

Critical survey: The Third Sector and the Regional Development of Social Capital

Birch, Kean; Whittam, Geoff

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Birch, K., & Whittam, G. (2008). Critical survey: The Third Sector and the Regional Development of Social Capital. *Regional Studies*, 42(3), 437-450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400701874222>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



CRITICAL SURVEY: The Third Sector and the Regional Development of Social Capital

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Regional Studies</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | CRES-2006-0246.R2 |
| Manuscript Type: | Critical Surveys |
| JEL codes: | L3 - Nonprofit Organizations and Public Enterprise < L - Industrial Organization, R0 - General < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R58 - Regional Development Policy < R5 - Regional Government Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics |
| Keywords: | Third Sector, Social economy, Social enterprise, Social entrepreneurship, Social Capital, Regional development |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **CRITICAL SURVEY: The Third Sector and the Regional Development of Social**
4
5 **Capital**
6
7

8
9
10 KEAN BIRCH

11
12 Centre for Public Policy for Regions

13
14 University of Glasgow

15
16 Ivy Lodge

17
18 63 Gibson Street

19
20 Glasgow

21
22 G12 8LR

23
24
25
26
27
28
29 Tel: 00 +44 (0)141 330 1913

30
31 Email: kean.birch@socsci.gla.ac.uk
32
33

34
35
36 GEOFF WHITTAM

37
38 Paisley Business School

39
40 University of Paisley

41
42 Paisley

43
44 PA1 2BE

45
46
47
48
49 Tel: 00 +44 (0)141 848 3368

50
51 Email: Geoff.Whittam@paisley.ac.uk
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 First received: October 2006
4
5
6

7 Accepted: August 2007
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3 ABSTRACT
4
5
6
7

8 There is a growing academic and policy interest in the Third Sector and its potential
9 impact on regional development. A key aspect of the Third Sector is its role in regional
10 development through the promotion of social capital. However, there is considerable
11 debate around the definition of the Third Sector that limits our understanding of its
12 impact. Here we first disentangle a number of ambiguities to clarify the distinctions
13 between the concepts before secondly exploring the relationship between the regional
14 development of social capital and the various aspects of the Third Sector. Finally we
15 consider UK policy agendas and initiatives in light of the earlier discussion.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 KEY WORDS: Third Sector, social economy, social enterprise, social entrepreneurship,
30 social capital, regional development.
31
32
33
34
35

36 JEL CODES: L3; R0; R58; R5
37
38

39 **Le secteur tertiaire et le développement régional du capital social**
40

41 **KEAN BIRCH et GEOFF WHITTAM**
42
43
44
45

46 RESUME
47

48 Le monde universitaire et la politique s'intéressent de plus en plus au secteur tertiaire et à
49 son impact potentiel sur le développement régional. Un aspect majeur du secteur tertiaire
50 est son rôle dans le développement régional par la promotion du capital social. Le secteur
51 tertiaire reste toutefois l'objet d'un débat considérable qui limite notre compréhension de
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 son impact. Dans cet article, nous commençons par démêler un certain nombre
4 d'ambiguïtés pour préciser la distinction entre les concepts avant, dans un deuxième
5 temps, d'explorer les relations entre le développement régional du capital social et les
6 divers aspects du secteur tertiaire. Enfin, nous analysons les programmes et les initiatives
7 de la politique du Royaume-Uni à la lumière des précédentes discussions.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16
17
18 Mots-clés : secteur tertiaire, économie sociale, entreprise sociale, entrepreneuriat social,
19 capital social, développement régional.
20
21

22
23
24
25 CODES JEL : L3; R0; R58; R5
26
27

28 **Der Dritte Sektor und die Regionalentwicklung von Sozialkapital**

29 KEAN BIRCH and GEOFF WHITTAM
30
31

32 **ABSTRACT**

33
34 Wissenschaft und Politik interessieren sich zunehmend für den Dritten Sektor
35 und seine potenzielle Auswirkung auf die Regionalentwicklung. Ein zentraler
36 Aspekt des Dritten Sektors ist seine Rolle in der Regionalentwicklung durch die
37 Förderung von Sozialkapital. Allerdings gibt es eine beträchtliche Debatte
38 hinsichtlich der Definition des Dritten Sektors, wodurch unser Verständnis seiner
39 Auswirkung eingeschränkt wird. In diesem Beitrag beseitigen wir zunächst
40 verschiedene Unklarheiten, um die Unterschiede zwischen den Konzepten zu
41 erläutern. Anschließend untersuchen wir die Beziehung zwischen der
42 Regionalentwicklung des Sozialkapitals und den verschiedenen Aspekten des
43 Dritten Sektors. Zuletzt erörtern wir die politischen Agenden und Initiativen in
44 Großbritannien im Hinblick auf die frühere Diskussion.
45
46
47

48 **KEY WORDS:**

49 Dritter Sektor
50 Sozialwirtschaft
51 Sozialunternehmen
52 Soziales Unternehmertum
53 Sozialkapital
54 Regionalentwicklung
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 JEL CODES: L3; R0; R58; R5
4
5
6
7

8 El Tercer Sector y el desarrollo regional del capital social
9 KEAN BIRCH and GEOFF WHITTAM
10

11 ABSTRACT
12

13
14 Existe un creciente interés académico y político en el Tercer Sector y su posible
15 efecto en el desarrollo regional. Un aspecto fundamental del Tercer Sector es la
16 función que desempeña en el desarrollo regional mediante el fomento del capital
17 social. Sin embargo, existe un debate significativo acerca de la definición del
18 Tercer Sector que limita nuestra capacidad para entender sus repercusiones.
19 Por ende aquí esclarecemos una serie de ambigüedades para clarificar las
20 diferencias entre los conceptos antes de explorar la relación entre el desarrollo
21 regional del capital social y los diferentes aspectos del Tercer Sector.
22 Concluimos con un análisis del programa y las iniciativas políticas en el Reino
23 Unido con respecto a la discusión anterior.
24
25
26

27 KEY WORDS:

28 Tercer Sector
29 Economía social
30 Empresa social
31 Empresariado social
32 Capital social
33 Desarrollo regional
34
35

36 JEL CODES: L3; R0; R58; R5
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1. INTRODUCTION
4
5
6

7 Despite the importance of the Third Sector to the UK and its regions (see
8 SMALLBONE, *et al.* 2001; ECOTEC, 2003; MCGREGOR *et al.*, 2003; ARTHUR *et al.*,
9 2004; HUDSON, 2005; IFF RESEARCH, 2005), there is considerable confusion over its
10 definition, the distinction between its constituent parts, and its impact on regional
11 development (ADAMS *et al.*, 2003; HARDING and COWLING, 2004). In part the
12 existence of numerous terms like social economy, social enterprise and social
13 entrepreneurship produces considerable confusion because these concepts have only been
14 subject to academic attention and debate in the last decade or so (SEELOS and MAIR,
15 2005). Thus it is particularly important for a journal like *Regional Studies* to address the
16 issue of *socio-economic* development that such debates on the Third Sector have
17 stimulated, especially in relation to the increasing importance placed on social
18 embeddedness and social capital in regional development.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 At present the lack of clarity in discussions around the Third Sector leads to
36 frequent theoretical and empirical slippage between concepts and terms such as the social
37 economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship. As a result, HAUGH (2005b,
38 p.10) argues that “research in social entrepreneurship ... is hindered by the lack of
39 standard and universally acceptable definitions”. This is something that NICHOLLS
40 (2006) suggests is particularly important to solve considering that the Third Sector has
41 become so popular with academics and policy-makers, although others would disagree
42 with the aim of creating such ‘essentialist’ typologies (see MOULAERT and
43 NUSSBAUMER, 2005). Section 2 of this article therefore explores three core concepts in
44 the Third Sector – the social economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship – to
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 draw out the differences between organisational and institutional characteristics, different
4 activities and their motivation. In so doing we address the relationship between the
5 concepts and what implications these might have for the Third Sector as a whole in order
6 to contribute to ongoing debates that cut across the social sciences. However, in so doing
7 we do not seek to eliminate conceptual diversity altogether.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Arguably the growing interest in the Third Sector can be seen as a result of the
16 'hollowing out' of the state provision of services and goods for their citizens (BUDD,
17 2003; PATON, 2003; FYFE, 2005) as well as recent policy concern with sustainable
18 development, climate change and other ecological issues. For example, the current British
19 government's social enterprise policy has been oriented around the promotion of social
20 enterprises as a "diverse and enterprising way of tackling social and environmental
21 issues" (SMALL BUSINESS SERVICE, 2005) including social inclusion, local
22 regeneration and community empowerment (see DTI, 2002). Part of the policy interest is
23 derived from the perceived relationship between the regeneration of deprived and
24 disadvantaged communities and social capital (HM TREASURY, 1999; DEVINE-
25 WRIGHT *et al.*, 2001), which we discuss in detail in Section 3. Thus it has been argued
26 that social capital can be promoted through the Third Sector (LEADBEATER, 1997;
27 THOMPSON *et al.*, 2000; see FYFE, 2005 for critical view), which, in turn, promotes
28 and cements (sustainable) regional development (DEVINE-WRIGHT *et al.*, 2001;
29 RYDIN and HOLMAN, 2004).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 In the final section of the article we turn to regional policy to illustrate how the
52 relationship between regional development and the Third Sector has been conceived in
53 rather limited terms by both national and 'regional' governments. We focus explicitly on
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the UK because of the strong recent interest in social enterprise in academic and policy
4 debates. We have also chosen to focus on Scotland because it represents an example of a
5
6
7
8 'region' suffering from the consequences of long-term *socio-economic* uneven
9
10 development that has adopted Third Sector policies distinct from the national and other
11 devolved governments. This discussion illustrates the differences between policy agendas
12 and initiatives at different scales and how they impact on the regional development of
13 social capital within and across different geographical locations. In particular we separate
14 discursive claims from policy implementation in order to consider the conceptual
15 confusion around visions of and for the Third Sector that blur the already confused
16 distinction between the social economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship (see
17 ARTHUR *et al.*, 2003). Thus we highlight the current government emphasis on public
18 service delivery in Third Sector policy, especially in relation to regional development,
19 and how this might prove detrimental to the promotion of social capital.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **2. THREE CORE CONCEPTS: SOCIAL ECONOMY, SOCIAL ENTERPRISE** 37 38 **AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP** 39 40 41 42

43
44 The literature on the Third Sector, particularly the recent expansion of interest in
45 social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, emphasises the importance of the 'triple
46 bottom line' of economic, social and ecological goals (BOSCHEE and McCLURG, 2003;
47 SOCIAL ENTERPRISE COALITION, 2003; ELKINGTON, 2004; WALLACE, 2005;
48 JONES and KEOGH, 2006).¹ However, there is considerable blurring between concepts
49 like the social economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship as well as between
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the market, state and Third sector. Thus although the organisational, institutional and
4
5 motivational characteristics of the Third Sector sets it apart from the private and state
6
7 sectors, it does not mean that there is no link between these three sectors.
8
9

10 For example, the 'hollowing out' of the state and retreat from the state provision
11
12 of welfare has meant that social enterprise is being used to deliver government agendas
13
14 and policies (PATON, 2003), whilst the social objective precludes a market-based
15
16 solution. In turn, social entrepreneurs or entrepreneurship can emerge in and operate
17
18 across both the state and market sectors where service delivery may depend on
19
20 individually motivated people or where the development of the quasi-philanthropy of
21
22 corporate social responsibility (CSR) has arisen because of certain individuals within a
23
24 business organisation (THE OBSERVER, 2005; TREBECK, 2005). We represent this
25
26 blurring between the sectors in Figure 1 and suggest that it precludes the assumption of
27
28 clear boundaries between the three sectors, yet also necessitates the need for greater
29
30 conceptual clarity. In order to do this we explore the social economy, social enterprise
31
32 and social entrepreneurship below before considering how they impact on the regional
33
34 development of social capital in the next section.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 <Insert FIGURE 1 here>
44
45
46
47

48 2.1 SOCIAL ECONOMY 49 50 51 52

53 According to AMIN *et al* (2003), the term social economy itself dates back to the
54
55 early nineteenth century, if not before, although its usage in the English-speaking world
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 has been a relatively recent phenomena. Thus it has rarely featured in academic debates
4
5 before the 1990s when it was referred to as the ‘third’, ‘voluntary’ and / or ‘not-for-
6
7 profit’ sector(s) (AMIN *et al.*, 2002; DART, 2004; HUDSON, 2005). Broadly speaking
8
9 the social economy can be considered as economic activity performed by organisations
10
11 that are neither for-profit nor state run organisations and are therefore within the ‘Third
12
13 Sector’ (ANHEIER and BEN-NER, 1997; AMIN *et al.*, 2003; ARTHUR *et al.*, 2003;
14
15 WILLIAMS *et al.*, 2003; HUDSON, 2005; SEAM, 2005). However, the social economy
16
17 is distinct from both the household and informal economies – also part of the Third
18
19 Sector – because it consists of formal structures and institutions (see Figure 1).
20
21
22
23

24
25 Although they recognise earlier charitable and voluntary organisations,
26
27 MOULAERT and AILENEI (2005) also claim that the social economy has largely
28
29 nineteenth century origins, especially in relation to concerns about inequality. They argue
30
31 that there were country-specific forms with France developing an ‘associative’ variant
32
33 derived from notions of political liberty, whilst English versions were more closely
34
35 oriented around communities (MOULAERT and AILENEI, 2005; see also LINDSAY
36
37 and HEMS, 2004). Furthermore MOULAERT and AILENEI align the historical
38
39 expansion and contraction of the social economy with recurrent capitalist crises and the
40
41 popular, spontaneous reactions to the threat and effects of liberalism that KARL
42
43 POLANYI (1944[2001]) recounts in *The Great Transformation*. It has been suggested
44
45 that POLANYI’s (1957) conceptualisation of exchange based on reciprocity,
46
47 redistribution and markets neatly maps onto the three-way distinction between the social
48
49 economy, government provision and the private sector respectively (see LAVILLE and
50
51 NYSSSENS, 2001; LAVILLE, 2003; WILLIAMS *et al.*, 2003).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The importance of reciprocity as a characteristic of the social economy is evident
4
5 in the stress laid on non-profit, not-for-profit and voluntary principles, which contrasts
6
7 with the more recent definition of social enterprises. Non-profits can be defined as
8
9 organisations that are required to re-invest any profits in the organisation and its
10
11 activities, whereas not-for-profits may distribute profits between members or
12
13 stakeholders (MOULAERT and AILENEI, 2005; see also ARTHUR *et al.*, 2003; JONES
14
15 and KEOGH, 2006). It is also possible to distinguish between non-profits and not-for-
16
17 profits by arguing that the former are meant to serve public (e.g. national) or social (e.g.
18
19 local) interests whilst the latter serve the common interest of their members; they can also
20
21 serve the public and social interest, but are not required to do so (see LINDSAY and
22
23 HEMS, 2004).ⁱⁱ Furthermore, voluntary organisations (e.g. charities) can represent a
24
25 subset of the non-profit sector marked by a distinction between non-governmental
26
27 organisations (NGOs) and community organisations (MOULAERT and AILENEI, 2005),
28
29 both of which promote civic society and social cohesion through requirements for
30
31 ‘public benefit’.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 2.2 SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

42
43
44
45
46 Discussions of the social economy often entail a conceptual slippage between the
47
48 broad concerns of the various organisational forms like charities, voluntary associations
49
50 and cooperatives that constitute the broader social economy and the specific, relatively
51
52 new social enterprise model (e.g. HM TREASURY, 1999; SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE,
53
54 2003; see HUDSON, 2005). There is also considerable slippage between social enterprise
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and social entrepreneurship with some authors using the terms interchangeably to refer to
4 a set of specific organisational practices (e.g. HARDING, 2004; see also NICHOLLS,
5 2006). To provide clarity, it is useful to consider social enterprise as representing a “new
6 dynamic within the third sector” and it is therefore only one element in the broader Third
7 Sector (LAVILLE and NYSSSENS, 2001, p.624).

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 The emphasis in recent debates on ‘entrepreneurialism’ or ‘enterprise’ can be seen
16 as particular to social enterprise, and especially the *activity of social enterprise*. As a
17 fairly recent concept, social enterprise encapsulates both a specific form of social
18 economy organisation and, more importantly, a specific form of activity. It is
19 characterised by a business orientation and innovative approach focused on the delivery
20 of social benefits through trading to ensure the financial sustainability of the
21 organisations concerned (BUDD, 2003; ARTHUR *et al.*, 2004). This conceptualisation
22 makes social enterprise distinct from the common definition used by the DTI, which
23 covers an array of different organisations with distinct and sometimes disparate
24 objectives (e.g. charity and workers co-operative):

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 “A social enterprise is a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses
42 are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community,
43 rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and
44 owners” (DTI, 2002, p.8).
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 Although social enterprise involves a social objective, the definition of such objectives is
54 itself complicated by the different weight given to organisational forms, as well as the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 emphasis placed on market models of trading activity (DART, 2004). For example,
4
5 worker cooperatives might be excluded from the UK government definition of social
6
7 enterprise because their social goal is collective ownership, which has been implicitly
8
9 side-lined by government policies focused on ‘stakeholding’ (ARTHUR *et al.*, 2004).ⁱⁱⁱ
10
11
12 Therefore it is more useful to argue that social enterprise concerns the pursuit of
13
14 particular activities rather than representing certain social forms (e.g. cooperatives,
15
16 democratically-run organisations) with the aim of producing collective benefits
17
18 (LAVILLE and NYSSSENS, 2001).
19
20
21

22 Thus the main defining characteristic distinguishing social enterprise from the
23
24 broader social economy is that social enterprise involves the derivation of a significant
25
26 proportion – between 25 and 50 percent – of organisational income from trading
27
28 activities (OECD, 1999; DTI, 2002; IFF RESEARCH, 2005; THE OBSERVER, 2005).
29
30
31 Furthermore, it has been suggested that social enterprise represents a particular point in
32
33 the life cycle of social economy organisations; i.e. the point at which they achieve
34
35 financial sustainability (JOHNSON, 2000; ARTHUR *et al.*, 2004; EIKENBERRY and
36
37 KLUVER, 2004). This conceptual definition concentrates on the ‘activity’ rather than
38
39 ‘organisation’ of social enterprise because it relates to the extent to which trading (i.e.
40
41 means) dominates an organisation (NICHOLLS, 2006). Social enterprise can therefore be
42
43 considered as trading for a social purpose, rather than as a distinct Third Sector
44
45 organisation with certain characteristics distinct from the reciprocity and mutualism
46
47 inherent in the social economy (DART, 2004; HAUGH and TRACEY, 2004; HAUGH,
48
49 2005a).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.3 SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Whereas the recent interest in the social economy focuses on organisational forms and for social enterprise on specific activities (i.e. trading), the recent and continuing popularity of social entrepreneurship concentrates on individual motivation and leadership (see LEADBEATER, 1997; THOMPSON *et al.*, 2000; CONE *et al.*, 2003; BORNSTEIN, 2005; SEAM, 2005; JONES and KEOGH, 2006). Consequently all three concepts discussed here constitute an element of the Third Sector rather than representing its defining features (see also PEARCE, 2003). The individual basis of social entrepreneurship is evident in the definitions of MAIR and MARTI (2006) and DEES (2001), which both cut across different typologies and tackle the issue of whether individuals or organisations can engage in social entrepreneurship. However, there is still considerable conceptual slippage between social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in many such definitions (GRENIER, 2002; HOCKERTS, 2006; PEREDO and McLEAN, 2006). We define social entrepreneurship at the individual level because of our argument that the organisational and activity bases of the Third Sector can be represented by the social economy and social enterprise respectively.

We think it is important to define social entrepreneurship in a limited fashion because of the problems evident in ‘outcome-based’ definitions. Here the conceptualisation of social entrepreneurship can appear self-defining through the naturalisation of certain characteristics as entrepreneurial because they have achieved specific goals (i.e. ‘success’). One example of this tendency is represented by BRINCKERHOFF’s (2000, p.1) claim that social entrepreneurs are “*people who take risk*

1
2
3 *on behalf of the people their organization serves*” and that “[s]ocial entrepreneurship is
4 one of the essential characteristics of successful not-for-profits”. Thus risk and success
5 are presented as two-sides of the same terminology in that without risk there would be no
6 ‘success’ and without ‘success’ there would be no need for risk-taking. As such this may
7 simply reflect the introduction of market-driven agendas into the Third Sector in pursuit
8 of self-sufficiency resulting from declining public and private funds (HOCKERTS,
9 2006). Furthermore, it is important to avoid definitions that are based on the idea that
10 social entrepreneurship refers to the establishment of social enterprises (HAUGH, 2005b;
11 MAIR and MARTI, 2006).

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 In discussing social entrepreneurship at this individual level we can identify the
26 importance of motivation and leadership. In his now famous definition, DEES (2001, p.2)
27 describes entrepreneurs as people who “mobilize the resources of others to achieve their
28 entrepreneurial objectives”. Consequently, social entrepreneurs can be defined as people
29 who act as “change agent[s] in the social sector” through the adoption of a mission,
30 pursuit of new opportunities to achieve that mission, continual “innovation, adaptation
31 and learning”, avoidance of limits on current resources, and concern with accountability
32 to clients and community (DEES 2001, p.4). In a similar vein, BORNSTEIN (2005, p.1)
33 writes about social entrepreneurs as “people with new ideas to address major problems
34 who are relentless in the pursuit of their visions”. The ‘vision’ is a crucial aspect of social
35 entrepreneurship, but also for entrepreneurship more generally (see also MORT *et al.*,
36 2003), consisting of imagination and evangelism, where the former provides the
37 motivation to pursue the latter. Thus the willingness to chart new paths and bring others
38 along with you is based on a set of guiding principles. In some ways this is reminiscent of
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the idea of the ‘public entrepreneur’ (WADDOCK *et al.*, 1991) or the ‘social’ or ‘civic’
4 entrepreneur (HOCKERTS, 2006), which means that it does not necessarily involve the
5 strategies or activities that characterise the social economy and social enterprise.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **3. THE THIRD SECTOR AND THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF** 14 **SOCIAL CAPITAL** 15 16 17 18 19

20 Having briefly summarised the differences between the concepts of the social
21 economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, we now turn to their role in
22 regional development. The Third Sector is linked to regional development in relation to
23 the pursuit of ‘sustainable’ forms of economic activity (e.g. trading) as well as the
24 creation and development of social capital and broader *socio-economic* outcomes (see
25 PEARCE, 2003; FLOCKHART, 2005; EVANS and SYRETT, 2007; JONES *et al.*,
26 2007; see FYFE, 2005 for critical view). Implicit in this view is that certain forms of
27 economic and social activity are sustainable (e.g. markets-driven economic growth)
28 which differs from ‘strong’ arguments on sustainability (CHATTERTON, 2002). In
29 contrast, sustainability more closely resembles the triple or quadruple bottom line that
30 blends economic, social, ecological and community concerns (ELKINGTON, 2004;
31 REID and GRIFFITH, 2006). Consequently we concentrate on the regional development
32 of social capital in order to consider the implications of policy agendas and initiatives
33 undertaken to encourage, promote and support the Third Sector and their *socio-economic*
34 impact (AMIN *et al.*, 2002; PEARCE, 2003; AMIN, 2005; HAUGH, 2005a, 2005b;
35 WALLACE, 2005).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Defining social capital would take another critical survey in itself so we draw on a number of existing reviews of the concept by the likes of WOOLCOCK (1998), FINE (2001), ONS (2001), JOHNSTON and PERCY-SMITH (2003), QUIBRIA (2003), and WESTLUND and BOLTON (2003). The first thing to note is that social capital, despite its meta-theoretical claims, is a diverse concept that cuts across disciplines and has been strongly criticised (e.g. FINE, 2001) despite its popularity in academic and especially policy circles. According to WOOLCOCK (1998) it was first identified by Jane Jacobs and Pierre Bourdieu and later developed by James Coleman, Ronald Burt and Robert Putnam. It can be “generally defined as the information, trust, and norms of reciprocity inhering in one’s social networks” (WOOLCOCK, 1998, p.153; also p.189) and conceived as both individual (Bourdieu) and community (Putnam) based as well as functional (Coleman) and consequentialist (see QUIBRIA, 2003).

Like WOOLCOCK (1998, p.168), we differentiate between four types of social capital that all relate to regional development including: (1) norms (e.g. ‘bonds’ or intra-community ties), (2) networks (e.g. ‘binding’ or extra-community ties), (3) links (e.g. ‘diversity’ or the difference between communities) and (4) holders (e.g. ‘bridge-builder’ or change agents). These four types of social capital not only relate to the Third Sector in distinct ways, as summarised in Table 1 below, but they also entail geographical specificity in their relationship to particular places and scales; i.e. their context (see PORTES, 1998; WOOLCOCK, 1998). For example, norms can be seen as both a broad scale phenomena covering the whole Third Sector (e.g. mutualism, voluntarism etc.), as well as specific to the Third Sector in distinct places (e.g. local communities). Networks can also be conceptualised in these terms in that they connect different sectors (e.g.

1
2
3 private, state and Third) as well as different institutions, organisations and people in and
4
5 across distinct places and scales. In similar terms, the differences (i.e. diversity) between
6
7 such social actors can cut across scales, whilst the position of such actors (i.e. holders) is
8
9 also constituted by place and scale.
10
11

12
13 Although it is possible to construct a typology of the relationship between the
14
15 Third Sector and social capital as we have done in Table 1, it is important to note that
16
17 there is a diversity of possible relationships between the two concepts that cannot be
18
19 captured in such an ideal type. For example, bonding social capital (e.g. norms) of local
20
21 communities can help in the development of the social economy in that emerging and
22
23 existing organisations (e.g. social firms) rely upon existing values, beliefs and attitudes
24
25 (e.g. voluntarism) that help to foster collective action through the building of trust (see
26
27 MOULAERT and NUSSBAUMER, 2005; EVANS and SYRETT, 2007). In this sense
28
29 the varieties of social capital embedded within communities, groups and wider society
30
31 are necessary for the promotion of the Third Sector, but also, just as crucially, they are
32
33 actively embedded and promoted in place and across scales by the Third Sector in *socio-*
34
35 *economic* relationships. It is the latter concern, however, that interests us here because it
36
37 is more relevant to the focus on regional development in this article.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 <Insert TABLE 1 here>
47
48
49

50 3.1 ORGANISATIONAL SOCIAL CAPITAL 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Some authors have argued that there is a misplaced academic and policy emphasis on the social economy as an “economic circuit in its own right” that is embedded in “the ‘local’, the ‘community’ or the ‘neighbourhood’”, especially in relation to the alleviation of social exclusion through employment (AMIN *et al.*, 2003, p.31; see also AMIN, 2005; HUDSON, 2005). In conceptualising the characteristics of the social economy in organisational terms, we argue that the regional development of social capital goes beyond such a focus on the employment and employability of socially disadvantaged groups prevalent in these discourses (CHANAN, 1999). Instead, as WILLIAMS *et al* (2003) argue, the social economy entails norms of mutualism and independence alongside not-for-profit principles that make the focus on employment and employability problematic because it ties organisations to specific locations that may inhibit *socio-economic* development as well as limiting the contribution of the social economy to the development of social capital because it would then also be tied to particular places and scales (AMIN, 2005; HUDSON, 2005). Thus it would be difficult to promote extra-community network ties or the linking of diverse groups embedded in different places where there is an overwhelming focus on local employability.

However, this does not mean that locality, community and place are irrelevant in the development of social capital. ARTHUR *et al* (2003) argue that the social economy includes local and ‘employee’ ownership, local and employee control, mutual values, and local finance, whilst others argue that the social economy concerns the addressing of unmet material and social needs at a local level with an “explicit reference to the ethical values of solidarity and reciprocity” (MOULAERT and AILENEI, 2005, p.2048; also MOULAERT and NUSSBAUMER, 2005). This touches on a crucial aspect of social

1
2
3 capital, namely the necessary link between social and material resources, which is
4 highlighted in the literature (FORREST and KEARNS, 2001; EVANS and SYRETT,
5 2007). It is particularly important that the pursuit of social objectives like democratic
6 participation, voluntarism and mutualism through economic activity does not lead to
7 profit “leakage” – i.e. leaving an organisation (LINDSAY and HEMS, 2004, p.276) – and
8 consequently the means (i.e. economic activity) are considered to be as important as the
9 ends (i.e. social objective) (EIKENBERRY and KLUVER, 2004). Thus the development
10 of social capital is inextricably tied to material development and therefore the social
11 economy entails the build up of both tangible and intangible community assets through
12 local regeneration and community empowerment (THOMPSON *et al.*, 2000).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The social economy consists of numerous organisations that embed both social
28 and material resources in particular places and provides access across different scales.
29 This organisational and institutional infrastructure promotes social capital by providing
30 access to both types of resource and in particular through the development of mutualism
31 amongst and between different groups thereby leading to greater ‘active participation’
32 and ‘stakeholding’ in society, not just the local community (JESSOP, 2000; AMIN *et al.*,
33 2002). However, there is a risk of ossification if such organisational and institutional
34 relationships and networks are over-embedded in particular places; i.e. bonding
35 communities together around certain social and material resources, but limiting access to
36 other resources (EVANS and SYRETT, 2007). Thus there are concerns that the
37 development of only one form of social capital (e.g. bonding) can inhibit change, in that
38 the promotion of strong bonds detracts from developing new relationships, whilst also
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 limiting access to resources for individuals who are peripheral group members (MAIR
4 and MARTI, 2006).
5
6

7
8 The importance of extra-local and extra-organisational linkages is therefore
9 crucial, whilst the ethos of mutualism underpinning the social economy helps to alleviate
10 the possibility of insularity highlighted above. The emphasis on mutual, democratic, and
11 voluntary norms can stimulate the development of these networks and foster linkages that
12 avoid local or organisational boundedness (RYDIN and HOLMAN, 2004). Consequently,
13 certain types of social capital (e.g. bonding) are necessary to promote other types of
14 social capital (e.g. binding) and are embedded in the organisations and institutions
15 particular to different places, but they are not sufficient in themselves. Thus there is a
16 need to question the existence of 'excessive' social capital (QUIBRIA, 2003; BARON,
17 2004), which the social economy can do by enabling these different groups, communities
18 and actors to connect and interact with one another across different places and scales
19 through a shared ethos. However, the social economy does not fully account for the
20 creation of new networks (i.e. bridges) or the evolving process of forging new
21 relationships and networks that link different and diverse groups, organisations and
22 institutions; it is here that social enterprise plays a crucial role as discussed next.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 3.2 *ACTIVITY-BASED SOCIAL CAPITAL* 47 48 49

50 Social enterprise involves the acquisition of funding through trading and sales,
51 rather than grants or donations (CROSSAN *et al.*, 2004), and as such it is closely related,
52 although still distinct from, the public and private sectors; for example, social enterprise
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 can involve both the provision of services through public procurement and market
4 exchanges in the private sector (DTI, 2003; JONES *et al.*, 2007). Social enterprise also
5 relates to capacity, in terms of both organisational capabilities and scope, and
6 consequently it is important to consider how such activity, as process, inheres in and
7 across specific territories. Thus, in relation to social capital, the activity of social
8 enterprise has two major functions in regional development. First is the binding of
9 different groups together in a network, both within specific places such as local
10 communities and, more broadly, at the regional and national scale. Second is the linking
11 of diverse and often disparate normative frameworks (e.g. mutualism and profit-seeking)
12 and structures (e.g. social firms and private companies), which produces new insights and
13 resources through inter-group learning. Again this entails territorial embedding because
14 of the linkages forged between regions, or even across scales, that lead to the
15 development of social capital.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Social enterprise is able to bridge diverse groups and therefore assist in the
35 development of social capital through the process of binding actors together, although the
36 lack of an existing organisational or institutional basis of relationships may prove
37 detrimental to this process; e.g. by limiting the social as well as economic resources
38 available for activities (HUDSON, 2005). Social enterprise provides the means through
39 which the process of bridging can occur because it necessitates activity across a number
40 of different spheres (e.g. economic, social, political) incorporating the economic concerns
41 of trading for income with the pursuit of a social purpose, all undertaken with the
42 assumption of democratic accountability to a specific constituency or community
43 (PEARCE, 2003). Such processes entail a shift in emphasis from emergent and informal
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 associations that bond groups together, as provided by the social economy, to new modes
4 of operation and governance that move beyond the immediate group or territory (EVANS
5 and SYRETT, 2007). Therefore social enterprise can be seen as the process through
6 which actors can embed themselves in a network of relationships that help to promote the
7 successful pursuit of certain objectives; social, ecological, community or otherwise.
8 However, an unfortunate consequence of this pluralism is that the strong bonding ties (i.e.
9 mutualism) characteristic of the social economy as a whole are necessarily weakened
10 thereby reducing the link with a particular territory or place, whilst co-operation may also
11 be threatened by the turn towards market principles; e.g. competition (EIKENBERRY
12 and KLUVER, 2004; EVANS and SYRETT, 2007).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The threat to bonding social capital may also prove beneficial in that it can lead to the development of new approaches or new connections that are not locally bounded. In particular, the emphasis on trading leads to a market focus in activities which encourages the development of new processes that link diverse concerns and incorporates goals and means that were not previously associated, but can still prove beneficial. However, one major concern here is that values may end up recast as the means to an end, rather than the objective themselves. Thus the regional development of social capital may be considered as the means to economic competitiveness, reducing such values to a process (e.g. trading) for reasons that relate more to ideological assumptions than usefulness (FINE, 2001). Therefore the possibility of pursuing emancipatory or empowering activities during place-specific regeneration and development could be replaced by market-based assumptions and norms that preclude certain activities (e.g. co-operation or collective ownership and control). For example, it has been argued that the Community

1
2
3 Interest Company legal form recently introduced in the UK fails to challenge existing
4 ownership forms, which thereby precludes the adoption of social or cooperative
5 ownership (ARTHUR *et al.*, 2004). Consequently the motivation behind social enterprise
6 is a central concern in regional development, but one that cannot be addressed in the
7 conceptualisation of social enterprise as process.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 3.3 *MOTIVATION-BASED SOCIAL CAPITAL* 19

20
21
22 In turning to social entrepreneurship, it is important to note that the concept
23 cannot be defined in relation to outcomes nor can it simply relate to just a process. Rather
24 it relates to the issue of individual motivation (i.e. agency) as much as the process of
25 institutional transformation inherent in the pursuit of social change. There are a number
26 of ‘agency’ definitions of social entrepreneurship such as “any person, in any sector, who
27 uses earned income strategies to pursue a social objective” (BOSCHEE and McCLURG,
28 2003, p.4). However, the assumption that only income-earning strategies are indicative of
29 social entrepreneurialism is problematic. As JOHNSON (2000, p.12) points out, this
30 definition implicitly accedes to the expectations and objectives of a wider capitalist
31 economy, rather than providing the means to pursue alternative economies such as the
32 ‘co-operative commonwealth’ (JONES and KEOGH, 2006, p.18). Furthermore, the
33 association between income-earning and entrepreneurialism ignores a whole swathe of
34 people involved in a range of activities from corporate social responsibility (CSR) or
35 corporate philanthropy (TREBECK, 2005) through to ‘antipreneurs’ from the anti-
36 globalisation movement.^{iv} It is therefore largely a reformist as opposed to radical
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perspective. Consequently, several writers have argued for an understanding of social
4 entrepreneurship that accounts for a range of individual characteristics such as leadership,
5 vision and risk-taking; all of which add extra dimensions to the concept
6 (LEADBEATER, 1997; THOMPSON *et al.*, 2000; DEES, 2001; MORT *et al.*, 2003;
7 MAIR and MARTI, 2006; PEREDO and McLEAN, 2006).

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 When this 'agency' conceptualisation of social entrepreneurship is wedded to the
16 idea of 'process', it shows how *social value* is created through the "innovative use and
17 combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyse social change and/or address
18 social needs" (MAIR and MARTI, 2006, p.37). In particular, HOCKERTS (2006, p.7-13)
19 outlines three sources of social entrepreneurialism covering activism, self-help and
20 philanthropy, which all impact on social capital development. However, the process of
21 innovation does not necessarily sit well with policy objectives aimed at community
22 empowerment or capacity building because innovation – in Schumpeterian terms – would
23 entail the 'creative destruction' of existing institutions, organisations and communities
24 and their replacement by new ones (see ZAFIROVSKI, 1999). In some ways then this
25 view of social entrepreneurship (e.g. LEADBEATER, 1997) is limited by the assumption
26 that entrepreneurialism implicitly concerns new processes that may unnecessarily break
27 down existing institutional structures, social relationships etc. Thus it is important to
28 embed the notion of individual motivation with that of process in order to avoid the
29 'destruction' that innovation can mean for the regional development of social capital.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Using the concept of social entrepreneurship outlined above that is oriented
51 around the wedding of agency with process, it is possible to identify the important linking
52 role performed by social entrepreneurs, whether in terms of a person or group, in the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 production of social capital that connects *process-agents* to diverse social actors drawn
4 from across the three sectors (PURDUE, 2001; GRENIER, 2002). Thus social
5 entrepreneurship involves, on the one hand, collaboration with a diverse and often
6 disparate range of people, groups and organisations, and, on the other hand, the
7 promotion and development of new networks of such divergent interests in the pursuit of
8 specific social goals (JOHNSON, 2000; PEREDO and McLEAN, 2006). However, just
9 as this may prove destructive of existing social capital, it may also preclude challenges to
10 existing interests, necessitating that social entrepreneurship adheres to a 'reformist', as
11 opposed to 'radical', social agenda (JONES and KEOGH, 2006). It also rests on the
12 social entrepreneur developing a specific form of social capital (i.e. bridge-builder),
13 which may entail inadequate accountability and democratic governance.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The development of linking social capital is central to social entrepreneurship
30 because it concerns the capability to juggle the triple or quadruple bottom line necessary
31 for sustainable development. Where greater emphasis is placed on economic
32 sustainability over social and ecological issues this may prove problematic.
33 Consequently, the issue of accountability in social entrepreneurship is vital because it is
34 only through considerations of 'stakeholding' and other forms of 'citizenship' (see
35 TRACEY *et al.*, 2005) that social entrepreneurship gains any legitimacy (MORT *et al.*,
36 2003; DART, 2004; NICHOLLS, 2006; REID and GRIFFITH, 2006). Thus community
37 empowerment and accountability necessitates a focus on social embeddedness (MAIR
38 and MARTI, 2006), which may be sidelined where there are disparities in power
39 engendered by the implicit ability of individual social entrepreneurs to define the 'good'
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and 'bad' characteristics of society (QUIBRIA, 2003; BARON, 2004) and their capacity
4
5 to operate across different geographical scales.
6
7
8
9

10 **4. THE THIRD SECTOR AND REGIONAL POLICY IN THE UK**

11
12
13

14
15 In turning to the implications of the Third Sector for regional policy, it is
16 important to distinguish between policy *agendas* (i.e. discursive claims) and policy
17 *initiatives* (i.e. implementation). Although we acknowledge that conceptual clarity is not
18 necessarily possible, or even desirable,^v it is evident that there are numerous conceptual
19 slippages in policy discourse and its application that problematically blur the already
20 hazy distinctions between the private, state and Third sectors (e.g. SCOTTISH
21 EXECUTIVE, 2003; see ARTHUR *et al.*, 2003). Such conceptual fuzziness not only
22 presents a problem in assessing regional policy, it also inherently confuses a number of
23 policy aims and their subsequent implementation. Here we concentrate on UK and
24 Scotland in order to focus the discussion of Third Sector policy and to consider the
25 difference in such policy agendas and their implementation at different scales. As
26 mentioned previously, we have chosen to focus on Scotland for a number of reasons.
27 First, it has suffered from long-term *socio-economic* uneven development; second, it has
28 a policy agenda distinct from the national and other devolved governments; and finally,
29 the wealth of policy literature on Scotland is greater than for other regions of the UK (see
30 JONES *et al.*, 2007).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **4.1 THIRD SECTOR POLICY AGENDAS**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 At the UK level, policy agendas have tended to conflate social enterprise with the
7
8 social economy and even the broader Third Sector, despite the significant differences that
9
10 exist between these concepts. Thus policy that initially focused almost exclusively on
11
12 social enterprise (e.g. DTI, 2002, 2003) has not changed despite the recent establishment
13
14 of the Office of the Third Sector (OTS) in 2006. This is demonstrated in the similarity
15
16 between the definitions used in the 2002 DTI social enterprise strategy and 2006 OTS
17
18 report on the role of the Third Sector in regeneration. The former defines social enterprise
19
20 as:
21
22
23

24
25
26
27 “...a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally
28
29 reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than driven
30
31 by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners” (DTI, 2002, p.8).
32
33
34

35
36 The latter defines the Third Sector in a similar vein as:
37
38
39

40
41 “...non-governmental organisations which are value-driven and which principally
42
43 reinvest their surpluses to further social, environmental or cultural objectives”
44
45 (HM TREASURY and CABINET OFFICE, 2006, p.5).
46
47
48

49
50 Such inability to differentiate between the different features of the Third Sector leads to a
51
52 number of problematic assumptions when considering not only how to measure the sector
53
54 (in essentialist terms, see MOULAERT and NUSSBAUMER, 2005), but also how to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measure the impact of policy initiatives, especially in relation to regional development
4
5 and local regeneration.
6

7
8 The definitional shift does not necessarily represent an accidental confusion of
9
10 concepts since an ECOTEC report commissioned by the DTI had explicitly referred to
11
12 social enterprise as the ‘trading’ arm of the Third Sector, or “that part of the social
13
14 economy which is *primarily* engaged in trading” (ECOTEC, 2003, p.22). Thus it appears
15
16 to be a more deliberate discursive attempt to identify certain activities (i.e. trading) with
17
18 specific qualities (i.e. enterprise and entrepreneurialism) that side-line other possible
19
20 policy discourses (e.g. ‘strong’ sustainability – see CHATTERTON, 2002).
21
22
23

24
25 There is further evidence of this perspective in regional policy agendas in relation
26
27 to Scotland; not least because Scottish policy is increasingly aligned with the broader UK
28
29 agenda (see SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2007b). However, Scottish policy discourse is
30
31 different in that it makes a clearer distinction between the social economy and social
32
33 enterprise by stating that social enterprise is part of the social economy (e.g. SCOTTISH
34
35 EXECUTIVE, 2006). Furthermore, there are separate reviews and strategy documents
36
37 that differentiate between the two (e.g. SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2003; SCOTTISH
38
39 EXECUTIVE, 2006) with a change in emphasis from a specific organisational structure
40
41 to an activity (i.e. entrepreneurial and income earning) over time (SCOTTISH
42
43 EXECUTIVE, 2007a). In particular, the Scottish policy agenda has been strongly
44
45 influenced by the threat of lost European development funding in 2007, although such
46
47 concerns are prevalent throughout the UK as well (AMIN *et al*, 2003; CROSSAN *et al.*,
48
49 2004; FLOCKHART, 2005; WALLACE, 2005; HM TREASURY and CABINET
50
51 OFFICE, 2006). Thus the focus on social enterprise is driven by concerns with financial
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 self-sufficiency, not only for the organisations themselves in terms of grant dependency
4
5 (JONES *et al*, 2007), but also for local communities in relation to government funding
6
7
8 and the implementation of government policy (e.g. public service reform) through social
9
10 enterprise (see RIDLEY-DUFF, 2007, p.388).^{vi}
11

12 13 14 15 4.2 *THIRD SECTOR POLICY INITIATIVES* 16

17
18
19
20 The concern with the financial sustainability of the social economy and local
21
22 communities also helps to explain the interest in the development of social capital as a
23
24 resource for community economic development, regeneration and empowerment (see
25
26 SMALLBONE *et al*, 2001; SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2003; HM TREASURY and
27
28 CABINET OFFICE, 2006; OTS, 2006; SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2006; SCOTTISH
29
30 EXECUTIVE, 2007b). Tying together this policy agenda of “[b]uilding human and social
31
32 capital ... to strengthen local communities which is essential if there is to be successful
33
34 regeneration” (HM TREASURY, 1999, p.107) and the various policy initiatives
35
36 undertaken to ensure its success is the UK Labour government’s view that citizenship as
37
38 constituted by employment participation (SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMISSION, 1994;
39
40 AMIN *et al.*, 2002; WILLIAMS *et al.*, 2003). Therefore a key aspect of social enterprise
41
42 policy intervention is “empowering individuals and communities, encouraging the
43
44 development of work habits and increasing employment diversity” (DTI, 2002, p.21; also
45
46 see HM TREASURY 1999, pp.107-108).
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 It is important to take this particular focus on employment participation into
54
55 account when considering the promotion of social capital in the UK because social
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 enterprise policy initiatives directed at community development, regeneration and
4
5 empowerment are more oriented towards finding market solutions for market failures as
6
7 opposed to *socio-economic* ones. For example, early initiatives were directed at ‘creating
8
9 an enabling environment’, ‘making social enterprises better businesses’ and ‘establishing
10
11 the value of social enterprise’ (see DTI, 2002), and were implemented through the
12
13 introduction of new organisational forms (e.g. the Community Interest Company in 2005)
14
15 and funding institutions (e.g. Community Development Finance in 2003) alongside
16
17 profile raising initiatives supporting organisations like the Social Enterprise Coalition
18
19 (DTI, 2003; see also AFFLECK and MELLOR, 2006; RIDLEY-DUFF, 2007). Much of
20
21 this activity does not directly address the concern with developing social capital or social
22
23 cohesion in deprived communities (see SMALL BUSINESS SERVICE, 2005b), but
24
25 rather implicitly assumes that the promotion of market solutions will release an
26
27 entrepreneurial spirit in these localities.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 In Scotland there was a greater emphasis on the broader social economy, rather
35
36 than a specific focus on social enterprise (e.g. SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2003), although
37
38 this has changed more recently (e.g. SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2006, 2007a, 2007b).
39
40 However, the 2004 introduction of Local Social Economy Partnerships (LSEP) can be
41
42 seen as creating a more bottom-up approach in Scotland (see SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE,
43
44 2004, 2006) in comparison to the top-down initiatives favoured by the UK national
45
46 government such as the voluntary sector *Compacts* and, particularly, their application in
47
48 England (FYFE, 2005). There are supposed to be LSEPs in every local authority in
49
50 Scotland providing the means to co-ordinate cross-sector activities in support of the Third
51
52 Sector and its role in local development and regeneration (e.g. SEAM 2005). Despite this
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 supposedly bottom-up approach, it has been argued that the emphasis on community
4 regeneration has led the Scottish Executive to side-step local government in favour of
5 community partnerships that are less accountable (see COLLINS, 2006). Furthermore,
6 there are concerns about the disparity between how LSEPs operate in and across Scotland
7 (SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2007a) as well as an increasingly evident emphasis on top-
8 down initiatives (see SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2007b).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 In terms of direct government investment, this has been driven by a number of
19 different funding schemes, but has been particularly focused on the provision of public
20 services rather than the promotion of social capital. Most notable is the £125 million
21 *Futurebuilders* programme established in 2004 as a non-profit company (DTI, 2003;
22 AFFLECK and MELLOR, 2006), which is designed to support the Third Sector in public
23 service delivery.^{vii} Consequently it contributes to the reworking of governance that
24 follows on from the ‘compacts’ mentioned above, which themselves entail an agreement
25 by voluntary sector organisations “that public funding is provided on the basis of its
26 contribution to government ‘policy priorities’” (FYFE, 2005, p.543).^{viii} Thus in Scotland
27 the £18 million *Futurebuilders* fund is mainly directed towards ‘investment’, alongside
28 contributions to ‘training’ and ‘support’, with a sizeable proportion of this funding (£12
29 million) set aside for medium and large sized organisations that are already providing
30 services in order to promote “capital investment and to encourage them to operate in a
31 more business-like fashion” (SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, 2004, p.4). However, the
32 emphasis on growth and expansion has certain implications for local empowerment and
33 participation since it has been argued that larger organisations, oriented more towards
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 service delivery, produce “passive forms of citizenship” (FYFE, 2005, p.550), which
4
5 implies that social capital is neither encouraged nor developed.
6
7

8 As is evident in the discussion above, it is often difficult to identify what impact
9
10 the implementation of policy has on the promotion of social capital. In the DTI policy
11
12 vision, for example, social enterprise is seen as a “key factor” in local community
13
14 development through “empowering individuals and communities” (DTI, 2002, p.21).
15
16 However, there are a number of barriers to the regional and local development of social
17
18 capital implicit in the policy initiatives designed to encourage social enterprise (see
19
20 WILLIAMS *et al.*, 2003). First, communities may lack the necessary material resources
21
22 that go hand-in-hand with developing social capital in particular localities and
23
24 communities (EVANS and SYRETT, 2007), whilst a top-down, service delivery model is
25
26 unlikely to provide the material capital desired by local communities. Second, individuals
27
28 and communities may lack the wide or strong networks necessary for the expansion of
29
30 social capital, especially where there is a deficit of embedded values or trust in a
31
32 particular place and relevant interpersonal and communication skills necessary for
33
34 developing social capital. Finally, individuals and communities may have to work within
35
36 specific institutional boundaries (e.g. tax credit, welfare systems) that proscribe certain
37
38 actions and activities (WILLIAMS *et al.*, 2003, p.156), limiting choice to a set of
39
40 prescriptive policies rather than those suited to local specificity.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 CONCLUSION

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

This paper has sought to contribute to the existing debate on the Third Sector by providing an overlapping definition of the social economy, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship that seeks to situate them within the overall Third Sector. As such it has sought to emphasise the importance of regional *socio-economic* development in reference to social embeddedness and social capital.

We outlined how the social economy is characterised by a combination of both organisational forms and values, whereas social enterprise can be seen as a particular type of activity – namely the earning of income through trading in pursuit of a social objective – representing a drive towards financial self-sufficiency. Although this is a more restrictive definition than others may use, it is meant to distinguish between the particularities of social enterprise and other constituent forms of social economy organisation and activity that embody different values (e.g. worker co-operatives). The final category, social entrepreneurship, is also broadly used and therefore in need of greater conceptual clarity. Here we focused on the individual level and especially the importance of combining motivation and vision in order to bring together a diverse and often divergent set of interests in the pursuit of the entrepreneur's goal.

After the explication of the three core concepts we considered how the Third Sector can contribute to the regional development of social capital; a major policy agenda. In particular we argue that the social economy can be seen as encouraging two types of social capital: bonding – in the form of norms and values – and binding – in the form of mutual and democratic processes. In turn, social enterprise encourages both binding and linking social capital in that it links together different objectives derived from social and market principles. Finally, social entrepreneurship promotes linking and

1
2
3 motivational social capital through the encouragement of particular visions of social
4
5 change that cut across organisational and institutional boundaries. Throughout we have
6
7 stressed that such development is both place specific and inter-dependent in that one form
8
9 of social capital is not enough to ensure regional *socio-economic* development nor is the
10
11 encouragement of social capital always necessarily beneficial. Instead it is important to
12
13 consider how the encouragement of different types of social capital can lead to
14
15 problematic outcomes.
16
17
18

19
20 In the final section we have considered the relationship between UK and Scottish
21
22 (i.e. regional) Third Sector policy agendas and initiatives, especially in relation to the
23
24 regional development of social capital. Here we have identified a shift in policy discourse
25
26 from treating social enterprise as a distinct category in the Third Sector to the constitutive
27
28 feature of the Third Sector. We then showed how the implementation of policy initiatives
29
30 has been based on a specific agenda of public services reform, which not only fails to
31
32 encourage social capital but also side-lines a number of core features of the Third Sector
33
34 such as mutualism, democratic control and accountability. In particular, policy discourse
35
36 and implementation has failed to consider the relationship between material and social
37
38 capital in regional development and local regeneration. Overall we would argue that it is
39
40 vital for regional policy to encourage and generate both financial and social capital
41
42 because of the possible loss of both that either would cause when developed alone (see
43
44 CALLISON, 2003).
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 52 53 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3
4 Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 2005 *Regional Studies*
5
6 *Association* annual conference as well as the 2007 *CPPR Seminar Series*. This article has
7
8 benefited from discussions at these events as well as the specific comments of Andrew
9
10 Cumbers, Katherine Trebeck and the anonymous referees on earlier drafts. Usual
11
12 disclaimers apply.
13

14 15 16 17 18 REFERENCES

19
20
21
22 ADAMS, J., ROBINSON, P. and VIGOR, A. (2003) *A new regional policy for the UK*.
23
24 IPPR, London.

25
26
27 AFFLECK, A. and MELLOR, M. (2006) Community Development Finance: A Neo-
28
29 Market Solution to Social Exclusion? *Journal of Social Policy* 35(2), 303-319.

30
31 AMIN, A. (2005) Local community on trial, *Economy and Society* 34(4), 612-633.

32
33 AMIN, A., CAMERON, A. and HUDSON, R. (2002) *Placing the Social Economy*.
34
35 Routledge, London.

36
37 — (2003) The Alterity of the Social Economy, in LEYSHON, A., LEE, R. and
38
39 WILLIAMS, C. (eds) *Alternative Economic Spaces*. SAGE Publications, London.

40
41 ANHEIER, H. and BEN-NER, A. (1997) Shifting Boundaries: Long-term changes in the
42
43 size of the for-profit, nonprofit, cooperative and government sectors. *Annals of Public*
44
45 *and Cooperative Economics* 68(3), 335-353.

46
47
48 ARTHUR, L., SCOTT CATO, M., KEENOY, T. and SMITH, R. (2003) Developing an
49
50 Operational Definition of the Social Economy. *Journal of Cooperative Studies* 36(3).
51
52

- 1
2
3 ARTHUR, L., KEENOY, T., SMITH, R., SCOTT CATO, M. and ANTHONY, P. (2004)
4
5 People versus pounds: the prospects for radicalism in the UK social economy. *Crises*
6
7 *conference on Innovation and Social Transformation*, Montreal University, 11-12
8
9 November.
- 10
11
12 BARON, S. (2004) Social Capital in British Politics and Policy Making, in FRANKLIN,
13
14 J. (ed.) *Politics, Trust and Networks: Social Capital in Critical Perspective*. Families &
15
16 Social Capital ESRC Research Group Working Paper no.7, South Bank University.
- 17
18
19 BORNSTEIN, D. (2005) *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power*
20
21 *of New Ideas*. Penguin Books, New Delhi.
- 22
23
24 BOSCHEE, J. and McCLURG, J. (2003) Towards a Better Understanding of Social
25
26 Entrepreneurship: Some Importance Distinctions. [http://www.se-](http://www.se-alliance.org/better_understanding.pdf)
27
28 [alliance.org/better_understanding.pdf](http://www.se-alliance.org/better_understanding.pdf). Accessed 24 May 2006.
- 29
30
31 BRINCKERHOFF, P. (2000) *Social Entrepreneurship*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- 32
33
34 BRINDLE, D. (2006) Marking out the territory. *The Guardian* (20 September 2006),
35
36 Society Section.
- 37
38
39 BUDD, L. (2003) Can Social Enterprise Succeed in Building the Regional Agenda?
40
41 *Regions* 243(1), 7-11.
- 42
43
44 CALLISON, S. (2003) 'All You Need is Love?' Assessing Time Banks as a Tool for
45
46 Sustainable Economic Development. *Local Economy* 18, 264-267.
- 47
48
49 CHANAN, G. (1999) Employment policy and the Social Economy: promise and
50
51 misconceptions. *Local Economy* 13(4), 361-368.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 CHATTERTON, P. (2002) 'Be Realistic: Demand the Impossible'. Moving Towards
4 'Strong' Sustainable Development in an Old Industrial Region. *Regional Studies* 36(5),
5 552-561.
6
7

8
9
10 COLLINS, C. (2006) 'The Scottish Executive is open for business': The New
11 Regeneration Statement, The Royal Bank of Scotland and the Community Voices
12 Network. *Variant* 26: 10-13.
13
14

15
16
17 CONE, C., FELDMAN, M. A. and Da SILVA, A. (2003) Causes and Effects. *Harvard*
18 *Business Review* 81(7), 95-103.
19
20

21
22 CROSSAN, D., BELL, J. and IBBOTSON, P. (2004) *Towards a Classification*
23 *Framework for Social Enterprises*. Third Sector Research Programme, University of
24 Ulster.
25
26
27

28
29 DART, R. (2004) The Legitimacy of Social Enterprise. *Nonprofit Management and*
30 *Leadership* 14(4), 411-424.
31
32

33
34 DEES, J. G. (2001) *The Meaning of 'Social Entrepreneurship'*. CASE, Duke University.
35 http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_SE.pdf, Accessed 13 July 2006.
36
37

38
39 DEVINE-WRIGHT, P., FLEMING, P. and CHADWICK, H. (2001) Socio-psychological
40 perspective. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 19(2), 161-167.
41
42

43
44 DTI (2002) *Social Enterprise: a strategy for success*. Department of Trade and Industry,
45 London.
46
47

48
49 — (2003) *Social Enterprise: A progress report on Social Enterprise*. Department of
50 Trade and Industry, London.
51
52

53
54 EC (2000) *Commission Discussion Paper - The Commission and Non-governmental*
55 *Organisations: Building a Stronger Partnership*. European Commission, Brussels.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ECOTEC (2003) *Guidance on Mapping Social Enterprise: Final Report to the DTI*
4
5 *Social Enterprise Unit*. Department of Trade and Industry, London.
6

7
8 EIKENBERRY, A. and KLUVER, J. (2004) The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector:
9
10 Civil Society at Risk? *Public Administration Review* 64(2), 132-140.
11

12
13 ELKINGTON, J. (2004) Enter the Triple Bottom Line, in HENRIQUES, A. and
14
15 RICHARDSON, J. (eds) *The Triple Bottom Line*. Earthscan, London.
16

17
18 EVANS, M. and SYRETT, S. (2007) Generating Social Capital? The Social Economy
19
20 and Local Economic Development. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 14(1), 55-74.
21

22
23 FINE, B. (2001) *Social Capital versus Social Theory*. Routledge, London.
24

25
26 FLOCKHART, A. (2005) Raising the profile of social enterprises. *Social Enterprise*
27
28 *Journal* 1(1), 29-42.
29

30
31 FORREST, R. and KEARNS, A. (2001) Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the
32
33 Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* 38(12), 2125-2143.
34

35
36 FYFE, N. (2005) Making Space for “Neo-communitarianism”? The Third Sector, State
37
38 and Civil Society in the UK. *Antipode* 37(3), 536-557.
39

40
41 GRENIER, P. (2002) The Function of Social Entrepreneurship in the UK. *ISTR*
42
43 *Conference*, Cape Town, July 2002.
44

45
46 HARDING, R. (2004) Social Enterprise: The New Economic Engine. *Business Strategy*
47
48 *Review* 15(4), 39-43.
49

50
51 HARDING, R. and COWLING, M. (2004) *GEM: Social Entrepreneurship Monitor*
52
53 *United Kingdom 2004*. London Business School, London.
54

55
56 HAUGH, H. (2005a) The role of social enterprise in regional development. *International*
57
58 *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 2(4), 346-357.
59
60

1
2
3 — (2005b) A research agenda for social entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal*
4
5
6 1(1), 1-12.

7
8 HAUGH, H. and TRACEY, P. (2004) The Role of Social Enterprise in Regional
9
10 Development. *Social Enterprise and Regional Development Conference*, Cambridge-MIT
11
12 Institute, University of Cambridge.

13
14 HM TREASURY (1999) *Enterprise and Social Exclusion: National Strategy for*
15
16 *Neighbourhood Renewal*. HM Treasury, London.

17
18
19
20 HM TREASURY and CABINET OFFICE (2006) *The future role of the third sector in*
21
22 *social and economic regeneration: interim report*. HMSO, London.

23
24 HOCKERTS, K. (2006) Entrepreneurial Opportunity in Social Purpose Business
25
26 Ventures, in MAIR, J., ROBERTSON, J. and HOCKERTS, K. (eds) *Social*
27
28 *Entrepreneurship*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

29
30
31 HUDSON, R. (2005) The Social Economy Beyond the Local? Developmental
32
33 Possibilities, Problems and Policy Considerations. *Urbanistica*, Forthcoming.
34
35 <http://eprints.dur.ac.uk/archive/00000049/>. Accessed 13 July 2006.

36
37
38 IFF RESEARCH LTD (2005) *A Survey of Social Enterprise Across the UK*. Small
39
40 Business Service, London.

41
42
43 JESSOP, B. (2000) Globalisation, entrepreneurial cities and the social economy, in
44
45 HAMEL, P., LUSTIGER-THALER, M. and MAYER, M. (eds) *Urban Movements in a*
46
47 *Global Environment*. Routledge, London.

48
49
50 JOHNSON, S. (2000) *Literature Review of Social Entrepreneurship*. Canadian Centre for
51
52 Social Entrepreneurship, University of Alberta.

1
2
3 JOHNSTON, G. and PERCY-SMITH, J. (2003) In search of social capital. *Politics and*
4
5
6 *Policy* 31(3), 321-334.

7
8 JONES, D. and KEOGH, W. (2006) Social enterprise: A case of terminological
9
10 ambiguity and complexity. *Social Enterprise Journal* 2(1), 11-26.

11
12 JONES, D., KEOGH, W. and O'LEARY, H. (2007) *Developing the Social Economy:*
13
14 *critical review of the literature.* Communities Scotland, Edinburgh.

15
16 LAVILLE, J-L. (2003) A New European Socioeconomic Perspective. *Review of Social*
17
18
19 *Economy* 61(3), 389-405.

20
21
22 LAVILLE, J.-L. and NYSSSENS, M. (2001) The Social Enterprise: Towards a Theoretical
23
24 Socio-economic Approach, in BORZAGA, C. and DEFOURNY, J. (eds) *The Emergence*
25
26 *of Social Enterprise.* Routledge, London.

27
28
29 LEADBEATER, C. (1997) *The rise of the social entrepreneur.* Demos, London.

30
31
32 LINDSAY, G. and HEMS, L. (2004) Societes Cooperatives d'Interet Collectif: The
33
34 Arrival of Social Enterprise Within the French Social Economy. *Voluntas: International*
35
36 *Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 15(3), 265-286.

37
38
39 MAIR, J. and MARTI, I. (2006) Social entrepreneurship research: A source of
40
41 explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business* 41, 36-44.

42
43
44 MATHIASON, N. (2005) Social Enterprise: Business phenomenon of the century. *The*
45
46 *Guardian*, 20 November 2005.

47
48
49 MCGREGOR, A., GLASS, A. and CLARK, S. (2003) *ReValuing the Social Economy.*
50
51 CEiS, University of Glasgow.

52
53
54 MORIN, M., SIMMONDS, D. and SOMERVILLE, W. (2004) Social Enterprise:
55
56 Mainstreamed from the Margins? *Local Economy* 19(1), 69-84.

1
2
3 MORT, G., WEERAWARDENA, J. and CARNEGIE, K. (2003) Social
4 entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and*
5
6
7
8
9 *Voluntary Sector Marketing* 8(1), 76-88.

10
11 MOULAERT, F. and AILENEI, O. (2005) Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity
12 Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present. *Urban Studies* 42(11), 2037-
13
14
15 2053.

16
17 MOULAERT, F. and NUSSBAUMER, J. (2005) Defining the Social Economy and its
18 Governance at the Neighbourhood Level: A Methodological Reflection. *Urban Studies*
19
20
21
22 42(11), 2071-2088.

23
24
25 NICHOLLS, A. (2006) Playing the field: a new approach to the meaning of social
26 entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal* 2(1).

27
28
29
30
31
32
33 OECD (1999) *Social Enterprises*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and
34 Development, Paris.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
ONS (2001) *Social Capital: A review of the literature*. Office of National Statistics,
London.

OTS (2006) *Social enterprise action plan: Scaling new heights*. Office of the Third
Sector, London.

— (2007) *Consultation on the Community Assets Fund*. Office of the Third Sector,
London.

PATON, R. (2003) *Managing and Measuring Social Enterprises*. SAGE Publications,
London.

PEARCE, J. (2003) *Social Enterprise in Anytown*. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation,
London.

1
2
3 PEREDO, A. and McLEAN, M. (2006) Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the
4 concept. *Journal of World Business* 41, 56-65.
5
6

7
8 POLANYI, K. (1957) The economy as instituted process, in POLANYI, K.,
9 ARENSBERG, C. and PEARSON, H. (Eds) *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*,
10 Free Press and Falcon's Wing Press, Illinois.
11
12

13 — (2001) [1944] *The Great Transformation*. Beacon Press, Boston.
14
15

16
17 PORTES, A. (1998) Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology.
18 *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1), 1-24.
19
20

21
22 PURDUE, D. (2001) Neighbourhood Governance: Leadership, Trust and Social Capital.
23 *Urban Studies* 38(12), 2211-2224.
24
25

26
27 QUIBRIA, M. (2003) The Puzzle of Social Capital: A Critical Review. *Asian*
28 *Development Review* 20(2), 19-39.
29
30

31
32 REID, K. and GRIFFITH, J. (2006) Social enterprise mythology: critiquing some
33 assumptions. *Social Enterprise Journal* 2(1), 1-10.
34
35

36
37 RIDLEY-DUFF, R. (2007) Communitarian Perspectives on Social Enterprise. *Corporate*
38 *Governance* 15(2), 382-392.
39
40

41
42 RYDIN, Y. and HOLMAN, N. (2004) Re-evaluating the Contribution of Social Capital
43 in Achieving Sustainable Development. *Local Environment* 9(2), 117-133.
44
45

46
47 SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE (2003) *A Review of the Scottish Executive's Policies to*
48 *Promote the Social Economy*. Scottish Executive, Edinburgh.
49

50
51 — (2004) *Futurebuilders Scotland: Investing in the Social Economy*. Scottish Executive,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Edinburgh.

1
2
3 — (2006) *A social enterprise strategy for Scotland: a consultation*. Scottish Executive,
4
5
6 Edinburgh.

7
8 — (2007a) *A social enterprise strategy for Scotland: Consultation response*. Scottish
9
10 Executive, Edinburgh.

11
12 — (2007b) *Better business: A strategy and action plan for social enterprise in Scotland*.
13
14 Scottish Executive, Edinburgh.

15
16 SEAM (2005) *The Social Economy in Midlothian: A Framework for Development*. Social
17
18 Enterprise Alliance for Midlothian, Dalkeith.

19
20 SEELOS, C. and MAIR, J. (2005) *Sustainable Development: How Social Entrepreneurs*
21
22 *Make It Happen*. Working Paper No.611, IESE Business School - University of Navarra.

23
24 SMALLBONE, D., EVANS, M., EKANEM, I. and BUTTERS, S. (2001) *Researching*
25
26 *Social Enterprise*. Small Business Service, London.

27
28 SMALL BUSINESS SERVICE (2005) *Social enterprise: emerging priorities, Working*
29
30 *Group Meeting with Alun Michael*. Small Business Service, London.

31
32 SOCIAL ENTERPRISE COALITION (2003) *There's more to business than you think: A*
33
34 *guide to social enterprise*. The Social Enterprise Coalition, London.

35
36 SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMISSION (1994) *Social Justice: Strategies for National*
37
38 *Renewal*. Vintage, London.

39
40 THE OBSERVER (2005) Social Enterprise: Supplement. *The Observer*, 20 November
41
42 2005.

43
44 THOMPSON, J., ALVY, G. and LEES, A. (2000) Social entrepreneurship - a new look
45
46 at the people and the potential. *Management Decision* 38(5), 328-338.

1
2
3 TRACEY, P., PHILLIPS, N. and HAUGH, H. (2005) Beyond Philanthropy: Community
4 Enterprise as a Basis for Corporate Citizenship. *Journal of Business Ethics* 58, 327-344.
5
6

7
8 TREBECK, K. (2005) Democratisation Through Corporate Social Responsibility? The
9 Case of Miners and Indigenous Australians. *The Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy*
10 *Research (CAEPR)*, Australia National University. Unpublished PhD Thesis.
11
12

13
14 WADDOCK, S. and POST, J. (1991) Social Entrepreneurs and Catalytic Change. *Public*
15 *Administration Review* 51(5), 393-401.
16
17

18
19
20 WALLACE, B. (2005) Exploring the meanings(s) of sustainability for community based
21 social entrepreneurs. *Social Enterprise Journal* 1(1), 78-89.
22
23


24
25 WESTLUND, H. and BOLTON, R. (2003) Local Social Capital and Entrepreneurship.
26 *Small Business Economics* 21, 77-113.
27
28

29
30 WILLIAMS, C., ALDRIDGE, T. and TOOKE, J. (2003) Alternative Exchange Spaces,
31 in LEYSHON, A. LEE, R. and WILLIAMS, C. (eds) *Alternative Economic Spaces*.
32 SAGE Publications, London.
33
34

35
36
37 WOOLCOCK, M. (1998) Social capital and economic development: Toward a
38 theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society* 27, 151-208.
39

40
41 ZAFIROVSKI, M. (1999) Probing into the social layers of entrepreneurship: outlines of
42 the sociology of enterprise. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 11, 351-371.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE 1: THE PRIVATE, PUBLIC AND THIRD SECTORS



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE 1: RELEVANCE OF THE THIRD SECTOR TO THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

| SOCIAL CAPITAL | Social Economy | Social Enterprise | Social Entrepreneurship |
|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Structure (bridge) | X | - | - |
| Process (bridging) | X | X | - |
| Diversity (bridged) | - | X | X |
| Holder (bridge-builder) | - | - | X |

er Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 ⁱ REID and GRIFFITH (2006: 2) even talk about a ‘quadruple’ bottom line consisting of
8
9 economic, social, ecological and community empowerment goals.

10
11 ⁱⁱ MOULAERT and AILENEI (2005) suggest that the English-speaking literature has
12 largely ignored the role of not-for-profit organisations like producer or consumer
13 cooperatives, which represent more continental European organisational types

14
15 ⁱⁱⁱ Some argue that government policies such as the new Community Interest Company
16 legal form are actually driven by enabling access to finance rather than promoting
17 stakeholder models of governance (LINDSAY and HEMS, 2004, p.283).

18
19 ^{iv} <http://adbusters.org/metaspolitico/antipreneur/forum/> (accessed June 2006).

20
21 ^v One of the anonymous referees emphasised the point that the diversity of concepts
22 “cannot and should not be eradicated”.

23
24 ^{vi} More recently the UK government has sought to downplay the role of the Third Sector
25 in public services reform (see BRINDLE, 2006).

26
27 ^{vii} http://www.futurebuilders-england.org.uk/content/QuestionsandAnswers1/-article_37_25.aspx?iid=78
28 (accessed April 2007).

29
30 ^{viii} The UK government announced a new scheme in December 2006 called the
31 Community Assets Fund. This established a £30 million fund to promote the transfer of
32 local authority assets to Third Sector organisations in order to “increase the community
33 ownership or management of assets, to enable community organisations to be successful
34 and independent in the way they respond to local needs, strengthen cohesion and promote
35 wellbeing” (OTS, 2007, p.2).