7 Social Enterprises in Lithuania

Historical Roots and Current Trends

*Audronė Urmanavičienė, Eglė Butkevičienė,
Philipp Erpf and Agota Giedrė Raišienė*

Introduction

The discourse on social enterprise (SE) in Lithuania emerged at the beginning of the new millennium, together with processes of legal institutionalisation of such types of enterprise. However, until now, the use and understanding of the concept have remained rather limited and fragmented. The coexistence of the conceptually similar—yet different— notions of “social enterprise”, “social company” and “social business” makes it difficult for society and academia to have a clear vision. This chapter presents an overview of the general SE context in the country, analysing factors that shaped SE development, and discusses three main models of social enterprise in Lithuania, namely work-integration social enterprises, social-business organisations and entrepreneurial non-profit organisations, and their links to the EMES indicators.

1. The General SE Context in Lithuania

The Lithuanian Law on Social Enterprises was adopted in 2004 and amended in 2011.¹ It provided a rather narrow definition of social enterprises as initiatives aiming

to employ the persons belonging to the target groups indicated in this Law and who have lost their professional and general capacity for work, are economically inactive and are unable to compete in the labour market under equal conditions; to promote the return of these persons to the labour market and their social integration; and to reduce social exclusion.

2004 Law on Social Enterprises, Article 2²

This law thus promotes initiatives that are usually referred to, at the international level, as work-integration social enterprises (WISEs). Their main goal is to integrate disadvantaged groups back into the

labour market and society. However, there are also in Lithuania organisations that do not meet the criteria linked to the employment and reintegration of disadvantaged people (e.g. the disabled and the long-term unemployed) and are consequently not considered as social enterprises by Lithuanian law, but which might be considered as “*de facto* social enterprises”.

This has led to a situation in which different groups of stakeholders (such as policymakers, civil-society organisations, social entrepreneurs and researchers) have diverse understandings of the notion of social enterprise. As emphasised in a country report about social enterprise in Lithuania,

[M]ost policy makers interpret social enterprise in a narrow sense (following the legal definition, which narrowly refers to work-integration social enterprises), while social-sector representatives tend to interpret the concept more broadly, referring to the concept of social entrepreneurship.

Gaušas *et al.* (2014: 1)

The limitations of the legal definition have been recognised by experts as well as by practitioners and social entrepreneurs. As recommended by experts in the same country report,

[S]ocial enterprise as it is defined legally is a rather limited concept, and therefore, government and public authorities should reform [the law] and lean towards a more liberal and broader definition of social enterprise.

Gaušas *et al.* (2014: 2)

NGOs that promote ideas of social entrepreneurship in Lithuania (e.g. NGO Avilys³) were in favour of the adoption of a broader definition and actively supported the need to amend the legislation.

Such initiatives resulted in the development of a “Conception of Social Entrepreneurship” (hereafter referred to simply as “the Conception”), which was approved by the Minister of Economy on April 3, 2015 (Order 2015, No. 4–207).⁴ The Conception presents the general principles of social business; however, it did not completely solve the conceptual problems linked to the notion of social enterprise. This document uses two concepts, namely that of “social business” and that of “social enterprise”, interpreting the latter as a part of the broader notion of social business. The Conception identifies three major tasks that should be accomplished to support the development of social businesses in Lithuania: (1) to create a favourable legal environment for social entrepreneurship; (2) to create a favourable financial and tax support system; and (3) to improve the visibility and raise awareness about the social-business and social-enterprise

phenomena in society. According to Greblikaitė *et al.* (2017c), on a strategic level, the Conception enhances the recognition of the importance of social entrepreneurship; however, in practice, the concept itself remains underdeveloped because of the lack of specific legal acts about social enterprises and the functioning of social business.

In 2019, new initiatives were launched with a view to legally defining and promoting the notions of “social business” and “social enterprise”. New legislative acts were initiated: a new Law on Social Enterprise was adopted on September 19, 2019 (No. XIII-2427)⁵ and came into effect in 2020; and a bill on Social Business Development⁶ is currently under consideration. The comparison between these two new pieces of legislation is summarised in Table 7.1.

The discussion between stakeholders in the public arena shows that, unfortunately, both the representatives of people with disabilities and social enterprises’ executives are unsatisfied with the changes brought about by the new law. Organisations of disabled people claim that the new law does not ensure that government support actually reaches the disabled employees, as subsidies are granted to companies rather than people. Meanwhile, social enterprises’ executives think that imposing tougher restrictions on the activities that these enterprises can conduct will make the majority of them go bankrupt. Some members of the government have declared that issues related to social enterprise and the disabled will be discussed anew (Adomavičienė 2019; Beniušis 2019; Balčiūnaitė 2019; Zumerytė 2019).

Considering the impact of contextual factors on the early-stage development of social enterprises in Lithuania (Erpf *et al.* 2019), there are several categories of factors that can account for the current state of social enterprise in the country, namely the absence of SE traditions in Soviet history; the weakness of the voluntary and non-profit sector; and an unfavourable legal environment, with a blurry understanding of social enterprise.

As just said, the first category of contextual factors includes historical reasons, and more specifically the *absence of social entrepreneurship and civic traditions during the Soviet period* (Erpf *et al.* 2019). Only from 1990 onwards, when Lithuania regained its independence, did the political system become “favourable [to the] development of private businesses, after a long period of planned economy” (Erpf *et al.* 2019: 1214); however,

as a legacy of the Soviet occupation, Lithuania inherited an almost completely state-owned agriculture, which was firmly moulded by . . . Soviet orthodoxy, [and where] both nominally collectively-owned kolkhozes and state-owned sovkhoses were operating under a heavy hand of state.

Samonis (1995: 5)

Table 7.1 Comparison between the new Law on Social Enterprise and the bill on Social Business Development

<i>Law on Social Enterprise (adopted, came into effect in 2020)</i>		<i>Bill on Social Business Development (under consideration)</i>
Definition	A social enterprise is a legal entity or its subdivision that employs a certain number (defined by law) of workers from a target group.	A social-business entity is a tiny, small or medium-sized enterprise that seeks a social impact, and whose annual income from economic activities represents more than 50% of its total income.
Social-impact aims	In the area of integration of vulnerable people, recruitment is aimed at people who have lost their professional and general capacity to work.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Integration of vulnerable persons through the promotion of employment of such persons or groups of persons; (2) efficient use of natural resources and waste management (actions related to climate change); (3) protection of biodiversity and landscape, animal care; (4) cultural activities and support to creativity in society; (5) disease prevention, patient protection and mutual assistance; (6) promotion of public health and healthy lifestyles; (7) defence of human rights and equal opportunities; (8) education in citizenship, patriotism, reduction of emigration, education of the public and information on issues related to state defence; (9) provision of social services as defined in the catalogue of social services approved by the Minister of Social Security and Labour; (10) improvement of the living conditions and/or activities of persons with disabilities and promotion of their freedom of movement and access to services in the community.
Reinvestment of profits	75% of profit must be allocated to the promotion of social integration and to the reduction of social exclusion.	80% of profits must be devoted to solving social problems.

Support

A social enterprise may receive wage subsidies and may benefit from reductions on state social-insurance contributions; it may also receive subsidies to create jobs, buy work equipment and adapt workplaces for disabled workers, and subsidies for the training of target group staff.

The following forms of governmental support may be provided to a social business:

- (1) right to use state assets;
- (2) reserved right to participate in public procurement;
- (3) provision of public services for social business in an authorised facility, business incubator, etc.;
- (4) promotion measures provided for in the Law on Small and Medium Business Development of the Republic of Lithuania.

The following forms of municipal support may be provided to a social business:

- (1) exemption from local charges;
- (2) right to use municipal property;
- (3) other forms of promotion established by municipal authorities.

Source: created by authors based on the new Law on Social Enterprise (adopted on September 19, 2019, No. XIII-2427⁷ and the bill on Social Business Development⁸

Thus, at that time, businesses and entrepreneurship that were mostly oriented towards gaining profit as collective forms of economic activities had negative connotations in society and were associated with the soviet period. It took a while to rediscover ideas linked to social entrepreneurship in Lithuania. Although “the formal entrepreneurship environment is [currently] considered to be very developed in the Baltic countries” (Rugina 2019: 58), social entrepreneurship is still in its early stage of development.

The *weakness of the voluntary and non-profit sector* in Lithuania and its lack of sustainability (Dvarionas 2017), despite gradually increasing civil liberties and levels of volunteering (Salamon and Sokolowski 2018), constitute a second category of factors having influenced the development of the SE sector in Lithuania. As emphasised by Nakrošis *et al.* (2018: 35), “Lithuanian society shows only an average interest in public affairs, while the social environment remains unfavourable for civic engagement”. Such situation also affects the development of social entrepreneurship and social enterprises.

Finally, as explained earlier, the *legal environment* does not facilitate the development of socially oriented businesses. Despite all the debates that have taken place at different levels, social enterprises such as they are strictly described in the law remain the only form of SE-like initiatives that receive financial support (subsidies and/or tax benefits) from the state. Many socially oriented companies are still not fully recognised as social enterprises.

2. Identification of SE Models

Based on an analysis of current legal regulations, scientific literature and examples of social enterprises, we identified three main models of social enterprise in Lithuania, namely *work-integration social enterprises*, *social-business organisations* and *entrepreneurial non-profit organisations*. In this second section, these types of organisation will be analysed with regard to the social, economic and governance-related indicators of the ideal-typical social enterprise such as they have been identified by the EMES Network (see Table 7.2).

2.1. Work-Integration Social Enterprises

The aim of Work-Integration Social Enterprises (WISEs) is the reintegration into work of excluded persons belonging to specific target groups, through production or service-provision activities. The origins of WISEs date back to Soviet times, when Lithuania belonged to the Soviet Union. Around 1960, several production units for the blind and deaf were set up to recruit these people and enable them to work. After Lithuania's accession to the EU, in 2004, efforts were made to harmonise Lithuania's policy with EU policy; this led to the adoption, in the same year, of the

Table 7.2 Lithuanian SE models and their links to the EMES indicators

<i>SE models</i>	<i>Work-integration social enterprises</i>	<i>Social-business organisations</i>	<i>Entrepreneurial non-profit organisations</i>
<i>EMES indicators</i>			
<i>A continuous activity producing goods and/or selling services</i>	✓	✓	Not always
<i>A minimum amount of paid work</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>A significant level of economic risk</i>	✓	✓	Not always
<i>An explicit aim to benefit the community</i>	Economic (and social) aims	✓	✓
<i>A limited profit distribution, reflecting the primacy of the social aim</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>An initiative launched by a group of citizens or a third-sector organisation</i>	Private investors	Private investors	✓
<i>A high degree of autonomy</i>	State aid for legally recognised enterprises	✓	✓
<i>A participatory nature, which involves various parties affected by the activity</i>	Limited stakeholder involvement	✓	✓
<i>A decision-making power not based on capital ownership</i>	Decision-making power usually held by executives and shareholders	Decision-making power usually held by the director/owner, who makes the key decisions	✓

Source: Created by the authors, based on Defourny and Nyssens (2012, 2017)

Law on Social Enterprises of the Republic of Lithuania. This law encouraged the employment of persons with various disabilities (not only the deaf and blind) and other vulnerable persons; it thus expanded the potential target group by enlarging the list of vulnerable groups concerned. As a result, many social enterprises of this type came into existence after the law was passed.

These enterprises offer professional integration for the most of the vulnerable groups in society, and the state supports their activities with constant subsidies. Between 2014 and 2018, the number of enterprises officially registered as social enterprises according to the 2004 law experienced a continuous increase. At the end of 2018, there were 177 WISEs in Lithuania. They employed about 7,018 employees belonging to their target groups, among which 6,699 persons with disabilities and 319 persons from other target groups.⁹ According to Greblikaitė *et al.* (2017b), major fields of activity include activities related to manufacturing (sewing and textile products, furniture, paper products, etc.) (36.7%), cleaning services (25%), consulting (10%), packaging manufacturing (9%), auxiliary construction and finishing (7%) and health (6%). Thanks to state subsidies, the working places can be adapted, so these enterprises can offer work activities for physically or mentally disabled persons. Although work enables these persons to acquire professional experience, there are no data about how many of these employees enter the open labour market after gaining work experience in a WISE. These enterprises, which offer permanent employment contracts, receive long-term state subsidies, which aim to compensate for the gap between the productivity required by the regular labour market and the actual capacity of the disabled persons. The vocational training offered is often on-the-job training. These enterprises usually have only a few volunteers.

According to the Law on Social Enterprises that was adopted in 2004 and amended in 2011, all WISEs had to meet the same prerequisites in order to qualify for the SE status: they had to create employment for people who were severely disadvantaged in the labour market, and they had to conduct activities that were supported by the state. In addition, employees belonging to specified target groups (the disabled, the long-term unemployed, persons for whom no more than five years were left until the pensionable age, single parents, ex-prisoners and drug addicts after rehabilitation) should represent at least 40% of the annual average number of employees, and the number of employees belonging to the target groups should be at least four. WISEs for the disabled were subject to all the requirements applying to social enterprises in general, but they should moreover meet additional criteria: (1) employees belonging to the target group of persons with disabilities had to represent at least 50% of the enterprise's annual average number of employees; (2) persons with a severe to moderate disability or with a working capacity of less than 40% of the average working capacity or with a high or medium level of special needs had to make up at least 40% of the annual average number of employees; and (3) the number of such employees should not be less than four. All these requirements are still present in the new Law on Social Enterprise¹⁰ (adopted on September 19, 2019, No. XIII-2427) that came into effect in 2020.

State aid is provided for legally recognised WISEs. A WISE may be granted state aid of the following types: (1) wage subsidies and subsidies

covering social-insurance contributions; (2) subsidies for the creation or adaptation of workplaces for disabled employees and acquisition or adaptation of working equipment for these employees; and (3) subsidies for the training of employees from the target groups. Social enterprises for the disabled may be granted additional state aid of the following types: (1) subsidies for the adaptation of the work environment, production premises and rest rooms for the disabled employees; (2) subsidies for the reimbursement of additional administrative and transport expenses; and (3) subsidies for the reimbursement of expenses linked to the employment of an assistant (sign-language interpreter). In addition to the aforementioned subsidies, WISEs are entitled to certain privileges in public-procurement procedures. Greblikaitė *et al.* (2017a) point out that over a decade, state subsidies to social enterprises were multiplied by more than 20, from €0.57 million in 2004 to over €11.58 million in 2014. Since 2008, a large share of subsidies has come from EU funds.

WISEs can be classified as hybrid organisations since they pursue both economic goals—earning profit—and social goals—they employ people from the target groups listed earlier, develop these persons' working and social skills, and work towards their social integration (Raišienė and Urmanavičienė 2018). They are governed by both a social-welfare logic and a commercial logic. They do not fully meet all the indicators characterising the ideal-typical social enterprise such as it has been described by the EMES Network. Until recently, their profits were distributed to the shareholders and were not invested in the well-being and vocational development of excluded workers. These companies do not fit either into EMES' conception of the governance-related dimension of social enterprise. This type of social enterprise is not open to multi-stakeholder involvement, and employees and other stakeholders are not involved in decision-making and management processes. The decision-making power rests with the company's executives and shareholders (Gaušas *et al.* 2014).

The leading players promoting WISEs are business-sector companies. Indeed, they see WISEs as beneficial to the business, to the extent that they can be viewed as a tool that allows them to earn as much revenue as possible. Recently it has become clear that there had been cases in which the law had been abused, and some social enterprises had been set up purely because of the support they expected from the state. Disabled people's organisations and other civil-society organisations heavily criticised this WISE model for its lack of real social impact and the disproportionate public support it received. The new Law on Social Enterprise provides for reduced wage subsidies, and the duration of state support is limited to six months. Seventy-five per cent of WISEs' profits must be reinvested for social inclusion and measures aiming to support job-skills development. However, the way in which profit should be reinvested is not defined, and the new Law on Social Enterprise is still heavily criticised by representatives of disability organisations and by some politicians, who believe that

the law does not address the problem in its entirety, to the extent that the state-aid model remains more focused on helping companies than on supporting individuals, thus creating the conditions for abuse and inefficient use of public funds.

2.2. Social-Business Organisations

Social-business organisations are businesses in which the social mission is the most important mission, and the main aim is to find solutions for social problems in society. Social-business organisations choose and implement their business strategies in a way that is consistent and does not conflict with their social mission (in the best of cases, their business model even strengthens the social mission). For example, the “Mano guru” cafe,¹¹ which re-integrates former drug addicts, does not sell alcohol, because that would contradict their social mission—that is, integration of and promotion of a healthy lifestyle for former addicts—despite the fact that selling alcohol could increase their income and profit. According to Stevens *et al.* (2015), social enterprises combine social and economic goals, and they have to manage a tension between these two different goals. However, social-business organisations prioritise their social mission and this can entail a risk of mission drift (Battilana and Dorado 2010); indeed, mission drift could occur when the organisation is intensively focused on the social mission, and it does not maintain its economic efficiency¹² (Raišienė and Urmanavičienė 2018).

The aim of social businesses is to pursue a social mission; whether they do so through manufacturing or through the provision of services, the most important aspect is solving social issues in society. Businesses of this kind solve various problems; they empower women, provide transportation for disabled people, fight poverty of elderly people and large families, etc. These businesses are quite sustainable, financially speaking: they are able to survive solely from their economic activity (provision of services or sale of goods), or they strive to diversify their income—at least half or more of their income is generated by their economic activity, while the rest comes from project-related EU funds, private grants, etc. As these companies devote all or part of their profits to the pursuit of social goals, they usually have the legal status of non-governmental, non-profit organisations (such as a public-institution status). According to the laws of Lithuania, organisations that choose the legal status of non-governmental organisation (NGO) cannot distribute any profit to their owners or managers, and their profit must be devoted to the pursuit of their objectives such as they are specified in the articles of association. However, some social businesses use the legal status of private limited-liability company (*uždaroji akcinė bendrovė*, or UAB) or that of small partnership (*mažoji bendrija*, or MB), which are more typical of traditional business organisations, and which do not impose any limitation on the distribution of profits to company managers and shareholders. It

should be noted that social-business enterprises are, in some cases, created by a group of active citizens or a third-sector organisation seeking to solve a particular social problem, but very often, they are created and run by a single person, a social entrepreneur, who leads the organisation forward and makes key decisions.

Social businesses are not legally recognised in Lithuania; they exist *de facto* and, consequently, they do not receive any state support. Thus, in order to ensure the financial stability of their activities or to increase their income, they also seek to take part in various EU-supported projects and programmes. On the other hand, a bill on Social Business Development¹³ foresees that these organisations will be eligible for state support in the future, although social-business organisations will not be entitled to the same state support as WISEs (see Table 7.1). Under this bill, it is proposed to define social businesses as organisations engaged in continuous economic activity with the primary goal of achieving a measurable social impact. The bill on Social Business Development is strongly supported by various civil-society organisations active in the field of social entrepreneurship (non-governmental sector) and by the Ministry of Economy and Innovation, which is interested in the development of social innovation and social business in Lithuania. The purpose of this bill is to align the Lithuanian legal framework for social enterprises with the general criteria provided by the European Commission for social businesses and social enterprises, in particular regarding the reinvestment of profits for the development of activities.

It is important to note that, as of yet, there are no official data on the current number of social businesses in Lithuania. Thanks to the programmes developed by several non-governmental organisations, various incubators have been set up and workshops have been organised to promote the establishment of this kind of businesses, and public interest in social businesses is noticeable. Kuklytė and Raišienė (2018) highlighted, through an analysis of Google Trends data from 2016, an increasing interest, among Lithuanian Internet users, for concepts related to the social-business model.

Social businesses are the organisations that, in the Lithuania context, come closest to the ideal-type of social enterprise such as it has been described by the EMES Network. Indeed, the primary mission of this type of business is social; their profits are not distributed to the business' owners, which reflects the primacy of the social goal; they have a steady economic activity (selling goods and services on the market); and they are exposed to economic risks. However, as already mentioned, this type of business is not always created at the initiative of a group of citizens or a third-sector organisation; social businesses are indeed often established and developed by a key leader. Consequently, decisions are sometimes made unilaterally by the head of the organisation, but these organisations are usually open to the participation of and to partnerships with various stakeholders in the development of their activities.

2.3. Entrepreneurial Non-Profit Organisations

Like social businesses, entrepreneurial non-profit organisations are non-governmental, non-profit organisations that aim to apply various earned-income strategies in their activities. However, unlike social businesses, entrepreneurial non-profit organisations do not have any financially sustainable business model, and they are quite dependent on state support, project-related funds from the European Social Fund, etc.

It should be emphasised that the economic activities implemented by entrepreneurial NPOs usually involve small-scale trade or manufacturing in local communities, among members, sponsors of the organisations, etc. There are no official data on how much income entrepreneurial NPOs earn from their economic activity, and how much income they derive from other sources.

The European Union supports entrepreneurial activities—high amounts of EU funds are dedicated to this, especially in rural areas. For instance, special support now focuses on social entrepreneurship involving local action groups in Lithuanian rural areas. The new rules for the calls for proposals for EU-funded projects that have recently been implemented¹⁴ provide new opportunities for rural areas to develop social enterprise, to reconstruct existing activities in a socially oriented way, creating various products and added value for actors in rural areas (Greblikaitė *et al.* 2017a). But very often, non-profit organisations transform themselves into entrepreneurial NPOs in order to obtain financial support from public institutions, because it gives them better access to distribution channels (Kuklytė and Raišienė 2018); but once this support is terminated, the market activities of these organisations often cease too. As a result, these market activities can be periodical.

The activities of entrepreneurial NPOs involve people belonging to the community or to a group who share common needs or goals. Usually, key decisions are made by the members of the organisation or the community. These enterprises widely use volunteering and create only few paid working positions. It should be noted that there are no official data on the current number of entrepreneurial non-profit organisations in Lithuania.

Conclusion

Lithuania regained its independence only in 1990. This marked a watershed for entrepreneurial activities and private businesses, which started focusing on making profits. It took a while for the concept of social enterprise to start emerging, though—not least because of the fact that the third sector in Lithuania is historically rather weak. The state is still seen as the first provider of social services.

In 2004, the first “Law on Social Enterprises” was adopted; it defined a social enterprise as any sort of enterprise that is set up to create employment for people that are severely disadvantaged in the labour market

and provided for financial support from the state for organisations that obtained the SE status.

Due to the narrow perspective adopted in this law, a lot of organisations with a clear social aim (and which might be considered as “*de facto* social enterprises”) were not legally considered as social enterprises because they did not meet all the criteria set out in the law.

With a view to overcoming this situation, the new Bill on Social Business Development seeks to legitimise and develop other social-business models. The aim of this bill is to align the legal framework for the activities of social enterprises with the general criteria provided by the European Commission for social businesses and social enterprises, in particular regarding the reinvestment of profits for the further development of social activities.

Currently, three SE models can be distinguished in Lithuania: (1) organisations that operate under the SE status and which are, in fact, work-integration social enterprises (WISEs); (2) social businesses, which apply business strategies to achieve their social mission; and (3) entrepreneurial non-profit organisations, that is, non-governmental organisations that act in an entrepreneurial way, to the extent that they try to implement some earned-income strategies in their activities.

In a forward-looking perspective, some initiatives and efforts aim to further promote Lithuanian social enterprises. The Social Enterprise Summit,¹⁵ for example, is a regularly organised conference that brings together decision-makers, leaders from social enterprises, incubators and EU representatives. The summit addresses topics such as the social-business concept, perspectives for social enterprises, and potential practice transfers inspired by successful cases from other European countries to Lithuania.

Lithuania is still facing challenges regarding the promotion of social enterprise. However, developments point in a positive direction: the improvement of the legal situation of social enterprise leads to better conditions and support, as well as to a higher acceptance and understanding on the part of decision- and policy-makers, and this in turn leads to an increase in the number of organisational entities of the three types identified here and thus to a better understanding and higher awareness of the SE phenomenon in society at large.

Notes

1. Law on Social Enterprises, June 1, 2004, No. IX-2251 (No. XI-1771, 2011–12–01, Žin., 2011, Nr. 155–7352 (2011–12–20)); amendments Nr. X-293, 2005–06–30, Žin., 2005, Nr. 85–3137 (2005–07–14); Nr. X-872, 2006–10–19, Žin., 2006, Nr. 116–4405 (2006–10–31), Nr. X-1040, 2007–01–18, Žin., 2007, Nr. 17–629 (2007–02–08).
2. *Ibid.*
3. See www.nvoavilys.lt/?lang=en.

4. See www.ukmin.lt/uploads/documents/Verslo%20aplinka/Smulkus%20verslas/Socialinio_verslo_koncepcija_2015_%C4%AF-sakymas.pdf.
5. See <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.235368/asr>.
6. See <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/5ea44c40761411e99ceae2890faa4193>.
7. See <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.235368/asr>.
8. See <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/5ea44c40761411e99ceae2890faa4193>.
9. Užimtumo tarnybos prie Socialinės apsaugos ir darbo ministerijos Socialinių įmonių veiklos ir administravimo analizė; see <https://uzt.lt/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Socialini%C5%B3-%C4%AFmoni%C5%B3-veiklos-ir-administravimo-analiz%C4%97-2014-2018-m.docx>.
10. See <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.235368/asr>.
11. See www.manoguru.lt/.
12. The term “mission drift” usually refers to a situation in which economic goals take precedence over the social mission; however, it can also, though it is much rarer, refer, as it does here, to the opposite situation.
13. See <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/5ea44c40761411e99ceae2890faa4193>.
14. See www.nma.lt.
15. Social Enterprise Summit, 2014–2017 annual reports; see www.socialinisverlas.lt/en/summit/.

References

- Adomavičienė, L. (2019) *Neigaliųjų įdarbinimą vadina 21 amžiaus vergove: imonės lobsta valstybės sąskaita*. Available HTTP: www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/1098619/neigaliuju-idarbinima-vadina-21-amziaus-vergove-imonės-lobsta-valstybės-saskaita (accessed on October 18, 2019).
- Balčiūnaitė, S. (2019) *Seimas nustatė naują socialinių įmonių veiklos tvarką*. Available HTTP: www.diena.lt/naujienos/verslas/ekonomika/seimas-nustate-nauja-socialiniu-imoniu-veiklos-tvarka-931161 (accessed on October 19, 2019).
- Battilana, J. & Dorado, S. (2010) “Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 6, pp. 1419–40.
- Beniušis, V. (2019) *Sprendžiant neigaliųjų įdarbinimo klausimus—žingsnis į priekį*. Available HTTP: www.diena.lt/naujienos/lietuva/politika/sprendziant-neigaliuju-idarbinimo-klausimus-zingsnis-i-prieki-934234 (accessed on October 9, 2019).
- Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M. (2012) “The EMES approach of social enterprise in a comparative perspective”, *EMES Working Papers*, No. 12/03, Liege: EMES International Research Network.
- Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M. (2017) “Fundamentals for an international typology of social enterprise models”, *Voluntas*, Vol. 28, pp. 2469–97.
- Dvarionas, D. (2017) “Incentives for social sustainability of the third sector in Lithuania”, in Gervasi, O., Murgante, B., Misra, S., Borruso, G., Torre, C. M., Rocha, A. M. A. C., Taniar, D., Apduhan, B. O., Stankova, E. & Cuzzocrea, A. (eds) *Computational Science and Its Applications—ICCSA 2017*, Vol. 10409, New York: Springer.
- Erpf, P., Bryer, T. A. & Butkevičienė, E. (2019) “A Context-Responsiveness Framework for the Relationship Between Government and Social Entrepreneurship:

- Exploring the Cases of United States, Switzerland, and Lithuania”, *Public Performance & Management Review*, Vol. 42, No. 5, pp. 1211–29.
- Gaušas, S., Suduiko, E. & Balčiūnė, A. (2014) *Country Report: Lithuania: A Map of Social Enterprises and Their Eco-systems in Europe*. Available HTTP: www.google.com/url?sa=t&rcrt=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwjPwPbOgOfmAhXOyqQKHb2KC8AQFjAAegQIBRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2FblobServlet%3FdocId%3D12994%26langId%3Den&usg=AOvVaw0zmCr6rv-eQnkwc2fVOJDI (accessed on February 1, 2018).
- Greblikaitė, J., Gerulaitienė, N. & Sroka, W. (2017a) “From traditional business to social one: New possibilities for entrepreneurs in rural areas”, proceedings of *The International Scientific Conference “Rural Development 2017”*, November 23–24, 2017, Kaunas, pp. 1031–35.
- Greblikaitė, J., Gerulaitienė, N., Žiukaitė, Ž. & Garcia-Machado, J. J. (2017b) “Social economy: the potential and challenges of social enterprises in Lithuania”, *European Integration Studies*, Vol. 11, pp. 53–64.
- Greblikaitė, J., Rakštys, R. & Caruso, D. (2017c) “Social entrepreneurship in rural development of Lithuania”, *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 157–65.
- Kuklytė, J., & Raišienė, A. G. (2018) “Assessment of social business model in Lithuania by using factor analysis”, in *Drivers for Progress in the Global Society: The 5th European Interdisciplinary Forum 2017* (EIF 2017), Vilnius, Bologna: EDlearning, pp. 35–42.
- Nakrošis, V., Vilpišauskas, R. & Jahn, D. (2018) *Sustainable Governance Indicators 2018: Lithuania Report*, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung. Available HTTP: www.sgi-network.org/docs/2018/country/SGI2018_Lithuania.pdf (accessed on October 20, 2019).
- Raišienė, A. G. & Urmanavičienė, A. (2018) “Mission drift in a hybrid organization: How can social business combine its dual goals?” *Ekonomski vjesnik/ Econviews-Review of Contemporary Business, Entrepreneurship and Economic Issues*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 301–10.
- Rugina, S. (2019) “Female entrepreneurship in the Baltics: Formal and informal context”, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 58–74.
- Salamon, L. M. & Sokolowski, W. (2018) “The size and composition of the European third sector”, in Enjolras, B., Salamon, L. M., Sivesind, K. H. & Zimmer, A. (eds) *The Third Sector as a Renewable Resource for Europe: Concepts, Impacts, Challenges and Opportunities*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Samonis, V. (1995) *Transforming the Lithuanian Economy: From Moscow to Vilnius and from Plan to Market*, Warsaw: CASE Research Foundation. Available HTTP: https://case-research.eu/files/?id_plik=2402 (accessed on October 9, 2019).
- Stevens, R., Moray, N. & Bruneel, J. (2015) “The social and economic mission of social enterprises: Dimensions, measurement, validation, and relation”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 1051–82.
- Zumerytė, S. (2019) *Konservatoriai siūlo naikinti dabar galiojančių socialinių įmonių sistemą*. Available HTTP: www.diena.lt/naujienos/verslas/ekonomika/konservatoriai-siulo-naikinti-dabar-galiojancia-socialiniu-imoniu-sistema-930953 (accessed on October 18, 2019).