

**ESRC TSRC
co-centre
seminar series
2012-13**

Seminar Two

Social enterprise and environmental sustainability: challenges and opportunities

16 April 2013

TSRC 
Informing civil society

BRAS2
The Centre for Business Relationships
Accountability, Sustainability & Society

E · S · R · C
ECONOMIC
& SOCIAL
RESEARCH
COUNCIL

ESRC TSRC
co-centre
seminar series
2012-13

Seminar Two
Social enterprise
and environmental
sustainability: challenges
and opportunities

This publication is produced in partnership with the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Third Sector Research Centre (TSRC), and is part of a series of co-centre publications covering:

- **The third sector as a public service provider**
with the Centre for Market and Public Organisation (CMPO), University of Bristol
- **Social enterprise and environmental sustainability**
with the centre for Business Relationships, Accountability, Sustainability and Society (BRASS), Cardiff University
- **Entrepreneurial philanthropy and social investment in the 21st century: implications for social entrepreneurship and social innovation**
with the centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy (CGAP), Cass Business School, London, and the Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (ISBE), London
- **Innovations in public services**
with the Innovation Research Centre (IRC), Cambridge University, and Imperial College, University of London

Contents

- 4 Executive Summary

SECTION A: academic overview

Paper Title

- 6 One Can social enterprise save the world?
Experience from a decade of research into co-operatives
- 8 Two Taking their own practices seriously:
social enterprise and environmental management systems (EMS)
- 10 Three Beyond green niches? Growth strategies of environmentally-motivated
social enterprises

SECTION B: policy and practice perspectives

Paper Title

- 14 Four Social enterprise and waste
- 16 Five Getting the message across: the role of social enterprises as
inspirers of sustainable living
- 20 Biographies
- 22 Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

Ken Peattie

Director, Centre for Business Relationships,
Accountability, Sustainability and Society (BRASS)

Social enterprise and the environment: can social enterprise save the world?
Experiences from a decade of research



Social enterprises play a vitally important role within society when it comes to mapping a path towards a more environmentally sustainable society and economy. However it is a role that, if not entirely overlooked, is frequently under-appreciated. This may reflect the presence of the word “social” in their title, or the long tradition of work-integration enterprises across Europe making a very specifically social contribution, or perhaps even the recent emergence in the UK of many community health related social enterprises as NHS spin-outs. Whatever the reason, when perusing the research literature, or policy discussions, relating to social enterprise, the phrase ‘social and environmental value (or contribution)’ is used ubiquitously, yet the value under discussion is almost always ‘social’. This imbalance is something that the Third Sector Research Centre’s research stream on the environment was very explicitly established to address. It is something that the Social enterprise and environmental sustainability seminar organised jointly between the Third Sector Research Centre and BRASS, summarised in this publication, also aimed to correct.

In practice social enterprises have been prominent as catalysts and innovators in a range of important environmentally-orientated sectors. In waste management and reduction, social enterprises have often driven the introduction of curb side recycling within communities or have established businesses to reclaim and return to the value stream resources represented by end-of-use products ranging from computers to furniture. In house building, social enterprises have provided some of the more innovative schemes for low carbon homes, and in terms of energy supply, community energy social enterprises have been instrumental in driving forward renewable energy investments. Similarly whether it comes to reducing food miles through local food ventures, or reducing carbon emissions linked to transport through alternative vehicle ownership or use schemes, social enterprises have been the ones creating new business models and driving innovation

in the marketplace. These sectors all matter because, according to the European Environmental Impact of Products study,¹ around 75-80% of the environmental impact of a European citizen’s lifestyle is linked to their home and how they manage it (particularly in terms of energy and waste), the food they eat, and how they travel for work or leisure.

The other reason why social enterprises matter when considering environmental sustainability challenges, is that many of them operate at a community level where sustainability issues can be both clearly perceived and effectively tackled. The individual citizen acting alone can find it very difficult to move to sustainable energy, reduce their waste or change how they travel. Social enterprises operating at a community level can create more sustainable systems of consumption and production whilst simultaneously providing more sustainable livelihoods. The ability of social enterprise to build viable businesses at a community level can also be important for protecting the environmental resources and eco-system services on which we all ultimately depend. One of the most rapid areas of growth in social enterprise globally is in the tourism sector. Locally focused community enterprises are more likely and more able to protect local environmental and cultural resources, and to retain the profits generated by tourism than the global commercial players, whose approach to tourism development is too often as an ‘extractive industry’.

As an area for research, policy and practice social enterprise and environmental sustainability is set to become increasingly important in future. This is particularly true in sectors and countries where environmental limits linked to the availability of cheap energy, land or water are beginning to impact on conventional businesses and business models. The seminar presentations, summarised here, illustrate the multi-faceted nature of the contribution that social enterprises make in relation to environmental sustainability, along with some of the challenges that social enterprises face in ensuring that their own environmental performance as organisations does not compromise the social or environmental value that they generate. The seminar brings together researchers, practitioners and policy-makers who share an interest in the environmental contribution of social enterprise to exchange ideas and experience and help to drive forward an agenda that is both intriguing and important.

1 See Tukker, A. and Jansen, B. (2006) ‘Environmental impacts of products: A detailed review of studies’, *Journal of Industrial Ecology*. 10 (1), pp.159-182.

SECTION A: academic overview

Paper One

Can social enterprise save the world?

Experience from a decade of research into co-operatives

Molly Scott Cato, Professor of Strategy and Sustainability,
University of Roehampton



Given the failure of the model of capitalism based around external shareholder ownership in recent years, there are many reasons why we might look with renewed interest at the co-operative enterprise as a source of greater responsibility and accountability. But what about sustainability? Why might we think that the green economy would have a significant proportion of its businesses using a shared governance model?

The first feature of the conventional economy we need to consider is growth, the key dynamic of the economy as a whole and of all the businesses within it. A shareholder-owned business is designed to grow and thus to yield more profits to its owners. Yet growth is problematic within a green economy, which recognises the importance of living within planetary limits. Can we suggest that a co-operative business might take a different approach to growth? Might it be more willing to seek a strategy of optimisation rather than maximisation?

We might argue that co-operatives are naturally limited by the size of their membership. As co-operatives increase in size it is a challenge for them to maintain the commitment to thorough involvement of members in decision-making. One important stage of development arises when the co-operative becomes too big for all its members to be in the same room at the same time to make decisions. The need to elect representatives reduces engagement and ends direct accountability. For this reason co-operatives are more likely to expand by networking and by creating spin-offs than by expanding into ever-larger businesses.

Equity is at the heart of the co-operative model of enterprise, and is also important for a sustainable economy. Once we accept that the pie cannot keep expanding the question of how we share the pie becomes much more pressing. The co-operative model has always been about sharing the value of production fairly, and about producers and consumers co-operating over the quality and quantity of production, and how what is produced should be shared fairly. To live within planetary limits means that we do not have the luxury of allowing the extraction of productive value by middlemen or by external shareholders, hence the co-operative model of enterprise has renewed relevance.



And finally, let us think about innovation, that central achievement of the capitalist economic model, and one that we are so urgently in need of today to speed up the transition to sustainability. In a profit-driven enterprise the sorts of innovations that are encouraged are those that lead to rapid profit generation, rather than those that are in the social interest. The most obvious example of this is the pharmaceutical industry, where we have drugs for slimming and tanning but no drugs for sleeping sickness or malaria. In the environmental sphere, we have the history of the electric car, which was held back by opposition from the oil industry and the automotive industry. In the early days of car development, there were both electric cars and biodiesel cars, but once the US oil industry took off, this was the route that these vehicles followed, in spite of the disastrous environmental consequences.

So a green economy will be different in kind from the economy we know today, not just a different range of products made using renewable rather than fossil energy. The sort of economy we are looking for is one with equity at its core, which is highly innovative but does not fetishise growth. Co-operatives are likely to play a central part within this sustainable economy of the future.

Paper Two

Taking their own practices seriously: social enterprise and environmental management systems (EMS)

Graham Smith, University of Westminster
Rebecca Edwards, Bournemouth University
Milena Büchs, University of Southampton
(all previously TSRC)



There is a tacit or sometimes explicit assumption that the social purpose of social enterprises will ensure that the environment is considered seriously in their everyday decision-making. But this cannot be assumed in practice. Just because a social enterprise is realising social benefits, it does not necessarily follow that these are achieved in an environmentally-sustainable manner – or that the organisation has given any consideration to the environmental impacts of its activities. While environmental rhetoric is present across the sector, actual practice in environmental management is rather sparse. There are, of course, well known examples of organisations for which the environment is a central concern, who ‘trade’ on their environmental credentials; but for many social enterprises, and the third sector more broadly, practice is lagging. This is particularly evident in comparison to the ‘audit explosion’ in demonstrating social mission.

A series of interviews and case studies carried out within the Third Sector Research Centre (TSRC) provides insights into why the environment has not received such systematic attention. Interviews with key organisations, public officials and practitioners involved in the development of audit and management tools indicate a lack of knowledge and understanding of the demands of environmental performance management. While the sector has developed a range of approaches to assess and improve its social impacts, this has not transferred to environmental considerations.

Case studies with social enterprises with an explicit commitment to taking environmental management seriously (a small minority) provide evidence that they have looked to the private sector for inspiration, typically in the form of ISO14001 or some other established environmental management system (EMS). Whereas the third sector has played a leading role in the development of tools for the consideration and management of social impacts, it is private sector practice on EMS that is arguably a long way ahead. But as

with experience in the private sector – in particular amongst small-and-medium-sized enterprises – there are challenges to the adoption of EMS:

- Concern over the costs of implementation. Social enterprises often find their resources stretched: the technical knowledge, staff time, financial outlay and the like that are needed to effectively embed EMS are limited.
- Sector-specific tools that take into account the needs – including the limited resources – of different organisational forms and activities across the sector. ISO14001 and similar corporate systems are not necessarily the most relevant for social enterprises, leading to the in-house development of bespoke systems.
- Tension between environmental and a more holistic sustainability management approach. Purely environmental tools focus the attention of the organisation on a neglected aspect of its activities. But such a focus may mean that trade-offs between different priorities (environmental, social and financial) are not made explicit.
- Bespoke systems and accreditation. While any organisation can have environmental commitments in its mission statement or an environmental policy, publicly-recognised accreditation at the very least provides a reference point. There is a tension between flexibility and comparability.

There is currently a lack of demand or pressure for more systematic embrace of EMS from within the social enterprise sector. Only particular types of organisations whose commitments are matched by sufficient capacities and resources are willing to take environmental performance management seriously at the present time. However, it may well be external pressures that force the sector’s hand. Many of our interviewees argue that whilst currently light, environmental expectations will increase in the coming years, particularly in relation to the procurement of public services. Just as the demands of government (arguably) drove much of the development and adoption of tools to consider social impact, it may well be government pressure that stimulates the development and adoption of EMS. But as with social audit, this may well result in inappropriate demands through regulatory creep, with administrative costs outweighing environmental benefits.

Acknowledgement: This paper draws heavily on Edwards, R., Smith, G. and Büchs, M. (2013) ‘Environmental management systems and the third sector: exploring weak adoption in the UK’. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* (in press).

Paper Three

Beyond green niches? Growth strategies of environmentally-motivated social enterprises

Ian Vickers and Fergus Lyon (TSRC), Centre for Enterprise and Economic Development Research, Middlesex University Business School



How do environmentally-motivated social enterprises (ESEs) grow their environmental, social and economic impacts? Growth can take multiple forms, including expanding environmental value through conserving resources, ecosystems and biodiversity, and increasing economic value by providing products, services and supporting employment in environmental sectors. Contributions to social value include tackling social exclusion and strengthening self-actualisation amongst individuals and communities.

Case study research shows that ESEs have particular competencies and strengths in areas where they are strongly motivated by their core interests and value commitments. This can include an ability to enlist support from their immediate interest groups and communities, as well as social and environmental impact reporting. Also needed are business skills similar to those required by more purely commercial activities, with an ongoing need for support to address specific gaps (e.g. access to finance, marketing, human resources).

Our analysis suggests a typology of three broad but distinct approaches or modes:

- **small and beautiful** niche ventures seek to address needs and deepen impact within particular communities and local economies, often taking their inspiration from bottom-up alternative visions of community development and eco-localisation. Although individual initiatives may have limited impacts, their increase in number and geographical spread has potential in terms of developing local economies that are more sustainable and diversified. Examples include local food initiatives and other ventures involving community ownership and management of biophysical assets. ESEs in this category often choose to remain small to avoid the demands and compromises associated with business growth. In some cases, scaling impact involves collaboration with other local enterprises and policy actors. Challenges include competing with established supply and distribution chains (e.g. in relation to local/ethical food), and a high dependence on voluntary energies.

- **green knowledge economy** ventures aim to achieve a wider impact through the provision of knowledge-intensive services and advice to others, often drawing on their own practical experience. They have particularly strong links to a wider knowledge base, such as universities and other sympathetic sources of expertise. Scaling and growth comes from both sharing information freely and from turning their knowledge into an income stream. Enterprise models include establishing consultancy and training programmes, as well as charging others for replicating their business model.
- **green collar army** enterprises prioritise employment creation in labour-intensive sectors and activities, such as waste recovery. Success is dependent on entrepreneurial teams that have diverse business capabilities, and being able to link opportunities created by environmental regulation with public sector programmes for work integration. This category has particular resonance in the context of 'Green New Deal' type arguments for government-led stimulus packages to support significant employment creation while addressing sustainability challenges.

Being able to build legitimacy and enlist support from public sector, corporate and other sources of support is particularly important for ESEs that are seeking to grow. Also crucial is the ability to innovate and adapt through learning and being responsive to markets (or quasi-markets) which are ill-defined and emergent in character. While some cases emphasised the opportunities created by the increasing trend to outsource public services, most also expressed concerns about the nature of the commissioning processes involved, as well as public sector austerity measures.



Growth can also present new dilemmas. Scaling-up to encompass a wider geographic area can result in a loss of local focus and autonomy, giving rise to concerns around the extent to which ethical aims and alternative visions of sustainability are being compromised. Many ESEs, particularly 'small and beautiful initiatives', are reluctant to engage with the corporate private sector and are resistant to accommodating the ethos and language involved.

Typology of environmentally-motivated social enterprises:

	Small and beautiful	Green knowledge economy	Green collar army
Markets	Local/regional ethical consumer markets (e.g. food, management of biophysical assets, local transport and renewable energy).	Knowledge intensive services for local government, universities, businesses, individual consumers/households, and social enterprises in their region and beyond.	Labour intensive services to address regulation-driven needs of corporates (e.g. waste/resource recovery) and public sector (e.g. work integration services).
Forms and strategies	<p>Emphasising local ownership/control, often focused on a biophysical asset;</p> <p>Focus on healthy/sustainable consumption and related behavioural/social change;</p> <p>Deepening impact through education and collaboration within community;</p> <p>Informal replication of initiatives and local system building with other ESEs, small businesses and social economy actors.</p>	<p>Increasing impact through consultancy services and sharing knowledge with a focus on social/environmental sustainability, rather than employment/turnover growth.</p>	<p>Strongest potential for business growth under current conditions, while addressing human recovery as well as waste of material resources;</p> <p>Organisational expansion through hybrid forms and new sites;</p> <p>Growth and contraction linked to specific contracts for services.</p>
Capabilities: Human capital	Green activists with specific skills; abilities to engage with and manage volunteers.	Highly qualified experts/enthusiasts in partnership/co-operative structures.	<p>Dependent on diversified teams with strong business skills and capabilities;</p> <p>Empathy and ability to manage beneficiaries who are often low skilled/'hard to help'.</p>

continued...

Social/relational capital	<p>Close to customers/members;</p> <p>Supportive activists and volunteers plus other social economy organisations and networks.</p>	<p>Close to customers/clients;</p> <p>Strong relationships with wider knowledge base (e.g. universities).</p>	<p>Building trust/legitimacy with corporate and public sector; winning contracts through having an 'ethical product', using claims of social and environmental impact, backed up by evaluations.</p>
Issues and challenges	<p>Generally restricted to niche/premium markets (e.g. ethical/organic food);</p> <p>High dependence on voluntary input;</p> <p>Deepening impact dependent on building alternative supply chains through engagement with other actors;</p> <p>Often lack specific business skills – need for low or no cost/sympathetic support;</p> <p>Oppositional/countercultural values – limiting willingness to engage/compromise with large/powerful actors.</p>	<p>Income strongly reliant on niche markets driven by regulation/incentive structures and sustainability policies of public sector;</p> <p>Growth and competitive market pressures may increase tension between value-based sharing and need to capitalise on know-how/intellectual property.</p>	<p>Dependence on public quasi-markets in which ESEs often subordinate to corporate prime contractors (e.g. welfare to work programmes);</p> <p>Limited empowerment of trainees/employees in positions which may be temporary and on minimum wage;</p> <p>Limited policy support for green/sustainable job creation.</p>

Acknowledgement: This summarises research reported in greater detail in Vickers, I. and Lyon, F. (2012) 'Beyond Green Niches? Growth strategies of environmentally-motivated social enterprises', *International Small Business Journal*, published online 4 December 2012.

SECTION B: policy and practice perspectives

Paper Four

Social enterprise and waste

Emma Hallett, Operations Manager, REalliance



There is a wealth of third sector organisations involved in “resource efficiency” activities across the UK. We estimate that there are approximately 800 organisations involved in these activities including furniture reuse, community composting, scrap stores, recycling services and much more. The organisations range from small, volunteer-run groups to large social enterprises with multi-million pound turnovers. In 2009, these organisations diverted almost 250,000 tonnes of material and saved an estimated half a million tonnes of CO₂.

One of the clearest ways that these organisations support pro-environmental behaviour change is by providing waste management services that would not be otherwise available. Termed “providing alternative infrastructure” in the recent Third Sector Research Centre literature review, third sector organisations have long been at the forefront of developing sustainable waste management practices in the UK. Arguably the biggest example of the “up-scaling” of third sector organisation pro-environmental activities is household recycling services. The first kerbside recycling services in the UK were developed by local groups of people, who wanted to show that recycling could (and should) be done. Combining campaigning and practical action, many of these groups were affiliated to Friends of the Earth. Several of these groups grew to become social enterprises providing services to large populations. Even twenty years ago the idea that all houses would receive a separate recycling collection seemed at best unlikely. Aided by EU waste legislation, over the last decade, such collections have now become mainstream and a statutory duty and these services are now more often than not provided by private waste contractors. While there is still debate about whether this is the best way for these services to be provided, there is little doubt that activity started by a number of small organisations has now become almost universal.

Another example of “disruptive innovation” is that of GreenWorks, a social enterprise which developed a re-use and remanufacturing model for office furniture. This has changed the behaviours of the commercial market in a dramatic way. Twelve years ago when refurbishing an office the norm was to dump old commercial furniture except for that which had the greatest commercial value. That meant 90% of all redundant furniture

was land filled. Now it is the complete reverse. Almost all commercial removal companies have followed the GreenWorks lead and are offering reuse, charity donation and recycling and some are even offering apprenticeships and repair facilities.

Many of the activities carried out by third sector organisations working with “waste” resources are not solely focused on providing environmental benefits but have social objectives too. For example many furniture reuse organisations have a focus on providing affordable furniture to low-income families and providing jobs and training opportunities for people with a variety of disadvantages. Reusing discarded furniture is a means by which this is done. Similarly many community composting projects see compost as a resource for growing activities and have objectives about health and local food production; creating compost is an input into the process not the end in itself.

The fact that these activities are not primarily environmentally focused is interesting in terms of pro-environmental behaviour change impacts. One view could be that the impacts could be diminished because the sole emphasis is not on environmental behaviours. However, there is a “normalising” effect on the behaviour if it is not solely for environmental purposes. Research into motivations for donating show that often the reason people donate furniture is for the social good rather than environmental reasons. So the linking of the social and environmental in this instance at least, actively bolsters pro-environmental behaviour.

Another aspect of the social focus of the work of these organisations is that it often includes communities or sections of communities that may not be influenced by “traditional” pro-environmental behaviour change messages. This helps to overcome some of the difficulties of engaging with broader (or “hard to reach”) groups as identified in the TSRC literature review. By providing services that are of value to people on low incomes or otherwise disadvantaged, the pro-environmental behaviours message is more relevant.

In addition to providing direct environmental services to individuals, the organisations also provide information and messages about the value of resource efficiency and local waste management services that are available.

Social enterprises in resource or waste management have the potential to bring together the “triple bottom line” and to help innovate to solve some complex problems faced by society.

Paper Five

Getting the message across: the role of social enterprises as inspirers of sustainable living

Graham Russell, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)

Defra's Social Enterprise Strategic Partnership (SESP) has published Getting the Message Across, reporting on the important role of social enterprises to inspire and encourage sustainable living.

Defining social enterprises as "trading organisations with social and community objectives with the majority of profits used to fulfil social purpose", and looking at their impact in areas such as local food projects, recycling initiatives and sustainable tourism, the report finds that:

- social enterprises operate in ways which generate sustainable solutions to issues affecting people's lives;
- many social enterprise solutions have the potential to be scaled up to increase their impact;
- there is scope for social enterprises and Government to do more to work collaboratively on influencing sustainable living.

"This report confirms that social enterprises make a real difference through the work they do to inspire people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles. Their innovative and creative approaches together with their positive impact make them vibrant partners across Defra's key priorities".

The report points out that as social enterprises seek to combine business success with social value; sustainability is part of their core purpose. This is a diverse and innovative sector, active in all communities, which is providing much-needed goods and services, tackling social disadvantage, and coming up with sustainable solutions to issues that affect people's lives.

The sector ranges from large businesses with a turnover of millions to small volunteer-led enterprises set up in response to local need, and is growing rapidly.

The report was put together using workshops with members of social enterprises and case studies across the UK, ranging from a community-owned shop in Gloucestershire to a web-based project for households to lend out possessions, a sustainable tourism scheme in Cornwall, a project to improve waste ground in Sheffield, and an enterprise in Manchester selling second-hand furniture and paint.

The report found that social enterprises are particularly motivated to come up with innovative solutions to the challenges of sustainability. They live their values and demonstrate them to the communities in which they operate, making sustainable living appear both normal and achievable: for example, a community shop will use the eco-products that it sells or sign up for solar energy.

Their localism encourages social cohesion and trust – key factors in influencing behaviour. This is demonstrated in schemes to improve shared space on estates, grow food on neglected gardens, or encourage tourism businesses to actively engage with communities and customers to inspire change.

Social enterprises also address under-served markets, stepping in where conventional businesses have failed or public funding has been withdrawn. One success story here is Brockweir Community Shop, part of a network of 271 community-owned shops supported by volunteers which have been set up in villages where the last remaining store has closed. In a village of 500 inhabitants, 120 are directly involved with the shop.

Social enterprises naturally collaborate with each other to share expertise and spread examples of success, which is one way the sector can grow.



The government also has a role to play in enabling high-quality business support through organisations such as Business Link and Local Enterprise Partnerships; and, crucially, by providing accessible opportunities for social enterprises to tender for public sector contracts. As the report explains:

“It has long been recognised that there is scope for public procurement to deliver positive social impact as part of achieving best value. The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 will require all public bodies in England and Wales to consider how the services they commission and procure might improve the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the area.”

Social enterprises already have a voice within Defra, but the report highlighted additional areas of development. Partnerships with local authorities or other public sector organisations, recognising and utilising the innovative nature of social enterprise, could foster opportunities for shared solutions; while if government were to act as an advocate of social enterprise and give it a higher profile, that would support the scaling up of the sector.

There is much scope for social enterprise and government to collaborate on influencing sustainable living; to this end the report contains many positive case stories intended to inspire people to act.



<http://sd.defra.gov.uk/2012/09/the-role-of-social-enterprises-as-inspirers-of-sustainable-living/>

Biographies



Milena Büchs, Lecturer, Sociology and Social Policy, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Southampton

Milena's current research focuses on environmental third sector interventions for low carbon practices. She is co-directing (with Graham Smith) the environment stream of the ESRC Third Sector Research Centre and is a Co-Investigator on the RCUK-funded "Community-Based Initiatives for Energy Saving" project. She was also Principal Investigator on the ESRC-funded project "Who emits most?"

Rebecca Edwards, Research and Knowledge Exchange, Bournemouth University

Trained as a geographer, Rebecca is an interdisciplinary researcher specialising in exploring the impacts of policy at a localised level. Currently her work is focused around public engagement with academic research.

Emma Hallett MCIWM, Operations Manager, REalliance

Emma has been the Operations Manager at REalliance since its formation in 2008 and works to support and represent community and social enterprises in the waste and resources field. She represents REalliance on Defra's Social Enterprise Strategic Partnership. Previously she was general manager at the Community Recycling Network UK.

Fergus Lyon, Professor of Enterprise and Organisations, and Director of Centre for Enterprise and Economic Development (CEEDR), Middlesex University

Fergus leads the social enterprise research Capacity Building Cluster funded by the ESRC. He is responsible for the social enterprise research stream of the ESRC funded Third Sector Research Centre. His interests cover enterprise development, social enterprise, and co-operation. His research has been carried out in the UK, Ghana, Nigeria as well as several south Asian countries.

Ken Peattie, Professor of Marketing and Strategy at Cardiff Business School, and Director of the Centre for Business Relationships Accountability, Sustainability and Society (BRASS), Cardiff University

Ken's research interests focus on the impact of sustainability on marketing and corporate strategy making; social marketing for sustainable lifestyles; social enterprise and education for sustainability. He has published three books and numerous book chapters

and journal articles on these topics including contributions to California Management Review, Journal of Business Research, Journal of Marketing Management, and Public Policy and Marketing.

Graham Russell, Sustainable and Competitive Farming Strategy, Defra

Graham has considerable experience of working with the private sector and was, for ten years Director of Business in the Community. He has set up a number of social enterprises; has worked in local government to lead on major regeneration and economic development initiatives; is the Chair of a housing association; is Visiting Professor at Plymouth University's School of Management; and an Expert Adviser for the OECD.

Molly Scott Cato, Professor of Strategy and Sustainability, Roehampton University

Molly is a member of the Welsh Government's Co-operative Commission and a member of the UK Society for Co-operative Studies. She was previously Director of Cardiff Institute for Co-operative Studies. This article draws heavily on a keynote presentation given to the ICA Research Conference in Mikkeli, Finland in August 2011 and published as 'The Green Economy: Why Ownership and Control Matter', *Journal of Co-operative Studies*, 45 (1), pp. 61-68.

Graham Smith, Professor of Politics at the Centre for the Study of Democracy, Politics and International Relations, University of Westminster

Graham is a specialist in democratic theory and practice and environmental politics. He is currently Principal Investigator on the Research Councils UK project 'The Role of Community-Based Initiatives for Energy Saving' and co-directs (with Milena Büchs) the Environment stream of work in the Third Sector Research Centre.

Ian Vickers, Senior Lecturer, Business and Management, Middlesex University

Ian is a principal researcher at Middlesex University with over 15 years experience of researching small business, social enterprise and economic development policy, including evaluation studies for a number of government departments and agencies. He has authored a number of published policy reports for government departments and agencies, academic papers and book chapters.

Acknowledgements



The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is gratefully acknowledged in the production of this publication. The work was part of the programme of research conducted by the joint ESRC, OCS, Barrow Cadbury, Third Sector Research Centre.

