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Abstract

Purpose-- This study analyses the development of social enterprises in the UK, in the context of the increased need for creative solutions to ameliorate deprivation and deliver effective public services.

Design/methodology/approach-- The investigation draws on a mixed method approach From a postal survey of 102 social enterprises complemented by detailed analysis of two selected cases and key informant interviews.

Findings-- The results of the study show that there is a paradigm shift in the practice and conceptualisation of social enterprises in South Yorkshire as they are increasingly taking a more corporate approach to achieve their outcomes.

Research limitations/implications-- The study is limited to social enterprises in South Yorkshire, UK. Further comparative analysis in other regions and social contexts is required in order to explore if these results are widely applicable.

Practical implications-- This study is of potential benefit to researchers and those involved in formulating policies for the development and support of social enterprise.

Originality/value-- The study contributes to the extant literature by investigation of the development of social enterprise in competitive markets, which is an area that requires further academic scrutiny. The South Yorkshire region presents an interesting case that extends our understanding of the operations of social enterprises in the UK given the high levels of deprivation due to the steady decline of its industrial base (Bache and Chapman, 2008).
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1. Introduction

The concept of social enterprise is increasingly being acknowledged as an effective intervention to address a variety of social problems (Smith et al., 2013; Mason et al., 2006). Social enterprises are found in many forms and seek to address some form of socio-economic deprivation through enterprise, in contrast to other non-profit organisations whose emphasis
is primarily on profit maximisation and capital gain (Parenson, 2011). As a concept and practice, social enterprise is politically contested and subject to different interpretations (Kerlin, 2010; Teasdale, 2011; Young and Lecy, 2014). Scholars agree, however, that a social enterprise is a business engaged in some form of trading to produce a surplus or profit so as to reinforce its social ethos (Cornelius and Wallace, 2013; Eversole et al., 2013). In spite of its recent emergence in academic literature, social enterprise is generally underdeveloped and lacks the critical mass needed to fully understand it (Haugh, 2005; Urban, 2008). Drawing from components of Historical Institutionalism (HI) this paper seeks to address this gap in knowledge by providing insight into the development and evolution of social enterprises in South Yorkshire UK, a region which still faces an exceptionally difficult set of economic challenges due to the demise of its industrial base (Bache and Chapman, 2008). The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 focuses on the selected theoretical framework and a review of extant literature on the development and evolution of social enterprise. Section 3 discusses methodology and data collections. Section 4 outlines key findings. Section 5 discusses the findings and offers concluding remarks.

2. Theoretical approach: Historical institutionalism and Social Enterprise

2.1 Historical institutionalism (HI)

This paper adopts the Historical Institutionalism (HI) approach, which is an approach to studying politics and change (Steinmo, 2008; Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, 2003). This theoretical lens provides insight into how institutions structure behaviour and outcomes as well as how institutional changes occur over time (Sepulveda, 2014; Steinmo, 2008). Though HI only emerged in academia in the early 1990s, the approach itself is not new as it incorporates both old and new institutional theoretical ideas (Sepulveda, 2014). Weber (1968) and Polanyi (1957) are generally considered early historical institutionalists through their work demonstrating the interconnectedness of politics and economics. Polanyi’s Great Transformations (1957) provides insight into the interactions between the state, society and markets, and the instability resulting from the strictures of the latter. He argued that the economy is an instituted process, implying that markets are essentially political constructs and economics cannot be viewed separately from the political and social systems in which they are embedded. There followed a variety of variant approaches, often referred to as the new institutionalism; these understood the system of rules and regulations as the method by which institutions structure behaviour (Clarke et al, 2016; Hall, 1989; Steinmo, 2008; Schmidt, 2010).
Sepulveda (2014) and Karlhofer (2015) identify two key assumptions that underpin HI. Firstly, this approach places great emphasis on how institutions shape behaviour and politics through their focus on structural analysis. This perspective also makes it possible to identify and analyse the asymmetric power relations and strategies between different actors within a broader social structure. Imnergut (1992) also supports this view, further arguing that institutions can both inform and prevent the development of specific policy interventions. Secondly, HI assumes that history shapes the way that institutions operate and discharge their duties. In this regard a more meaningful analysis of any institutional change should consider the historical origins of a path or path dependant trajectory. This argument is consonant with the views of Broschek (2011), Pierson (2000) and Salvador et al. (2014) who posit that initial decisions or past choices can influence specific institutional trajectories. Capoccia and Kelemen (2007) further stress that if the initial decisions or path dependence result in fundamental institutional change, then critical junctures should be the starting point in the historical analysis of a phenomenon. Historical institutionalists therefore will want to know the reason certain choices are made and/or why specific outcomes occur.

2.2 HI and social enterprise

While there is a significant body of literature on institutional theory and its different forms in the study of social enterprise (Pinch and Sunley, 2015; Teasdale, 2012), there is little scrutiny on the HI theoretical approach to understanding the social enterprise sector. Researchers such as Borzaga (2007) and most recently Sepulveda (2014), however, have used components of this approach in analysing the development of social enterprise. Their work shows that in order to understand contemporary enterprise, it is important to gain insight into its historical origins and specific events that led to its development. In this paper we tap into two constructs of the HI approach, namely, structural analysis (ability of institutions to shape behaviour) and the historical dimension, incorporating path dependency and critical junctures. These allow us to examine the development of social enterprise in the UK as a key welfare intervention as well as a culmination of a sequence of past independent events which continue to shape the future development of the concept (Steinmo, 2008; Karlhofer, 2015). We start our discussions with the historical development of social enterprise, given that historicity is a key construct of HI (Sepulveda, 2014; Broschek, 2011).
Researchers agree that the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century, characterised by rapid industrialisation and harsh economic conditions, is associated with the emergence of social enterprise (Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005; Mendell, 2005). Extensive analytical work undertaken by Borzaga (2007), Moulaert and Ailenei (2005) and Polanyi (1957) provides an interesting etiology of the establishment and growth of social enterprise. Their work shows that in the nineteenth century, social enterprise was seen as a counter-narrative to the pervasive exploitation of labour by the capitalist modes of production prevailing at the time. Polanyi (1957) and McClelland (1963) were critical of the effects of the internal logic of a self-regulating market system which led to industrial workers being the casualties of rapid industrialisation. The exploitative nature of the capitalist system and insufficient state welfare support provided the impetus for philanthropists to explore ways of alleviating poverty and deprivation through a variety of charitable programmes and institutions such as mutual societies and co-operatives (Monzon, 1989; Moulaert and Ailenei, 2005). Increasing welfare needs, limited state aid and decreasing philanthropic support forced some of these interventions to explore ways in which they could achieve financial sustainability, hence the development of contemporary social enterprises as we know them today (Bridge et al, 2009). Both Borzaga (2007) and Moulaert and Nussbaumer (2005) argue that there was a greater need for a more entrepreneurial approach to addressing social needs rather than relying on donations and philanthropic support. This sequence of events, path dependant processes or critical junctures (Broscheck, 2011; Erdmann et al., 2011) therefore gave rise to contemporary enterprise. Social enterprise therefore emerged as a key policy construct within the matrix of the state, markets and society to address socio-economic instabilities arising from the interactions of these institutions. This is consonant with Polanyi’s (1957) argument that self-regulating markets produced disorder which left labour vulnerable and therefore requiring protection from the state.

Given this historical development, the development of social enterprise has been characterised by democratic models of governance and explicit social objectives such as job creation or provision of local services (VanSandt and Mukesh, 2012). In addition, social enterprises seek to be viable businesses that make surpluses from trading activities. This allows them to achieve financial sustainability and develop capacity to support their socio-environmental obligations (Doherty et al., 2009; Eversole et al., 2013). Social enterprises in the UK, however, are facing significant challenges to remain viable given the effects of changes in the broader macro environment and the subsequent cuts in spending. We argue
that these institutional changes are influencing the trajectory of social enterprise growth and the specific choices they are making to achieve their outcomes (Capoccia and Keleman, 2007; Erdmann et al., 2011). For example, there is evidence that some social enterprises are increasingly considering corporate business operating frameworks such as share capital legal frameworks in order to compete in the market (Mswaka and Aluko, 2014; Harradine and Greenhalgh, 2012). These developments show a distinct shift from the philanthropic origins of social enterprise and we argue that they are a significant causal mechanism of institutional change and practice of social enterprise.

This paper acknowledges some weaknesses of the HI approach in framing social enterprise, particularly the potential bias arising out of an overemphasis on path dependant developments and lack of clarity in explaining institutional change (Schmidt, 2010). This approach, however, is useful for our study in two ways. First, it allows us to understand the contemporary development of social enterprise and how it has evolved over time as a historically constructed institution, created by a sequence of events and path dependant processes. This makes it possible to understand present dynamics and the extent to which the past has shaped the phenomenon. Second, the approach’s focus on structural analysis provides a framework to understand and discuss the positionality of social enterprise within a broader social field involving other actors such as the state and markets. This enables us to understand how social enterprises make decisions on ways to survive in challenging environments.

2.3 Social enterprises in South Yorkshire

This section provides the contextual background of social enterprises in the UK and South Yorkshire. The UK has about 70,000 social enterprises contributing £24 billion to the economy and employing nearly 1 million per year (FT, 2015). Social enterprise is central to the UK government’s policy on tackling deprivation and regeneration of economically deprived areas across the country (Bertotti et al., 2011; Mason et al., 2006; Spear et al., 2009). This policy thrust regards social enterprise as a mechanism to tackle deprivation and exclusion through sustainable enterprise activities (Bacq & Janssen, 2011).

Understanding the nature of social enterprise in South Yorkshire requires gaining insight into its regional political economy. The South Yorkshire region comprises four unitary boroughs of Sheffield, Rotherham, Barnsley and Doncaster. Historically, the economy of South Yorkshire was primarily industrial and this dates back to the nineteenth century industrial
revolution with coal mining and steel production being the mainstay of the economy (Birch, 2006). The accelerated closures of steel industries and coalmines in the 1980s, however, resulted in massive job losses and devastated entire towns (Beatty et al., 2007). This in turn created a plethora of socio-economic problems that resulted in high levels of unemployment and many families requiring welfare support. The region therefore benefited from a £1.8 billion financial assistance programme from the European Union to tackle unemployment through a variety of regeneration interventions with a particular emphasis on social enterprise (Bache and Chapman, 2008).

In summary, the decline of the region’s industrial base of steel manufacturing and coal mining resulted in particularly challenging socio-economic conditions that the state could not address on its own. This required the intervention of other forms of institutional support to complement the state’s efforts.

3. Methodology and data collection
Due to the extent of the geographical area to be covered, the preferred methodological approach in this study is a mixed method approach involving the complementary use of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods (Denscombe, 2003; Ghauri and Gronhaug, 2005). The quantitative component of the research involved a postal survey of 102 self-defined social enterprises in South Yorkshire. A total of 218 postal questionnaires were sent in June 2012 and 102 were returned by the end of August 2012. This represented a response rate of approximately 48%. This method allowed the researchers to identify numbers and patterns of organisations that described themselves as social enterprises across the region. While an informal survey of social enterprises was carried out by Sheffield Community Enterprise Development Unit (SCEDU) in 2003, there was no official database available across the region. The researchers used their knowledge and contacts in key social enterprise support organisations across the region to obtain contact information. This involved the scrutiny of available sub regional unpublished databases as well as information gleaned from archival data and other published information on the region. This exploratory quantitative research was complemented by an in-depth qualitative analysis of two selected cases. Information was obtained through the use of face to face interviews of key informants to explore the conclusions from the data collected through the questionnaire survey (Jack et al., 2008; Saunders et al., 2009). A semi-structured interview guide was used to extract relevant data from the selected interviewees. These were the relevant founders, directors and
staff of the social enterprises as highlighted below in Table 1. Eight interviews were conducted in total lasting approximately one and a half hours each. The interviews were carried out, recorded and transcribed by the authors. The social enterprises were purposely selected and given fictitious names to anonymise them. One had company limited by guarantee (CLG) legal structure (The Adviser) and the other (The Consultant), had company limited by shares (CLS) legal structure. Type of legal structure and thematic activity were the key factors used to select relevant cases for this study. This allowed us to compare and contrast their outcomes.

The two cases selected for this study are shown below in Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Legal Structure</th>
<th>Thematic Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Adviser</td>
<td>CLG</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Consultant</td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPSS was used to analyse the data because of the empirical nature and size of the sample that had been obtained. SPSS made it possible to define independent variables and conduct cross tabulations and descriptive statistical analysis of the data (Saunders et al., 2009). It was possible to produce relevant descriptive statistics to support the findings of this investigation. The qualitative information from interviews of key informants was analysed through a content analysis approach. The interviews from key informants were recorded and manually analysed. Taking into cognisance the objective of this study, we were able to generate relevant codes that we utilised to identify emerging themes (Basit, 2003).

4. Key findings
The descriptive statistics from this work were complemented with qualitative data gleaned from key informant interviews. This allowed us to analyse the development and identify key emerging characteristics of social enterprises in South Yorkshire as discussed below.

4.1 History of social enterprise in South Yorkshire
Figure 1 shows that the majority of the social enterprises have been in existence for more than six years. Their history also pre-dates the influx of European financial investments into South Yorkshire which started in 1999 and is also linked to socio economic challenges arising out of the decline of this region’s industrial base (Beatty et al, 2005). This was confirmed by a respondent from the Consultant who stated ‘A lot of social enterprises from this area are a direct result of the closure of mines and factories...unemployment figures were unbelievable’. The results also show a high number of social enterprises aged between two and four years. This might be explained by the launch of several financial support initiatives launched by the then Labour Government in 2006. Further analysis of the ages of the respondents’ enterprises reveals that the number of those that have been in existence for less than a year is significantly greater than those that have been in existence for four to six years. The reason for this needs further research, although we argue that this figure may include some organisations that re-branded themselves as social enterprises. This dimension was confirmed by a respondent from the Adviser who stated, ‘Our social enterprise is probably one of the oldest in our area. We have also been called a charity or community group during our existence but our aim has always been to help people’.

While the exact ages of social enterprises in South Yorkshire are difficult to ascertain, their history can be traced back to the interventions implemented to address socio-economic challenges arising out of the economic upheavals of the 1980s (Thompson et al., 2000).

4.2 Social enterprises and generation of income

The achievement of economic objectives allows social enterprises to achieve their social objectives. By analysing how social enterprises in South Yorkshire generate revenue, we
were able to evaluate the importance of their economic and social objectives in their practices, as shown below.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Table 2 shows that grant funding continues to be one of the most common sources of finance for social enterprises, with 75% of the total income of the respondents coming from this source. It is also not surprising that this finding is associated with the CLG legal structure which is a common legal vehicle in the social enterprise sector and associated with non-commercial activities and strong social objectives (Lyon and Humbert, 2012). This [grant dependence] was confirmed by a respondent from the Adviser who remarked; ‘At board level, we know must earn more money... work towards sustainability... but we rely mainly on grant support... we don’t want full scale commercial operations because we are here to help people’.

Table 2 also shows that 18% of the respondent organisations’ income came from commercial trading and equity investments. The bulk of the Consultant’s income came from taxable income and contracts with various public bodies and private customers as confirmed by one of the respondents: ‘We are a commercial social enterprise ... [and] we are negotiating with more private sector and local authority clients at the moment who are prepared to invest in us’. This response shows a strong corporate approach, underpinned by sustainable commercial activities. The Consultant, however, benefited from a CLS legal structure that permits equity investments and also permits distribution of profit and surpluses to those that have invested in the enterprise.

4.3 Governance and ownership of social enterprises in South Yorkshire

Given that social enterprises have traditionally been associated with the democratic model of governance, Table 3 below shows a cross tabulation of type of legal structure and governance of social enterprises in South Yorkshire.
Table 3 shows that all social enterprises that have CLG legal structures are governed by volunteer boards of directors. The volunteers are largely motivated by the satisfaction they get from the intrinsic nature of what they do (Pearce, 2003; Mswaka and Aluko 2015). On this particular point, the respondent from The Adviser aid, ‘We are all volunteers; we don’t want to get anything out of this…I mean…financially. We are here to help the community’. This response resonates with Evans and Syrett’s (2007) observations on volunteerism in the non-profit sector. He argues that individuals on the boards of these organisations have been selected on the strength of their passion for the community and its wellbeing, not necessarily the expertise they bring to the organisation.

Table 3 also shows that there is a small number of social enterprises with paid boards of directors and staff. This is a significant finding in that there it shows a distinct move from traditional forms of democratic governance systems associated with social enterprise (Harradine and Greenhalgh, 2012). This was confirmed by the respondent from The Consultant who said, Yes we have a good board and we go to them for advice on strategic ... we are like a commercial company’. This for-profit governance dimension signifies a paradigm shift is the way social enterprises seek innovative ways to achieve their outcomes in competitive environments (Mswaka and Aluko, 2015; Parenson, 2011).

4.4 Thematic activities of social enterprises in South Yorkshire

The thematic activities of social enterprises in South Yorkshire are illustrated in Table 4 below.

The results show that the respondents were involved in 18 thematic areas across South Yorkshire. This paper uses the term ‘Regeneration Catalyst’ as an umbrella term to cover social enterprises that are simultaneously involved in a number of thematic trading activities
in pursuit of their objectives. This dimension was illustrated by the respondent from The Adviser who said ‘We do almost everything here that we think can help our community...we have training facilities, a shop, advice service and a trading arm that assists the elderly who live here...one could call us a Jack of all trades’. Further analysis of the findings suggests that social enterprises are widening their thematic areas as confirmed by the respondent from The Consultant who said, ‘We started on a very small scale but we have expanded into other activities in addition to our core work...we offer environmental consultancy services to a wide variety of clients country wide’. This is a significant finding, particularly in view of the generally accepted view that social enterprises operate in areas of market and state failure (Chell et al., 2010). This finding further indicates the continuing evolution of social enterprise beyond traditional paradigms and its ability to survive without traditional sources of funding.

5. Discussion and concluding remarks

In this paper the HI approach has allowed us to understand and analyse the evolutionary processes by which social enterprise has developed. The results of this study show us that the history of social enterprise in South Yorkshire predates the influx of European financial investment into the region and is directly and intricately linked to interventions designed to ameliorate deep-seated deprivation across the region. Given that South Yorkshire was once a key economic hub of the UK economy, it is evident that the socio-economic conditions resulting from the collapse of the region’s economic base provided the impetus for the establishment of social enterprises. These enterprises perform a crucial social function that complements the state’s welfare programmes.

A key component of HI is the concept of critical junctures and path dependence (Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, 2003; Erdmann et al., 2011; Vohora et al., 2004). These allowed us to identify key specific events that had an impact on the trajectory of contemporary social enterprise development. We therefore argue that due to the complexity of the economic environment and the continuing need to address social needs, some social enterprises in South Yorkshire are incorporating for-profit business strategies to achieve long term financial sustainability. This corporatisation of social enterprise is an interesting development of social enterprise, given its philanthropic origins. The emergence of for-profit stewardship governance models as well as share capital legal structures in the social enterprise sector
highlights this dimension. Brown (2006) and Mswaka (2015) argue that this particular
development reflects challenges that social enterprises face in mobilising capital and
technical expertise. Therefore, consideration of for-profit business practices provides an
infrastructure that allows corporate practices to be transferred to the social enterprise sector.
The UK government is also a key factor in corporatisation of social enterprise activities
through the reduction in institutional funding. For example, the increasing entreprization of
public services is seen as a direct result of cost cutting measures implemented by the current
government (Sepulveda, 2014). This trajectory is also reflected by the results of the census
and thematic analysis of social enterprises in South Yorkshire. They show that social
enterprises are expanding boundaries and becoming more business-like, moving into areas
such as manufacturing and ICT, not traditionally associated with social enterprise. We argue
therefore that despite being mission led social enterprises have a symbiotic relationship with
the markets.

The challenges that social enterprises are facing are therefore some of the critical junctures
that they have to overcome in their development (Broscheck, 2011; Edmann et al., 2011).
Overcoming them has resulted in fundamental shifts in practice that has seen an increased
willingness to embrace creativity and innovation in order to maximise extraction of value
beyond the social enterprise sector (Douglas and Grant, 2014; Teasdale, 2012).

In conclusion, we can see a paradigm shift in the form of a path dependant process (Salvador
et al., 2014; Vohora et al., 2004) in how social enterprises in South Yorkshire are configured
to deliver economic prosperity in challenging environments (Cornelius and Wallace, 2011).
Considering their historical philanthropic background, these findings have deepened our
understanding of how social enterprise practices and characteristics are evolving as the
sector tries to respond to challenges in the broader economic environment. This study has
also produced vital empirical data essential in understanding both historical and
contemporary development of the sector across the region. This contributes to current
knowledge and profiling of the sector. Importantly, these findings mean that the current
conceptualisation of social enterprise which rejects profit distribution and personal capital
gain no longer captures its true essence. For example, the current UK government’s definition
of a social enterprise needs to be revisited as this no longer reflects contemporary
developments in the sector.
The findings of this study have practical policy implications; there is a need for continued institutional and technical support for social enterprises in South Yorkshire to enable them to develop capacity and complement the state in provision of welfare and in creating sustainable communities (Evans and Syrett, 2007; VanSandt and Mukesh, 2012).

We acknowledge that further research is required to explore the key themes emanating from this study. It would be interesting to investigate whether social enterprises have relevant skills and competencies needed as they become more business-like. In addition, comparative experiences in other social contexts in the UK are required to explore whether these findings are widely applicable.
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### Table 1: Cases under scrutiny

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Adviser</th>
<th>The Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic activity and</td>
<td>1. Provision of employment advice</td>
<td>1. Provision of environmental consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enterprise activities</td>
<td>2. Training facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Community shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of legal structure</td>
<td>Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG)</td>
<td>Company Limited by Shares (CLS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Director, 3 trustees and 2 staff members</td>
<td>Director, 2 board members, 1 member of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of income</td>
<td>Grant and trading</td>
<td>Trading and equity investments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

### Table 2: Means of generating income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of generating income</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Structure</th>
<th>Components and structure of income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant funding and trading activities</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>CLG</td>
<td>Grant funding -75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trading income -15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loans/equity investments -0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading activities/loans and equity investments</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>Grant funding -0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trading income -80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/equity investments -20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data
Table 3: Cross tabulation of legal structure and governance of social enterprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of legal structure</th>
<th>Governance of social enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer board and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLG</td>
<td>8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust deed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet incorporated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data
Table 4. Thematic activities of social enterprises in South Yorkshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Activity</th>
<th>Number of organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and new media</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental preservation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed workspace</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy, training and education</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well being</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration catalyst</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology and communications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking and financial products</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language promotion and development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial cleaning services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and safety equipment installation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Figure 1 Ages of social enterprises

Source: Survey data