



university of
 groningen

DEMONSTRATING IMPACT: UNVEILING THE CONTRIBUTION OF A DUTCH WISE TO MARGINALIZED PEOPLE'S WELL-BEING

EFSTATHIA SDROLIA

University of Groningen

The aim of this paper is how can WISEs demonstrate their contribution to marginalized groups' well-being by exploring the different dimensions of well-being (material, occupational, social, community, physical) realized for the beneficiaries, identifying challenges and restraints on measuring and monitoring and possible ways of effectively demonstrating that impact. A qualitative single-case study was conducted with a Dutch WISE that revealed that all five categories of well-being were realized in some way in the organization. Furthermore, it identified another category of well-being realized for the targeted group, emotional well-being which refers to feelings of increased confidence, pride and feeling of fitting in.

INTRODUCTION

As part of the broader discussion about sustainability and the role that enterprises play in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Social Enterprises (SEs) have gained a lot of attention as capable of solving various social problems. In light of the recent interest in the social economy from a policy and programmatic perspective, governments support social businesses as being able to mobilize the socially excluded and reconnect at least some of them to the mainstream economy (1),(2). Likewise, in varied degrees, social economy organizations' responsiveness has been positioned as an alternative for government commitments and public welfare initiatives (3),(4).

One form of SE is the Work-Integration Social Enterprise (WISE) whose goal is to provide coordinated theoretical and practical professional training and/or the development of work skills to socially vulnerable and excluded groups with the aim to integrate them (5). Mainly these groups include people with disabilities, the chronically unemployed and low-skilled, refugees and immigrants, and those with truly limited employment possibilities for a range of reasons (6). In their capacity as enablers, WISEs may be seen as "special" workplaces created to address the inability of mainstream organizations to include participants who require specific ongoing support or for a limited time, such as mentoring and flexibility in roles or working conditions (7).

The quote from Savio and Righetti (8) "work is one of the most suitable tools for re-acquiring social abilities, practical skills, a job and, most of all, a new relationship with oneself and the world" foreshadows the wide range of impacts that WISEs can generate for these people that transcend the

simple provision of work. They present a unique experimental setting for demonstrating the effects of social interventions on health and well-being. Researchers have not been indifferent to the impacts WISEs generate for marginalized people. There is a substantial body of literature on the topic (9),(10), focusing on specific contexts (8),(11),(12), or specific groups of beneficiaries (7),(13),(14), however, there is limited research on how social enterprises and health are linked (15) and further confusion on which indicators of well-being should be included or to which level (individual, interpersonal, community).

Even less attention has been paid, with almost non-existent studies, on how WISEs can demonstrate that contribution to their stakeholders. Measuring and reporting their social performance, and in case their contribution to the well-being of marginalized people, is of great importance as a tool to communicate with stakeholders and for reasons of accountability towards funders (16). Especially for WISEs that are often economically dependent, effectively demonstrating their impact is a way of securing access to funding from foundations, government initiatives, and private investors who all want to make sure their investments and donations are used as effectively as possible (17). Great challenges have been identified in trying to integrate formal impact measurement into the social sector (18).

Although there are numerous approaches to assessing social impact, the absence of standards makes accountability to different stakeholders especially difficult (19). There are no widely accepted methods or indicators for measuring social impact (19),(20),(21) and all existing methodologies have their own strengths, weaknesses and purposes

(22). Quantitative performance indicators have been criticized for numerous factors, including the fact that not all benefits produced by an organization can be measured or expressed in monetary terms (23). Hadad and Găucă note that it is particularly challenging to financially convey psychological changes, like enhanced self-confidence or higher dignity, that take place in the lives of persons belonging to vulnerable groups (24). Since WISE's actions are concentrated on bringing about change for disadvantaged categories of people, it is believed that they may be challenging to quantify and evaluate only numerically. This is because the social impact itself has a qualitative nature (25). Since it is argued that social impact measurements must be more flexible and case-specific (different communities will see different health improvements (16), the scientific literature increasingly emphasizes the relevance of qualitative research and the applicability of the Theory of Change and chain of change/logical model (26), (27), (28). According to this methodology, an organization's activities are causally related to its short-term, outcome-related, and impact-related results and can give thorough explanations of how and why the desired change is being accomplished.

Given that the existing literature frequently emphasizes WISEs' ability to empower people and communities, it falls short of explaining in detail how these businesses uniquely help marginalized groups. There is a gap caused by the lack of empirical data and comprehensive examination of the methods by which WISEs can successfully demonstrate their contribution to the well-being of underprivileged communities. Therefore, in this paper, I try to answer how can WISEs demonstrate their contribution to marginalized groups' well-being by exploring the different dimensions of well-being (material, occupational, social, community, physical) realized for the beneficiaries, identify challenges and restraints on measuring and monitoring and possible ways of effectively demonstrating that impact. The results can possibly

have great contributions, both theoretical, by advancing the understanding of how WISEs contribute to the well-being of vulnerable groups and by enhancing the social impact assessment literature, and practical, by informing strategies and practices for WISEs and stakeholders interested in supporting marginalized communities.

For this purpose, I conducted a qualitative case study with a Dutch WISE and interviewed executives and staff who work with/for the beneficiaries. A substantial amount of Dutch social enterprises, 48% (29), focus on increasing the labor market participation of vulnerable target groups (such as those with low labor qualifications, youth who have dropped out of school, people with mental or physical disabilities, ex-offenders, ex-addicts, people who have trouble finding work because of their advanced age, or refugees). The Participation Act, which replaced a number of earlier legislation, was passed in 2015 with regard to social inclusion in the Dutch setting. Its goal is to help those who face obstacles in the job market acquire employment as regular employees (30). In 2017, more than 200.000 people in this target category were formally registered in the Netherlands (31).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, I identify the current understanding, gaps, and debates in the existing literature regarding WISEs and social impact, WISEs and well-being, and measurement and assessment approaches for social enterprises. In the methodology section present and justify the chosen methodology and describe the process of collecting and analyzing the data. Then the results are presented followed by a discussion of the main points. Finally, the paper concludes with a presentation of the main findings, an underlying of the key contributions of the research and the main limitations that require further research.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Wises and Social Impact

WISE is a form of SE whose goal is to provide coordinated theoretical and practical professional training and/or the development of work skills to socially vulnerable and excluded groups with the aim to integrate them (5). WISEs can be extremely idiosyncratic, varying greatly in terms of the kinds and forms of employment they provide, their social mission, and their capacity for self-sufficiency (32). Davister et al.'s paper identified four modes of integration in European WISEs (6): transitional occupation, creation of permanent self-financed jobs, professional integration with permanent subsidies and socialization through a productive activity. The fourth form of integration, which shows a focus on social inclusion and social integration outcomes outside of the workplace and uses work activities as a catalyst, is a crucial factor to take into account when evaluating the social impact of WISEs, which goes beyond professional integration.

Given the diversity of social enterprises, the results themselves will probably differ based on the organizational mission, cultural background, and the methods utilised to accomplish its objectives (33). There are several studies which research the impact of WISEs on the people they support (13), (34), that in return affects their immediate environment (35),(36) and the society as a whole (37),(38),(39). These studies all centre on various groups with various disadvantages, in various organizations, with various goals, in various countries. One research on WISEs in Hong Kong identified three themes of positive impact generated for the employees of these enterprises, meaningful engagement, individual-based empowerment, and relational-based empowerment (9). Another research emphasizes the impact as both direct, in terms of financial self-sufficiency, structure, and

activation, and indirect, in terms of increased self-esteem and self-awareness (10). Already these studies foreshow the impact that WISEs can have on the well-being of the beneficiaries and society but there are only a few studies that explicitly link WISEs' interventions to well-being (40).

Roy et al. (15) used a systematic review methodology to investigate social entrepreneurship as a public health intervention., identifying two "high quality" research investigating alterations in physical health and five studies looking at effects on mental or psychological health. At the same time, every study included in the review offered proof of social benefits, such as employment, involvement, and improvement of living conditions., which Roy et al. (15) grouped under three 'social determinants of health' categories: social integration, reduction of stigma, and employability. Roy et al. (40) also noted that there is still a stubborn lack of clarity regarding the ratio of direct health benefits (and what they would be) produced by social enterprises vs indirect advantages such as income, access to housing, employment, or training produced by working at a social company.

The notion of diverse economies takes into account the various economic activities that communities use to support their livelihoods in place of or in addition to, capitalist commercial enterprise. (41). The theory acknowledges that there are many practices involved in how we care for and sustain ourselves, practices that are rarely mentioned in conventional discussions of "the economy." In addition to paid work and capitalist firms, the varied economy also includes unpaid labour, bartering, subsistence farming, giving, gleaning, and scavenging. Numerous business kinds, such as cooperatives, community gardens, non-profits, homes, and social enterprises engage in these activities (42). The economic benefits generated go beyond mere money. Economic actors in a diversified economy are thought to be influencing

the economy by choosing how to strike a balance between commercial and social objectives. Communities and organisations need to strike a balance between various forms of wellness that support holistic livelihoods in order to continue to survive well together (defined as continuing to live together well, possibly despite risks). Gibson-Graham et al. (43) suggest five categories of well-being within the diverse economies theory:

- Material well-being – having the resources to meet basic needs
- Occupational well-being – a sense of enjoyment of what we do each day
- Social well-being – having relationships and a supportive social network
- Community well-being – involvement in community activities
- Physical well-being – good health and a safe living environment.

Therefore, the diverse economies approach offers a different perspective on how social enterprises can contribute to the community and individual well-being and these five categories are extremely appropriate to examine how and if they are realized in the context of WISEs.

Challenges faced by WISEs

WISEs organizations are characterized by increased complexity due to the hybridity of goals, social and economic (43). A study of twenty WISEs in the Netherlands (10), with the aim to identify the biggest barriers to scaling up, found that the most important external factors were the intake of the target group and access to finance, where both of them are highly dependent in most cases on the government and local municipalities. Another internal factor was referring to communicating their value (10). Social impact measurement and reporting can mediate these factors and provide WISEs with a strong communication tool to demonstrate their impact to funders, various

stakeholders and especially the government and municipalities. But social impact measurement and reporting don't come without challenges. For instance, there is uncertainty on the nature of social impact (44), the connection between the activities of social enterprises and social impact (18), and the methods for measuring social impact (21).

The scientific debate spends a lot of time discussing how social impacts are defined, measurement techniques, and instruments, but there is little examination of how well WISEs can conduct the evaluation and to what extent. (45), (46). Epstein and Yuthas (27) observe that many businesses, due to the simplicity of gathering data, measure only outputs, such as how many trainings are held or how many people are hired. Ebrahim (45) contends that in some circumstances, a social enterprise should place more emphasis on assessing immediate successes than on long-term results because the latter may cause it to stray from its primary social objectives. This is because the enterprise may place too much emphasis on the measurement method and anticipated outcomes. Other studies contend that a social enterprise should assess impact, the final shift in the chain of impact value creation that takes place in the community or society from a long- or medium-term organisational perspective. For instance, decreased unemployment, poverty, and crime, as well as significant adjustments to social norms and attitudes. It's crucial to remember that these changes frequently take place over a long period of time, making it challenging to discover and evaluate them. All of these components of the impact value chain must also have a direct and obvious causal relationship (18). Ebrahim points out that there is not always a direct and obvious causal relationship between outputs and outcomes, and that sometimes outcomes and impacts are not caused by the actions of a social enterprise but rather by other environmental factors, such as the actions of other organisations working in the same industry. In their study, Ebrahim and Rangan (18) found that social

impacts, such as reduced unemployment and crime, created at the societal level (macro, meso-level), is rarely achieved by one organisation; instead, it is typically the aggregate influence of numerous organisations. According to Grieco (47), it is at least necessary to go from measuring the perspective of output in the logical chain to measuring the perspective of outcome (48), in order to comprehend the social impact produced by social enterprises.

The purpose of measuring is to examine how outputs affect individuals and the larger environment, including individual groups and communities, in the short- and medium-term of an enterprise's activities. As a result, there are several discussions on how and what WISEs should measure and WISEs frequently find themselves in a scenario where social impact assessment is not implemented in their organizations due to the vagueness of what should be assessed. Practitioners appear to be concerned about social impact measurements failing to capture their "true impact" and have doubts about their ability to improve the results of their initiatives (18). Furthermore, social entrepreneurs perceive social impact measurement as immeasurable, imprudent, incomplete, and irrelevant due to ambiguity and complexity (49).

Well-being could be a useful and policy-acceptable pathway, as social enterprise practice and research moves to a desire to understand the wider benefits of social enterprise, i.e., beyond jobs, some income, and work experience. To quote the "Stiglitz report": "What we measure shapes what we collectively strive to pursue" (50) There are two challenges at this point: first, defining the "theory of change" that describes how social enterprises affect well-being and then health (at the individual and community levels); and second, identifying and measuring this, or at the very least making wellbeing components more tangible, so that changes can be appreciated (40)

Social Impact Measurement

The numerous attempts at identification and classification of impact measurement frameworks and methods that can be found in the literature are a good indicator of the extreme complexity of social impact measurement. Grieco et al. identified 76 methods and frameworks, classified them into 4 clusters, and attributed this plethora of choices to the inability of one framework to fit all organizations (51). Another study classified the available measurement methods into 6 broad categories while emphasizing organizations should focus on output measurement and leave impact measurement to funders (18).

A study of social impacts of WISEs in Hong Kong (52) has examined more than 20 impact evaluation techniques and categorized them into three groups. The first one, the outcome-based approach, is focused on the different types of outcomes generated by the social enterprise and usually implies quantification of these outcomes. The most representative methods are the Social Return on Investment (SROI) and cost-benefit analysis. Although this approach is very suitable in order to establish credibility and show responsibility to funders and the public, putting every outcome into one number or currency may be challenging or deceptive, and some performance indicators simply cannot be stated in monetary terms in a meaningful way (53), especially when concerning well-being indicators.

The second approach is the structure-based approach, which focuses on effective organizational frameworks that control the operation and growth of certain social enterprises. Representative examples are the Balanced Scorecard and Social Accounting and Auditing. Apart from the difficult implementation of this approach, its ability to assess

well-being realized at the individual and community level is limited.

The third approach, the process-based, examines the connections between activities to determine whether social enterprises' production processes can, in fact, produce the outcomes and impacts that are sought (short-, medium-, or long-term). The Logic Model and Theory of Change are part of this category. This methodology describes the organization's chain of change and establishes a causal connection between its actions and its short-term, outcome-related, and impact-related outcomes. Theory of change aids in identifying which initiatives and treatments result in the intended change (26). This outlines the issue, the anticipated outcomes, the target population, and the underlying presumptions. Prior to carrying out any activities to accomplish these goals, it is first decided what changes are to be made. Then, it is determined whether the activities will result in the required changes. The Theory of Change approach is based on the application of qualitative research, as opposed to other standardized methodologies like SROI or cost-benefit analysis, which demand the application of complicated statistical analysis (28), and also offers a graphic depiction of the transformational process. Using this process, you can give thorough explanations of how and why the desired change will be accomplished.

METHODOLOGY

Design and Participants

The aim of this research is to investigate how WISEs can demonstrate their contribution to marginalized groups' well-being. The nascent understanding of the topic justifies the qualitative approach taken. Accordingly, I introduce a single-case study (57),(58), which I believe is

The claim that social impact measurements need to be more adaptable and case-specific (16), since outcomes and impacts are quite specific to the business and the (sub-)industry it operates in (54) and the fact that recent research has shown that social entrepreneurs often forgo ready-made options in favor of creating their own measuring frameworks through the bricolage of context-specific indicators (55), developing the Theory of Change can be an extremely useful guide for identifying relevant impact indicators and developing a measurement and reporting framework. But before developing the Theory of Change there is a need for defining the change that is occurring.

Academics, decision-makers, and civil society have recently shown a significant increase in interest in the idea of well-being (56). Even so, the potential of WISEs, as a vessel for enhancing well-being on the individual and community level is under-researched (40),(15). The ability of WISEs to demonstrate this link can provide them with legitimization and security of funding. In this paper, I try to address these gaps by conducting a qualitative case study in a Dutch WISE. The details of the approach I undertook are described in the next section.

helpful for understanding "how and why some social phenomenon works" (58). Every social company is a unique sample with context-specific resources, according to Granlund, which reasons for their in-depth analysis using a case study (59). The case company is not being chosen based on the requirements of the research design but rather the opposite, which reveals the transdisciplinary nature of the research. The alignment of research interests and practical problems faced by the company was the criteria for collaboration. Even so, the specific

characteristics of the organization make it extremely suitable for examination. Specifically, their long-term existence ensures that all short, mid, and long-term impacts on beneficiaries and society have been observed, and their ownership by municipalities makes the need for demonstrating impacts even more prominent (60),(61).

The case-organization. The case organization that is being studied is a Dutch work-integration social enterprise owned by four municipalities that operate in the Friesian region since 2002. More specifically, it is a talent and employment organization that collaborates with businesses that want to focus on social entrepreneurship and are looking for personnel. They assist those with a distance to the labor market, through training and mentoring, in finding a position that suits them. These individuals may work for one of the partner businesses or at one of the company's own facilities in Heerenveen, Drachten, or Leeuwarden. Some of the activities the organization offers are packaging, installation and assembly, bicycle fitting, metallurgy, graphics, mail delivery, and related services.

Data collection

To collect the data I conducted 6 semi-structured interviews, of an average duration of 30 minutes, with executives and staff working for and with the beneficiary groups. More extensive case studies with direct interaction with management have been urged for in recent times (62),(63),(64). Moreover, this particular group of stakeholders is suitable to identify the impacts generated by the organization as well as the challenges and limitations of demonstrating that impact. There were no hard selection criteria for the participants apart from a minimum duration of working with the organization for 1 year. An appropriate and efficient technique to acquire a thorough grasp of the social repercussions brought on by the investigated WISEs is through individual interviews with various stakeholder groups. Additionally, the semi-structured design can

successfully strike a balance between flexibility and standardization in the exploration stages. The interviews were decided to be conducted online to ensure flexibility, convenience, and willingness (65). The interviews were audio recorded to facilitate the analysis process. An interview guide [APPENDIX 1](#) was developed to guide the interviews around the impacts generated by the organization on the individual beneficiaries, their immediate environment and society, the importance of demonstrating that impact and the challenges that entail, and the external factors that affect the organization's ability to generate the impacts. Purposefully the word 'well-being' was not referred to not predispose the participants' answers.

Data analysis

After the interviews were conducted, the audio recordings were transcribed using otter.ai. A link for access to the full transcripts is provided in [APPENDIX 2](#). After familiarizing myself with the data by going back and forth through the transcripts, I initially divided the responses according to main categories derived from the topics described in the interview guide to facilitate the emergence of codes and themes. Next, I searched the collected data on the category of reported impacts to identify impacts related to the five categories of well-being (material, occupational, social, community, physical). In that stage, another form of well-being was identified, which I refer to as 'emotional well-being'. The rest of the data to find limitations and challenges in measuring and reporting the reported impacts, possible ways of doing so, and external factors that the participants reported that affect the organization. The themes and sub-themes generated were organized in an Excel sheet with corresponding quotes from the interviews. A detailed coding tree can be found in [APPENDIX 3](#).

Limitations

No research design comes without limitations. Even though the single-case study is appropriate for the in-depth analysis that was intended, it hinders the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the data collection and data analysis suffer from inevitable subjectivity in the responses of the participants and my personal in the analysis and coding of the collected data. Another limitation may be the social-desirability bias of the respondents due to their desire to excaudate the impacts of the organization.

Ethical concerns

In order to adhere to all business ethical guidelines, each participant received a consent document (APPENDIX 4) before of each interview, making sure that the participants were aware that they were not obliged to participate or answer any question that made them uncomfortable, and that the interview was going to be audio-recorded. Along with the consent form, the participants were provided with an information sheet (APPENDIX 4) detailing the aim of the research and the main topics to be discussed during the interview. In the transcription process, the name of the organization, the participants, and any other personal information were erased and substituted with pseudonyms to ensure anonymity. The research is in accordance with the Campus Frysland Ethics Committee.

FINDINGS

Interventions and Realization of Well-being

All five categories of well-being, material, occupational, social, community, and physical, were identified to some extent in the changes that the targeted group experiences by working in the organization, according to what the participants reported. Furthermore, another category of well-being was identified, emotional well-being which refers to changes in the feelings of the beneficiaries such as increased self-confidence, the

feeling of dignity and pride or general happiness, and the feeling of fitting in in society. These changes were the more frequent that all participants referred to. According to the participants, apart from the provision of employment, the interventions of the organization that realize these impacts consist of providing an adjusted working environment and interventions that fall under what they called “the talent house” such as support on personal issues, workshops and training and personalized development. Regarding the “talent house” one participant commented:

We don't just look at work but we see it as a house. Every person is a house and on the first floor, you have your health, your family, people are taking care of you, how you feel, your body and your mind. So your mental health and your physical health. On the second floor of the House, we see how you connect with other people, ... and on the third floor, we try to look at work. So if you look at the employees as a whole as part of the system, their own health, their own well being their families, the way they can grow in their work, instead of just an employee taken care of in, in work, you can make better, bigger steps and see them much more as independent individuals in society

Next, I describe what changes in the beneficiaries the participants reported in the well-being categories.

Material and occupational well-being. Half of the participants referred to how the material well-being of the beneficiaries is affected by working in the organization. All three of them though recognized it as one of the most important contributions. Especially one participant commented “it gives people sort of dignity, but also their families. It gives stability, it gives income, financial, that's... Work is the most important thing.” Another

participant commented on the importance of becoming financially independent:

And sometimes we hear from parents, especially when the parents have the person who is working with us, and sometimes people have 50-60 years old, they still live with their parents. And the parents are very concerned about what's happening when the parents are dying, who's going to look after their child?

All participants referred to at least one impact that has to do with the realization of occupational well-being. More specifically they reported that the beneficiaries found a sense of meaning in their work and in their development through the work, and it provided them with structure. For example, one participant noted:

if you want to see what the short-term change might be, or impact might be is that we give people structure to start the day, to go to work, to do something, and to have an idea that they are also delivering to society

Social and community well-being. Most participants related the impacts of the organization to social-wellbeing and gave great importance to the socialization that occurs on the job. Especially one participant's quote demonstrates perfectly the impact on this category "but the most big changes are with people who now are at home and doing nothing and have a very small world, know a few people who can help them...and are lonely", as well as this quote of another participant "he didn't talk. He didn't look you in the eye. I know, of my leadership program. And now he's talking and making contact". Regarding the community well-being in all participants' responses hinders the importance of the beneficiaries being part of the community again. An example given by one participant regarding an employee that managed to

graduate high school after working with the organization illustrates the point well:

And he's, he was so proud being in his 40s, 45 years, with his first, second, and third certificate to show that he was able to reach a real career as he thought he had, and the way he could be an example for his daughter and his son right now. So he went to his old school teacher, he had when he was a little kid, to tell them his story and how proud he was that he was able to do what he's doing now, and to be a good father to his kids. And I think that, those small stories tell the impact of [the organization].

Physical and emotional well-being. All participants except one referred to changes that the participants experience in their health, mostly in their mental health. One participant noted:

And I think work is one of the best things to avoid health care for, for instance. When you're unemployed, long-term, unemployed, people need mostly more health care, health care for, in hospitals with the mental health care. And if they get jobs, and they have the right people to take them and teach them skills and give them dignity, they, it works, good. People don't need to have to go to any kind of health care, mental health care or anything else. Because, because of the, yeah they have a big feeling job, and they have dignity and they get skills. That's that's, that's Yeah, I think that's the most important thing to stay healthy.

Another participant stated that by working in the organization over time people stop using the emergency number for the police, specifically:

then they start to work with us and those phonecalls stopped, um, for, for the police is very nice that these person is not calling everyday [number], eh, and, but that's, that's

a, that's, it's difficult to measure these kinds of effects but, um, um, they, um, in such case is a huge effect for the police because they have no work from it anymore

which illustrates the improvement in their mental health. Regarding emotional well-being, all participants recognized changes in the emotional state of the beneficiaries like confidence, dignity, pride, and the feeling of fitting in and all linked them with immediate outcomes of having employment and being part of the society, "I think you can see it very quickly when they start and that's the start of having a job, the start of the self confidence". Another participant commented "but I think the majority of people who work here feel more confident because they work, because they have a contribution to society"

Societal well-being. Another category of well-being worth mentioning is the impacts on well-being that transcend the individual effects. More specifically all interviewees commented on how the organization affects society by affecting the families of the beneficiaries and the neighbourhoods, and regions they live in:

That people are sitting at home, they have, they have all the problems with their landlord, sometimes they are more ill, so they have to go to the doctor, they have to come to the, to the hospital, or they are more in, on the street, and they have problems on, during their, on, on the streets.

But in, in families, I'm convinced that it has impact. Yeah, I think especially in multi problem families, so where they have health problems, children who are not able to fit in school system. When a mother or father doesn't have a proper job, is sitting at home all day, it has an negative impact on the family. So work is the key to helping these

families to a better life. And I'm convinced of that. Yeah.

Measuring and Demonstrating Impact

The participants were also asked if and why the organization should measure these impacts and what challenges they face in doing so. All participants recognized the importance of demonstrating what the organization is achieving but also reported various challenges.

Importance. The main reasons for measuring and reporting the impacts that participants reported were access to financing and demonstrating the benefits the organization produces beyond employment. Regarding the first reason one participant commented:

when you can show the impact, and because it's political decision to, to give us money, you can make sure that, that's in more situations, know, what, were they choose for, and what the impact is, and what cost in other, other departments you are reducing

And another noted:

and we have to report monthly, also to the council to get at or to show how the development of our workers are. They give us money, it's subsidized work. And we have to, we shoot, we have to show that it's, that the money we get from the council that it's it's it's yeah, how can I say it? That it's a good thing to give the money to our organization to help that people.

Challenges. The main challenges in measuring and reporting the contribution of the organization on the beneficiaries and the society that the participants reported were the nature of the social impact that is difficult to capture and even more to quantify, the legislation on privacy that prevent them from

gathering data from the employees, and lastly, the integration of all the different impacts the organization generates in one framework. The last point is nicely illustrated by one participant:

I think columns to our employees. So, there is a column who is interested in work-integration, that's the column who is interested in how are they physically doing, are they, are they healthy and feeling well, there are guys, so, boys and girls who are looking at their financial situation, and I think that putting those, those things together and trying to look at it, at an integrated way, is more interesting

It is worth noting that most participants proposed the use of storytelling as an effective, and maybe the most appropriate way of demonstrating the impact.

External Factors Affecting the Organization

The last theme generated by the interviews is external factors affect the function of the organization and its ability to generate benefits for the beneficiaries and society. The main factors that participants identified were the dependency on the local government, economic and on employee resources, and the political environment. Regarding the first factor one participant noted “It's because the system is now with regional and not on the government. And it's always a choice if you get money to us or to get money, for example, to the swimming pool”. Another illustrative quote is:

At the moment, there is a new legislation since 2015, and the local government can choose what they are going to do with a person with a disability. So, is he going to [the organization] or to and other, other company in the marketplace? So we, in

2015, we have 1500 employees, at the moment, we have 1800 employees. So we are increase every year by approximately 100 employees. So that's, yeah, that's, that's not good for [the organization]. Because we have a lot of different jobs you can do at [the organization] . But when you're increasing, you can't handle all these different jobs.

Regarding the second factor, one participant commented on what the organization need to succeed:

some stability in legislation, some trust in getting the job done, some time to find out what's the best way to work. Because now, sometimes now, I think we are more or less playing ball for politics. No. Stability. Not not skyrocketing, but stability also in budgets, and time to prove that our, that we can make our contribution to society. And if that's perhaps this varies on the main idea, and nowadays in politics, that's hasty and people want to score about political topics. This is an area in which you should not experience, or no, do experiments, but trying to work out a focused policy or something. What we need is time stability and some some euros.

Another illustrative quote of the same participant is “the policy government on the national level is deviding, in combination with the translation on a local level, what that national level means for local situation”

DISCUSSION

The data collected from the interviews confirmed that all categories of well-being proposed by Gibson-Graham et al. (43) were to some degree realized for the beneficiaries of the case organization. They revealed another form of well-being realized, emotional well-being that

concerns feelings of increased confidence, pride, dignity and a feeling of fitting in. These effects agree with previous findings of research on the impact of WISEs (10). Another point worth making is that most of these effects were realized to be made simply by the provision of employment which is relevant to a point made by Canadian scholars Evans and Wilton (7), the value of work has penetrated modern culture to the point where people equate employment with being recognized as a "legitimate citizen." They attribute some of the good effects discovered in their research of people with mental illness working in social enterprises to employees feeling that they are contributing to society because they have a job. This category could also be referred to as subjective well-being since it reflects the subjective feelings of the targeted groups. Furthermore, another category was employed, that of societal well-being, to signify the well-being realized at the societal level and revealed effects on the well-being of the families of the beneficiaries and the regions they live in by giving meaning in the lives of the targeted groups and providing cohesion in the society (52).

The external factors reported by the participants, economic and employee resource dependency on the local government and the political environment, that hinders the progress of the organization in generating all the forms of well-being, agree with another study of twenty WISEs in the Netherlands (10) and underlines variety of stakeholders that WISEs need to succeed and importance of meaningful collaboration. It also supports another argument made in a study that the government in the Netherlands is sometimes seen as an unreliable partner (66)

Regarding how a WISE can demonstrate the benefits on the well-being of the beneficiaries, apart from storytelling, a method mentioned by most of the participants, the well-being scorecard, proposed by Gibson-Graham et al. (43) (TABLE 1), by

adding the category of emotional well-being, or subjective well-being can be a promising way.

TABLE 1
Well-being Scorecard

| WORKER'S WELL-BEING | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Material | | X | |
| Occupational | | X | |
| Social | | | X |
| Community | | | X |
| Physical | | | X |

Conclusion

The research presented in this paper has both theoretical and practical contributions. It enhances the understanding of WISEs and the different benefits they generate for the targeted groups and society, by exploring the well-being of marginalized groups it expands knowledge on practices and interventions focused on aiding them, contributes on the measurement of well-being outcomes by suggesting the six categories of well-being as a reference point of assessing. The practical contributions consist of informing practices and strategies of WISEs on providing help to vulnerable groups and how to demonstrate it and can inform governments and policy-makers on support initiatives and policies regarding WISEs.

Even though the desire of the case organization to demonstrate their social impacts mainly to the local governments, to whom they are highly dependent, may not be entirely satisfied by the results of the research, I hope it guides them on using well-being

outcomes when deciding on the most appropriate framework for them.

Future research can focus on how to develop a measurement framework with a long-term perspective as most of the changes realized need long-term monitoring. Another avenue for research is employing the six categories of well-being to more WISEs in different contexts and maybe with multi-case studies.

REFERENCES

1. Hudson AA Angus Cameron , Ray. *Placing the Social Economy*. London: Routledge; 2002. 160 p.
2. Amin A. *The Social Economy: International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity*. Bloomsbury Publishing; 2009. 276 p.
3. Amin A. Extraordinarily ordinary: working in the social economy. *Social Enterprise Journal*. 2009 May 22;5(1):30–49.
4. Hudson - 2009 - Life on the edge navigating the competitive tensi.pdf.
5. Cooney K. The Business of Job Creation: An Examination of the Social Enterprise Approach to Workforce Development. *Journal of Poverty*. 2011 Jan 21;15(1):88–107.
6. Davister C, Defourny J, Gregoire O. WORK INTEGRATION SOCIAL ENTERPRISES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION: AN OVERVIEW OF EXISTING MODELS.
7. Evans J, Wilton R. Well Enough to Work? Social Enterprise Employment and the Geographies of Mental Health Recovery. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*. 2019 Jan 2;109(1):87–103.
8. Savio M, Righetti A. Cooperatives as a social enterprise in Italy: a place for social integration and rehabilitation. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 1993 Oct;88(4):238–42.
9. Chui CHK, Shum MHY, Lum TYS. Work integration social enterprises as vessels of empowerment? *Perspectives from employees*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*. 2019 Apr 3;29(2):133–48.
10. De Bell L, Drupsteen L. How to scale the societal impact of work integration social enterprises? Evidence from The Netherlands. In: *Proceedings 5th CARPE Conference: Horizon Europe and beyond* [Internet]. Universitat Politècnica València; 2019 [cited 2023 Mar 3]. Available from: <http://ocs.editorial.upv.es/index.php/CARPE/CARPE2019/paper/view/10191>
11. Urmanaviciene A. WISEs' Social Impact Measurement in the Baltic States. *European Journal of Social Impact and Circular Economy*. 2020 Oct 18;48-75 Páginas.
12. Ho AP ying, Chan K tong. The social impact of work-integration social enterprise in Hong Kong. *International Social Work*. 2010 Jan;53(1):33–45.
13. Ferguson KM, Islam N. Conceptualizing Outcomes with Street-living Young Adults: Grounded Theory Approach to Evaluating the Social Enterprise Intervention. *Qualitative Social Work*. 2008 Jun;7(2):217–37.
14. Gidron B. Market-Oriented Social Enterprises Employing People with Disabilities: A Participants' Perspective. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 2014 Jan 2;5(1):60–76.
15. Roy MJ, Donaldson C, Baker R, Kerr S. The potential of social enterprise to enhance health and well-being: A model and systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2014 Dec;123:182–93.
16. Hertel C, Bacq S, Lumpkin GT. Social Performance and Social Impact in the Context of Social Enterprises— A Holistic Perspective.
17. Arvidson M, Lyon F, McKay S, Moro D. Valuing the social? The nature and controversies of measuring social return on investment (SROI). *Voluntary Sector Review*. 2013 Mar;4(1):3–18.
18. Ebrahim A, Rangan VK. What Impact? A Framework for Measuring the Scale and Scope of Social Performance. *California Management Review*. 2014 May;56(3):118–41.

19. Ebrahim A, Battilana J, Mair J. The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 2014;34:81.
20. Kroeger A, Weber C. Developing a Conceptual Framework for Comparing Social Value Creation. *The Academy of Management Review*. 2014;39(4):513–40.
21. Nicholls A. ‘We do good things, don’t we?’: ‘Blended Value Accounting’ in social entrepreneurship. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. 2009 Aug;34(6–7):755–69.
22. McLoughlin J, Kaminski J, Sodagar B, Khan S, Harris R, Arnaudo G, et al. A strategic approach to social impact measurement of social enterprises: The SIMPLE methodology. *Social Enterprise Journal*. 2009 Aug 14;5:154–78.
23. Grieco C, Michelini L, Iasevoli G. Measuring Value Creation in Social Enterprises: A Cluster Analysis of Social Impact Assessment Models. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 2015 Dec;44(6):1173–93.
24. Hadad S. Social impact measurement in social entrepreneurial organizations. 9(2).
25. Maas K, Liket K. Social Impact Measurement: Classification of Methods. In: Burritt R, Schaltegger S, Bennett M, Pohjola T, Csutora M, editors. *Environmental Management Accounting and Supply Chain Management* [Internet]. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2011 [cited 2023 May 20]. p. 171–202. (Eco-Efficiency in Industry and Science; vol. 27). Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-1390-1_8
26. Hornsby A. *The Good Analyst: Impact Measurement and Analysis in the Social-purpose Universe*.
27. Epstein MJ, Yuthas K. *Measuring and Improving Social Impacts: A Guide for Nonprofits, Companies, and Impact Investors*. 1st edition. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers; 2014. 272 p.
28. Zeyen A, Beckmann M. *Social Entrepreneurship and Business Ethics: Understanding the Contribution and Normative Ambivalence of Purpose-driven Venturing*. 2018.
29. *The Social Enterprise Monitor 2019 (English) :: Social Enterprise NL* [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 24]. Available from: <https://www.social-enterprise.nl/over-sociaal-ondernemen/publicaties/intern/social-enterprise-monitor-2019-english>
30. Koninkrijksrelaties M van BZ en. *Participatiewet* [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 24]. Available from: <https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0015703/2022-08-26>
31. *Werknemersverzekeringen U. UWV Monitor Arbeidsparticipatie 2017* [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 24]. Available from: <https://www.uwv.nl/overuwv/kennis-cijfers-en-onderzoek/kennis-onderzoeken/uwv-monitor-arbeidsparticipatie-2017.aspx>
32. Spear R, Bidet E. Social enterprise for work integration in 12 european countries: a descriptive analysis*. *Ann Public & Coop Econ*. 2005 Jun;76(2):195–231.
33. Macaulay B, Mazzei M, Roy MJ, Teasdale S, Donaldson C. Differentiating the effect of social enterprise activities on health. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2018 Mar 1;200:211–7.
34. Denny S, Hazenberg R, Seddon F. Social enterprises and NEETs: Ethical and effective entrepreneurial skills programmes?
35. Azmat et al. - 2015 - Understanding the Dynamics between Social Entreprene.pdf.
36. Datta and Gailey - 2012 - Empowering Women through Social Entrepreneurship .pdf.
37. Alvord et al. - 2004 - Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformatio.pdf.
38. Haugh and Talwar - 2016 - Linking Social Entrepreneurship and Social Change.pdf.
39. Hietschold et al. - 2022 - Pathways to social value and social change An int.pdf.
40. Roy MJ, Farmer J, Mandiberg JM. *Social Enterprise, Health, and Wellbeing*. In: *Social Enterprise, Health, and Wellbeing* [Internet]. 1st ed. New York: Routledge; 2021 [cited 2023 Apr 25]. p. 1–23. Available from:

- <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781003125976/chapters/10.4324/9781003125976-1>
41. Gibson-Graham JK. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. U of Minnesota Press; 317 p.
 42. Gibson K, Cameron J. *Community Enterprises: Imagining and enacting alternatives to capitalism*. *Social Alternatives*. 2007 Jan 1;26:20–5.
 43. Hockerts - 2015 - *How Hybrid Organizations Turn Antagonistic Assets* .pdf.
 44. Choi N, Majumdar S. Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 2014 May;29(3):363–76.
 45. Ebrahim A, Battilana J, Mair J. The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 2014 Jan 1;34:81–100.
 46. Crucke S, Decramer A. The Development of a Measurement Instrument for the Organizational Performance of Social Enterprises. *Sustainability*. 2016 Feb 6;8(2):161.
 47. Grieco C. *Assessing Social Impact of Social Enterprises: Does One Size Really Fit All?* [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2015 [cited 2023 May 3]. (SpringerBriefs in Business). Available from: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-15314-8>
 48. Harling AM, Hehenberger L, Scholten P. *A Practical Guide To Measuring and Managing Impact*. 2013 Apr 1 [cited 2023 May 20]; Available from: <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1847607/a-practical-guide-to-measuring-and-managing-impact/2593943/>
 49. Molecke G, Pinkse J. Accountability for social impact: A bricolage perspective on impact measurement in social enterprises. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 2017 Sep;32(5):550–68.
 50. Stiglitz J, Sen A, Fitoussi J. *Report of the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress (CMEPSP)*. 2009 Jan 1;
 51. Grieco et al. - 2015 - *Measuring Value Creation in Social Enterprises A* .pdf.
 52. Leung ZCS, Ho APY, Tjia LYN, Tam RKY, Chan KT, Lai MKW. Social Impacts of Work Integration Social Enterprise in Hong Kong – Workfare and Beyond. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 2019 May 4;10(2):159–76.
 53. Lingane A, Olsen S. Guidelines for Social Return on Investment. *California Management Review*. 2004 Apr;46(3):116–35.
 54. Khare P, Joshi K. Systems Approach to Map Determinants of a Social Enterprise’s Impact: A Case from India. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 2017 Dec 17;9:1–21.
 55. Molecke G, Pinkse J. Accountability for social impact: A bricolage perspective on impact measurement in social enterprises. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 2017 Sep;32(5):550–68.
 56. Bache I, Scott K. *The Politics of Wellbeing Theory, Policy and Practice: Theory, Policy and Practice*. 2018.
 57. Patton MQ. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc; 1990. 532 p. (Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 2nd ed).
 58. Yin RK. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. SAGE; 2009. 241 p.
 59. Granlund - 2003 - *Management accounting system integration in corpor*.pdf.
 60. Greiling D, Traxler AA, Stötzer S. Sustainability reporting in the Austrian, German and Swiss public sector. Giuseppe Grossi, Dr Ulf Papenfuß an D, editor. *Intl Jnl Public Sec Management*. 2015 May 11;28(4/5):404–28.
 61. Greiling et al. - 2015 - *Sustainability reporting in the Austrian, German a*.pdf.
 62. Holmes RM, Bromiley P, Devers CE, Holcomb TR, McGuire JB. Management Theory Applications of Prospect Theory: Accomplishments, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Journal of Management*. 2011 Jul;37(4):1069–107.

63. Joseph J, Gaba V. The fog of feedback: Ambiguity and firm responses to multiple aspiration levels: Ambiguity and Firm Responses to Multiple Aspiration Levels. *Strat Mgmt J.* 2015 Dec;36(13):1960–78.
64. Shinkle GA. Organizational Aspirations, Reference Points, and Goals: Building on the Past and Aiming for the Future. *Journal of Management.* 2012 Jan 1;38(1):415–55.
65. Bell E, Bryman A, Harley B. *Business Research Methods.* Oxford University Press; 2018. 687 p.
66. Smit A, de Graaf B, Verweij E, Brouwer P. Sociale ondernemingen en werknemers met een arbeidsbeperking. 2011 [cited 2023 May 24]; Available from: <https://repository.tno.nl/islandora/object/uuid%3A8907bb12-f41c-464f-9bcf-6fc585136111>

APPENDIX 1

Interview Guide

- What is your role in the organization and how long have you been working with them?
- What is your contact with the target employees, the ones with a distance to the labour market?

- What short-, mid-, and long-term changes/impacts can you observe [the organization]'s employees experiencing?
 - How can these changes be directly attributed to [the organization]'s intervention?
 - When these changes are begin to manifest?
 - Are there any challenges or limitations to collecting data or using certain indicators to measure these changes?
- In your experience, are there any indirect positive changes that the employees are experiencing that cannot be directly attributed to [the organization]'s interventions? If so, which ones, and how are they manifested?
- In your experience, do [the organization]'s interventions have an impact on the employees' immediate environment (family, friends), and if so how?
- Apart from the impactful changes in the lives of the individual employees, what is [the organization]'s overall contribution to society?
 - Should [the organization] account for and manifest that contribution as a long-term goal, and if so, what difficulties does this entail?
- Are there mechanisms in place to monitor these changes or measure progress towards [the organization]'s goals?
 - Are there any challenges or limitations to collecting data or using certain indicators to measure these changes?
- Are there any external factors that may influence [the organization]'s ability to establish causal links between its activities or interventions and its intended outcomes and impacts? (What factors can potentially undermine [the organization]'s interventions?)
- What preconditioned assumptions does [the organization] have about the target population, the community, or the broader system in which it operates? (Are there specific requirements or circumstances that allow [the organization]'s interventions to have the intended impacts on the employees?)

- Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel it's important and we haven't covered so far?

APPENDIX 2

Link to the transcripts of the interviews

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1jDn_BKtwVJjD38GrEJcHpyOibJ5s-T0P?usp=sharing

APPENDIX 3

Coding Tree

| THEMES | 1ST ORDER CODES | 2ND ORDER CODES |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Impact | Societal well-being | In families In neighbourhoods |
| | Individual well-being | Material Occupational Social Community Physical Emotional |
| Interventions | Adjusted working environment | Support on personal issues Workshops and training Personalized development |
| Measuring impac | Challenges | Nature of social impact Legislation on privacy Integrate differt impacts |
| | Importance | Access to financing Demostrating benefits beyond work |
| External factors | Government | Economical dependency Employee resource dependency |
| | Political environment | |

APPENDIX 4

Consent Form and Information Sheet

Information sheet

TITLE OF THE STUDY:

DEMONSTRATING IMPACT: UNVEILING THE CONTRIBUTION OF A DUTCH WISE TO MARGINALIZED PEOPLE'S WELL-BEING

I would like to invite you to take part in a research study. Before you decide you need to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. Please take time to read the following information carefully. Ask questions if anything you read needs to be clarified or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not to take part.

WHO I AM AND WHAT THIS STUDY IS ABOUT

My name is Fey Sdrolia and I am currently a Master's student in Sustainable Entrepreneurship. The research you are asked to participate in is my final project (thesis) for concluding my studies. The aim of the research is to show how a social enterprise focused on work integration can identify, measure, and report the impact it has on its beneficiaries (employees).

WHAT WILL TAKING PART INVOLVE?

In the case that you consent to participate in the research, you will be contacted to schedule an online interview of 30 minutes to 45 minutes. The interview will be audio-recorded for the analysis of the collected data.

The topics that you will be asked to discuss during the interview involve:

- What short-, mid-, and long-term changes/impacts you can observe [the organization]'s employees experiencing
- How these changes can be directly attributed to [the organization]'s intervention
- When are these changes begin to manifest
- Are there any unintended negative impacts that you have observed [the organization]'s employees experiencing or possible ones that you can think of that can derive from [the organization]'s intervention
- Are there mechanisms in place to monitor these changes or measure progress towards [the organization]'s goals
- Are there any challenges or limitations to collecting data or using certain indicators to measure the impact
- What is [the organization]'s overall contribution to society
- What preconditioned assumptions does [the organization] have about the target population, the community, or the broader system in which it operates?

WHY HAVE YOU BEEN INVITED TO TAKE PART?

Your extensive knowledge of [the organization]'s interventions and the close interaction with the beneficiaries of [the organization] enables you to provide insightful input on the aforementioned topics.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART?

Participation in the research is voluntary. In case of any discomfort, the participant has the right not to answer any of our questions or terminate the interview at any point without consequences.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF TAKING PART?

The results of this study will assist [the organization]'s, and possibly other social enterprises, with identifying, measuring, and reporting their impacts

There is no possible physical or psychological harm that may come to a participant as a result of participating in the research. The duration of the interview, 45 minutes to an hour, can be considered a disadvantage for the participant.

WILL TAKING PART BE CONFIDENTIAL?

The interview will be recorded and transcribed - sensitive information will be removed or substituted with pseudonyms; only the author will have access to the recording; the supervisor and assessors will have access to the transcript and final report; and the final report will be posted on the university's website. Non-anonymized data in the form of signed consent forms and audio recordings are collected and retained as part of the research process.

HOW WILL THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE BE RECORDED, STORED AND PROTECTED?

Signed consent forms and original audio recordings will be retained on my computer until my degree is conferred. A transcript of interviews where all identifying information has been removed may be retained for further time. Under freedom of information legalization, you are entitled to access the information you have provided at any time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY?

The results will be submitted for the master's thesis to be reviewed but won't be published in scholarly publications.

WHOM SHOULD YOU CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION?

Fey Sdrolia
MSc Sustainable Entrepreneurship
S5296501
e.sdrolia@student.rug.nl

Arianna Rotulo
Sustainable Project Supervisor
a.rotulo@rug.nl

THANK YOU

Research Consent Form

Participant: _____

Interviewer: _____

The purpose of this research is to show how a social enterprise focused on work integration can identify, measure, and report the impact it has on its beneficiaries (employees).

Participation in the research is voluntary. The interviews will be recorded and transcribed, however, participants' names will be changed for anonymity. In case of any discomfort, the participant has the right not to answer any of our questions or terminate the interview at any point without consequences.

By signing this form I give my informed consent to participating in the interview.

Signature

Researcher

Participant

Fey Sdrolia
MSc Sustainable Entrepreneurship
S5296501
e.sdrolia@student.rug.nl

Arianna Rotulo
Sustainable Project Supervisor
a.rotulo@rug.nl