Multidiszciplináris tudományok, 13. kötet. 4. sz. (2023), pp. 172-183 ***https://doi.org/10.35925/j.multi.2023.4.15***

THE EFFECT OF COVID-19 EPIDEMIC TO THE SUSTAINABLE OPERATION OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIAL COOPERATIVES BASED ON FINANCIAL REPORTS FROM 2019, 2020 AND 2021

Sándor Bozsik
associate professor, University of Miskolc, Institute of Accounting and Finance
3515 Miskolc, Miskolc-Egyetemváros, e-mail: hgzb@uni-miskolc.hu

Abstract

This paper measures the effect of Covid-19 crisis to the sustainable operation of the Hungarian social cooperatives based on financial reports between 2019 and 2021. Consequently, 740 financial reports were analysed, which covers the population of the whole social cooperative sector in Hungary. The purpose of research was to detect the effect of Covid crisis to the management of Hungarian social cooperatives sector that faced two challenges in this period – the draining out of state subsidies and the dramatic changes caused by the epidemic. The changes of net sales, value-added, operating profit, net profit, and the changes of investment were examined between 2019 and 2021. Rank correlation was used to detect the significance of sectors to the variables, where the sectors were identified by one digit depth (according to Nomenclature of Economic Activities, NACE). The overall ranking was determined by calculating the aggregate average ranking by each examined variable. Findings were the followings: The operational sustainability of social cooperatives is determined by the aptitude of the management, the local microeconomic environment, and the availability of financing sources, rather than the changes in macroeconomic climate. In the world of social cooperatives, the outperforming sectors were the accommodation and recreation ones, while the construction industry and information services performed poorly.

Keywords: *Covid-19, social cooperatives, profitability analysis, rank correlation*

1. Introduction

More than two years have passed since the outbreak of the Covid-19 epidemic. Macroeconomic effects can be assessed relatively quickly, as the Central Statistical Office publishes data on industrial production on a monthly basis, and GDP data is also published quarterly. However, the analysis of the effects on individual companies had to wait, since the financial reports from the year 2021 had to be prepared only by May 2022. This article examines the impact of the Covid-crisis and the draining out of state subsidies on the sustainability of social cooperative sector. The main goal of the study is to determine the crisis-resistant and crisis-sensitive economic sectors, as well as to generally examine the importance of the sector in the economic results of social cooperatives based on the data of the 2019 and 2021 financial reports. The structure of the study is as follows: in the first part, we summarize the most important literature dealing with the economic nature of the crisis, then present the brief history of the Hungarian social cooperation. Next, we will describe the most important features of the database available to us, as well as our methodology applied to the analysis of sectoral effects. Consequently, the

above-mentioned data are presented and analysed. The paper ends up with the summary of the most important results and conclusions.

2. Literature overview

In this subchapter the two main challenges of social cooperatives' management are introduced, namely the nature of the Covid crisis and the operational changes within the Hungarian legal environment.

2.1. Atypical nature of Covid crisis

The Covid-19 economic crisis is an atypical economic crisis. A typical economic crisis (such as the 2008 crisis originating from the United States) typically begins with an economic sector being over credited, resulting in the creation of a financial bubble (overpricing). It was stock market speculation in 1929, it was the debt securities of some emerging countries such as Brazil, Mexico, and Poland in 1981, and it was the American mortgage market in 2008. As soon as overpricing becomes obvious, loans flowing into the overpriced sector become non-performing. Non-performing loans cause a capital adequacy and liquidity crisis for lending banks. In order to fulfil their capital base and manage the liquidity situation, lending is restrained throughout the economy. The credit crunch turns a financial crisis into a general crisis of overproduction since the indebted economic sectors should cut their demand. As a result of the curbing of lending and the lacking demand of indebted sectors, the crisis spills over into the entire economy further worsening the capital situation of banks, increasing unemployment, and further reducing aggregate demand. The psychological effect of the crisis is that people who are not directly exposed to the crisis but are afraid of the future also cut their demand. The increase in savings and the decrease in consumption further increase the overproduction crisis, so the economy enters a vicious circle. (Mattick, 2020)

The Covid crisis follows a different pattern. (Borio, 2020) Closures and production restrictions due to the epidemic have resulted in the disruption or significant damage to supply chains. The service sectors primarily exposed to the closures were tourism and accommodation, as well as personal services, like entertainment and recreation. The most exposed industrial sectors were the vehicle and the machinery industry, which formerly used more extensively the benefit of international division of labour. The first phenomenon of the crisis; therefore, was a lack of supply, which resulted in increased prices of manufactured goods. Thus, the decrease in GDP is not primarily caused by a decrease in consumption, but rather by a decrease in supply. The decrease in consumption mainly regarded to services (tourism, personal services). Market imbalances are only exacerbated by classic crisis management tools, like fiscal and monetary stimuli. This can be seen in the acceleration of inflation, the deteriorating balance of payments, and the increase in the public budget deficit.

The Covid crisis is very similar to the 1973 oil crisis. (Altiparmak, 2021) Unfortunately, crisis management is also similar. States consider the decline in GDP and the increase in unemployment to be a greater threat than runaway inflation and increasing indebtedness. That's why they are reacting to the crisis with a revival now like in the 1970s, which then led to the international debt crisis in the early 80s. However, according to some estimates, thanks to the stimulus measures, the decline in world GDP would have been 8% greater in the 1970s. (Gourinchas et al., 2021) However, the lesson of the 70s was that the increase in external and internal indebtedness and rising inflation permanently reduced the growth of the economy, so the price of temporary GDP growth will be paid in the future as a result of the decline due to the increase in debt and inflation.

The crisis management strategy of the European Union countries was generally the same as the crisis management practice of the other OECD countries and used the same tools as if the Covid crisis were

classical. Consequently, the economic policy mainly used extensive fiscal and monetary policy instruments. (Haroutunian et al., 2021) A wide range of measures were used to improve the liquidity of economic operators (interest rate reduction, preferential, targeted loans, loan moratorium), reduce the tax burden on the economy (VAT reduction, reduction of taxes on wages), and increase aggregate demand (extension of unemployment benefits, wage subsidies, family subsidies) (Podvrsic et al., 2020). Although there were significant differences in the composition, extent, and duration of the stimulus measures used by individual countries, they agreed that balance issues (inflation, indebtedness) were subordinated to cyclical issues, increasing GDP and reducing unemployment. (Liu and Geva-May, 2021)

2.1.1. Tools of Hungarian crisis management

Similar to other countries of the European Union, the Hungarian monetary and fiscal policy began a quantitative ease, and almost all way of expansionist policy tools were used (tax allowances, expense boost, interest rate cut and extensive money creation). (Terták et al., 2020) The more important measures of the instruments are presented in Tables 1 and 2 according to three aspects – who was the acting authority (government or MNB); whether the support was temporary or permanent, and the nature of the support (general or targeted). The estimated cost is expressed in % of GDP.

Table 1. *The fiscal instructions made by Hungary to manage the Covid-pandemic in 2020 (instruction against expansion with italics)*

	General	Targeted
Permanent	Decrease of payroll taxes (2%) Tax allowances for SME sector (1%) Shorter VAT reclaim period	Tax allowance for targeted groups (pensioneris, mother with four children, young employees) (0,5%) VAT rate decrease in sensitive sectors (0,3%)
Interim	Postponement of liquidation, enforcement General credit moratorium Launching state investments (6,3%) Extraordinary health expenses (2%)	Cancellation of payroll taxes in personal services and tourism and accommodation Extension of cafeteria (used for recreation, accommodation) wage subsidy (1,8%) Pre-financing of EU funds (4%)

Generally, the fiscal policy boosted the economy by 4.3% of GDP; however, caused a 15% increase of state debt in percentage of GDP in 2020. (Antal et al., 2021)

Monetary policy also began to expand strongly as a result of the crisis and in terms of the amount of loans extended and it did not lag behind on fiscal policy in its acceleration. Not only businesses, but also the population showed significant demand for loans and fixed interest loan schemes, which were particularly popular. As a result, the total balance sheet of MNB increased three timesin the past two years. (MNB, 2020)

Unfortunately, there were no instructions targeted the Hungarian social cooperatives. The eruption of the epidemic coincided with the end of governmental financing of these organisations. So, the social cooperatives remained without operational subsidies and should manage the lack of demand caused by the economic decline in 2020.

Table 2. *Main monetary policy instructions made by Hungarian National Bank to manage the Covid-crisis*

	General	Targeted
Permanent	Reserve rate to 0% (0,05%) Direct purchase of state securities (5%)	Expansion of Lending for Growth programme (4%)
Interim	Expansion of currency swap (0,3%) Refinancing backed by corporate loans (2%)	Corporate bond purchase programme (5,4%) Refinancing of SME and home loans at 0% (5%)

2.2. Concept of social cooperatives and the brief history of their subsidies

The foundation of social cooperatives in Hungary has been permitted by the 2006/X. Act on Cooperatives (Cooperative Act, 2006; § 14-24) and government decree (Government Decree 141, 2006) since 2006. Social cooperatives aim to create jobs for people who are permanently unemployed or socially disadvantaged and to encourage them to become active members of the social economy.

The social cooperative is a special economic entity with unique rules; namely the social cooperative is not a business organisation, so it can apply for public benefit status. Its name contains the term "social cooperative". Since 2013, non-profit organizations and municipalities can become members. From 2017, a newly founded social cooperative must have a local government member if it would be entitled for government subsidies. At least seven members must create the cooperative, and the members must undertake personal contribution to the operation (except for municipal and charitable organizations) (Piactárs, 2017).

However, the possibility of founding social cooperatives could not generate mass self-organization, so a government body - the National Employment Foundation Nonprofit Ltd. ((hereinafter referred to as: OFA) announced supportive programmes from 2008 to promote the creation of these organizations (Számadó, 2011). In the framework of the first OFA program, 36 social cooperatives were established in 2008. In 2010, a new subsidiary program was launched to support an atypical form of employment under the name TÁMOP-2.4.3.B-2-10/1,2. As a result, 200 new social cooperatives were founded, of which 57 people received support from this program. (Simkó-Tarjáni, 2011)

To aid the expanding network of domestic social cooperatives, a support organisation was established in 2009 within the framework of TÁMOP-2.4.3.b-1-09/1, whose task is to popularize new rural support programs, generate new applications, organize conferences, trainings, workshops, and forums on various topics, such as legal problems of founding, business planning, community development, and accounting, including financial support in these.

The second founding wave of social cooperatives started in 2016, when OFA launched a new subsidiary program entitled “Focus – Social cooperatives with local government membership”. (Focus, 2016) This additional program was based on the government decree on the purpose of public work (Government Decree, 2016). The program supported the employment of former public workers in the framework of social cooperatives with self-government among the members.

The program was conducted in two cycles with continuous evaluation between June 21 and October 4, 2016 (cycle 1) and between March 1 and August 31, 2017. The financial close of the first cycle was February 28, 2020, the second cycle ended on September 30.

The condition of the application was that at least two of the members were former public workers, and the employees were former unemployed, students or apprentices (Katonáné Kovács et al., 2017).

Table 3. *Main subsidies targeted the foundation and operation of social cooperatives in Hungary*

Name of application	Year	Total sum (mHUF)	Aim	Result
Let's cooperate	2008	945	Founding new social cooperatives	36 new cooperatives
Cooperation, Cooperation+, Market fellow	2008-2012	1 500	Supportive actions, advisory activity for social cooperatives	300 new social cooperatives
GINOP 5.1.3, 5.1.7 program	2013 - 2015	12 540	Founding and operation of new social cooperatives	around 1000 new social cooperatives
Name of application	Year	Total sum (mHUF)	Aim	Result
Fokus application I-II.	2016-2017	around 150 000	Founding and operation of new social cooperatives with local government membership	around 2000 new social cooperatives
"Sui Generis" Programme I-II	2016-2022	30 000	Stimulating the employment of existing cooperatives	about 1/3 of cooperatives remain operational
Market in fokus	2019-2021	270	Promoting the marketing effort of former Fokus members	n.a.

As you can see from the above table, the subsidies dropped dramatically when the Covid epidemic outbroke. The only available source for social cooperatives in this period was the market in Fokus program and the even less important „Diving Board" programme; however, the latter was not a governmental program but a private initiative.

Note, that in 2023 a new programme was launched that is called Fokus Start. This program partly finances the employment of maximum 2 employees that is far less than the traditional Fokus program, where the maximum was 7 employees. (OFA, 2023)

3. Data and methodology

The results of the study are based on the database provided by CrefoPort. The Faculty of Economics of the University of Miskolc purchased this company database from the CrefoPort company. This database contains the financial reports of Hungarian companies from 2004 to 2021 in text files, from which the data was uploaded to a MYSQL database. In addition to the data of the balance sheet and income statement, the database contains information on the name and address of the enterprises, the number of employees, the core activity sector, the territorial location, and legal status of the enterprises (operating or liquidated).

The research was aimed to examine how the economic situation of social cooperatives was affected by the Covid-19 crisis and the cut of state subsidies considering the sectorial distribution of theses organisations. From the financial report, we examined the change in the 3 most important categories of the income statement from 2019 to 2021, as well as the investments, also from 2019 to 2021 (Musinszki-

Süveges, 2019). The following indicators were used for the study to avoid the problem from division by zero:

$$Change\ in\ net\ sales = Net\ Sales\ in\ Current\ Year - Net\ Sales\ in\ Previous\ Year \quad (1)$$

$$Change\ in\ EBIT = EBIT\ in\ Current\ Year - EBIT\ in\ Previous\ Year \quad (2)$$

$$Change\ in\ Value\ Added = Value\ Added\ in\ Current\ Year - Value\ Added\ in\ Previous\ Year \quad (3)$$

$$Change\ in\ Investments = Investments\ in\ Current\ Year - Investments\ in\ Previous\ Year \quad (4)$$

The Net Sales and the Earnings Before Interest and Taxes (EBIT or operational profit) are raw data of the financial report. The Net Sales comes from the customers, and this has got a vital role in point of sustainability. The EBIT is the profit of core operation. The latter two indicators should be calculated in the following way.

$$Value\ Added = Net\ Sales - Material\ Costs \quad (5)$$

$$Investments = Closing\ Balance\ of\ Non - current\ Assets - Opening\ Balance\ of\ Non - current\ Assets + Depreciation\&Amortisation \quad (6)$$

The statistical tests were performed with the SPSS 25.0 program package. A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether the averages of the variables were significantly different in each sector, after cleaning the database of outliers. The sectoral breakdown was carried out based on the main sectors by the NACE08 statistical sector classification, which shows the sectors of the national economy by a European Union standard. (NACE, 2008) Although the main activity of each company was available in a four-digit breakdown, the number of cases in certain sectors would have been very small in the case of a finer breakdown. The other reason for choosing only the main sectors was that the main activity according to NACE does not always faithfully reflect the actual activity of the enterprise, so the use of aggregated data is more reliable. We did not use the division by main activity, however, because we sought a finer analysis than being able to determine only how the manufacturing industry performs compared to agriculture or the construction industry. Table 4 contains the number of analysed cooperates by the main NACE sectors.

Table 4. *Sectorial distribution of the analysed social cooperatives*

Main sectors by NACE	Count of social cooperatives	% of total	National %
Accommodation and food service	57	7,7%	3,8%
Administrative and support service	97	13,1%	2,3%
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	70	9,5%	5,1%
Arts, entertainment and recreation	11	1,5%	7,4%
Construction	69	9,3%	4,5%
Education	20	2,7%	4,3%
Human health and social work	23	3,1%	5,6%
Information and communication	11	1,5%	2,1%
Manufacturing	161	21,8%	4,6%

Main sectors by NACE	Count of social cooperatives	% of total	National %
Other services	74	10,0%	2,2%
Professional, scientific and technical activities	39	5,3%	3,0%
Real estate activities	8	1,1%	2,0%
Transporting and storage	8	1,1%	4,0%
Water supply, sewerage, waste management	11	1,5%	5,5%
Wholesale and retail trade	81	10,9%	3,9%
Grand Total	**740**	**100,0%**	**60,3%**

As you can see, the first four largest sectors of operating social enterprises by count are the manufacturing, then the administrative and support service, trade and other services respectively. The sectorial distribution of the cooperates is significantly different from the national level. There are main sectors where there is no operational social cooperatives either, for example mining, utilities, financial activities.

In point of Covid crisis sensitiveness, the manufacturing was affected only. The majority of social cooperatives operated in those sectors, where the risk expose of Covid-crisis was moderate.

To rank the sectors, the following method was used: Firstly, the correlation matrix of the variables was calculated to check the mutual dependencies. If keep the variables, which prove independent from each other. Then the sectors were ranked in ascending order by the independent variables, and assigned a number to each sector (the highest average value was given 1). A rank correlation was calculated to check that the independency among the existing variables remained. The order of the individual sectors was determined by averaging the serial numbers determined according to the order of the individual variables. If the value obtained is low, it means that the sector has significantly felt the effects of the Covid-19 epidemic, while a high value means that it managed to increase its economic performance significantly in 2020 as well. We repeat the examination between 2020 and 2021.

4. Results of analysis

To test the relevance of the variables, the correlation matrix was calculated by the initial year of the examination. This was the last year before the outbreak of the Covid crisis, namely 2019. If the correlation is strong between two variables, one of them should be skipped. The explanation power of the strongly correlated variables is weak.

There was a very strong correlation between the operating profit and the net income. The reason is, that the financial profit and the corporate tax payment represent the difference between them. The social cooperatives are like the non-profit organisation, do not make significant profit, so the tax payment is not significant. The lending of these institutions is also negligible, so the financial profit is very small.

Consequently, the latter analysis neglected the Net Income, it was dropped from the analysed data.

The net sales show a moderate relationship with the value added, the operating profit, and the net income. These relationships can be explained economically. On the one hand, there are material expenses between sales revenue and added value, and on the other, between added value and operating profit are personnel expenses and depreciation. Material costs are more variable costs, while depreciation and personnel costs are mostly fixed.

Table 5. *Correlation matrix of the examined variable*

2019 initial data	Net Sales	Value Added	Operating Profit	Net Income	Investment
Net Sales	1				
Value Added	0,39	1			
Operating Profit	0,38	0,27	1		
Net Income	0,35	0,24	0,99	1	
Investment	0,15	0,11	0,12	0,12	1

The low value of the correlation between the value added and the operating profit is interesting because it means that personnel expenses and depreciation developed independently. The reason behind this phenomenon may be that the crisis was relatively short-lived. The size of the amortization changes only on the longer term depending on new investments, while the layoffs (which would have affected the size of wages) were not large in the relevant period.

At first, let's look the performance of the social cooperatives in the first year of Covid-19 epidemic. The percentage changes of the variables were calculated by dividing the change in variables with the 2019 figure. Thereafter the percentage changes were ranked in descending order, and the ranks are presented in the right half of the table. Finally, the aggregate rank was calculated. The lower the total rank, the better was the performance of the particular sector.

Table 6. *Changes of variables in 2020 compared to the 2019 figures and the rank and the aggregate rank.*

Sectors in 2020	Change in variables				Rank in variables				To-tal
	Net Sales	Value Added	Operating Profit	Invest-ment	NS	VA	OP	IN	
Accommodation and food service	25,1%	45,1%	-138,3%	78,7%	2	2	12	5	21
Administrative and support service	12,0%	-0,3%	897,6%	54,1%	5	10	1	12	28
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	-16,6%	92,3%	-21,6%	112,5%	12	1	5	4	22
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	27,3%	26,0%	-103,3%	-13,0%	1	5	11	15	32
Construction	24,5%	34,6%	72,7%	44,8%	3	4	2	14	23
Education	-7,8%	-32,5%	-206,7%	275,7%	10	12	13	2	37
Human health and social work	-21,2%	11,5%	-258,3%	48,8%	13	7	15	13	48
Information and communication	-8,0%	-102,4%	-267,7%	65,3%	11	16	16	10	53

Sectors in 2020	Change in variables				Rank in variables				To-tal
	Net Sales	Value Added	Operating Profit	Invest-ment	NS	VA	OP	IN	
Manufacturing	17,8%	42,2%	-39,2%	70,1%	4	3	7	8	22
Other services	-21,5%	-34,2%	-44,0%	185,6%	14	13	8	3	38
Professional, scientific, and technical activities	1,4%	7,5%	-29,9%	78,0%	8	8	6	7	29
Real estate activities	-5,7%	-3,6%	-96,3%	-65,6%	9	11	10	16	46
Transporting and storage	-39,7%	-46,4%	-257,8%	295,4%	15	14	14	1	44
Water supply, sewage, waste management	-53,6%	-61,9%	-65,1%	55,6%	16	15	9	11	51
Wholesale and retail trade	10,6%	24,7%	-18,7%	78,4%	6	6	4	6	22

The result was surprising. The best performing sector of the social cooperatives was the accommodation and food service, which sector was supposed to was beaten by the crisis hard. The sales, the investments and value added grew dramatically, however the operating profit fell. The agriculture, trade and construction were the next best performing sectors – this is not surprised, while the consumption did not fell significantly, and the agriculture was not Covid crisis sensitive. The construction industry was above the average in the income statement indicators but invested less.

The worst sectors in the first year of Covid crisis was the human health and real estate activities and transporting. The transporting and the human health service were seriously affected by the closures, the number of social cooperatives operating in real estate activities was limited, so the result can be random. This can be mentioned in case of water supply and waste management. The worst record came from the information and communication sector, which is a surprise. One of the major beneficiaries from the crisis was the information sector due to the widespread of remote work and online shopping.

In 2021 the national economy quickly recovered from the shock of the 2020 economic decline. Unfortunately, the financial performance of the social cooperatives was not so robust, as the following table shows. Here the methodology was the same, and the denominator of the ratios was the 2019 figure.

The results were presented in Table 7.

The winner in 2021 was the accommodation and food service, which enjoyed the economic recovery The worst sectors in the first year of Covid crisis was the human health and real estate activities and transporting. The transporting and the human health service were seriously affected by the closures, the number of social cooperatives operating in real estate activities was limited, so the result can be random. This can be mentioned in case of water supply and waste management. The worst record came from the information and communication sector, which is a surprise. One of the major beneficiaries from the crisis was the information sector due to the widespread of remote work and online shopping.

In 2021 the national economy quickly recovered from the shock of the 2020 economic decline. Unfortunately, the financial performance of the social cooperatives was not so robust, as the following table shows. Here the methodology was the same, and the denominator of the ratios was the 2019 figure. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: *Changes of variables in 2021 compared to the 2019 figures and the rank and the aggregate rank.*

Sectors in 2021	Change in variables				Rank in variables				To-tal
	Net Sales	Value Added	Operating Profit	Invest-ment	NS	VA	OP	IN	
Accommodation and food service	72,9%	160,7 %	356,6%	145,6%	3	1	1	3	8
Administrative and support service	11,6%	39,6%	91,4%	98,6%	9	7	7	5	28
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	9,2%	-65,5%	-143,4%	123,3%	10	16	16	4	46
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	158,0 %	92,6%	226,9%	-2850,1%	1	4	3	16	24
Construction	-24,3%	-34,3%	-72,2%	-0,9%	13	15	14	15	57
Education	-26,2%	-6,8%	21,2%	45,9%	15	13	10	10	48
Human health and social work	35,8%	60,7%	216,4%	27,2%	5	5	4	11	25
Information and communication	-24,5%	5,5%	153,9%	55,8%	14	10	5	8	37
Manufacturing	27,9%	93,3%	121,1%	48,9%	6	3	6	9	24
Other services	5,9%	3,8%	-39,0%	214,7%	11	12	13	1	37
Professional, scientific, and technical activities	43,1%	55,8%	-26,7%	96,0%	4	6	12	6	28
Real estate activities	-29,8%	24,4%	-138,2%	20,8%	16	9	15	12	52
Transporting and storage	5,4%	5,4%	68,8%	14,4%	12	11	8	13	44
Water supply, sewerage, waste management	79,3%	155,9 %	229,7%	58,1%	2	2	2	7	13
Wholesale and retail trade	16,6%	-11,0%	34,7%	157,3%	8	14	9	2	33

5. Summary

The main conclusions are the following. The social cooperative sector is very special and different from the rest of the economy. The individual performance of these non-profit organisations is dependent of their location, management, and the dependency from the available financial sources rather than the overall climate of the economy. The overall Hungarian economy shows a sharp decline in 2020 and a quick recovery in 2021, but this did not reflect the financial performance of the social cooperatives.

The social cooperative sector presented increase in sales, value added, operating profit and investment both in 2020 and 2021, however the growth was more robust in 2021 than 2020. But against the sectorial differences, the performance grew in the 2020 recession.

Table 8 shows the comparison of the 2020 and 2021 aggregate variables weighted with the appropriate 2019 sector data.

Table 8. *Aggregate figures of examined variables in two years of Covid crisis*

Aggregate data	Net Sales	Value Added	Operating Profit	Investment
2020	8,4%	5,4%	19,3%	66,3%
2021	16,6%	34,2%	12,5%	12,6%

The second interesting fact was, examining the sectorial differences, that some sectors of social cooperatives performed well against the national trend like the accommodation and the recreation, while other sectors performed worser than the national average in 2020 like the information technology and water supply. In 2021 the construction sector performed poorly against the national trend.

References

[1] Mattick, L. (2020). *Economic crisis and crisis theory*. Routledge, New York. **https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003069690**

[2] Borio, C. (2020). The Covid-19 economic crisis: dangerously unique. *Bus Econ,* 55, 181–190. **https://doi.org/10.1057/s11369-020-00184-2**

[3] Altiparmak, S. O.: *73 crisis versus Covid-19: Comparative cases in regard to the United States energy transition*, 2021 International Symposium of Scientific Research and Innovative Studies, pp. 2679-2693.

[4] Gourinchas, P. O., Kalemli-Özcan, S., Penciakova, V., Sander, N. (2021). Fiscal policy in the age of COVID: Does it 'get in all of the cracks?' *NBER Working Paper* No. 29293 September. **https://doi.org/10.3386/w29293**

[5] Haroutunian, S., Steffen, O., Kamila, S. (2021). The initial fiscal policy responses of euro area countries to the COVID-19 crisis. *Economic Bulletin Articles, European Central Bank, 2021*. **https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/economic-bulletin/html/eb202101.en.html**

[6] Podvrsic, A., Becker, J., Piroska, D., Profant, T., Hodulak, V. (2020). *Mitigating the COVID-19 effect: Emergency economic policymaking in Central Europe* (August 27, 2020). ETUI Research Paper 2020.07. **https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3684990**

[7] Liu, Z., Geva-May, I. (2021). Comparative public policy analysis of COVID-19 as a naturally occurring experiment. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 23(2), 131–142. **https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2021.1894074**

[8] Terták, E., Kovács, L. (2020). A szociális védelem és a társadalmi kohézió kihívásai válsághelyzetben a pénzügyi szférában. *Pénzügyi Szemle,* 65(3), 364–384. ISSN 0031-496-X **https://doi.org/10.35551/PSZ_2020_3_3**

[9] Antal, J., Augusztin, A., Köber, Cs., Szilágyi, K. (2021). *Makrogazdasági, államháztartási helyzetkép és kitekintés 2021-2023.* Makrogazdaság, államháztartás koronavírus-járvány idején. A Költségvetési Tanács részére készült elemzések összefoglalói. pp. 96-108. ISBN 978-615-5948-69-5

[10] MNB (2020). *A Magyar Nemzeti Bank monetáris politikai eszköztára a Covid-19 válság időszakában: likviditás, biztonság, rugalmasság*. MNB. **https://www.mnb.hu/letoltes/jegybankieszkoztar-2020-covid19.pdf**

[11] Cooperative Act (2006). *Act on Cooperatives*. (Cooperative Act, 2006/X; § 14-24)

[12] Government Decree (2006). *Decree on Social Cooperatives*. 141/2006.

[13] Számadó, R. (2011). *Módszertani Kézikönyv I. - A szociális szövetkezet alapításától a fenntartható működésig*. OFA. ISBN 978-963-88223-6-9

[14] Government Decree (2016). *Decree on aim of public work programs*. 11/2016.

[15] Szövetkezz (2007). Szövetkezz. *Szociális szövetkezet alapítási kérelem*. **https://palyazatok.org/palyazat-a-szocialis-szovetkezetek-fejlesztesere-es-bovitesereszovetkezz2007/**

[16] Simkó, J., Tarjányi, O. (2011). *A szociális szövetkezetek és a támogatásukat szolgáló programok elemzése*. OFA.

[17] Piactárs (2017). *Hogyan működhet együtt a közszféra a szociális szövetkezetekkel?* Methodological Manual for Public Organisations. OFA. ISBN 978-615-80260-9

[18] Katonáné Kovács, J., Varga, E., Nemes, G. (2017). Fókuszban a társadalmi innováció a magyar vidéken. *Észak-magyarországi Stratégiai Füzetek*, 14(1), 6–19.

[19] OFA (2023). Fókusz Start. *Pályázati felhívás*. **https://ofa.hu/hu/programs/fokusz-start**

[20] Musinszki, Z., Süveges, G. (2019). Strategic decision-making supported by traditional financial indicators. *Oradea Journal of Business and Economics,* 4(1), 29–37. **https://doi.org/10.47535/1991ojbe057**

[21] NACE (2008). *Nomenclature statistique des Activites economiques dans la Communaute Europeenne*. **https://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/index/nace_all.html**