy. Even though this uncertain context of field structures that are in a state of flux is detected as little innovative, the opposite also might be the case. According to hypothesis H3.5 (cf. section 4.1.3) dynamic changes can also foster social innovations, if uncertainty is small throughout the changing process. That this could be the case for France is indicated by the implementation of WISEs as a new organisational form. The innovative capacity might consequently be higher or lower in France than in Germany, depending on the effect the structural changes have in the field.

The similarities between France and Germany in regard to the institutional structures on country level cannot be entirely transferred to the field of work integration. As there is no clear

estimation in accordance with the Social Origins approach, the perspective of the Welfare Regimes suggests high innovative capacity for both countries. By contrast, the Varieties of Capitalism reflect on the strong structural changes in the field in France, which lead to the expectation of either a small or especially high likelihood of innovations. In Germany, the constant state supervision that in some degree allows for actor participation makes innovations moderately likely.

Spain is similar to France not in regards to institutional structures on country level, but to central actors and structural changes in the field of work integration. But instead of focusing on third sector organisations as means for work integration, networks across all sectors are supported in Spain.

Spain is classified by the Social Origin approach as statist country with small third sector and little civic engagement. As on field level the third sector is said to be central, but information on civic engagement are missing it can at least be stated, that innovations in the field of work integration are more likely than when referring to the country level.

In regard to Welfare Regimes Spain is typified as conservative. Given the description of network structures between sectors, work integration on country level can be described as medium and not lowly decommodified. The high third sector involvement indicates, as on country level, low stratification. Overall this indicates an especially innovative setting for the field of work integration in Spain.

The Varieties of Capitalism indicate a similar high innovative capacity for Spain as LME-like country. This can be confirmed on country level, as state regulations influence the current changes strongly, but leave room for market and third sector engagement. Altogether the field of work integration in Spain can be expected to be an especially innovative context. However, like in France, the opposite can be imagined, when said changes lead to an insecure setting. In this case the field would be better described as hybrid country, where social innovations are unlikely.

The Czech Republic is, in contrast, not estimated as especially innovative on the country level, which accords with the qualitative field description of work integration. From the perspective of the Social Origins approach the Czech Republic has a small third sector and little civic engagement. This characterisation as a not innovative statist country holds on the field level, at least in regard to a small third sector involvement. Civic engagement is not referred to.

Similarly, the Czech Republic is classified as a not innovative post-socialist Welfare Regime, with little market influence and low solidarity. High stratification can also be detected on the field level, when compulsory community work is implemented for beneficiaries of unemployment assistance. The decommodification is moderate, with market actors participating in the field but a pronounced state dominance. The field of work integration is consequently to be classified as somewhere between a post-socialist and liberal context in accordance with Welfare Regimes and can be estimated as moderately to lowly innovative.

Lastly, the Varieties of Capitalism describe the Czech Republic as a hybrid country in a state of transformation from socialist to CME or LME. One indicator for this transition in the field of work integration is the discourse on the implementation of WISEs and other forms of third sector organisations. This procedure is embedded in a state- dominated, i. e. CME-like, field

where market actors operate to some extent (LME-like). Consequently, all theoretical frameworks imply a small innovative capacity in the field of work integration in the Czech Republic.

The estimation for France and Germany is similarly difficult, as the two applied theoretical frameworks lead to different conclusions. While Germany can be described as very innovative or moderately innovative, France is either very innovative or not innovative, depending on the effect the structural changes in the field have. The same effect of structural changes has to be considered in Spain. However the focus on network structures, and thus actor participation from state, market, and third sector, indicates strong innovative capacity. Altogether for the quite similar countries Spain and France in regards to actor dominance and current changes, high innovative capacity is expected for both countries in the field of work integration. For the Czech Republic the consistent proposition of unlikely social innovations can be made.

4.2.7. Community development

Community development is of interest for the ITSSOIN project, with special focus on the integration of refugees. In this regard the Netherlands are of special interest, as this country experiences new refugee movements claiming rights. Further, Italy that is currently facing strong and steady refugee streams from North Africa has to be considered. The Czech Republic is an interesting case, because law regulations are decentralised and coordination between institutions is weak. Another interesting case in this field is the UK as an example of a country that does not focus on specific groups when addressing community development, but that rather trusts in the support of communities as a whole that develop own programmes for the integration of refugees independently from national state programmes.

When embedding the Netherlands in theoretical frameworks, a strong civic engagement of protest movements claiming rights for undocumented people and a dominant third sector in the field can be observed. In contrast to the characterization of the Netherlands on country level the field is consequently not described as liberal, implying low civic engagement, but as corporatist and as such as likely to allow for social innovations.

This high probability of social innovations can also be expected in view of the Welfare Regime of the Netherlands. This applies especially because it is a social-democratic country on the boundary to a conservative regime. High third sector involvement and its support by public funding, high civic engagement as well as the wish of municipalities to support refugees suggest a high level of solidarity. Although these tendencies are opposed by a restrictive immigration policy on the national level, they cannot be refrained. Market actors are, on the other hand, not mentioned as relevant in the field. Consequently decommodification is high. The field of community development can thus be also described as social-democratic and moderately to highly innovative.

Regarding the Varieties of Capitalism the Netherlands are a LME-like country and remain an innovative context from a theoretical perspective. On the field level this impression is reflected by the qualitative description. The strong third sector is central in the field. Even though market actors are not relevant in the field, free participation seems to be possible in this sense and is supported by public funding. On the other hand, the immigration policy is restrictive, even more restrictive than wished by municipalities, and related law regulations do not comply with to international human rights conventions. These last aspects provoke the impression of a

CME, but as strong third sector activity is still possible, the field can be described as LME-like with high likelihood of social innovations. With the Netherlands an overall very innovative country is analysed in the field of community development.

Similarly to the Netherlands, in Italy the third sector is of central importance in the field of community development. Furthermore, strong civic engagement can be detected in the form of families that provide accommodations for refugees in their private homes. In contrast to the Social Origins approach that describes Italy as a social-democratic country with a small third sector, on field level Italy is to be characterised as corporatist and hence presumably innovative.

From the perspective of Welfare Regimes the high civic engagement and additionally the emerging cooperation between third sector organisations and municipalities indicate a high solidarity and consequently low stratification. Further, market actors have no influence, which indicates high decommodification. Instead of a conservative regime, as estimated on the country level, the field of community development is hence described as a social-democratic regime, with medium innovative capacity.

The Varieties of Capitalism approach describes Italy as a hybrid country. Third sector organisations in the field often depend on public funding and municipalities are described as dominant actors on the local level. This implies some government influence in the field, even though the third sector is generally described as central. In Italy, market actors are, as in all other countries, not relevant. The changing influence of the government on the local level in comparison to the national level indicates that this also applies on the field level. Referring to the Varieties of Capitalism approach vague settings imply a small likelihood of social innovations. On the other hand, we assume disruptions and dynamic changes, like the high number of refugees in Italy, to increase the innovative capacity of a field (cf. H3.5, section 4.1.3). In Italy, the cooperation between municipalities and third sector organisations suggests such an increase of innovations resulting from dynamic changes. Accordingly, the community development in Italy is considered as an especially innovative field.

In the Czech Republic, third sector organisations provide services and serve as advocates for asylum seekers. With a state that is described as dominating the field, the impression of a statist field confirms the country perception from the perspective of the Social Origins approach.

The description of the Welfare Regime on the field level has to account for the fact that central state regulations are still missing or have just been implemented in accordance with EU regulations. The coordination between responsible institutions is rather weak. The impression of a post-socialist country that is highly decommodified and stratified also applies to the field level.

The same applies in regard to the Varieties of Capitalism approach according to which post-socialist countries are understood as hybrids that are in a process of transformation. This applies to the field of community development in the Czech Republic, where regulations on immigration are partly implemented but not yet coordinated. A context that is in a state of flux to this high degree is regarded as an obstacle to social innovations, since instability and vagueness imply a high risk of failure. The community development in the Czech Republic is thus not expected to be especially innovative.

In the UK, third sector organisations and civic engagement are supported by the state, which indicates a high innovative capacity. The important role of the third sector and civic engagement in community development accords with the Social Origins approach characterising the UK as a corporatist country.

The characterisation of the UK as a liberal Welfare Regime on the country level with low solidarity and high market influence also applies on the field level. The withdrawal of direct state interventions that shall be replaced by national guidelines implemented by means of cooperation between market, state, and the third sector on the local level indicates low solidarity, as liberal principles are thought to regulate community development. This high stratification is complemented by low decommodification, as participation of market and third sector actors is encouraged, although, according to the field description, market actors rarely make use of this participation. Accordingly, from this perspective the innovative capacity is moderate.

Similar to the Welfare Regimes according to the Varieties of Capitalism the UK is a LME-type country. This accords with the description of the field where state influence is reduced to guidelines and cuts in public funding are observable. Again, this provides a context that allows for moderate social innovation. Altogether, the UK provides a moderate to highly innovative context in regard to community development.

Community development in the Czech Republic is thus a context where innovations are not expected, whereas the UK provides a moderate innovative field conditions for social innovations according to its liberal setting reflected by the theoretical frameworks. The Netherlands are, in contrast, promising a strong innovative capacity in this regard. This can especially be ascribed to a new and strong involvement in the rights of refugees. Similarly, Italy can be expected to show some social innovations resulting from new challenges for the state and third sector in consequence of a high number of refugees. Again, community developments allows for the comparison of countries that show a different probability of social innovations.

5. Conclusion

The country field selection is based on qualitative empirical descriptions of the seven fields in nine countries. The resulting country selection for each field is reflected in accordance with the Social Origins theory, the Welfare Regimes, and the Varieties of Capitalism. The employed theoretical frameworks allow for an overall assessment of the innovative capacity of each selected country field. These considerations reflect the hypotheses H3.1 to H3.5 and accordingly provide a helpful guidance for the empirical work in the field. The empirical work aims at the explanation of the success or failure of innovations in the country fields. The theoretical reflections provided in this deliverable can help to analyse the empirical findings in these the case studies. A final conclusion can, in turn, reflect on the question as to how the insights arising from the case studies in the selected country-field combinations inform insights on the innovative capacity on the country level.

As successful social innovations were of particular interest, when conducting the country selection a strong focus was on countries that promised to be especially innovative. This focus is reflected in the country selection as to the field of environmental sustainability, where the theoretical frameworks suggest a high innovative capacity for almost all selected countries. In this field a comparison of contexts that are relatively similar in regard to their innovative capacity but different as to the empirical setting can be conducted. Further, the analysis of the

fields 'arts & culture' and 'consumer protection in finance' concentrates on countries where social innovations are very or at least moderately likely. As social innovations highly depend on context conditions, these fields are expected to reveal specifics that foster social innovations. In this context, the interplay between country and field level is an interesting issue. The questions as to how an especially innovative capacity on the country level affects innovative processes in a field less likely to foster innovations (and vice versa) can be addressed. This particularly applies to the field of consumer protection, where for Spain and the Czech Republic more innovative potential is detected on the field level than on the country level, whereas in Denmark the country level is a more promising setting for innovations than the field level.

To be able to provide counterfactuals to the hypothesis of high innovative capacity, for the fields of social services, health care, work integration, and community development countries have been selected that provide contexts that are expected to be highly, medium, or lowly innovative. With this country selection we are able to assess country field combinations in four of seven fields, where social innovations are not to be expected, based on the assumption of the ITSSOIN project, that third sector especially fosters social innovations.

However the empirical investigation of social innovations in the selected country field combinations always evaluates the evolution of said social innovations. Hence the empirical role of the third sector, as well as of market and state will be evaluated. The empirical work is thus open to describe the influence of important actors in social innovations processes independent of their sector affiliation. Even though we expect third sector organisations to have a particular strong influence in these processes, the empirical investigation for all cases that draws on this country selection is open to reveal the opposite.

6. Annex

6.1. Guideline for country vignettes

The aim of the country vignettes is to gain an overview on the specifics of our seven fields of activity across all of the ITSSOIN countries. To create such an overview all country partners will have to provide structural data and insights on the subjects and the actors in the fields and significant changes over time. As to the time period we shall consider approx. the last 10 years, but predominantly focus on the current state of the field. From the vignettes we intend to derive insights on the following aspects:

- the **importance of the field** in the respective country (also in respect to other fields of activity);
- its **actor patterns and variety** (the involvement and interplay of commercial, state, and third sector entities);
- some key **regulative characteristics** of the field (especially recent changes in the latter, for instance in legislation);
- the **dynamism of the field** (Are there major reforms? Is it a contested field (both in terms of competition and political or public controversies)? Are there many new entrants or predominantly established players? Etc.).

Sources and procedure

To find this information you are free in the choice of sources you use. Please just make sure that you provide appropriate references for the information you give.

Concerning the structural data (public budgets spent on the field, numbers of organisations, sector provenience of providers/advocates, etc.) you can draw on your sources and inputs for D2.1 (or do this in a field-specific way according to the general pattern we formerly used for country portraits of the third sector as a whole).

In regard of the involved actors and their objectives, first insights can be drawn from the media analysis and the policy framing, or these might at least lead you to further sources. The websites of the responsible ministries for the respective fields can also be a useful source of information. Policy documents often sum up the current central objectives of activities in the field, name the actors involved, and point to their interplay.

The reports of stakeholder meetings or conferences that deal with current issues in the respective fields are further interesting sources. They can provide a good overview of the currently pressing issues in the field, which we are most interested in against the background of some basic description of field characteristics. Starting from this the search for statements and press releases issued by involved actors that respond to the most pressing issues can be helpful in drafting a comprehensive picture of the developments and debates in the field.

Apart from the organisational level (including, less organised forms such as movements or action groups) we will be interested to learn whether there are specifics on civic engagement and its functional equivalents, in case these stand out in what is currently happening in the field (as usual, we would be most interested specifically in volunteering). We are not interested

in separate screening of volunteering in each field; we rather intend to account for it if it is in itself perceived as a key component of the state and enhances the progress of the specific field.

Please make sure that you adequately consider actors from state, market, and third sector.

Please note: The portraits we provide have to be sketchy by reasons of practicality. Please limit the amount of text per country-field combination that comes in addition to the structural data to about 1 page (or around 600-700 words). We do not intend to provide an in-depth account of each such combination but a brief mentioning and outlining of the key pillars the fields rests upon and/or changes in a field that might point it out as an interesting case to examine.

A conference call will be scheduled for January to discuss the consolidated portraits of field-country vignettes and to select about three countries per field, where social innovations shall be investigated in the case work (one country per field has already been pre-defined in the ITSSOIN proposal, namely that of the respective work-packages' (co-)leader).

6.2. Template country vignettes

ITSSOIN country-field combination: YOUR COUNTRY – THE FIELD

[Please take the following pattern for what it is, an approximate guidance to describing key aspects of the field. The tables provide you with a draft structure, nothing more. The number of lines, for instance, is neither indicative of the minimum number of aspects you should discuss nor of the maximum. You might also find it more useful to discuss e.g. actors and their interplay in one single paragraph rather than listing and discussing actors separately. BUT please keep in mind to be brief! ALSO please delete all our commentary notes before submitting the completed vignette to us. Finally, please bear in mind to provide separate files for each country-field combination and thus seven files in total.]

Structural data – as an indicator of the importance (and traits) of the field in the country

[Sources used for inputs on D2.1 might serve as a helpful starting point for giving field specific indication. Not all of the below lines have to be completed if search costs are too high or data are simply unavailable. Please feel free to add a qualifying note if you think there is other indication that highlights the (un)importance of the field.]

	Year 1 (latest data)	Optional: Year 2
Economic shares of the field		
Share of GDP		
Total expenditures		
Share of expenditures of total social expenditures		
Share of overall paid workforce		
Share of volunteers (FTEs)		
Activity in field		
Total number of organisations		
Field shares		
State – market – third sector		
Income structure		
Government funding – fees – donations		
Qualifying comments:		

Key subjects currently shaping the field

Subject 1	[Please give a brief description of the most important subjects currently negotiated or happening in the field and challenges that arise from this or that are already being addressed within the field. 2-3 sentences to frame the main developments, problems, or perspectives per subject.]
Subject 2	
Subject 3	
Subject N	

Key actors – patterns and variety

Actor 1	[Please discuss briefly the actors involved in the above mentioned subjects or those that play a primary role in the field in general. What exactly is their role in the field? What are their interests, responsibilities, standings? Volunteering might (but does not have to [!]) come in here). Indicate whether and how business firms, public agencies, and third sector organisations are (or are not) involved. Can dominance of one of the actors be detected? 2-3 sentences per key actor.]
----------------	---

Actor 2	
Actor 3	
Actor N	

Key regulative characteristics

Regulation 1	[Please describe briefly the main regulative characteristics of the field and especially the changes in regulation that have recently occurred (new legislation, new issues on the political agenda, etc.)? If any statement on this is possible: How rigid are regulative frames in relation to innovation? 2-3 sentences per key regulative pillar.]
Regulation 2	
Regulation 3	
Regulation N	

Dynamism in the field

Change 1	[Please describe briefly any signs of dynamism in the field. Are there major legal or political reforms? Is the field itself contested (both in terms of competition between actors or in terms of discursive political or public controversies? Were new clearly visible ideas implemented in the field? Are there many new entrants or predominantly established players? Etc. 2-3 sentences per dynamic trait.]
Change 2	
Change 3	
Change N	

Summing up

[The last table forces you to boil things down to the most essential/dominant aspects that characterise the field, if at all possible and/or reasonable. This might be something that, based on the above, stands out explicitly, or the very fact that little outstanding developments or constellations are to be found in the field.]

Main subject	[Identify most important subject.]
Most important actor	[Identify most important actor(s).]
Central change in last 10 years	[Identify most important change (innovation?).]

References

[Please provide references for all sources you have used to compile the vignette in APA-format!]

7. Summary Country Vignettes

7.1. WP 4 Arts & Culture

	Main subject	Most important actor	Central Change in last 10 years
Czech Republic	Central theme is the role of the state in terms of funding and control as opposed to the efforts to bring in the neoliberal principles of competition and market are a central theme.	The Ministry of Culture is the most dominant actor, yet the future role of the state is not defined. Local governments provide most of the economic resources. Artists or community associations initiate change.	The central change is the transformation from a post-socialist into a capitalist system. Attempts were made to measure the economic value of the field. The implementation of EU-made principles had a major influence.
Denmark	Main subject is the search for new sources to finance art and culture. There is an increased focus on the business potential for culture and arts from government, seeking to encourage mergers within the field.	Main actor is the state in form of the Ministry of Culture (definition of policies) and the Danish Agency for Culture (implementation). Municipalities provide public funding, supplemented by philanthropic foundations.	There has been an ongoing struggle for funding between different subfields in culture and arts. This involved the use of the arm's length principle in tax-based subsidies and third sector actors.
France	The digital turn impacting both on the music industry and the publishing sector has led to massive losses due to digital downloads and online publishing. The state is counteracting.	The private sector is a major provider of cultural goods. The state too acts as a provider and as legislator. An independent body was set up through the law "HADOPI".	The digital revolution caused severs societal changes and transformations of the cultural industry, including consumer behaviour, legislation and the perception of culture.
Germany	The main subject discussed in the field of arts and culture in Germany is the question of funding. A central topic of debate is the substitution of public funding's with own gains of the field.	No single actor can be named. It is the cooperation between volunteers, public agencies and business firms that keep activities going. The state supports the economisation of the field.	Cuts in public funding lead to a turmoil in art and culture. New forms of financing and cooperation are arising between the state, the market and the third sector. The state is supporting the creative industry.
Italy	A strong development of new organizational forms can be observed. The forms of engagement include coproduction and inclusion, participative governance mechanisms and funding from the public.	Hybrid forms of third sector organizations are spreading. Banking foundations, participative trusts, mixed private and public foundations play a central role. Social movement alliances are seen as especially innovative.	Participative organizational forms have been established for the production and distribution of arts. Tax regulations support investments. Social movements have become a reference for innovative forms of arts and culture.
The Netherlands	The main subject of the field discussed in the Netherlands is the issue of budget cuts. Further, an emphasis on patronage structures can be observed.	The Ministry of Education, Culture & Arts as a state actor is most dominant. Municipalities invest comparatively more funds in the field as opposed to the national state.	The most prominent changes during the last 10 years have been budget cuts as well as tax regulations. Government reforms aimed at supporting investments in arts and culture.
Sweden	The political influence of the third sector increased due to cooperation with the state.	Cooperation of actors between the sectors can be observed punctually, yet the state remains	Cuts in public funding and national tax regulations are not favouring the growth of the

	Actors claim that private donations are difficult because of the complex rules allowing for donations.	the most dominant actor. The third sector acts as the bearer of innovations and workforce.	field. Nevertheless, cooperation between the state and the third sector increased.
UK	The need to legitimize the societal function of arts and culture has been heavily pointed out. A prominent subject of discussion is the function of arts to deliver social welfare outcomes.	Main actors in the field are third sector organisations in cooperation with the state in form of the NHS. Third sector organisations have a strong advocacy function to show the societal impacts of arts and culture.	Due to the pressure to legitimize the societal benefits of arts and culture, the sector is being commercialized and projects are increasingly being used as ways to achieve social welfare.
Spain	In a context of economic crisis the field needs justification. Concerns with accountability and transparency have increased. Alternative ways of funding and delivery of cultural activities are becoming prominent.	Most important actors are third sector organisations, funded by municipalities. This includes cultural, leisure-time and artistic associations, foundations, networks and digital platforms.	The concern for good governance within the third sector has increased. Alternative ways of funding are needed and organizations react to pressures for accountability and transparency by improving their channels of communication and similar measures.

7.2. WP 5 Social Services

	Main subject	Most important actor	Central Change in last 10 years
Czech Republic	Main subject is the transfer of the decision-making powers from national to the regional level as well as quality standards, methodologies and requirements.	Municipalities are the most important actor. They are affecting the flow of subsidies and thus the structure of providers. The market for social services is underdeveloped.	The Social Services Act 108/2006 aimed at introducing plurality of providers. However, public agencies are still in a privileged position. Questions of quality standards, transparency and a demand for structural unity came up.
Denmark	The state is promoting a new welfare mix and strives for better SROI without provoking EU-regulations. This is particularly visible in areas like elderly care and on people getting involved in non-formal temporary voluntary activities.	The state is dominant even against cutbacks in public budgets and willing to cooperate with third sector organisations and foundations.	In face of the currently very dominant position of public organizations in social services, political debate has increasingly called for stronger private and/or third sector involvement over the last 10 years.
France	Main subject of the field of social services in France is the demographic change. Current debates are focusing on the financial implications of these developments.	Both the public and the third sector play a major role in social services. The third sector generally displays a greater variety of organizations, activities and situations encountered.	The State has gradually improved the access to homecare by tax benefits etc. The market size and level of employment in the sector has increased significantly. Thereby the third sector has a leading position.

Germany	Germany's social care and security system is under pressure, mainly due to demographic change. The resulting cost pressures are tackled by the state through cost effectiveness and new forms of social service provision.	The state is the main actor in coordinating the social services. This influence however is relativized by the activating logic which gives more responsibility to private actors and by the plurality of actors.	Demographic change challenges the former system of social security. The debate on how to deal with the implications of these pressures is very diverse.
Italy	Main subject is the underdeveloped character of the social service sector and possible ways to cope with this situation. One trend is the formation of new network forms of organization at different levels.	Important actors are the providers of social services in the local districts. Municipalities play an important regulatory role. Families are still the most important caregiver.	From a fragmented system of cooperation, a new way of working among organizations has arisen. At the local level third sector organizations are playing an increasingly important role.
The Netherlands	Main subject in the Netherlands are budget cuts in public expenditures as well as the demand for societal participation for all.	Third sector organisations play a much bigger role in social services than commercial providers. However, the state remains the most important actor and almost exclusively grants for funding.	Over the past years the most important change has been the broad movement of public officials, professionals and citizens calling for a 'participation society' in the field of social services.
Sweden	State control and its procurement of services from the market and third sector can be named to most prominent subject.	Traditionally, the provision and regulation of social services is carried out by the government, municipalities and regions. In recent years commercial rather than third sector providers have expanded.	Continuing deregulation of social services and welfare has benefited the market and disadvantaged the third sector.
UK	Main subjects in the UK are prevention, integrated care and the activation of the individual through personal budgets.	The field is backed up by a wide range of organisations including those from the third sector, academia and the public sector. Actors of the civil society too have shown major influence in the shaping of the field.	Major change has been the introduction of choice and control of how people could spend the money they were entitled to, resulting in the legal incorporation of personal budgets, personalised assessment and care planning.
Spain	The search for efficiency and cost-contention in social services provision has become a key concern. The trend has been to increasingly rely on private (for-profit and non-profit) delivery of social services.	Social action third sector organisations and participants in social innovation networks and ecosystems, particularly at a regional level (Basque Country), are the main actors to be named.	New (quasi-) market opportunities arose and social enterprises appeared. The third sector is now focusing on the provision of immediate relief to the most vulnerable population groups.

7.3. WP 5 Health

	Main subject	Most important actor	Central Change in last 10 years
Czech Republic	The main subject is the conflict between the desire for economic efficiency of the system and its social and political impacts.	The Ministry of Health, chambers of medical professionals as well as commercial actors are the most important actors in the field.	The past ten years showed a slow and hidden but persistent implementation of the market principles in the area. There has been a transformation of the citizens-patients into the citizens-clients.
Denmark	The regional authorities have centralized health care into 5 so-called “super-hospitals”. This triggered local protests, but only little social innovation is based on civic engagement.	Main actors are the regional authorities and the Ministry of Health as well as, to a lesser degree, local authorities.	The last decade has shown a number of centrally initiated reforms and innovation processes. The third sector is now asked to fill gaps in health services, but little organized social innovation is happening.
France	The public welfare system is being threatened by the new public management logic which is progressively gaining dominance over the traditional “care” logic.	The public sector is the most important health care provider. After ongoing decentralization processes over the past years, Regional Health Agencies (ARS) are steering the entire system.	A gradual paradigm shift prioritized efficiency, led to decentralization and the implementation of a business-like general management. This neoliberal reform has triggered many critics and led to controversial results.
Germany	Main subject are rising costs in health supply and the care sector as the demographic change leads to a rising number of people in need of care.	The statutory health insurances play a major role as financing body. Private service developer act as service providers.	The most important challenges are the demographic change and the altering disease panorama in an aging society.
Italy	The public sector owns a traditional monopoly role in the field while the private sector is increasingly gaining influence.	Regional governments play an important role in regulation and funding. Private providers are gaining influence.	The main dynamic in the field has been a decrease in public health expenditure and an increase in private provision. Consequences are complex regarding governance, quality standards, monitoring etc.
The Netherlands	The biggest issue in the Netherlands is the question how personal responsibility and informal/ voluntary care in the health sector can be combined.	The state constituted by the Ministry of Healthcare, Wellbeing and Sport is the main actor in the field.	The last years have shown a transition from a largely public health system to a system that is now partly a regulated, partly based on private and communal responsibility and partly public.
Sweden	The main topic debated in the field is the one of private for-profit companies in health care. The consequences of a ban are discussed.	As the debate on whether private for-profit companies should enter the field is still on, political parties can be named the main actors.	One central change of the last years has been the increased uncertainty of the future of for-profit welfare services, which continues to be an open question.

UK	The subjects in focus of the field in the UK are the devolution of power to the local level and to patients, the new role of community health initiatives and the topic of integrated care movements.	Major actors are the state health authorities, partnerships and charities that represent people with particular long-term conditions and the Kings Fund.	More serious attempts have been made to achieve integration between health and social care, to focus more on prevention in the community and to personalise services.
Spain	In a context of efficiency objectives, expenditure constraints and diminishing support for citizens, new governance mechanisms and new types of health care-related services respond to social needs.	Main actors are the regional authorities which have vast competences including health care planning, public health services, and management of health-care related services.	The increased presence of the private sector and the trend for public-private partnerships and collaborations in clinical and other health care-related services are the major trend.

7.4. WP 6 Environmental sustainability

	Main subject	Most important actor	Central Change in last 10 years
Czech Republic	In focus are the usage of fossil fuels and biodegradable materials with its impacts on environment, the promoting of biodiversity and efforts to decrease air pollution.	Main actor is the Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic with a State Environmental Fund, along with the umbrella organization association of non-profits called 'Green Circle'.	Along with the entry into the EU and the assigned EU funds, financial resources in the field have increased. This boosted interest of political parties in environmental sustainability.
Denmark	New solutions and systemic methods are necessary in all themes of the field. A wide range of private and public initiatives is working towards sustainability, focusing mainly on jobs and growth.	Various ministries are in charge of setting a political agenda for municipalities, private and public-private groups to implement. Municipalities are acting as front runners and partly cooperate with private businesses	Denmark established an overall strategic framework to integrate climate change into all relevant sectorial policies. Until now however, dialogue between the different players is largely missing.
France	Main focus in the field is put on farming, shifting towards sustainable models of agriculture. The endeavours stem both from the state as well as civic actors.	Local authorities as the owners of property are an essential actor, often acting by public private partnerships. The third sector is dynamic, but its impact is hard to assess.	An important change was the adaptation to European regulations and the shift from conventional to a more sustainable farming. The most innovative change is the sharing economy.
Germany	The main subjects in Germany are the exit of nuclear and fossil fuel energy and the reduction of greenhouse emissions.	Main actor is the state, which is however exerting its influence by creating networks and frame conditions for the civil society, NGOs and associations to work together.	The most central change has been the invention of a 'Green Economy' trying to balance the interests of environmental protection and the economy/wealth.
Italy	In Italy, the most prominent subject is the sharing economy with certain cities exerting a pioneer role for the country.	Municipalities and city-run public utilities are the central actors. New forms of third sector organisations are emerging.	Municipalities have become engaged in new types of action to protect the environment in the field of waste collection and increasing pollution.

The Netherlands	The main subject in the Netherlands is that of the ways and means of adopting the green growth agenda.	The Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs is the main actor in the field.	The past ten years brought greater acceptance of the notion of environmental sustainability in both the public and the private sector.
Sweden	In Sweden the questions of climate change, its consequences, and how to prevent it as well as the topic of sustainable development are the most dominant subjects in the field.	The state is the most important actor in the field. Here, a strong cooperation with the market is necessitated. Punctual instances of self-regulation in the market can be observed.	Both emission allowance and congestion charges have changed. The rules for emission allowance and carbon credit trade has changed and congestion charges were introduced in two large cities.
UK	In the UK, grassroots movements coexist with globalised action plans. Attention is drawn towards the possible ways to connect these fields of action.	In order to connect the different levels of action, networks of third sector and community groups are the most prominent actors in the field.	The past ten years brought a wide range of innovations, new policies and regulations to address climate change.
Spain	The main focus for the third sector has been on environmental education, particularly at a childhood and youth level. Another field of action is advocacy.	A relatively small but stable number of environmental foundations, most notably dedicated to environmental education and advocacy, are the main actors.	Public policies and educational initiatives have resulted in significant long-term advances at a social level. Environmental sustainability has become a socially accepted area of public interest both for civilians and corporate actors.

7.5. WP 6 Consumer protection in finance

	Main subject	Most important actor	Central Change in last 10 years
Czech Republic	In the Czech Republic the main subject is the ways of supporting the financial education as well as the means of raising the awareness of consumers.	Two state ministries – the Ministry of Industry and Trade and the Ministry of Finance – are the main actors.	Main changes are related to the period after the accession of the Czech Republic to the EU which brought the reception of EU legislation into domestic legal norms.
Denmark	There is little going on in the field, with consumer protection in public services being the only exception. Almost no activities are found in the area of financial services.	At government level consumer issues are subject to regulation by a number of public agencies. Also, a few membership-based NGOs act as advocates for consumer interests, however not focusing on financial services.	In the aftermath of the financial crisis, criticism of the financial sector has been voiced. Nevertheless, little organized protest and no self-organized co-production have taken place in Denmark.
France	Consumer protection in finance in France is concerned with transparency, security and freedom, but with more control on individuals and households. The field is still ascending.	Most important actor is the state, acting through institutions which are in charge of implementing French and European regulations on consumer protection.	The most severe change is the hindering of innovations such as crowdfunding or alternative currencies on behalf of consumers protection.

Germany	Main subject in Germany is the question of how to guarantee the transparency on the financial market for costumers.	The market constitutes the most important actor. State and associations for customer services are struggling to implement regulations for customer protection.	The financial crisis destroyed the trust in the financial market and lead to broad and general critique against the capital system.
Italy	The introduction of different forms of class action when consumers' rights are violated is the major subject in the field.	Individuals or consumer associations are taking on a more and more important role especially in advocating consumers' rights.	Since the introduction of collective support structures in the case of individual damage, the costs are cut down and individuals are strengthened against big business.
The Netherlands	The main subject in the field is the debate on the consequences that have to be drawn from the financial crisis.	Main actor is the Netherlands Authority on Consumers and Markets. The state and the third sector both offer services and provide an advocacy function, but they do not cooperate. Engagement by market actors is rising.	Over the past 10 years and especially in the aftermath of the financial crisis, new authorities and web platforms that facilitate consumer protection have been set up.
Sweden	In Sweden, the questions of financial security, consumer education, advice structures and mortgages are the most prominent ones.	State actors such as the Swedish Consumer Agency and Finansinspektionen, along with important voice-carrying third sector organizations, are shaping the field.	The biggest changes are the increased availability of consumer information due to the expansion of internet-based services, the changes in general communication and the emergence of social platforms.
UK	In the UK, the focus lies on new products and developments in response to more complex and bigger markets and the importance of digital technologies.	The third sector is most prominent. One of the main representatives in this regard in the field of consumer protection is the Citizens Advice Bureau.	Last changes have been the development of new products and changes in response to more complex and bigger markets including digital technologies.
Spain	Spain is displaying a generalized social distrust towards banks in view of a series of irresponsible behaviour and a broad perception of opacity and moral hazard.	Newly emerging social economy entities and solidarity networks provide alternative financial services to citizens. Third sector organizations and civic platforms hold a strong advocacy position.	The social action of savings banks and their foundations was traditionally very relevant to the third sector. The last years brought big cutbacks. Foundations now experience dramatic reductions of their budgets.

7.6. WP 7 Work integration

	Main subject	Most important actor	Central Change in last 10 years
Czech Republic	Most important subject is the shape and tools of government employment policy, regarding active vs. passive strategies, and its costs and results.	The Government and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs are the main actors in the field of work integration.	There has been a discursive and political shift from state strategies of compensating unemployment towards emphasising active strategies of fighting with unemployment.

Denmark	Cut backs on social benefits pressure the unemployed to become integrated on the labor market. The process is being enhanced by incentives which are subject to innovation.	The National Board of Social Services is the main actor. Municipalities are taking operational action in the field. Public agencies and private foundations invest in social innovation.	There were no major reforms. Nevertheless, public and political attention to social-economic enterprises increased. An official registration system for such businesses is currently under discussion.
France	The main subject is the lack of efficiency of organizational structures in the field. They are said to be too complex and inflexible. Employment rates of people who left the program are too low.	The third sector dominates the field. The networks of actors are diverse. WISEs vary concerning dynamic, influence and innovative power.	Assignments of public benefits changed and led to cost pressures. This is dealt with by higher efficiency and/or a search for other sources of revenue i.e. a turn to the market.
Germany	The field in Germany is mainly concerned with the recruitment of disadvantaged persons and their integration on the job market.	Main actor is the state as represented by the German Federal Labour Market Authority.	Demographic change led and is leading to a rising pressure on the job market through the declining number of workforce.
Italy	Work integration of disadvantaged individuals is the main subject. The emergence of WISEs is seen as the most important social innovation.	The Ministry of Labour and Social policies plays an important role. Further, on the local level there are agencies for work integration and 'type B' social cooperatives.	The most important innovation of the past 10 years has been the emergence of social enterprises. The field continues to experience big changes due to the Job Act etc.
The Netherlands	Main subject in the Netherlands is the debate on compulsory community service for those receiving long-term income supports.	The Executive institute employee insurance for unemployment insurance and labor impairments, and municipalities for other forms of income support are the main actors.	The past 10 years mainly brought a harmonization of previous regulations. This also involved processes of decentralization.
Sweden	Sweden is mainly discussing the new government's policies on employment for those people who are most disadvantaged. Another subject is emergence of compulsory work integration projects.	In Sweden it is stated that Work Integration Social Enterprises make up a relatively small part of work integration. The most dominant actor is the Swedish employment service AF.	The previous administration implemented an employment program that was heavily criticized. Currently the discontinuation of the final phase of this program is being discussed.
UK	The field in the UK is mainly focusing on personalised support schemes to help people back into employment.	The third sector is the most dominant actor in the field. Cooperations between state and market are observable. For example, private market actors offer services that are financed by public funding.	The law extension of flexible working hours to all employees has been a significant change in the UK working culture.
Spain	High unemployment rates are particularly striking the young and the socially excluded. Main subject is the reintegration of these vulnerable groups.	Third sector organisations and social economy entities in the form of cooperatives are the main actors. Collaboration with public administrations and firms is taking place.	New actors and governance schemes have emerged. Self-employment, entrepreneurship and various social economic partnerships are being promoted.

7.7. WP 7 Community development

	Main subject	Most important actor	Central Change in last 10 years
Czech Republic	Efforts focus on homeless people and immigrants. Concerning the former, main issue is the lack and coordination of social services. The latter are in need of social integration.	Two state ministries are involved in the field, being the Ministry of Work and Social Affairs for the homeless and the Ministry of Interior for the refugees.	A national policy was formulated to prevent and eradicate homelessness, and the law on asylum and refugees was unified with EU norms.
Denmark	Denmark displays a defensive attitude toward refugees. Work opportunities and social integration of disadvantaged people are subject to debate.	In general, the state is the most important actor in the field. Opinion leaders are political actors and parties. Another player is the Ministry of Social Affairs and Integration.	The topic of refugees was discussed several times, but no action plans were executed or made. The tone of political debate is harsh and inconsequential to action.
France	The field is not widely being discussed. If at all, instead of 'community' the talk refers to 'local development'. Respective programmes were established after the riots in the suburbs of big cities in 2005. There is no reliable structural data available.	National governments concentrate on national guidelines and give responsibilities to the local authorities to support civic engagement. Third sector activity mainly takes on the form of advocacy.	Some policies were implemented that strengthen the responsibilities of municipalities and local actors from third sector and market. References to refugees were not reported on in this context.
Germany	The German focus in the field lies on civic engagement and participation movements. Topics include urban planning or questions that result from demographic change.	Main actor is the state, implementing policies that aim at more engagement and strengthen municipalities and third sector actors.	Engagement and participation have become identified as important and positive influences to grant for innovative and sustainable solutions for societal problems.
Italy	Major issues are the international protection of refugees and the support for homeless people. In both cases third sector organizations and civil society are working together in networks.	Different actors are present in the different spheres of the field. Mainly they are the Ministry of Interior and the National Protection System, municipalities, local communities, third sector organizations and even families.	Cooperation structures have been reinforced. Examples are the national network of local governments or the 'Freezing plan' involving municipalities, third sector organisations and the community.
The Netherlands	The main subject in the Netherlands is the issue of granting rights and access to services for people without documents.	The main activity is being exerted by community support initiatives around squatted shelters.	A major change has been and continues to be the 'coming-out' of undocumented people for purposes of advocacy and activism, rather than remaining underground.
Sweden	The interplay and/ or cooperation between the state and the third sector is the main subject in Sweden. Public procurement of services from the market has increased significantly, especially with regard to housing.	Because of the direct and indirect support and services the state provides it is the biggest actor. Additionally, its cooperation with the third sector plays an important role.	Major changes have come with the influx of immigrants due to the Syrian crisis. It mainly affected the issue of housing and related policies.

UK	Social impact bonds are seen as a promising financial vehicle for innovation at the community level. Thereby the focus lies on the health field and the infrastructure for citizen activities.	Third sector organisations participated in the development of social impact bonds and are involved in their implementation. Partnerships of different sectors can be observed as well.	The recent Localism Act shifted power to local communities. Community assets are increasingly being used to replace public services and the field is going through a process of professionalization.
Spain	Social and technological innovations are seen as powerful tools in dealing with social inclusion. Main focuses are people affected from school drop-out, the digital gap, and unemployment.	Main actors are third sector organisations and social movements with public national and EU funding. Recently they are expanding to include corporate actors.	Initiatives from the third sector and social movements promoted and facilitated access to ICTs, civic engagement and political participation. The focus of related policies recently shifted toward social and technological innovation.

8. Overview Theoretical consideration – country field selection

8.1. Country field selection in reflection of the Social Origins approach

Name of theoretical type	Level of Social Innovation	Country	Field						
			Arts & culture	Social services	Health	Environmental sustainability	Consumer protection	Work integration	Community development
Statist	Small	Czech Republic			X	X	X	X	X
		Spain	X	X			X	X	
Liberal	Medium/ CE low, 3 rd S large	Netherlands	X						X
		Germany				X		X	
		France			X			X	
Social-democratic	Medium/ CE high, 3 rd S small	Denmark			X	X	X		
		Italy	X	X		X			X
		Sweden		X					
Corporatist	High	United Kingdom		X	X				X

Peculiarities in fields and countries clustered by the level of social innovation, the level of civic engagement (CE) and the scale of the third sector (3rdS)

8.2. Country field selection in reflection of the Welfare Regimes

Regime	Social innovation potential	Country	Field							
			Arts & culture	Social services	Health	Environmental sustainability	Consumer protection	Work integration	Community development	
Post-socialist; decom. high, strat. high	Low	Czech Republic			X	X	X	X	X	
Social-democratic; decom. high, strat. low	Medium	Sweden		X						
Conservative; decom. low, strat. low	Medium	Italy	X	X		X			X	
		France			X			X		
		(Spain)	X	X			X	X		
Liberal; decom. low, strat. high	Medium	United Kingdom		X	X				X	
Between	High	Netherlands (SD)	X							X
		Denmark (SD)			X	X	X			
		Germany (C)				X		X		

Peculiarities in fields and countries clustered by type of regime, level of decommodification (decom.) and level of stratification (strat.)

8.3. Country field selection in reflection of the Varieties of Capitalism

Variety of Capitalism	Country	Field						
		Arts & culture	Social services	Health	Environmental sustainability	Consumer protection	Work integration	Community development
Hybrids	Italy	X	X		X			X
	Czech Republic			X	X	X	X	X
CME	Germany				X		X	
	France	X		X			X	
LME	Denmark			X	X	X		
	United Kingdom		X	X				X
LME-like	Spain	X	X			X	X	
	Netherlands	X						X
	Sweden		X					

Peculiarities in fields and countries clustered by Variety of Capitalism

9. References

- AA.VV. (2014). *Primo Rapporto sulla Protezione internazionale in Italia*. Retrieved from http://www.caritasitaliana.it/pls/caritasitaliana/v3_s2ew_consultazione.mostra_pagina?id_pagina=5396
- accenture.com. (2015). *Juntos por el Empleo de los más vulnerables*. Retrieved from <http://www.accenture.com/es-es/outlook/Pages/outlook-journal-2013-together-for-the-most-vulnerable-employment.aspx/>
- ADICAE. (2014). *Situación de los colectivos de consumidores especialmente vulnerables: Asociación de Usuarios de Bancos Cajas y Seguros*. Zaragoza.
- Aghová, I. (2011). *Zaměstnanost: Politika zaměstnanosti, vývoj a jak nyní*. Retrieved from <http://irenamauranovotna.blog.idnes.cz/c/233417/Zamestnanost-Politika-zamestnanosti-vyvoj-a-jak-nyni.html>
- Allodocteurs.fr. (2010). *Quel est le rôle des associations de patients ?* Retrieved from <http://www.allodocteurs.fr/actualite-sante-quel-est-le-role-des-associations-de-patients--1703.asp?1=1>
- Amelung, V., Hildebrand, H., & Wolf, S. (2012). Integrated care in Germany: A stony but necessary road. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, (12).
- Amnesty International Nederland. (2013). *Vreemdelingendetentie in Nederland: mensenrechten als maatstaf*. Amsterdam.
- ANAP. (2015). *Piloter la performance dans le secteur médico-social: Agence nationale d'appui à la performance des établissements de santé et médicaux sociaux*.
- Anheier, H. K. (2005). *Nonprofit Organisations: Theory, management, policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Anheier, H. K. (2010). Social Origins Theory. In H. K. Anheier & S. Toepler (Eds.), *International Encyclopaedia of Civil Society* (pp. 1445–1452). New York: Springer.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., & Mildemberger, G. (2014a). *ITSSOIN Hypotheses*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., Mildemberger, G., Bekkers, R., Mensink, W. (2014b). *Social Innovation as Impact of the Third Sector*. A deliverable of the project: "Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation" (ITSSOIN), European Commission - 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., Mildemberger, G., & Einarsson, T. (2014c). *Theory and Empirical Capturing of the Third Sector at the Macro Level*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., Mildemberger, G., Einarsson, T., & Flening, E. (2015). *Social Innovation in Policy: EU and Country Level Profiles and Policy Perspectives*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission - 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.

- Arts, W., & Gelissen, J. (2002). Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism or more?: A State-of-the-Art Report. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12(2), 137–158.
- AUSBANC Consumo. (2015). *Website AUSBANC Consumo: Asociación de Usuarios de Servicios Bancarios*. Retrieved from <http://www.ausbanc.es/>
- Bäcker, G., Naegele, G., Bispnick, R., Hofemann, K., & Neubauer, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Sozialpolitik und soziale Lage in Deutschland: Grundlagen Arbeit Einkommen und Finanzierung*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- BaFin. (2012). Zehn Jahre BaFin: Von der Blitzgeburt zur Reife. *BaFin Journal*, (5), 4–12.
- Baum-Ceisig, A., Busch, K., Hacker, B., & Nospickel, C. (2008). *Wohlfahrtsstaaten in Mittel- und Osteuropa: Entwicklungen, Reformen und Perspektiven im Kontext der europäischen Integration*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Benvenuti, M. (2011). *La protezione internazionale degli stranieri in Italia: Uno studio integrato sull'applicazione dei decreti di recepimento delle direttive europee sull'accoglienza, sulle qualifiche e sulle procedure*. Napoli: Jovene.
- Bibisidis, T. & Fuchs, P. (2012). *Brücken bauen: Gemeinschaft zusammen gestalten*. Bericht über einen Fach- und Bürgerkongress im Rahmen des Europäischen Jahres der Freiwilligentätigkeit 2011. Retrieved from www.deutscher-verein.de
- Bodo, C., Spada, C., & Da Milano, C. (2004). *Rapporto sull'economia della cultura in Italia: 1990-2000*. Bologna: Il mulino.
- Boje, T. B. & Ibsen, B. (2006). *Frivillighed og nonprofit i Danmark: Omfang, Organisation, Økonomi og Beskaeftigelse*. Kopenhagen.
- Borzaga, C., & Paini, F. (2011). *Buon lavoro: Le cooperative sociali in Italia*. Storia, valori ed esperienze di imprese a misura di persona. Milano: Altreconomia.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). *Sozialer Raum und Klassen: Leçon sur la Leçon*. Zwei Vorlesungen. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Die verborgenen Mechanismen der Macht*. Hamburg: VSA.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Das politische Feld: Zur Kritik der politischen Vernunft*. Konstanz: UVK.
- Brink Lund, A. & Lilleor, A. (2015). *Media Framing of Third Sector Activities in Europe: A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission - 7th Framework Programme*. Brussels.
- Care Act 2014, British Government 2014.
- Bryndová, L., Pavloková, K., Roubal, T., Rokosová, M., Gaskins, M., & van Ginneken, E. (2009). Czech Republic: Health system review. *Health Systems in Transition*, 11(1), 1–122.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit. (2013). *Aufbau und Organisation*. Retrieved from <http://www.arbeitsagentur.de/web/content/DE/service/Ueberuns/AufbauundOrganisation/index.htm>
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit. (2014). *Unternehmensbroschüre: Der Weg zur Arbeit*. Die Bundesagentur für Arbeit stellt sich vor. Donauwörth. Retrieved from http://www.arbeitsagentur.de/web/wcm/idc/groups/public/documents/webdatei/mdaw/mjmmz/~edisp/16019022dstbai665890.pdf?_ba.sid=L6019022DSTBAI665893

- Bundesbank. (2015). *Aufgaben und Organisation der Bundesbank*. Retrieved from http://www.bundesbank.de/Redaktion/DE/Standardartikel/Bundesbank/Aufgaben_und_Organisation/aufgaben_der_deutschen_bundesbank.html
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales. (2011). *Übereinkommen der Vereinten Nationen über Rechte von Menschen mit Behinderungen: Erster Staatenbericht der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Retrieved from http://www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/staatenbericht-2011.pdf;jsessionid=F4E5FEF3D1AFB5F3C3746745E8BC13A7?__blob=publicationFile
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales. (2014a). *Maßnahme zur Aktivierung und beruflichen Eingliederung*. Retrieved from <http://www.bmas.de/DE/Themen/Arbeitsmarkt/Arbeitsvermittlung/massnahmen-zur-aktivierung-und-beruflichen-eingliederung.html>
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales. (2014b). *Was ist Soziale Sicherung?* Retrieved from <http://www.bmas.de/DE/Themen/Soziale-Sicherung/erklaerung-soziale-sicherung.html>
- Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit. (2012). *Bundesumweltministerium fördert innovative Klimaschutzprojekte*. Berlin. Retrieved from www.bmub.bund.de/N48467/
- Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie. (2014). *Initiative Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft der Bundesregierung*. Retrieved from <http://www.kultur-kreativwirtschaft.de/KuK/Redaktion/PDF/kreativ-kulturwirtschaft-initiative-der-bundesregierung,property=pdf,bereich=kuk,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>
- Burlando, C., & Mastretta, M. (2007). *Il car sharing: Un'analisi economica e organizzativa del settore*. Milano: Angeli.
- Campanini, G., & Negri, M. (2011). *Banche e musei oltre la sponsorizzazione: Una panoramica sui musei europei creati da fondazioni bancarie*. Bologna: Bononia University Press.
- Censis. (2013). *Aspetti del consumerismo in Italia: Centro Studi Investimenti Sociali*. Roma.
- CEPES. (2015). *Website CEPES: Confederación Empresarial Española de Economía Social*. Retrieved from <http://www.cepes.es/>
- Cergas Bocconi. (2014). *Rapporto OASI: La sanità che vogliamo*. Milan.
- CERMI. (2015). *Website CERMI: Comité Español de Representantes de Personas con Discapacidad*. Retrieved from <http://www.cermi.es/>
- CES. (2012). *Desarrollo autonómico, competitividad y cohesión social: Medio ambiente*. Consejo Económico y Social (Colección Informes). Madrid.
- Česká televize. (2013). *Místo veřejné služby veřejná práce: nezaměstnaní změnu vítají*. Retrieved from <http://www.ceskatelevize.cz/zpravodajstvi-brno/zpravy/246690-misto-verejne-sluzby-verejna-prace-nezamestnani-zmenu-vitaji/>
- Consumers' Forum. (2009). *Le nuove sfide per la tutela dei consumatori*. Roma: Simmaco.
- Damon, J. (2008). *Grenelle de l'insertion: Haut-commissaire aux solidarités actives contre la pauvreté*.

- Danish Government. (2015). *Aftale om finanslov 2015: Et stærkere fællesskab, et tryggere arbejdsmarked og mere sundhed*. Retrieved from <http://www.fm.dk/nyheder/pressemeddelelser/2014/11/aftale-om-finanslov-2015/>
- Davister, C., Defourny, J., & Gregoire, O. (2004). *Work integration social enterprises in the European Union: An overview of existing models* (working paper).
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2008). Social enterprise in Europe: Recent trends and developments. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 4(3), 202–228.
- Département des études de la prospective et des statistiques. (2014). Chiffres clés statistiques de la Culture 2014. *Chiffres clés statistiques de la culture*, (1), 9–67.
- Department for Communities and Local Government. (2011). *A plain English guide to the Localism Act*. London.
- Department for Education & Department for Culture Media & Sport. (2013). *Cultural Education: A summary of programmes and opportunities*. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/226569/Cultural-Education.pdf
- Department of Health. (2012). *Caring for our future: Reforming care and support*. London.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Du Ministère Travail, d. L. e. D. S. (2014). *Réforme de l'insertion par l'Activité Économique: Retours sur les journées d'information et d'échanges*. Retrieved from <https://www.emploi.gouv.fr/files/files/REFORME-IAE-Synthesedessyntheses.pdf>
- EAPN. (2015). *Website EAPN: Europa de Lucha contra la Pobreza y la Exclusión Social en el Estado Español*. Retrieved from <http://www.eapn.es/>
- Economía Solidaria. (2015). *Website Economía Solidaria*. Retrieved from <http://www.economiasolidaria.org/>
- Edis. (2012). *Anuario del Tercer Sector de Acción Social en España 2012: Fundación Luis Vives*. Madrid.
- Eme, B., & Gardin, L. (2002). Les entreprises sociales d'insertion par le travail en France. *Working Papers Series*, 2(1).
- ENEA Agency Italy. (2000). *Rapporto Energia e ambiente: Analisi e scenari*. Ente per le nuove tecnologie, l'energia e l'ambiente. Roma.
- Enste, D. H., Neumann, M., & Schare, T. (2012). *Erster Engagementbericht 2012: Für eine Kultur der Mitverantwortung*. Engagementmonitor 2012. Berlin. Retrieved from www.bmfsfj.de
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism* ([Pbk. ed.]). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Evers, A., Heinze, R. G., & Olk, T. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbuch Soziale Dienste*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- FACUA Consumidores en Acción. (2015). *Website FACUA*. Retrieved from <http://www.facua.org/english/>

- FEACEM. (2015). *Website FEACEM: Federación Empresarial Española de Asociaciones de Centros Especiales de Empleo*. Retrieved from <http://www.feacem.es/>
- Feldmann, M. (2007). The Origins of Varieties of Capitalism: Lessons from Post-Socialist Transition in Estonia and Slovenia. In B. Hancké, M. Rhodes, & M. Thatcher (Eds.), *Beyond Varieties of Capitalism. Conflict, Contradiction, and Complementarities in the European Economy* (pp. 328–350). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fiala, Z. (2014). *Sociální podnikání dostane nový zákon: Parlamentní list*.
- Fillion, S., Danon, M., Pelosse, H., & Claudon, V. (2013). *Le financement de l'insertion par l'activité économique: Inspection Générale des Finances (IGF)*.
- Fligstein, N. (2001). Institutional Entrepreneurship and Cultural Frames: The case of the European Union's Single Market Program. *European Societies*, 3(3), 261–287.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2011). Toward a General Theory of Strategic Action Fields. *Sociological Theory*, 29(1), 1–26.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012). *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Foro Cultura y Buenas Prácticas. (2015). *Website Foro Cultura y Buenas Prácticas*. Retrieved from <http://www.culturaybuenaspracticass.org/>
- Forum. (2013). *What role should the third sector have in Swedish welfare?* Retrieved from <http://www.socialforum.se/?article=vilken-roll-ska-civilsamhallet-ha-i-den-svenska-valfarden>
- Fosti G., & Notarnicola E. (2014). *Il Welfare e la Long-term in Europa*. Milan: Milano: EGEA.
- Fosti, G. (2014). *Rilanciare il welfare locale: Ipotesi e strumenti*. una prospettiva di management. Milano: EGEA.
- Fridberg, T., & Skov Henriksen, L. (2014). *Udviklingen i frivilligt arbejde 2004-2012*. København: SFI - Det Nationale Forskningscenter for Velfærd.
- Garnier, L. (2008). *Man and nature: Making the relationship last* (Technical Notes No. 3). Paris. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001584/158417e.pdf>
- Giardini, F., Mattei, U., & Sprengelburd, R. (2012). *Teatro Valle occupato: La rivolta culturale dei beni comuni*. Roma: DeriveApprodi.
- Gilmore, A. (2014). *Raising our quality of life: The importance of investment in arts and culture*. Retrieved from http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2014_Policy_Paper_-_investment_in_the_arts_-_Abi_Gilmore.pdf
- Glendinning, C., Challis, D., Fernandez J., Jacobs, S., Jones, K., Knapp, M., ... *Evaluation of the Individual Budgets Pilot Programme: Final Report*. York: University of York, Social Policy Research Unit.
- Gouvernement français. (1990). *Décret n°90-66 du 17 janvier 1990 modifié relatif à la diffusion des œuvres cinématographiques et audiovisuelles: Pub. L. No. Décret n° 90-66*.
- Gouvernement français. (1991). *Loi n° 91-1 du 3 janvier 1991 tendant au développement de l'emploi par la formation dans les entreprises, l'aide à l'insertion sociale et professionnelle et l'aménagement du temps de travail, pour l'application du troisième plan pour l'emploi: Pub. L. No. 91-1*.

- Gouvernement français. (2006). *Loi n° 2006-396 du 31 mars 2006 pour l'égalité des chances (1): Pub. L. No. loi n° 2006-396.*
- Gouvernement français. (2009). *Loi Création et Internet dites HADOPI: Pub. L. No. Loi n°2009-669.*
- Graf Strachwitz, R. (2010). German Civil Society in the Realm of Culture. In A. Evers & A. Zimmer (Eds.), *Third Sector Organisations facing turbulent environments. Sports, Culture and Social Services in five European countries* (pp. 41–53). Berlin: Nomos.
- Grasseni, C. (2013). *Beyond Alternative Food Networks: Italy's Solidarity Purchase Groups.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Gretsch, S. (2011). *Soziale Arbeit im Zeitalter des G-DRG Systems: Auswirkungen auf den Sozialdienst der somatischen Kliniken in Akutkrankenhäusern.* Hamburg: Diplomica Verlag GmbH.
- Grossi, R., Napolitano, G., Delrio, G., & Giovannini, E. (2013). *Una strategia per la cultura, una strategia per il paese: IX rapporto annuale Federculture 2013.* Milano: 24 ore Cultura.
- Gustavsson, M. (2012). *Privata välgörare i den svenska staten: Civilsamhället samhällskontraktet.* Stockholm: European Civil Society Press.
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. W. (Eds.). (2001). *Varieties of Capitalism.: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/46969900>
- Hjorth-Andersen, C. (2013). *Hvad koster kulturen?* København: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets forlag.
- Hodgkinson, V. (2003). Volunteering in Global Perspective. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Eds.), *Nonprofit and civil society studies. The values of volunteering. Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 35–53). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- House of Commons Health Committee. (2007). *Patient and public involvement in the NHS: Third Report of Session 2006-07.* London.
- Hutchinson, D. (2014). *Education secretary Nicky Morgan: 'Arts subjects limit career choices'.* Retrieved from <http://www.thestage.co.uk/news/2014/11/education-secretary-nicky-morgan-arts-subjects-limit-career-choices/>
- INSEE. (2012). *Insee - Santé - Dépenses totale de santé dans les pays de l'OCDE en 2012: Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques.* Retrieved from http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/tableau.asp?reg_id=98&ref_id=CMPTEF06312
- ISPRA. (2014). *Qualità dell'ambiente urbano: Rapporto 2014.* Istituto Superiore per la Protezione a la Ricerca Ambientale. Roma.
- Johansson, O. (2011). *Tjäna eller tjäna? – om vård eller vinst. Privatisering av vård, omsorg, skola – vilka tar över?: Idéburen vård och social omsorg.* Stockholm: FAMNA.
- King, L. P. (2007). Central European Capitalism in Comparative Perspective. In B. Hancké, M. Rhodes, & M. Thatcher (Eds.), *Beyond Varieties of Capitalism. Conflict, Contradiction, and Complementarities in the European Economy* (pp. 307–327). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kinkorová, J., & Topolčan, O. (2012). Overview of healthcare system in the Czech Republic. *The EPMA Journal*, 3(4), 1–8.
- Konsumentverket. (2014). *Hallå Konsument: Ny upplysningstjänst för konsumentfrågor*. Retrieved from <http://www.konsumentverket.se/Om-oss/Uppdrag-och-mal/Halla-konsument--ny-upplysningstjanst-for-konsumentfragor/>
- Krimmer, H. & Priemer, J. (2013). *ZiviZ Survey 2012: Zivilgesellschaft verstehen*. Zivilgesellschaft in Zahlen. Berlin.
- La direction générale de la cohésion sociale. (2013). *Rapport d'activité*.
- Lamping, W., Schridde, H., Plaß, S., & Blanke, B. (2002). *Der Aktivierende Staat: Positionen, Begriffe, Strategien*. Studie für den Arbeitskreis Bürgergesellschaft und Aktivierender Staat der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Löschel, A., Erdmann, G., Staiß, F., & Ziesing, H.-J. (2014). *Expertenkommission zum Monitoring-Prozess "Energie der Zukunft": Stellungnahme zum zweiten zweiten Monitoring-Bericht der Bundesregierung für das Berichtsjahr 2012*. Berlin, Mannheim, Stuttgart. Retrieved from <http://www.bmwi.de/BMWi/Redaktion/PDF/M-O/monitoringbericht-energie-der-zukunft-stellungnahme,property=pdf,bereich=bmwi2012,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>
- Mensink, W., Klerk, M. d., Boer, A. de, Feijten, P., & Vonk, F. (2014). Informele ondersteuning. In M. Kromhout, P. Feijten, F. Vonk, M. d. Klerk, A. M. Marangos, W. Mensink, ... (Eds.), *Wmo in beweging. Evaluatie Wet maatschappelijke ondersteuning 2010-2013* (pp. 133–152). Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Mikeszová, M., & Lux, M. Faktory úspěšné reintegrace bezdomovců a nástroje bytové politiky pro řešení bezdomovství v ČR. *Czech Sociological Review*, 49(1), 29–52.
- Ministère de l'écologie de développement durable transports et logement. (2009). *Le grenelle environnement: Memento à l'usage des maires*.
- Ministère de ville de jeunesse et sports. *Website Ministère de la ville, de la jeunesse et des sports*. Retrieved from <http://www.ville.gouv.fr/?ses-domaines-d-intervention>
- Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. (2013a). *Estrategia Española de Ciencia y Tecnología y de Innovación 2013-2020*. Retrieved from http://www.idi.mineco.gob.es/stfls/MICINN/Investigacion/FICHEROS/Estrategia_espanola_ciencia_tecnologia_Innovacion.pdf
- Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. (2013b). *Plan Estatal de Investigación Científica y Técnica y de Innovación 2013-2016*. Retrieved from http://www.idi.mineco.gob.es/stfls/MICINN/Investigacion/FICHEROS/Plan_Estatal_Inves_cientifica_tecnica_innovacion.pdf
- Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad. (2013). *Plan Nacional de Acción para la Inclusión Social del Reino de España 2013-2016*. Retrieved from http://www.msssi.gob.es/ssi/familiasInfancia/inclusionSocial/docs/PlanNacionalAccionInclusionSocial_2013_2016.pdf
- Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad. (2014). *La Promoción de la Inclusión Social a través de los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión de la UE (Período 2014-2020): Guía de orientaciones y recomendaciones prácticas*. Retrieved from http://www.msssi.gob.es/destacados/docs/Guia_Inclusion_social_y_Fondos_estructurales.pdf

- Ministerium für Familie Kinder Jugend Kultur und Sport des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. (2013). *Tagungszusammenfassung: Bürgerschaftliches Engagement fördern - kommunale Strategien für die Zukunft*. Fachkongress am 09.10.2013 in Köln. Düsseldorf. Retrieved from www.mfkjks.nrw.de
- Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali. (2014). *Decreto Artbonus e turismo: Il decreto passa alla Camera senza voti contrari*. Franceschini: testo migliorato e arricchito. Retrieved from http://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/export/MiBAC/sito-MiBAC/Contenuti/MibacUnif/Comunicati/visualizza_asset.html_1137023887.html
- Ministerstvo financí. (2007). *Rámcová politika Ministerstva financí v oblasti ochrany spotřebitele na finančním trhu*. Retrieved from <http://www.mfcr.cz/cs/soukromy-sektor/regulace/ochrana-spotrebitele/ramcova-politika-mf-ochrany-spotrebitele>
- Ministerstvo financí. (2010). *Národní strategie finančního vzdělávání*. Retrieved from <http://www.mfcr.cz/cs/soukromy-sektor/regulace/ochrana-spotrebitele/ramcova-politika-mf-ochrany-spotrebitele>
- Ministerstvo financí. (2012). *Podklad Ministerstva financí České republiky k projednání oblasti finančního vzdělávání na schůzi Rady hospodářské a sociální dohody*. Retrieved from <http://www.asocr.cz/addons/100%20RHSD/Podklad-MF-CR-k-projednani-oblasti-financniho-vzdelani.pdf>
- Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí. (2014a). *Politika zaměstnanosti*. Retrieved from <https://portal.mpsv.cz/sz/politikazamest>
- Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí. (2014b). *Rekvalifikace*. Retrieved from <http://portal.mpsv.cz/upcr/kp/jhm/kop/vyskov/rekvalifikace>
- Møller Pedersen, K. (2012). *Sundhedspolitik, Beslutningsgrundlag, beslutningstagen og beslutninger i sundhedsvæsenet*. Sydanskt Universitetsforlag.
- Møller, M., & Nielsen, N. (2009). *Din økonomi: En bog om tid og penge*. L&R Business.
- Mykhnenko, V. (2007). Strengths and Weaknesses of 'Weak' Coordination: Economic Institutions, Revealed Comparative Advantages, and Socio-Economic Performance of Mixed Market Economies in Poland and Ukraine. In B. Hancké, M. Rhodes, & M. Thatcher (Eds.), *Beyond Varieties of Capitalism. Conflict, Contradiction, and Complementarities in the European Economy* (pp. 351–378). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Näringsdepartementet. (2010). *Handlingsplan för arbetsintegrerande sociala företag*. Stockholm.
- Observatoire des inégalités. (2014). *La grande pauvreté persiste en France*. Retrieved from http://www.inegalites.fr/spip.php?page=article&id_article=1648&id_groupe=9&id_mot=76&id_rubrique=123
- ONCE. (2015). *Website ONCE: Organización Nacional de Ciegos de España*. Retrieved from <http://www.once.es/new/otras-webs/english/>
- ONPES. (2012). *Crise économique, marché du travail et pauvreté: Rapport 2011-2012*. Observatoire National de la Pauvreté et de l'Exclusion Sociale.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2014). *International Migration Outlook 2014: Denmark*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2014-14-en

- Or, Z. & Renaud, T. (2009). *Principes et enjeux de la tarification à l'activité à l'hôpital (T2A): Enseignements de la théorie économique et des expériences étrangères.*
- Petersen, J. H., Petersen, K., & Christiansen, N. F. (2010). *Dansk velfærdshistorie: Bind 1. Frem mod socialhjælpsstaten, 1536-1898.* Denmark: University of Southern Denmark.
- Plataforma de ONG de Acción Social. (2012a). *Diagnóstico del Tercer Sector de Acción Social.* Madrid.
- Plataforma de ONG de Acción Social. (2012b). *Propuestas de la Plataforma del Tercer Sector Social para afrontar el impacto de la crisis.* Madrid. Retrieved from <http://www.plataformaong.org/biblioteca.php>
- Presse und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung. (2004). *Fortschrittsbericht 2004: Perspektiven für Deutschland.* Unsere Strategie für eine nachhaltige Entwicklung. Berlin. Retrieved from http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/_Anlagen/2006-2007/fortschrittsbericht-2004.pdf;jsessionid=02CAAB26D4E14C34194FD3A1C1966C97.s1t2?__blob=publicationFile&v=2
- redinclusion-social.org. (2015). *Website inclusión social.* Retrieved from <http://www.redinclusion-social.org/>
- Rey García, M. & Álvarez González, L. I. (2011). *El sector fundacional español: Datos básicos.* Madrid.
- Rey-García, M. (2012). Reinventarse o malvivir: De la importancia y de la urgencia de rediseñar el modelo de gestión de la cultura en España. *Nueva Revista de Política, Cultura y Arte*, (139), 12–19.
- Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1998). Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, 9(3), 213–248.
- Salon-Michel, D. (2010). *Rapport annuel 2009-2010: Comité consultatif du secteur financier.*
- Sanzo Pérez, M. J., Álvarez González L. I., Rey-García, M., & García Rodríguez, N. (2014). Business-Nonprofit Partnerships: A new form of collaboration in a corporate responsibility and social innovation context. *Service Business. An International Journal*, forthcoming.
- Sanzo Pérez, M. J., Álvarez González, L. I., & Rey-García, M. (2014). Social innovation and the professionalization of nonprofit organizations. *The Service Industries Journal*, forthcoming.
- Schneider, M., & Paunescu, M. (2012). Changing Varieties of Capitalism and revealed Comparative Advantages from 1990 to 2005: A Test of the Hall and Soskice Claims. *Socio-Economic Review*, 10(4), 731–753.
- Service de la coordination des politiques culturelles et de l'innovation. (2013). *The Economic Contribution of Culture* (Économie de la culture et de la communication No. 3). Paris. Retrieved from <http://www.culturecommunication.gouv.fr/Etudes-et-statistiques>
- SERVIZIO CENTRALE SPRAR. (2012). *Rapporto annuale del sistema di protezione per richiedenti asilo e rifugiati 2011-2012.* Roma.
- SGAE. (2014). *Anuario SGAE 2014 de las artes escénicas, musicales y audiovisuales: Resumen ejecutivo.* Fundación SGAE - Sociedad General de Autores y Editores. Retrieved from http://www.anuariossgae.com/anuario2014/anuariopdfs/RESUMEN_EJECUTIVO.pdf

- Sirovátka, T. & Šimíková, I. (2013). *Politika zaměstnanosti a další opatření na trhu práce v dlouhodobé perspektivě a v průběhu krize*. Prague. Retrieved from http://praha.vupsv.cz/Fulltext/vz_353.pdf
- Socialdemokraterna. (2014). *Avskaffa Fas 3*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialdemokraterna.se/Var-politik/Var-politik-A-till-O/Fas-3/>
- Sorcioni, M. (2014). *I servizi per il lavoro in Italia: Stato dell'arte e prospettive di sviluppo*. Documento per la discussione. Retrieved from <http://www.lavoro.gov.it/SemestreEuropeo/AttivitaEventi/Documents/Concept%20%20Document.pdf>
- Soukopová, J. (2011). *Ekonomika životního prostředí* (1st ed.). Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Sozialpolitik aktuell. (2014). *Neuregelungen 1998 - 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.sozialpolitik-aktuell.de/neuregelungen.html>
- Staatsblad (2011, December 22). Houdende wijziging van enkele belastingwetten: Geefwet. *Staatsblad*,
- Staatsblad (2014, July 2). Tot wijziging van de Wet werk en bijstand, de Wet sociale werkvoorziening, de Wet werk en arbeidsondersteuning jonggehandicapten en enige andere wetten gericht op bevordering deelname aan de arbeidsmarkt voor mensen met arbeidsvermogen en harmonisatie van deze regelingen: (Invoeringswet Participatiewet). *Staatsblad*,
- Statistics Denmark. (2014). *Statistical Yearbook 2014*. Retrieved from www.statbank.dk/NAT07N
- Stockholms Stadsmission. (2013). *Hemlös 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.stadsmissionen.se/Global/Social%20Verksamhet/Heml%C3%B6shet/Dokument/Stockholms_Stadsmission_Heml%C3%B6s_2013.pdf
- Straková, M., & Čermáková, K. (2008). *Standardy kvality sociálních služeb: Příručka pro uživatele*. Praha: MoLSA.
- TESSEA. (2014). *Co je TESSEA*. Retrieved from <http://www.ceske-socialni-podnikani.cz/cz/tessea>
- Thouvenin, D. & Delcey, M. (2013). *Usagers du système de santé: Connaissiez & faites valoir vos droits!* Le CISS.
- Thuesen, F., Bach H. B., Albæk K., Jensen, S., Hansen, N. L., & Weibel, K. (2013). *Socialøkonomiske virksomheder i Danmark: Når udsatte bliver ansatte*. Copenhagen: The National Centre for Social Research-SFI.
- TK. (2012/2013). *Toekomst AWBZ: Brief van de staatssecretaris van Volksgezondheid, Welzijn en Sport* (30597 No. 296).
- TK. (2014/2015). *Vragen gesteld door de leden der Kamer, met de daarop door de regering gegeven antwoorden* (Aanhangsel van de Handelingen No. 237).
- Turrini, A. (2009). *Politiche e management pubblico per l'arte e la cultura. Biblioteca dell'economia d'azienda*. Milano: EGEA.
- Valenti, C. (2004). *Teatro e disagio: Economia della Cultura*.

- Valterová, A. (2010). Zdravotnická politika. In S. Balík, O. Císař, & P. Fiala (Eds.), *Veřejné politiky v České republice v letech 1989-2009* (pp. 616–649). Brno: CDK.
- Van den Broek, A. (2013). Cultuur tussen collectieve verantwoordelijkheid en consumentensoevereiniteit. In V. Veldheer, J. Jonker, L. van Noije, & C. Vrooman (Eds.), *Een beroep op de burger. Minder verzorgingsstaat, meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid? Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2012* (pp. 231–253). Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Van Echteld, P., & Josten, E. (2013). Werken voor je geld. In V. Veldheer, J. Jonker, L. van Noije, & C. Vrooman (Eds.), *Een beroep op de burger. Minder verzorgingsstaat, meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid? Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2012* (pp. 95–115). Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Verbraucherzentrale. (2014). *Wir über uns*. Retrieved from <https://www.verbraucherzentrale.de/wir-ueber-uns>
- Vráblíková, K. (2010). Politika životního prostředí. In S. Balík, O. Císař, & P. Fiala (Eds.), *Veřejné politiky v České republice v letech 1989-2009* (pp. 368–398). Brno: CDK.
- Woods, M. (2012). *French farmers join environmental activists in protest against Notre-Dame-des-Landes airport*. Retrieved from <http://www.english.rfi.fr/france/20121205-french-farmers-join-environmental-activists-protest-against-dame-landes-airport>
- Zimmer, A. & Backhaus-Maul, H. (2012). *Engagementförderung vor Ort: Was gilt es in den Blick zu nehmen?* Eine Arbeitshilfe für lokale Entscheidungsträger. Münster.