The benefits and challenges of running a social enterprise
We are The Benevolent Society
We help people change their lives through support and education, and we speak out for a just society where everyone thrives.

We’re Australia’s first charity. We’re a not-for-profit and non-religious organisation and we’ve helped people, families and communities achieve positive change for 200 years.
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Executive summary

The Benevolent Society (TBS) was interested in exploring the research on social enterprise to inform its work. This paper considers the definitions of social enterprise and identifies the factors that contribute to long term success. It also presents case studies of two TBS social enterprises.

There is currently strong interest in social enterprise in Australia, but little consensus on a definition. It is generally agreed that social enterprises (a) have an explicit social purpose, (b) aim to become financially self-sufficient, and (c) do so through the trade of goods or services.

The reasons for establishing a social enterprise can be grouped into three categories:

- **market:** to fill a gap that a commercial market is unlikely to fill, such as an employment service
- **mission:** to help an organisation achieve its mission, by adopting a commercial approach
- **money:** to raise revenue or diversify funding streams.

The evidence suggests that social enterprises do not represent a ‘quick fix’ to funding problems. Most don’t generate a profit in their first five years of operation.

Social enterprises require comprehensive business and market planning, including a constant market vigilance throughout the life of the venture. Strong business expertise is vital. The required organisational commitment includes start-up capital, ongoing resourcing and passionate support from key staff and Board members.

Key to the success of a social enterprise is being clear on the primary purpose. If the primary aim is to raise revenue, the first step is to identify a genuine market need where the organisation could have an advantage over for-profit competitors. If the primary purpose is to fill a social need, it is important to determine whether a commercial approach is the best way to meet that need.

One of the greatest challenges in running a social enterprise is that of meeting the double bottom line: having to achieve a social goal and be a sustainable commercial business. Mission drift describes the tendency for the struggle to meet financial goals to overwhelm the social purpose.

Key learnings from research

- **A social enterprise is not an easy way to raise revenue.** Most take years before they break even. Long term commitment and subsidising are essential.

- **Balancing a social enterprise’s social and financial priorities is extremely challenging.** Enterprises must take care not to drift away from the original social purpose while simultaneously keeping a watchful eye on the commercial market and the financial bottom line.

- **A social enterprise is a business.** It needs to be run by, or have the involvement of, someone with commercial experience who understands feasibility studies, market orientation and analysis, financial planning, scaling and growth etc.
1 Introduction

There has been increasing interest in social enterprise in Australia over the last 10 years. State and federal governments are interested in innovative and entrepreneurial approaches to addressing society’s intractable problems, and not-for-profit organisations are seeking ways to diversify their income.

Social enterprise activity, however, is not new. Some examples of well-known Australian social enterprises include The Big Issue, Salvation Army Stores and Bendigo Bank Community Branches. Many Australian non-profit organisations offer fee-based services and run retail outlets to supplement their income from more traditional sources such as donations and government grants.

The Benevolent Society has long been an enterprising organisation, seeking innovative ways to increase opportunities for individuals, families and communities. Our social enterprises include Social Leadership Australia, established in 1999, and our more recent ‘Taste Food Tours’.

This paper explores some of the definitions and models of social enterprise, and the benefits and challenges involved in operating a social enterprise.

2 Definitions of social enterprise

Approaches to social enterprise differ in different parts of the world, generally as a result of differing historical and political contexts.

In Europe, the term social enterprise tends to refer to an organisational unit, deriving from a collective tradition that saw social enterprises generally taking the form of cooperatives (Defourny & Nyssens, 2006, as cited in Teasdale, 2009).

In the UK and Europe, social enterprises most commonly aim to combat unemployment, social exclusion, or revitalise deprived areas (Simons, 2000). A dominant form in Europe is the ‘work integration social enterprise’ (WISE) that focuses on supporting unemployed people who are at risk of permanent exclusion from the labour market (Defourny & Nyssens, 2008).

In the US there are two broad schools of thought. The “earned income” school of thought holds that social enterprise is a means which by non-profit organisations generate an income (Defourny & Nyssens, 2009). The focus is on increasing self-reliance through diversification of the funding base (Social Enterprise Alliance 2004, as cited in Barraket, 2006). The “social innovation” school of thought focuses on social entrepreneurs, and is more a question of outcomes and social impact than income (Defourny & Nyssens, 2009). Simons (2000) describes social enterprises in the US as generally referring to non-profit organisations applying business principles.

Discussions about social enterprise in Australia tend to focus on the values of entrepreneurship over specific trading functions or the legal form of the enterprise (Barraket, 2006). This is reflected in the definition given in Adelaide Central Mission’s Social Enterprise in Australia Handbook:

“Social enterprise is a means by which people come together and use market–based ventures to achieve agreed social ends. It is characterised by creativity, entrepreneurship, and a focus on community rather
than individual profit. It is a creative endeavour that results in social, financial, service, educational, employment, or other community benefits.” (Talbot, Tregilgas, Harrison, 2002, p.2)

Social Enterprise Alliance (US)
“A social enterprise is an organisation or venture that achieves its primary social or environmental mission using business methods. The social needs addressed by social enterprises and the business models they use are as diverse as human ingenuity. Social enterprises build a more just, sustainable world by applying market-based strategies to today’s social problems.”
https://www.se-alliance.org/what-is-social-enterprise

Australian Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
“A social enterprise is an organisation or venture that achieves its primary social or environmental mission using business methods. The social needs addressed by social enterprises and the business models they use are as diverse as human ingenuity. Social enterprises build a more just, sustainable world by applying market-based strategies to today’s social problems.”
https://www.se-alliance.org/what-is-social-enterprise

The reality is that the discourse about social enterprise is full of disagreement and ambiguity, with no consensus on definition or classification.

Some approaches focus on the type and legal status of social enterprises (e.g. for-profit versus not-for-profit organisations). There is no agreement about the extent to which income-earning strategies should be related to social purpose. Some commentators focus on innovation and creativity, others explore the role and characteristics of social entrepreneurs. There is also debate about the extent of community ownership and stakeholder participation.

The majority view seems to be that:
• social enterprises have an explicit social purpose
• the primary activity involves trading (goods or services)
• profit/surplus is reinvested to enable fulfilment of the purpose (although there is debate as to how much profit needs to be reinvested to classify as a social enterprise).

Dispelling the myth: any income-raising activity by a charity is social enterprise
If the broadest definition were applied, any activity of a not-for-profit organisation that generates income through commercial means (as opposed to grants or donations) could be classified as a social enterprise.

However, there is strong support for the argument that ‘income-generating activities’ are those that are integrated into the organisation’s activities, whereas a social enterprise is planned and conducted as a separate business (www.4lenses.org/; Katz & Kauder, 2011).
3 A snapshot of social enterprise in Australia

There has been little rigorous research on social enterprise in Australia.

The ‘Finding Australia’s Social Enterprise Sector’ (FASES) project was the first attempt to identify social enterprises in Australia. In order to capture a diverse range of activities, the researchers adopted a broad definition of social enterprise as:

- being led by an economic, social, cultural or environmental mission with a public or community benefit
- trading to fulfil that mission (through the exchange of goods and services, monetary or non-monetary, or contractual sales to governments through an open tender process)
- deriving a substantial portion of their income from trade
- reinvesting the majority of the surplus in reaching their mission (Barraket et al, 2010).

Barraket et al (2010) estimate that there are up to 20,000 social enterprises in Australia, including not-for-profit organisations with multiple business ventures. They also conclude that social enterprise is not a new phenomenon, with the majority of project participants being over 10 years old. The study found that:

- Social enterprises operate most commonly in the education and training industry (42%) and arts and recreation (32%).
- Most Australian social enterprises comprise a mix of inputs including earned income, grants and donations, paid staff and volunteers. 90% invest profits back into growing their enterprise.
- The majority of social enterprises provide a service for a fee (63%).
- Most social enterprises target local markets (62%) and most run only one venture (65%).
- The most common missions were to create opportunities for people to participate in their community (44%) and to develop new solutions to social, cultural, economic or environmental problems (26%). Most social enterprises identify a strong alignment between mission and trading activity.
- Target beneficiaries were extremely diverse, including young people (49%), a geographic community (36%) and families (33%). Beneficiary involvement in formal and informal decision-making of the enterprise was reported as being fairly low.

4 The Benevolent Society’s approach to social enterprise

At The Benevolent Society, our aim is for all social enterprises to have the following characteristics:

- an explicit, clearly defined social purpose
- planned and operated as a business, based on sound commercial principles
- designed and aiming to be financially self-sufficient in the long term
- any profit is reinvested either into the enterprise or the organisation.

In addition, where TBS establishes a social enterprise to support a particular community, it should have the following characteristics:

- geographically based and set up to benefit the community in which it is located
- local community participation, governance or ownership
- any profit is reinvested either into the enterprise or into community development activities in the local community.
TBS social enterprises are measured in terms of both social and financial success. Processes are in place to monitor progress against the double bottom line, including evaluation mechanisms. TBS social enterprises develop a program logic to clearly articulate their outcomes.

5 Reasons for establishing a social enterprise

There are many reasons for starting a social enterprise, and many social enterprises are established for multiple reasons.

The Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association groups the various reasons into the ‘three Ms’: market, mission and money. Following is a list of reasons gathered from across the literature, categorised according to the ‘three Ms’.

Market
• The aim is to fill a gap that the commercial market is unlikely to fill on its own (eg employment for marginalised communities).

Mission
• The aim is to further the organisation’s mission.
• A commercial approach may be identified as the best way to meet a social or environmental need.

Money
• The aim is to raise revenue or diversify funding streams.
• Services that charge a fee may be able to increase their income to the point of self-sufficiency if they adopt a business model.

6 Types of social enterprise

There have been some attempts to classify different types of social enterprise.

Social Traders (www.socialtraders.com.au) identify the following types:
• community enterprises (geographically based with some level of community governance)
• charities’ trading arms (a business established to raise revenue, which may or may not relate to the organisation’s social purpose)
• member benefit businesses (eg cooperatives, mutuals)
• fair trade organisations
• intermediate labour market labour market companies (training and employing disadvantaged job seekers)
• social firms that create employment for people with a disability
• community development finance institutions; common in the the UK, Europe and US hybrid (enterprises that involve a mix of approaches to achieve their goal).

While the identification of ‘types’ can be useful in the creation of a common understanding of social enterprise, it also tends to be restrictive as many social enterprises are either a hybrid of various models or do not fit into the typology at all.

Two of the models that may be of interest to not-for-profit organisations are community enterprises and charities’ trading arms.
Community enterprises
These are geographically based and set up to benefit the community in which they are located. They generally aim to fill a need in the local market (Enterprising Non-Profits, 2010). Most suggest community enterprises are accountable to the local community (BSL 2007, as cited in Bond, 2008), while others argue the need for collective community ownership of the enterprise (www.socialtraders.com.au).

The Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL) explains the difference between a community enterprise and a social enterprise as being that community enterprise uses business activities to achieve outcomes for a community of place or people, while social enterprise aims to maximise profit for a social purpose. That profit could be used to support a particular community or the organisation’s work more broadly (BSL 2007, as cited in Bond, 2008).

Brotherhood of St Laurence
“a type of business developed to meet a need in a community. While a mainstream business seeks to maximise profit for owners and shareholders, a community enterprise aims to deliver social outcomes through its activities in a way that is financially sustainable” (BSL 2007, p.5, as cited in Bond, 2008).

An example of a community enterprise is the Yackandandah Community Development Company, that is wholly owned by the local community and was established to secure local fuel supply when the only petrol station in the town closed down (www.socialtraders.com.au).

Charitable business ventures / charities’ trading arms
Some not-for-profit organisations establish a business to generate revenue. Some align closely to the organisation’s mission, others are unrelated. They often rely on a high degree of voluntary labour (www.socialtraders.com.au). Examples include opportunity shops, which raise income and often provide affordable goods to target clients, and St Luke’s Innovative Resources, a business run by St Luke’s Anglicare which retails materials for use by human services. Consultancy units that are established to charge a fee for staff expertise would fall into this category.

A much broader, and less commonly used, definition of a charity trading arm is one that enables “charities to meet their objectives in innovative ways” (SEL, 2001, as cited in Brown, 2003). This captures enterprises that are not designed primarily to generate a profit nor focused on a specific community, such as The Benevolent Society’s Social Leadership Australia (see case study on page 14).

Community child care is an example of a social enterprise that does not always fit neatly into a particular category. There are a number of child care centres that are established and run by parents which would be considered a member benefit business or cooperative. Other community child care models, such as GoodStart, are also social enterprises, aiming to provide quality and affordable child care while reinvesting any profits back into the enterprise.
‘Taste Food Tours’: A growing social enterprise

Launched in July 2010, The Benevolent Society’s ‘Taste Food Tours’ is designed to showcase South West Sydney’s multicultural food traditions. Its primary purpose is to bridge cultural divides, generate income for local businesses and create employment opportunities for residents. Having started initially in Bankstown, food tours now run in nine suburbs around South Western Sydney.

Taste’s paying customers are individuals and corporate organisations who pay a fee for a service. The clients that it serves in accordance with its social purpose are local businesses, and tour guides who were previously not part of the labour market. On offer are walking tours, progressive dinners, cooking classes and team building events. Tour guides show customers the best places to eat and shop, sharing stories and information about food and traditions from their culture.

Taste’s manager had conducted competitor analysis and market research before proposing the enterprise to The Benevolent Society. There was also survey data from Bankstown residents about the role of food in connecting people. Start-up funding came primarily from TBS for the manager position, with a donation from the Scanlon Foundation and in-kind support from local businesses.

Taste’s manager was constantly vigilant of the need to meet the enterprise’s double bottom line. She was often approached by local councils requesting that ‘Taste Food Tours’ operate in their catchment area. Her first consideration was whether that would help achieve the social purpose, followed by doing some market analysis in the region.

There are advantages and challenges involved in running a social enterprise as part of a medium to large non-government organisation. The greatest advantage is that the organisation can provide the financial commitment that is absolutely vital to the success of the enterprise. Taste’s manager pointed out that TBS support allows her to drive the enterprise without worrying about paying the rent. This enabled her to stay focused on Taste’s social purpose, avoiding the common pitfall of mission drift when the financial focus overwhelms the social mandate.

The challenge for well-established not-for-profit organisations is that their systems are generally not set up to support an enterprise. Running an enterprise involves very different processes from the traditional work of a not-for-profit organisation, such as focusing on cash flow forecasting and product lifecycles. At the most basic level, anyone considering setting up an enterprise within an existing organisation should consider whether the financial system will allow the creation of a separate transaction account.

Importantly, the organisation must have the agility to be able to act and react, with leaders that are able to think laterally. TBS is at the start of its journey with ‘Taste Food Tours’, and shows the energy and commitment that is required for the long-term success of the enterprise.

*In 2012, ‘Taste Food Tours’ won the NSW Government’s Building Inclusive Communities Award in the non-government category.*
7 Factors that contribute to social enterprise success

“Social enterprise performance is dependent on the interrelationship between money, people, community, resources, capacity, leaders, values, knowledge, culture, acumen, and vision, etc. and how these aspects work together, or in opposition, toward achieving the end goal of sustainable social impact. Thus, achieving a high performing social enterprise is like a steady fitness regime that requires enduring vigilance, not only to remedy problems, but to strengthen capacity and maintain general health.” (Dawsans & Alter, 2009, p.2.)

Good motivation
The first important step when considering establishing a social enterprise is to be clear on the motivation. For many not-for-profit organisations, stakeholder expectation that they will achieve large scale social impact while diversifying their funding base is a major driver in the establishment of social enterprise (www.4lenses.org). Foster & Bradach (2005) argue that non-profit organisations can feel under pressure, from their Board or the philanthropic sector, to become self-sufficient, sustainable and generally entrepreneurial rather than ‘passive’. They warn against moving towards a social enterprise approach in order to “appear more disciplined, innovative, and businesslike” to stakeholders (Foster & Bradach, 2005, p.1).

Clear primary purpose
All social enterprises have (at least) a dual purpose: a social aim and financial self-sufficiency. Others may have the additional purpose of environmental sustainability. Seedco (2007) proposes that before establishing a social enterprise, organisations should be clear on the primary reason for doing so: either to generate income or to fill a social need. The process of deciding whether to proceed will then differ under the two scenarios. When the primary aim is to fill a social need, there is a strong argument for considering whether a social enterprise - that is, a market approach - is the best way to do that (Cohen, Kohl, & Van, 2008; Seedco, 2007; SVA, 2010). Cohen, Kohl, & Van (2008) also emphasise the importance of identifying what success will look like.

Comprehensive planning and vigilance
Organisations should undertake a comprehensive planning process, including market research and growth planning, leading to the development of a business plan (Cohen, Kohl, & Van, 2008; Talbot, Tregilgas, & Harrison, 2002). Social Ventures Australia point out that social enterprises are always vulnerable to failure, highlighting the need to keep a constant watch on the market (SVA, 2010).

At the most basic level, organisations need to separate a social enterprise’s finances from other programs in order to track financial progress and facilitate timely business decisions (Enterprising Non-Profits, 2010).

Commitment and resourcing
Social enterprises need sufficient start-up capital, and continuing resources to support them (Cohen, Kohl, & Van, 2008). Organisations need to prepare for a long process, allowing 3-4 years before a social enterprise can cover its own costs (SVA, 2010). Importantly, the time and energy invested in a social enterprise can distract from other work (Cutler, 2005). To be successful a social enterprise will also need passionate support from key staff and Board members (Cohen, Kohl, & Van, 2008).

Jim Schorr (2006) argues that there are two options for social enterprises achieving long-term sustainability. The first is to develop business models that can scale up sufficiently to generate revenue. The second is to develop ongoing funding to subsidise shortfalls, acknowledging that most enterprises will struggle to become self sufficient.
Dispelling the myth: social enterprises must be scaled up to be successful
There is little evidence about the extent to which the size of an enterprise is related to success, either financially or socially. In Australia, the majority of non-profit organisations running a social enterprise run a single venture, and operate in only one location (Barraket, Collyer, O’Connor, & Anderson, 2010).

In their report focusing broadly on social innovation, Dees, Anderson, and Wei-Skillern (2004) suggest that social entrepreneurs need to take a more strategic approach to considering the spread of innovation. They argue that jumping to decisions about replication or scaling up biases social sector leaders to a limited set of strategies. Planning for growth should include whether the particular approach could be applied to different conditions, the extent of the social need, and market potential (Volkmann, Tokarski, & Ernst, 2011).

An organisation must be able to clearly show which of the core elements of its enterprise are critical to achieving the intended goals before it is ready to scale up (Dees, Anderson, and Wei-Skillern, 2004; Volkmann, Tokarski, & Ernst, 2011).

Social Leadership Australia: An established social enterprise
Social Leadership Australia (SLA) is a specialist leadership centre that aims to shift Australian leadership thinking and practice to help make the world a better place.

Established by The Benevolent Society in 1999, SLA started as a single, year-long program (Sydney Leadership) for 30 leaders from the corporate, government and not-for-profit sectors. It has since grown to include a wide range of open and customised programs, and a consultancy service, across Australia.

In its original form, the Sydney Leadership program was not planned as a social enterprise. It was conceived as an experiment, a visionary idea to bring together powerful, well-connected people and expose them to a range of social issues. After a few years, however, the organisation realised that the program needed a different funding model in order to be sustainable. In addition to the social mission a new goal of breaking even was introduced, and SLA began to operate a fee-for-service model.

The Director of SLA remains vigilant of the need to maintain revenue. At one stage in its history, one large client represented approximately 60% of the centre’s revenue, prompting SLA to develop a broader suite of programs and increase its client base.

At the same time, SLA understands how achieving the financial bottom line can become all-consuming, potentially to the detriment of the social mission. In 2012, the SLA team revisited its social purpose, taking the time to clarify its mission and explore ways in which to measure impact.

The role and status of SLA has been a regular point of discussion within The Benevolent Society, with the larger service delivery organisation sometimes struggling to find the right fit for this unique social enterprise. SLA has experienced some of the same challenges as ‘Taste Food Tours’, working with information technology and financial systems that are not designed to support an enterprise.

The Director of SLA argues that, ultimately, there are advantages to running the enterprise as part of a large not-for-profit organisation. Some tangible advantages include having Deductible Gift Recipient status and access to philanthropic funds. A significant benefit is being part of a bigger brand, and the competitive edge that SLA has been able to gain by leveraging off that brand.

TBS’ commitment to SLA’s social purpose has required significant, long-term investment. TBS and SLA now enjoy a mutually beneficial, symbiotic relationship. SLA provides an edgy, innovative approach to achieving TBS’ social mission. In return, it draws upon the centralised systems and brand payback offered by being part of a larger organisation.
8 Factors that contribute to social enterprise failure

“The problem is that the vast majority of these ventures, as they exist today, are not sustainable. Unless these organisations develop new models that enable social enterprises to deliver double bottom line results, or find permanent funding subsidies for their activities, their chances of long-term survival are not good.” (Shorr, 2006.)

A common point made throughout the literature is that nearly half of all small businesses fail within a few years, and that social enterprises are no different. In fact, they face additional complexities. The implications of failure for social enterprises can also be far greater than for for-profit businesses (Seedco, 2007).

The double bottom line

Perhaps the greatest challenge for social enterprises is meeting the double bottom line of having both social and financial priorities, which adds a layer of complexity that is not experienced by for-profit enterprises. Social enterprises are required to achieve a social goal and be a sustainable commercial business (Talbot, Tregilgas, & Harrison, 2002).

The need to meet social priorities can lead to decisions that are not in the best long-term interest of the enterprise, putting it at commercial risk (Foster and Bradach, 2005; Seedco, 2007). Equally, the decisions that need to be made in order to keep a business afloat (such as reducing staff or salaries) can challenge the social priorities and values of a non-profit organisation (Seedco, 2007).

The Adelaide Central Mission also points to the challenge of having multiple stakeholder participation, such as staff, customers, Board members and the community itself (Talbot, Tregilgas, & Harrison, 2002).

Mission drift

As a result of this double bottom line, there is a constant risk of being diverted, or subverted, from the social mission. The struggle to meet financial goals can overwhelm, or change, the social mandate (Bielefeld, 2009; Enterprising Non-Profits, 2010). There is also a risk for not-for-profit organisations that social goals can multiply and threaten to overwhelm the business bottom line; such increasing social responsibilities then make it more difficult to succeed in the marketplace (Cohen, Kohl, & Van, 2008; Seedco, 2007).

Unrealistic financial expectations

Many commentators warn that social enterprises do not represent a ‘quick fix’ to funding problems. Foster & Bradach (2005) found that 71% of the enterprises in their study were unprofitable, and 5% reported breaking even.

In their study of social enterprises, Cohen, Kohl, & Van (2008) found that unrealistic financial expectations were likely contributors to failed social enterprises. Most social enterprises will require financial support for several years - they initially cost money, and it may be years before they can start to break even let alone generate a profit (Social Ventures Australia, 2010; Cohen, Kohl, & Van, 2008; Enterprising Non-Profits, 2010). Many commentators point to the reality that undercapitalised businesses fail, highlighting the importance of a commitment to raising capital (Cohen, Kohl, & Van, 2008; Talbot, Tregilgas, & Harrison, 2002; Seedco, 2007).

“Social enterprises are businesses like any other - they need to cover their costs by selling their goods/services to customers” (SVA, 2010).
Lack of business acumen
In their study of social enterprises, Foster and Bradach (2005) report that many lack adequate business perspective, for example misunderstanding the difference between revenue and profit, and failing to take into account operating costs when reporting profits. The same study found over-optimism across social enterprises, with challenges being regularly discounted, and potential financial returns routinely overestimated.

Legal and tax implications
There are a number of potential legal and tax implications relating to a not-for-profit organisation establishing a social enterprise. Examples include compliance with the organisation’s constitution, the reinvestment of profit, GST implications, and the laws that affect particular industries. There is also debate about tax concessions for not-for-profit organisations, in relation to whether the profits from social enterprises should incur tax.

9 Evaluating the outcomes of social enterprises
While there is literature about the financial success of social enterprises, there is very little evidence about the extent to which they achieve their social goals.

Teasdale (2009) studied four social enterprises to explore whether, and which type of, social enterprise can address social exclusion. He found that different characteristics of social enterprise affected different dimensions of exclusion. Those with a stronger social orientation, such as community enterprises, increased bonding (‘within group’) social capital. Those with hierarchical decision-making processes were well placed to deliver services to excluded groups. Social enterprises with collective decision-making processes involving marginalised people were stronger at developing, bridging and linking social capital.

Barraket (2008) argues that some social enterprises that focus on employment do appear to increase not only employment but secondary benefits such as self-efficacy and social interaction. However, she cautions that many such enterprises focus on industries characterised by casualisation, raising the question of how to avoid the ‘revolving doors’ of casualised employment for those already disadvantaged in the labour market.

There are frameworks and tools that have been developed to guide the measurement of social enterprise impacts, many of which are based on the same principles as outcomes evaluation (logic models, theory of change etc).

10 Useful resources
• The Social Traders website has links to a wide variety of international guides for social enterprises. http://www.socialtraders.com.au
• Social Enterprise Finder is a database of Australian social enterprises design to assist buyers. http://my.socialenterprisefinder.com.au
• Enterprising Non Profits has a variety of resources about developing and planning social enterprises. http://www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca
• Seedco’s 2007 paper ‘The limits of social enterprise: A field study and case analysis’ which includes a section titled ‘Before you start a social purpose business: some first steps for nonprofits’. http://www.seedco.org
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