

State of the Art Review



The role of social enterprise in developing skills and creating employment opportunities in the UK



The Women's Organisation

Professor Richard Hazenberg
Institute for Social Innovation and Impact
University of Northampton
richard.hazenberg@northampton.ac.uk

SOTA Review No 50: April 2021

The positive impacts that social enterprises can bring to the skills development and employability of the UK population is often assumed, but the evidence for this on a large-scale has been somewhat lacking. This review explores education, training and employment support delivered by social enterprises, in order to identify these gaps in our knowledge, and also highlights the high efficacy of social enterprise interventions in disadvantaged areas, with socially excluded individuals, and in urban regeneration. Further, the review shows how certain models of social enterprise delivery focused on employee ownership could also benefit public service delivery and hence protect jobs and build community cohesion. The review frames this evidential exploration within a critique of the existing UK policy environment surrounding skills development and employment, to highlight how policy and funding could be used to grow the impact of social enterprise in the above areas.

Background

Following on from a decade of austerity, the UK is now facing a severe economic challenge in the form of the Covid-19 crisis, which is likely to lead to significant unemployment in the future¹. Office for Budget Responsibility (July 2020) forecasts show a worse-case scenario of a 14.3% drop in GDP in 2020, with UK unemployment rising to a peak of 13.2% from just 4% (December 2019 – February 2020) (ONS, September 2020). The last time that unemployment was near this level was when it peaked at 11.9% in 1984² (ONS, September 2020) and so policy-makers will be forced to identify new or alternative means of retraining, upskilling and creating jobs in the new economy. In relation to this, there has been growing interest from UK policy-makers over the last two decades as to how social enterprises can

¹ The government's furlough scheme has seemingly been quite successful so far in reducing sharp, early rises in unemployment. However, in the medium-term significant increases in unemployment and a large drop in GDP are expected (Office for Budget Responsibility, 2020).

² Comparable unemployment figures through the ONS only go back as far as 1971.

be utilised to upskill the populace and reduce unemployment, a focus that is likely to increase in the post-Covid world. This takes on even greater importance in the modern context, with 3.2% of the workforce now on zero-hours contracts, up from just 0.8% of the workforce in 2000 (ONS, August 2020); whilst research by the Living Wage Foundation and New Economics Foundation has highlighted that 15.5% of workers are in low-paid, insecure employment (Jaccarini and Krebel, June 2020).

Social enterprises can be defined as independent, self-sustaining organisations that create social and environmental value through their operations (Dart, Clow and Armstrong, 2010). The idea that social enterprises can support skills development and employability is not new, with work-integration social enterprises (WISEs) featuring prominently across the third sector in the UK and also Europe (Defourny and Nyssens, 2006). The defining feature of a WISE is a desire to reintegrate the socially excluded into work (Spear and Bidet, 2005), albeit many different types of social enterprises can impact skills and employability indirectly (and create employment), even if work-integration is not their primary focus. Typically, social enterprises have been shown to offer potentially significant benefits to individuals not just in the attainment of qualifications or employment, but also in the 'softer' outcomes so important to employability, including improved self-efficacy, self-regulation and social skills (Hazenberg, Seddon and Denny, 2014). The role of social enterprise as a whole in upskilling people and creating jobs is therefore of significant interest at this current time, as the UK looks towards alternative models of employment provision in the post-Covid world and seeks to address the 'levelling up' and 'green deal' agendas. This paper seeks to explore the existing evidence on the potential of social enterprises to develop skills and create employment, in order to identify research gaps and offer policy suggestions.

Evidence

Overview:

In the UK, whilst precise figures are difficult to ascertain, it is estimated that there are 100,000 social enterprises accounting for over £60 billion of UK GDP (SEUK, 2019) and employing 1.44 million people (DCMS, September 2017). Further, it has been estimated that if the economy was dominated by social enterprises rather than shareholder dominated businesses, four million more people would be being paid the real living wage and £118 billion of profits per annum would be being reinvested back into society (SEUK, 2019). These are not insignificant sums and demonstrate the impact that businesses operating both socially and economically can have, particularly on the poorest members of society. Indeed, this has been an emergent trend globally, with research in Canada identifying a Social Return on Investment of £3,522 per individual engaged through a social enterprise offering employment and training support³ (Walk et al., 2015). Back in 2013, a report published by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) explored the role of social enterprise in employment creation across eight countries⁴. The report identified that social enterprises focused on employment prioritised the quality of employment as a key social driver (even if this was sometimes difficult to achieve), and that over three-quarters of the surveyed social enterprises worked with disadvantaged groups (Buckingham and Teasdale, February 2013). Whilst the overall contribution to employment from social enterprises can be unclear, what repeatedly emerges from the evidence is their desire and ability to work with those most disadvantaged in society.

³ Figures originally reported in Canadian Dollars (\$5,381), which was then converted to £GBP through xe.com and then adjusted for inflation to 2019 levels through the Bank of England Inflation Calculator.

⁴ Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Romania and Sweden.

Social Enterprises – Upskilling, Equity and Employment Creation:

One of the key ways in which social enterprises support upskilling and employment creation is through a focus on creating social value, particularly in disadvantaged areas (Santos, 2012). Given that the current economic crisis is likely to disproportionately affect socially excluded populations, social enterprises provide a mechanism of support to counter this disparity (Bonnici and May 2020). Certainly, it has been evidenced in the Italian context that when working with socially disadvantaged unemployed individuals, social enterprises can provide more effective results and operate more efficiently than government programmes (Defourny and Depedri, 2013); whilst in Australia research has identified that social enterprise provides an excellent means for integrating immigrants and refugees into the employment market (Barraket, 2013)⁵. Further, research by Hazenberg et al. (2014) in the UK identified that one of the key benefits delivered by social enterprises involved in the education, training and employment of young people, were induction processes that did not discriminate against those individuals that were further from the labour market (often the most disadvantaged). This type of support is critical when seeking to train and employ disadvantaged young people and people living with disabilities, areas in which social enterprises are particularly adept (British Council, 2015). This non-discriminatory approach is also crucial in ensuring that employment issues around gender, BAME and other areas of possible discrimination in the workplace (i.e. religion) are tackled effectively through open and culturally sensitive programme delivery. These programmes of support and social enterprise's organisational uniqueness makes them particularly impactful in tackling employment and education problems within areas of urban regeneration. Further, in relation to this latter organisational uniqueness, across the social enterprise sector 40% of social enterprises are led by women and 35% have BAME Directors (SEUK, 2019). This relative diversity (compared to other sectors of the economy) means that social enterprises can act as beacons for change through their commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) within their leadership and organisational structures.

Social enterprises also provide support in other areas of urban regeneration, including social capital and skills development (Bertotti et al., 2012; Denny et al., 2011). The wider academic literature has ascertained that social enterprises can be crucial to local and regional regeneration through creating employment, networking stakeholders, and developing relational assets (Kim and Lim, 2017). This is in part due to the fact that they act as a mediating link between government and the community and are able to ensure local buy-in because they have deep understandings of local contexts (Cornelius and Wallace, 2013). The relevance for regeneration is also related to social enterprises' ability to conform to governmental agendas so as to gain access to resources that communities need (Dey and Teasdale, 2016). This enables social enterprises to understand the complex needs of local communities when it comes to skills training and employment, allowing them to potentially deliver more impact in areas of disadvantage/regeneration and to tackle discrimination with regards to sex, sexual preference, ethnicity and religious background/denomination.

Some social enterprises also utilise employee ownership in their legal models, a feature that has its origins in the UK cooperative movement that emerged in the nineteenth century (British Council, 2015). Such ownership models provide employees greater engagement in the businesses they work in, as well as an ability to shape the strategic goals of firms and benefit from surplus generation. Public Service Mutuals⁶ and social enterprise spin-outs provide a strong example of this, with the sector growing significantly during the last two decades. Since the creation of the Right to Request and subsequent Right to Provide policies from 2008 onwards that encouraged health and social care workers in the public sector to 'spin-out' their services into social enterprises (Miller, Millar and Hall, 2012), there has been

⁵ Particularly pertinent at the current time given the refugee crisis across Europe.

⁶ Defined as '*organisations which have left the public sector, that is, spun out, but continue to deliver public services and in which employee control plays a significant role in their operation*' (LeGrand and Mutuals Taskforce, 2012:9).

a proliferation of such entities with an estimated 400 plus spin-outs active by 2019 (Gregory, April 2019). Spin-outs and mutuals can save jobs that otherwise would be lost through the closure of non-statutory public services, whilst research has identified five-year sustainable growth rates of nearly 44% (Hazenberg, May 2014); and higher levels of employee satisfaction/retention (Gregory, April 2019).

Finally, the green policy agenda and the focus on climate change, through the [Green Deal](#) and Climate Change Committee, can have important implications for the role of social enterprises in the UK. The need for the coming green revolution to be social too, has been recognised within the EU's Green Deal, recognising the importance of organisations with social *and* environmental missions (European Economic and Social Committee, March 2020). Indeed, given the employment potential creation of green policies in the coming years, estimated to amount to up to 200,000 new jobs (Climate Change Committee, December 2020:22), social enterprises can contribute to this economic growth and job creation. Further, the Green Deal's focus on energy improvements to households can provide significant potential for social enterprise led employment, with research in the West Midlands identifying that social enterprises can act as effective intermediary gateways between communities and Green Deal providers, enabling trust and improving buy-in to the programme in local areas (Localise West Midlands and iSE, 2012). This potential has been recognised recently by Social Enterprise UK in their report 'Social Enterprise and Climate Change', in which SEUK argue that the triple-bottom line of social enterprises makes them perfectly placed to support sustainable green sector growth (SEUK, July 2020).

Government Funding and Policy:

However, despite these clear benefits, social enterprises supporting people with skills development, employability and securing jobs, have to operate within broader government policy frameworks for education and employment. Indeed, recognition of social enterprise within government and a move away from seeing them as part of the voluntary/charitable sector would be beneficial. Social enterprises should be supported by and come under the remit of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial strategy (DfBEI), rather than their current position in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). This is an area where partnership within government would be welcome, with a recent report jointly commissioned by DCMS, DfBEI and the Office for Civil Society exploring social enterprise market trends showing how governmental cooperation in this area could work (DCMS, September 2017).

Support for employment and training through social enterprise has been complicated in recent years with Brexit, as a significant amount of funding (around €2.3 billion per annum) has been provided through European Structural and Investment (ESI) funds for education and training, support for job-seekers, and green infrastructure (Davenport, North and Phillips, July 2020). Post-Brexit this will not be the case, with similar funding functions falling under the aegis of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF). However, such a shift presents opportunities (as highlighted by the Institute for Fiscal Studies) to change how these funds are distributed, including greater local discretion on expenditure and a more needs-based assessment of regional funding streams (Davenport et al., July 2020). The UKSPF also seeks to tackle inequality and support areas of deprivation, and hence social enterprises should be specifically targeted through this funding as a means of delivering employment, upskilling and better employment (i.e. allowing people to leave behind low-paid jobs and zero hours contracts). These are all important areas that need to be considered as the UK releases the first £220 million of funding through the UK Community Renewal Fund to be allocated ahead of the introduction of the UKSPF (MHCLG, March 2021).

Beyond the UKSPF, government policy in the UK towards unemployment remains mixed, with limited integration of social enterprises within policy mechanisms and funding streams. Indeed, in recent years it can be argued that policy has shifted even further away from an

Active Labour Market Policy model that would seek to integrate local, third sector organisations into support provisions for education, training and employment (Orton and Green, 2019). The government's Work and Health Programme (WHP) has replaced the (much larger) Work Programme that ran from 2010-2015, with the WHP seeking to support people back into work from a variety of disadvantaged backgrounds⁷; and engagement being voluntary unless an individual has been unemployed and claiming benefits for more than 24 months (UK Government, 2020). One of the criticisms of the Work Programme was that it was funded under a Payment by Results model that favoured larger, private sector companies that can provide the upfront capital required to engage in such payment arrangements (Hazenberg, 2012). This meant that the smaller, local voluntary organisations that could be best placed to support the disadvantaged unemployed were unable to compete for prime contracts (Winyard, 2016). The WHP is funded through the same mechanism, meaning that smaller, localised providers may be excluded from contract delivery (or forced to subcontract with larger providers). The WHP also does not place a high enough premium on the quality of a proposed contract tender response, with social value created not a major factor, despite the 2012 Public Services (Social Value) Act covering this type of commissioning⁸. This creates tensions in the engagement of social enterprises in those areas where their interventions can be most effective; dealing with individuals with complex needs who face skills and employability problems in disadvantaged areas.

Summary of Policy and Evidence Gaps

Overall, the evidence demonstrates that social enterprises already have a significant impact on skills development and employment in the UK, and that this impact could be even greater given the right policy and funding environments. Given the government's commitment to social mobility as epitomised through the [Social Mobility Commission](#), a focus on organisations that can support the upskilling and employability of individuals from diverse, complex and disadvantaged backgrounds whilst also reinvesting their profits into local communities, would seem to be a logical route for education and employment policy. Certainly, this review has demonstrated the key benefits provided by social enterprises with regards to skills and employment, namely: integrated support for socially excluded populations; employee ownership (in some models of social enterprise); urban regeneration and improved community cohesion; enhanced public service delivery; environmental sustainability; and social/environmental value creation in communities (see Figure 1 below). It is perhaps time we sought to collectively change the discourse as to how our economy should be structured, so that more effective alternatives to skills and employment creation can be identified. No doubt the economic context of the post-Covid world demands such an approach. Whilst it would be illogical to claim that social enterprise offers the only solution to employment and skills problems in the UK, a more prominent role for social enterprise in the UK economy, alongside traditional businesses becoming more aware of their social obligations, could be the sector's transformative approach in tackling the skills and employment gap, and building a more cohesive society, and robust, 21st century economy. This is also the case when seeking to create training and employment opportunities through new environmental initiatives, in which social enterprises' commitment to social and

⁷ Including people who are: disabled, a carer or former carer, homeless, a former member of the armed forces or an armed forces reservist, the partner of a current or former member of the armed forces, a care leaver, a young person in a gang, a refugee, a victim of domestic violence, dependent (or have been dependent) on drugs or alcohol and it's preventing you from getting work, an ex-offender and you've completed a custodial or community sentence, or an offender serving a community sentence.

⁸ Interestingly, whilst the Local Government Association (May 2016:12) identified compliance with the Social Value Act with regards to workplace health, it made no such assertion with regards to health-related worklessness (May 2016:11).

environmental objectives through their triple-bottom line can be crucial to successfully developing the environmental sustainability agenda.



Figure 1 – Social Enterprise Skills and Employment Impact Model

Policy Implications

What is clear from this review of the research evidence generated to date, is that the policy environment remains unconducive to social enterprises taking an active part in driving the upskilling of the population and creating employment, despite the significant impact already generated by the sector. On this basis this review suggests six policy recommendations to improve the impact that the social enterprise sector can have on skills and employment:

- 1. Focus on Social Value:** Greater adherence to the legal requirements and moral vision embedded within the 2012 Social Value Act, to ensure that provision within the Work and Health Programme (and future successor UKSPF national programmes) is focused on quality and social value, as much as best price and organisational size. Further, future successor programmes should include mechanisms that actively encourage third sector consortia to bid for contracts. These mechanisms could include less overt reliance on Payment by Results funding models, at least for the majority of prime contract funding. This would provide a more level playing field that would allow third sector organisations including social enterprises, to compete for prime contracts and deliver locally tailored support on skills and employability. Further, increased prioritisation of social value creation and the wider social impact delivered within contracts would also enable social enterprises to bid for contracts with more success.
- 2. Post-Covid Skills and Employment:** In the post-Covid world there will be a temptation for government to focus on Aiken's (2007:18) 'pile-em-high' employment model in which the response to high unemployment is large, centralised programmes with few providers. Whilst such programmes may be necessary for those individuals close to employment, for those disadvantaged individuals in need of more in-depth, localised support this could be a disaster. Therefore, a blended approach that also

supports small local providers (what Aiken termed the 'Tapestry' approach of mixed actions and many providers) would help to deal with high unemployment, whilst ensuring that the most disadvantaged are not left behind (Aiken, 2007:18).

3. **Promoting Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) in Employment:** Social enterprises, with their inherent focus on driving equality and creating social value, are perfectly placed to lead work in improving equality and diversity in the workplace. This is particularly relevant when seeking to deliver the government's 'levelling-up agenda' across the country. A commitment to working with and supporting social enterprises within the levelling-up agenda could significantly improve social mobility and equality of opportunity for disadvantaged groups and prevent discrimination/reduced opportunity on the basis of sex, sexual preference, ethnicity and religious background/denomination. Further, the social enterprise sector leads nationally on inclusion with significant numbers of women and BAME individuals in leadership positions. Social enterprises should therefore be partnering with and educating the private sector in EDI as part of knowledge transfer frameworks.
4. **Employee Ownership of Public Services:** Greater/continued support for employee ownership models and mutuals, as has been seen through the Public Service Mutuals programme and Right to Request/Right to Provide. These models of social enterprise delivery of public services could help protect (and even grow) employment in non-statutory public services that could otherwise be under threat post-Covid.
5. **Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy:** There should be increased BEIS support for the development of social enterprises, with recognition that social enterprises offer sustainable business platforms that can create good quality employment within local communities. Indeed, social enterprise should be recognised as part of the BEIS portfolio, not as part of the charity or voluntary sector.
6. **Growing the Green Sector:** Social enterprises should be recognised as a fundamental element in the government's drive towards growing the green sector, particularly with the renewed focus on meeting our climate change obligations and ensuring that the UK is carbon neutral by 2050. Specific focus on the role of social enterprises with regards to green job creation and the Green Deal could be beneficial in ensuring that new 'green' jobs are delivered by organisations that have a central mission commitment to environmental impact/sustainability.

Further Research

What is clear from this review is that there remains a lack of evidence as to the comparable impact of social enterprises training and employing individuals versus similar interventions operated by the public or private sector; this is a clear area for further research. Studies that can explore the impact of social enterprises on employees, as well as within the communities that they serve, would be welcome. This equally applies for demonstrating the efficacy of skills and employment interventions led by social enterprises in disadvantaged areas, as part of urban regeneration programmes and in supporting social mobility and EDI. There has already been much good work done by scholars and practitioners, but the evidence base needs to be strengthened to demonstrate the value that social enterprise can bring.

Sources

- Aiken, M. (2007) *What is the role of social enterprise in funding, creating and maintaining employment for disadvantaged groups?*, Cabinet Office Paper, January 2007.
- Barraket, J. (2013) "Fostering the Wellbeing of Immigrants and Refugees? Evaluating the Outcomes of Work Integration Social Enterprise." In Seddon, F. & Denny, S. (2013) *Social Enterprise: Accountability and Evaluation Around the World*, Routledge Publishing, Northampton, UK.

- Bertotti, M., Harden, A., Renton, A. & Sheridan, K. (2012) The contribution of a social enterprise to the building of social capital in a disadvantaged urban area of London, *Community Development Journal*, 47(2), pp. 168–183.
- Bonnici, F. (May 2020) *Why social entrepreneurs are critical to our response to and recovery from the COVID-19 crisis*, World Economic Forum Article, 5th May 2020, available online at <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/05/schwab-foundation-covid-response-alliance-social-entrepreneurs-coronavirus-recovery-response/>
- British Council (2015) *Social Enterprise in the UK: Developing a Thriving Social Enterprise Sector*, British Council Report, available online at https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/social_enterprise_in_the_uk_final_web_spreads.pdf
- Buckingham, H. & Teasdale, S. (February 2013) *Report: Job creation through the social economy and social entrepreneurship*, Organisation for Economic Cooperation & Development Report, available online at <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/jobcreationthroughthesocialeconomyandsocialentrepreneurship.htm>
- Climate Change Committee, (Dec 2020), *The Sixth Carbon Budget: The UK's Path to Net Zero*, available online at <https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/sixth-carbon-budget/>
- Cornelius, N. & Wallace, J. (2013) Capabilities, Urban Unrest and Social Enterprise, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(3), pp. 232-249.
- Dart, R., Clow, E. & Armstrong, A. (2010) Meaningful difficulties in the mapping of social enterprises, *Social Enterprise Journal*, 6(3), 186-193.
- DCMS (September 2017) *Social Enterprise: Market Trends 2017*, Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport/Department for Business Innovation & Skills Report, available online at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644266/MarketTrends2017report_final_sept2017.pdf
- Defourny, J. & Depedri, S. (2013) "When Social Enterprises Do It Better". In Seddon, F. & Denny, S. (2013) *Social Enterprise: Accountability and Evaluation Around the World*, Routledge Publishing, Northampton, UK.
- Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M. (2006) *Defining Social Enterprise*. In Nyssens, M. ed., 2006, *Social Enterprise*, pp. 3-26, Routledge Publishing, Oxon, UK.
- Denny, S., Hazenberg, R., Irwin, W. & Seddon, F., (2011), 'Social Enterprise: The Evaluation of an Enterprise Skills Programme', *Social Enterprise Journal*, 7(2), pp. 150-172.
- Dey, P. & Teasdale, S. (2016) The Tactical Mimicry of Social Enterprise Strategies: Acting 'as if' in the Everyday Life of Third Sector Organizations, *Organization* 23(4), pp. 485-504.
- European Economic & Social Committee (March 2020) *European Green Deal must be social too, says EESC*, 9th March 2020, available online at <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/news-media/news/european-green-deal-must-be-social-too-says-eesc>
- Gregory, D. (April 2019) *Public Service Mutuals: The State of the Sector*, Social Enterprise UK and Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport Report, available online at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/806202/Public_Service_Mutuals_-_The_State_of_the_Sector_2019.pdf
- Hazenberg, R. (2012) *Work-integration Social Enterprise: A NEET Idea?* PhD Thesis, University of Northampton, UK.
- Hazenberg, R., (May 2014), *Spin-Out Survey: Needs and Wants*, Report for the Transitions Institute, available online at <https://pure.northampton.ac.uk/en/publications/public-service-spinouts-2014-needs-and-wants>

- Hazenbergh, R., Seddon, F. & Denny, S. (2014) Investigating the *outcome* performance of work-integration social enterprises (WISEs): Do WISEs offer 'added value' to NEETs? *Public Management Review*, 16(6), pp. 876-899.
- Davenport, A., North, S. & Phillips, D. (July 2020) *Sharing prosperity? Options and issues for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund*, Institute for Fiscal Studies 13th July 2020, available online at <https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/14936>
- Jaccarini, C. & Krebel, L. (June 2020) *Tackling Insecure Work is Vital for any Meaningful Recovery from Crisis*, New Economics Foundation 19th June 2020, available online at <https://neweconomics.org/2020/06/why-tackling-insecure-work-is-an-important-part-of-any-meaningful-recovery-from-crisis>
- Kim, D. & Lim, U. (2017) Social Enterprise as a Catalyst for Sustainable Local and Regional Development, *Sustainability*, 9(8) [1427].
- LeGrand, J. & Mutuals Taskforce (2012) *Public service mutuals: The next steps*, London: Cabinet Office, available online at [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/44579/1/Public%20service%20mutuals%20next%20steps%20\(lsero\).pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/44579/1/Public%20service%20mutuals%20next%20steps%20(lsero).pdf)
- Local Enterprise West Midlands & iSE (2012) *Green Deal Opportunities for Social Enterprise*, LEWM & iSE Report, funded by the Local Energy Assessment Fund (LEAF) available online at <http://localisewestmidlands.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Green-Deal-opportunities-for-social-enterprise-evaluation-report.pdf>
- Local Government Association (May 2016) *Health, work and health-related worklessness: A guide for local authorities*, LGA and Public Health England Report, available online at <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/health-work-and-health-re-904.pdf>
- Miller, R., Millar, R. & Hall, K. (2012) New development: Spin-outs and social enterprise: the 'right to request' programme for health and social care services, *Public Money & Management*, 32(3), pp.233–236.
- MHCLG (March 2021) *UK Community Renewal Fund: Prospectus*, Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government, March 11th 2021, available online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-community-renewal-fund-prospectus>
- OBR (July 2020) *Coronavirus Analysis: Fiscal Sustainability Report*, Office for Budget Responsibility, available online at <https://obr.uk/coronavirus-analysis/>
- ONS (August 2020) *EMP17: People in Employment on Zero Hours Contracts*, Office for National Statistics, 11th August 2020, available online at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/datasets/emp17peopleinemploymentonzerohourscontracts>
- ONS (September 2020) *Unemployment Rate (aged 16 and over, seasonally adjusted)*, Office for National Statistics, 13th September 2020, available online at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peoplenotinwork/unemployment/timeseries/mgsx/lms>
- Orton, M. & Green, A.E. (2019) Active Labour Market Policy in the UK: At a (local) Crossroads? *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit*, 34(1), pp. 3-9.
- Santos, F. (2012) A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), pp. 335-351.
- SEUK (2019) *Capitalism in Crisis: Transforming our economy for people and planet*, Social Enterprise UK State of the Sector Report, available online at <https://www.socialenterprise.org.uk/state-of-social-enterprise-reports/capitalism-in-crisis-transforming-our-economy-for-people-and-planet/?su=t0>

- SEUK (July 2020) *Social Enterprise and Climate Change: What We Know, What We Need to Find Out*, SEUK Report July 22nd 2020, available online at <https://www.socialenterprise.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/climate-change-what-we-know-social-enterprise-uk-2020.pdf>
- Spear, R. & Bidet, E. (2005) Social Enterprises for Work Integration in 12 European Countries: A Descriptive Analysis, *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 76(2), pp. 195-231.
- UK Government, (2020) *Work and Health Programme*, available online at <https://www.gov.uk/work-health-programme>
- Walk, M., Greenspan, I., Crossley, H. & Handy, F. (2015) Social Return on Investment Analysis: A Case Study of a Job and Skills Training Program Offered by a Social Enterprise, *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 26(2), pp. 129-144.
- Winyard, P., (2016) *What to expect from the Work and Health Programme?* NCVO Article, July 13th 2016, available online at <https://blogs.ncvo.org.uk/2016/07/13/what-to-expect-from-the-work-and-health-programme/>
-

About the Author



Richard is Professor of Social Innovation and leads the Institute for Social Innovation and Impact at the University of Northampton. Richard has research interests in the areas of social innovation, social finance, public service innovation and social impact measurement and has published research in numerous international, peer-reviewed academic journals. He has also presented research papers at conferences in Europe, Asia, and America and has contributed to international/national government policy through papers and roundtable meetings (including for the European Commission; Cabinet Office; and HM Treasury). Richard has managed several international and national research projects for the University including projects funded by the European Social Fund, Horizon 2020, Big Lottery Fund and Big Issue. He has also conducted social impact measurement consultancy work with over 50 third sector organisations in the UK. Professor Hazenberg is Associate Editor for the *Social Enterprise Journal* and also the *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* and is a reviewer for a number of international peer-review journals including *Policy and Politics*, *Public Management Review*, *Public Money and Management*, and the *Journal of Social Policy*. He is also currently supervising eight PhD research students exploring topics related to social innovation and social entrepreneurship. Richard is the University of Northampton's leading academic researcher in the field of social investment, public service spin-outs, social innovation and social impact measurement.

Other SOTA Reviews are available on the Enterprise Research Centre web site www.enterpriseresearch.ac.uk. This SOTA Review is one of five published in March 2020 in partnership with the Institute of Small Business and Entrepreneurship's Gender and Enterprise Network. This set reviews the state of knowledge on women's entrepreneurship. The views expressed in this review represent those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the ERC or its funders.

