

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	Enabling States, Capitalising Enterprise and Confronting the Social: Issues and Implications in Researching Contemporary Social Capital and Enterprise	
Copyright Year	2018	
Copyright Holder	The Author(s)	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	Shé
	Particle	
	Given Name	Éidín Ní
	Suffix	
	Division	School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems
	Organization/University	University College Dublin
	Address	Dublin, Ireland
	Email	eidin.nishe@ucd.ie
Author	Family Name	Burton
	Particle	
	Given Name	Lorelle J.
	Suffix	
	Division	School of Psychology and Counselling, Faculty of Health, Engineering and Sciences
	Organization/University	University of Southern Queensland
	Address	Toowoomba, QLD, Australia
	Email	lorelle.burton@usq.edu.au
Author	Family Name	Danaher
	Particle	
	Given Name	Patrick Alan
	Suffix	
	Division	School of Linguistics, Adult and Specialist Education, Faculty of Business, Education, Law and Arts
	Organization/University	University of Southern Queensland
	Address	Toowoomba, QLD, Australia
	Email	patrick.danaher@usq.edu.au

Abstract

A key feature of late capitalism continues to be a complex reworking of previous approaches to the relationship between the state and business. This significant shift in the interplay between the public and private sectors has generated such developments as the privatisation of many services formerly provided by government and the growth of not-for-profit organisations seeking to fill gaps in service provision. These changes are highly significant for every citizen and community member and for all stakeholders (as witnessed by the ongoing Greek economic crisis). This first chapter in this book encapsulates these complex developments in terms of debates about the enabling imperatives of the contemporary state, the character of the intersection between capital and enterprise and a timely confrontation of what is understood by “the social” in current discourses, policies and strategies. In presenting this distillation, the authors introduce the subsequent chapters in the book in terms of how each chapter, including this one, contributes new insights to the broader project of eliciting the issues and implications attendant on researching contemporary social capital and social enterprise. This project is crucial if we are to understand the ways in which social capital and social enterprise can work sustainably and transformatively with variously marginalised and vulnerable groups in our societies, as well as the ways that such work is constrained and limited in its effectiveness.

Keywords (separated by “ - ”)

Enabling state - Late capitalism - Marginalisation - Social capital - Social enterprise

Enabling States, Capitalising Enterprise 1
and Confronting the Social: Issues 2
and Implications in Researching 3
Contemporary Social Capital and Enterprise 4

Éidín Ní Shé, Lorelle J. Burton, 5
and Patrick Alan Danaher 6

INTRODUCTION 7

We live in unsettled and troubling times, with previous certainties unravel- 8
ling and taken-for-granted assumptions in disarray. One such certainty was 9
centred on assumptions about the character and purposes of the state, as 10
affording security and facilitating prosperity for its citizens, as well as 11
ensuring minimum standards of care and support for its most vulnerable 12

É. Ní Shé (✉)
School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin,
Dublin, Ireland

L.J. Burton
School of Psychology and Counselling, Faculty of Health, Engineering and
Sciences, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, QLD, Australia

P.A. Danaher
School of Linguistics, Adult and Specialist Education, Faculty of Business,
Education, Law and Arts, University of Southern Queensland,
Toowoomba, QLD, Australia

© The Author(s) 2018

É. Ní Shé et al. (eds.), *Social Capital and Enterprise in the Modern
State*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68115-3_1

13 members, centred on the proposition of the welfare state. By contrast, and
14 as we elaborate below, mass movements of displaced populations and the
15 advent of global terrorism, in addition to the volatility of global financial
16 markets, among other developments, have placed unprecedented strain on
17 the capacities and resources of governments to provide previously guaran-
18 teed services. In the process, the very idea of “the state” has attracted
19 heightened scrutiny and growing scepticism.

20 As we also elaborate below, this book takes up three key ideas arising
21 from this complex situation: the modern state, social capital and social
22 enterprise. This chapter begins the task of identifying the theoretical and
23 material relationships among these ideas, and also of exploring some of the
24 ways in which they might provide the foundation for reframing the provi-
25 sion of necessary services and support. More broadly, this debate raises
26 significant questions about statehood, citizenship, globalisation and social
27 justice, as all of us grapple with living and learning with one another and
28 with the planet in the early to mid-twenty-first century.

29 The chapter has been divided into three sections:

- 30 • An outline of the book’s focus;
- 31 • Conceptual issues relevant to the book’s three research questions
32 focused on examining broader, present-day questions on the role of
33 the modern state in enabling social capital and social enterprise;
- 34 • The impetus for the book, and an overview of the book’s two parts
35 and 15 chapters.

36 THE FOCUS OF THIS RESEARCH BOOK

37 A caring state, and the building of such a state, is the responsibility of all citi-
38 zens. A caring state does not grow from nothing, but must be founded on
39 articulation and action by concerned citizens who not only visualise a demo-
40 cratic society, but make a case for it and support its realisation. (President of
41 Ireland Michael D. Higgins, 30 June 2017)

42 The Irish President’s powerful and poignant evocation of “[a] caring
43 state” (Higgins, 2017) encapsulates neatly the focus of this research book.
44 The chapters in the book, including this one, explore in diverse ways the
45 crucial intersections among three powerful ideas: *social capital*, *social*
46 *enterprise* and *the modern state*. Given the current state of the world, it is
47 particularly important that these intersections are mapped and analysed in

ways that render transparent and visible the winners and the losers, the included and the excluded and the powerful and the powerless with regard to late capitalism in the first quarter of the twenty-first century. This is vital to understanding, and where possible to ameliorating, contesting and reframing, the forces of control and marginalisation that beset our contemporary world.

More specifically, we are witnessing a deep transformation of the role of *the modern state*, caused by significant socio-structural changes and shifting political ideas, as well as by unanticipated events such as the 2007–2008 global financial crisis (Blanco, Griggs, & Sullivan, 2014; McInerney, 2014). As a result, organisations such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have played a central part in formulating and implementing economic policies by placing an emphasis on austerity and cuts (Brazys & Regan, 2017). This emphasis has in turn highlighted the relevance and significance of both *social capital* and *social enterprise* (which are conceptualised more fully in the next section of this chapter) to current debates about understanding and financing the fundamental relationship between the state and its citizens and other community members.

In a telling instance of these wider developments, with the advent of austerity in the United Kingdom, the then Prime Minister David Cameron introduced the “Big Society” manifesto in 2010 in a run up to a general election (Cabinet Office, 2010). This manifesto promised to “redefine the role of the state as a provider of public services”, narrated as a strategy to empower communities, encourage a diversity of service providers and foster volunteerism (Whelan, 2012). To enable such a vision, there was an emphasis on “localism”, “self-governing”, “resilience”, “pay by results”, “social value”, “social capital” and “social enterprise”, all focused on the rhetoric of the common good. At the core of the “Big Society” agenda was “commissioning”, which is the process of tendering the provision of services (Alcock, 2016; Grover & Piggott, 2015; Shaw, 2012).

These same far-reaching and widespread changes are being manifested and experienced by many governments across the globe. To take just one example, all levels of the Australian public sector are reforming and reviewing their service provision with a focus on returning the budget to surplus. Indeed, some elements of the “Big Society” are present at both the state and the federal levels of the government in Australia (Whelan, 2012). The consensus in the academic literature is that the narrative presented about the “‘Big Society’ is a ‘slippery one’” with a hidden agenda:

86 Beneath its seductive language about giving more power to citizens, the
87 “Big Society” is a major programme of structural change that aims to over-
88 turn the post-war welfare state. The key idea is to divest the state of respon-
89 sibility for meeting needs and managing risks that individuals cannot cope
90 with alone. (Coote, 2011, p. 82)

91 These shifts have sparked a debate about what the role of the state is,
92 which has been described on the one hand as a “passive state” or on the
93 other hand as an “enabling state” focused on collaborative approaches,
94 bottom-up initiatives and participation (Elvidge, 2014; Sullivan, 2012).
95 Against this backdrop of policy-making and politics, it is timely to look
96 again at the relationship between society and governments and to reflect
97 especially on the possibilities and the desirability of imagining and inter-
98 acting with the enabling state. This edited research book explores the
99 complexities of investigating these shifts and challenges, and is focused, in
100 particular, on the changing role of the modern state and both the viability
101 and the sustainability of the spheres of social capital and social enterprise.

102 In doing so, the book builds on and extends from several ideas previ-
103 ously presented in *Community Capacity Building: Lessons from Adult*
104 *Learning in Australia* (Postle, Burton, & Danaher, 2014). That earlier
105 volume investigated diverse conceptualisations of, and approaches to,
106 community capacity building from the perspective of university-community
107 engagement in contemporary Australia. The discussion traversed multiple
108 current social issues that community organisations and universities worked
109 in tandem to address. These issues ranged from disenfranchised youth and
110 older men to refugees and technological inclusion, to the roles of regional
111 and local government and to evaluating the community benefits of social
112 interventions and ensuring the sustainability of such interventions.

113 The earlier book analysed social issues that are familiar to many readers
114 of this volume, including from countries other than Australia. Those issues
115 were explored through the prism of community capacity building, under-
116 stood as universities engaging strategically and sustainably with various
117 community organisations to address “real world” issues from an integrated
118 cross-disciplinary and multi-sectoral perspective and against the backdrop
119 of Australia’s distinctive policy-making and political landscape. By con-
120 trast, this volume’s geographical reach has been widened to include
121 Bangladesh and Ireland as well as Australia, as well as drawing on the latest
122 international scholarship in this important area of public policy.
123 Furthermore, the social issues have been broadened to include social

housing and homelessness, educational inclusion, local governments and 124
 social enterprise, older men and digital technologies, microcredit for 125
 women entrepreneurs, refugee settlement experiences, mental illness and 126
 social entrepreneurship, business people helping to build social capital and 127
 university-community partnerships that enable pathways to higher educa- 128
 tion and employment for marginalised individuals. 129

CONCEPTUAL RESOURCES FOR RESEARCHING SOCIAL 130
 CAPITAL AND SOCIAL ENTERPRISE IN THE MODERN STATE 131

There are multiple conceptual resources that can be deployed to conduct 132
 research into social capital and social enterprise in the modern state. “The 133
 state” evokes ideas such as “governance”, “government”, “politics” and 134
 “polity”, and is predicated on notions of hierarchy, structure and the 135
 power to make and implement decisions (such as the provision of services 136
 and the promulgation of laws) applicable to the citizens of a geographi- 137
 cally located and bounded area. A current definition of “the state” focused 138
 on four identified crucial characteristics: 139

The classical approach of European constitutional, legal and state theory 140
 identifies three core elements of the state: (1) a politically organized coer- 141
 cive, administrative and symbolic apparatus endowed with general and spe- 142
 cific powers; (2) a clearly demarcated core territory under the more or less 143
 uncontested and continuous control of the state apparatus; and (3) a stable 144
 population on which the state’s political authority and decisions are bind- 145
 ing... Reference to state objectives suggests a fourth element: the idea of the 146
 state. This denotes the political imaginary that defines the nature and pur- 147
 poses of the state, invoking higher goal(s) than self-preservation and self- 148
 interest and thereby distinguishing it from mafia-like bodies. It serves to 149
 legitimate the state and its power and also provides more general criteria for 150
 legitimacy crises and state failure. (Jessop, 2016, pp. 72–73) 151

Yet, despite the conceptual utility of Jessop’s (2016) definition, the 152
 theoretical relationship between “the state” and “society” remains con- 153
 tested (Mayrl & Quinn, 2016). This contestation derives partly from a 154
 perceived fracturing and fragmenting of the assumed orderly and 155
 predictable interactions between citizens and the state framing the four 156
 elements identified by Jessop. This disruption of previously accepted 157
 notions of the functions and power of the state is connected integrally 158

159 with contemporary and continuing geopolitical shifts, including the mass
160 migrations of asylum seekers and refugees, the growth of global terrorism
161 and the impact of cyber technologies. These developments have had dev-
162 astating effects on displaced populations and on the victims of terror
163 attacks, and they have also diminished citizens' faith in the fixedness and
164 inviolability of their respective states' territories. Consequently, there is
165 increasing scepticism about "the political imaginary that defines the nature
166 and purposes of the state" (Jessop, 2016, p. 73), leaving some citizens to
167 aspire evermore hopefully to a world that moves beyond states to global
168 systems of governance on the one hand, and other citizens to seek to with-
169 draw from such a world in favour of separate and self-governing states on
170 the other hand. This profound ambivalence has been manifested in such
171 recent developments as "Brexit", or the United Kingdom's referendum to
172 exit the European Union, and the election of President Donald Trump in
173 the United States.

174 Given the ongoing debate about the character and purposes of the
175 modern state, it is important, in the context of this book, to explain the
176 importance of the two other key concepts framing the book: social capital
177 and social enterprise. With regard to social capital, Bourdieu (1986)
178 defined the term as being "the aggregate of the actual or potential
179 resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or
180 less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintanceship or recogni-
181 tion" (p. 248). Thus, social capital can be conceptualised as "the measur-
182 able resource arising from embedded economic relations" (Steele, 2009,
183 p. 68). Coleman (1988) posited three key aspects of social capital:
184 "obligations and expectations; information channels; and social norms"
185 (Coleman, 1988, p. S95). Putnam (2000) associated social capital with
186 citizens' membership of social groups such as social, political and religious
187 organisations, and he expressed concern that "American social capital in
188 the form of civic associations has significantly eroded over the last genera-
189 tion" (Putnam, 1995, p. 73). Despite the diversity of these approaches to
190 defining social capital, the common features of these definitions include a
191 sense of connectedness and mutuality, as well as the value of networks of
192 associations that generate meaning and support beyond what can be
193 achieved from a narrowly conceived self-interest.

194 One of the premises of this book is that social capital is generally a posi-
195 tive phenomenon, while noting the critique of this proposition by Portes
196 (2014). Moreover, in the context of the ambivalence and uncertainty
197 about the meaning and relevance of the state noted above, we contend

that social capital is even more important and potentially transformative than in situations where the state's purposes and power are largely undisputed. This is because the withdrawal by the state from providing services for its citizens, and/or the withdrawal by citizens and non-citizens from engagement with the state for multiple reasons, generates a vacuum of assistance and association that needs to be replaced in particular ways.

Furthermore, we assert that social enterprise constitutes a valid and viable means of maximising social capital and of ensuring service provision in the diverse manifestations of the modern state. Grieco (2015) positioned social enterprise as emerging from "The limits of the state-market binomial" (p. ix) and of "The crisis of traditional business models" (p. ix). Mnganga (2014) stated succinctly that "A social entrepreneur is an entrepreneur with a compelling social mission.... This is a person or a group of people who identify a social need and who use innovative business and entrepreneurial principles and solutions to meet that need" (p. 15). Similarly, Dees (1998) argued: "For social entrepreneurs, the social mission is explicit and central. This obviously affects how social entrepreneurs perceive and assess opportunities. Mission-related impact becomes the central criterion, not wealth creation" (p. 2). Helpfully, Dees (1998) elaborated this encapsulation of the key elements of social entrepreneurship as follows:

Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by:

- *adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),*
- *recognising and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,*
- *engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning,*
- *acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand and*
- *exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created* (p. 4; emphasis in original).

Bringing these three key concepts—the modern state, social capital and social enterprise—into juxtaposition, we see that the decline of the modern state, with its attendant ambitions and certainties, has created both the necessity and opportunities for new actors to enter the realm of service provision. Many of those new actors are associated with social enterprises of varying kinds, and a significant part of their social mission is to enhance

235 social capital and thereby to contribute to community capacity building
236 (Postle et al., 2014). It is this complex and contested interface among the
237 modern state, social capital and social enterprise that lies at the heart of
238 this book.

239 More specifically, how we understand the state's delivery of public ser-
240 vices has shifted significantly in the past few decades. The advent of the
241 new public management philosophy in the 1990s presented a major strate-
242 gic and cultural shift in the way that such services were defined and
243 delivered (Alford & O'Flynn, 2012; Considine, 2000, 2001; O'Flynn,
244 2007). This shift included measures such as privatisation, corporate man-
245 agement and the establishment of market-type approaches (O'Flynn et al.,
246 2014).

247 More recently, following the election of Donald Trump as the United
248 States' President in 2016, we are witnessing a "Deconstruction of the
249 administrative state that is associated with the 'shrinking the role of gov-
250 ernment' by outsourcing and 'cutting government regulations and agen-
251 cies tasked with protecting people and their rights'" (Klein, 2017, p. 3;
252 see also Posner, 2017).

253 Our political systems are going through a period of "shock politics"
254 that calls for a shift from a passive stance of opposition to active resistance
255 and the engagement of people (Klein, 2017). The results of the United
256 Kingdom snap election of June 2017 were quick to see a flurry of com-
257 mentators and academics suggesting that it will herald the end of "auster-
258 ity politics" (Eaton, 2017; Elliott, 2017; Ryan, 2017; Vasilopoulou,
259 2017). The evidence highlighting the impact of austerity was illustrated
260 clearly in a recent report by the United Kingdom Social Mobility
261 Commission (2017), which undertook an analysis of two decades of gov-
262 ernments' efforts to improve social mobility. The report found that poli-
263 cies have failed to reduce significant inequality between rich and poor,
264 despite two decades of interventions, citing three specific divides: geo-
265 graphical, income and generational. The report warned that, without radi-
266 cal and urgent reform, the social and economic divisions in British society
267 will widen even further, thereby threatening community cohesion and
268 economic prosperity. In Ireland, the impact of austerity following the
269 severe downturn of the economy in 2007 and 2008 was characterised by
270 mass emigration, increased taxation and reductions in public expenditure,
271 with specific cuts being made to welfare supports for young people and
272 substantial cuts in health and social care spending and cost shifting onto
273 households (Callan, Nolan, Keane, Savage, & Walsh, 2014).

Against the backdrop of these complex and continuing developments, we posit that the concept of an enabling state is well worth pursuing, not least because from our perspective it brings together the three notions of the modern state, social capital and social enterprise in new and potentially transformative ways. At the core of the enabling state lie six interlinked propositions:

1. Empowered citizens and communities 274
2. A co-production model for public services 275
3. Success where the state has traditionally failed 276
4. A level-playing field 277
5. A holistic approach to public service delivery 278
6. Shared responsibility (Elvidge, 2014, p. 2) 279

Sullivan (2012) has stressed that the key to supporting the implementation of the “enabling state” is an “active state” that can enable this shift. In diverse ways, the subsequent chapters in this book take up this challenge of charting the contours and tracing the trajectories attendant on such a development. This same challenge is intentionally synthesised in the title of this chapter, with its tripartite focus on enabling states, capitalising enterprises (in the sense of social enterprise mobilising the power and resources of capitalist enterprise but for a very different purpose, focused on mission rather than on profit) and confronting the social (by which we mean insisting on the continued and indeed the increased importance of placing “social” in front of both “capital” and “enterprise”).

Moreover, despite the intended diversity of the following chapters, taken together, they contribute to addressing the following three research questions framing the book:

1. What is the role of the modern state in enabling social capital and social enterprise? 300
2. What are the current experiences of social enterprises and community organisations, and which opportunities and challenges underpin those experiences? 301
3. Which examples of empowerment and innovation are occurring within communities in relation to social capital and social enterprise? 302

308 These research questions, we believe, capture broader contemporary
309 political debates about the role of states today, and they also assist us to
310 progress our discussions around the need for strong, active and enabling
311 states. The insights and concerns expressed within this book by those who
312 have contributed to it are therefore internationally significant and multi-
313 sectorally resonant.

314 THE IMPETUS FOR, AND AN OVERVIEW OF,
315 THIS RESEARCH BOOK

316 As three editors, our meeting and coming together that resulted in the
317 development of this edited research book could be seen as the beginning
318 of an interesting tale involving an Irish woman and two Australians work-
319 ing in an Australian regional university. The story began in 2012 at the
320 University of Southern Queensland (USQ), Australia, which was under-
321 going significant internal reform in building research capacity (Burton, Ní
322 Shé, & Olliver, 2015; O'Shea & McDonald, 2015). The central campus
323 of USQ is based in Toowoomba. Major changes continue to occur within
324 regional and rural Australia owing to the impacts of the resources boom
325 and its subsequent decline, drought, climate change and population shifts
326 (Hogan & Young, 2015; Morris, Gooding, & Molloy, 2015). With a pop-
327 ulation of over 158,000 residents, Toowoomba is the second biggest
328 inland city in Australia (Toowoomba Regional Council, 2014). Historically,
329 the city serviced a strong agricultural base. More recently, there has also
330 been a significant mining and coal seam gas boom within the Surat Basin
331 area that has seen almost \$200 billion invested in projects (Toowoomba
332 Regional Council, 2014). Like other Australian universities, a major part
333 of the university's community engagement activities is in the form of
334 engaged research and engaged learning and teaching (Postle & Garlick,
335 2014). It is within this context that we focused our work within and exter-
336 nal to USQ in building relationships with our partners, many of whom
337 have contributed to this book. During this time, we had numerous con-
338 versations about the role of the state as we undertook various community
339 capacities and research work with our partners across the region. We have
340 observed and partnered with many innovative practices within the south-
341 east Queensland region that are oriented to social enterprise, social pro-
342 curement and social capital. It is within this context that our focus shifted
343 to the theme of this book, being the reworking of the relationship between
344 the state and the diverse and multiple communities whom it serves.

We have included this information about ourselves and about some of the community engagement and research projects in which we have been involved not to be unduly solipsistic, but instead to encapsulate in our own range of experiences some of the broader ideas canvassed in the previous sections of this chapter, and also to explain the impetus for this book.

Several scholars responded enthusiastically to that impetus, and their work is represented in the following chapters. The editors and other colleagues provided comprehensive peer reviews of the submitted chapters, which the authors revised in the light of those reviews. The result is a rich array of research-based and evidence-informed chapters about a crucial contemporary issue that are simultaneously scholarly in outlook and engaged in practice.

The 15 chapters in the book have been clustered around two parts to maximise coherence and to enhance readability. The first part is concerned with selected concepts and contexts relevant to the project of investigating and understanding social capital and enterprise in the modern state. This chapter has situated the focus of this research book in relation to that project, and it has also identified several conceptual resources that can facilitate research into contemporary social capital and social enterprise. Chap. 2, by Chris McInerney (University of Limerick, Ireland), examines the notion of public administration—what he calls “the ghost in the machine” and “the machinery of the state”—as the site of an ideological struggle in which the primacy of democratic decision-making needs to be juxtaposed and interdependent with an engaged public administration system.

Part 2 of the book is taken up by 12 individual case studies, presented in Chaps. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. These case studies highlight different empirical and material aspects of the complex interplay among the modern state, social capital and social enterprise. In Chap. 3, Alan Morris (University of Technology Sydney, Australia) draws from 45 in-depth interviews with older social housing tenants in Sydney to make some broader points about the relationship between social housing and changing understandings of the contemporary state. Matt Gregg (METRO Care, Australia), Éidín Ní Shé (University College Dublin, Ireland) and Lorelle J. Burton (University of Southern Queensland, Australia) use Chap. 4 to portray METRO Care, a non-profit service organisation providing a number of outreach programmes in Toowoomba, Australia, as a microcosm of wider issues pertaining to the challenges of, and the opportunities for, care provision in regional Australia. Chap. 5, by Joan Hanafin,

384 Marie Flynn and Anne Boyle (Dublin City University, Ireland), analyses
385 the constructions of Irish Travellers by a range of Irish State documents
386 and the impact of those constructions on current official policies in rela-
387 tion to the Traveller community. In Chap. 6, Catherine Hastings
388 (University of Technology Sydney, Australia) and John Weate (Great
389 Lakes Community Resources, Australia) investigate the nexus between
390 local governments and social enterprise from the theoretical perspective of
391 networked governance and public value, illustrated by examples taken
392 from regional New South Wales, Australia. Francesca Rendle-Short,
393 Ronnie Scott, Stayci Taylor, Michelle Aung Thin and Melody Ellis (RMIT
394 University, Australia) use Chap. 7 to elaborate the phenomenon of home-
395 lessness in Melbourne, Australia's second largest city, through the insights
396 generated by #streatstories, an innovative creative writing project devel-
397 oped collaboratively between RMIT University and STREAT, a social
398 enterprise working with homeless youth and young people. Chap. 8, by
399 Lisa McDonald (Lisa McDonald & Associates, Australia), reconsiders the
400 crucial concept of trust in the context of older men's engagement with
401 digital social enterprise, in the form of a digital peer support network
402 designed to maximise connectedness and well-being in regional
403 Queensland, Australia.

404 In Chap. 9, Muntaha Rakib (Shahjalal University of Science and
405 Technology), Sayan Chakrabarty (University of Southern Queensland,
406 Australia) and Stephen Winn (University of Southern Queensland,
407 Australia) take up the intersection between gender and social and human
408 capital, as exemplified in access to, and applications of, microcredit in
409 Bangladesh. Eric Kong (University of Southern Queensland, Australia),
410 Sue Bishop (University of Southern Queensland, Australia) and Eddy
411 Iles (Multicultural Development Association, Toowoomba, Australia)
412 use Chap. 10 to analyse the impact of social enterprises on the life satis-
413 faction and self-reliance of culturally and linguistically diverse refugees
414 living in regional Australia. Chap. 11, by Luke Terry (Toowoomba
415 Clubhouse, Australia) and Marian Lewis (University of Southern
416 Queensland, Australia), narrates the first-named authors' aspirations and
417 experiences as a social entrepreneur working in regional Australia to
418 bridge the gap between business and social work and to create social
419 enterprises that generate sustainable employment for individuals with
420 mental health challenges. In Chap. 12, Sueanne M. Gola and Lorelle
421 J. Burton (University of Southern Queensland, Australia) explore strate-
422 gies for building social connections and thereby reducing stigma for people

with a lived experience of mental illness, centred on the Thrive programme 423
 at the Toowoomba Clubhouse, Australia. Lorelle J. Burton (University of 424
 Southern Queensland, Australia), Éidín Ní Shé (University College 425
 Dublin, Ireland) and Sue Olliver (University of Southern Queensland, 426
 Australia) use Chap. 13 to examine the Men of Business “Pay It Forward” 427
 programme as a particular model for building social capital among disen- 428
 franchised youth in schools on the Gold Coast in Queensland, Australia. 429
 Finally in Part 2, Chap. 14, by Rebecca Lane, Lorelle J. Burton and Gavin 430
 Beccaria (University of Southern Queensland, Australia), investigates the 431
 Clemente Toowoomba programme in Queensland, Australia, as a model 432
 of alternative education creating transformative pathways to higher educa- 433
 tion and employment for marginalised groups. 434

The book concludes with the Afterword by Glen Postle (University of 435
 Southern Queensland, Australia), which synthesises the intervening chap- 436
 ters’ responses to the three research questions posed in this book and also 437
 elaborates the author’s personal vision for reimagining the crucial connec- 438
 tions among the modern state, social capital and social enterprise. This 439
 vision is relevant to, and significant for, all communities and countries 440
 striving to engage with ethical and socially just relationships between indi- 441
 viduals and between nations. 442

CONCLUSION 443

All chapters in this book are concerned with the kinds of communities and 444
 societies that individuals and groups living in the early and mid-twenty- 445
 first century desire and need if they are to lead happy, meaningful and 446
 peaceful lives, in harmonious co-existence with one another and the other 447
 inhabitants of this planet. The subsequent chapters present theoretical 448
 ideas and practical experiences of the types of issues, and the accompany- 449
 ing implications, attendant on this fundament question. These issues and 450
 implications range from where and how people live, to the provision of 451
 education and health services, to access to various kinds of social enter- 452
 prises, to the types of partnerships that can enhance the positive impact of 453
 those enterprises and to the influence of the geographical location on that 454
 impact. 455

More broadly, the themes canvassed and traversed in this book are 456
 focused fundamentally on questions of access, equity and social justice—of 457
 who is enabled to live the happy, meaningful and peaceful lives mentioned 458
 above. If the modern state is to be transformed into the enabling state as 459

460 a means of helping to realise this vision, social capital and social enterprise
461 are vital elements of that transformation.

462

REFERENCES

- 463 Alcock, P. (2016, June). From partnership to the Big Society: The third sector
464 policy regime in the UK. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 7(2), 95–116. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2015-0022>.
- 465
- 466 Alford, J., & O'Flynn, J. (2012). *Rethinking public service delivery: Managing with*
467 *external providers*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 468 Blanco, I., Griggs, S., & Sullivan, H. (2014). Situating the local in the neoliberali-
469 sation and transformation of urban governance. *Urban Studies*, 51(15),
470 3129–3146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014549292>.
- 471 Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of*
472 *theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–260). New York:
473 Greenwood Press.
- 474 Brazys, S., & Regan, A. (2017). The politics of capitalist diversity in Europe:
475 Explaining Ireland's divergent recovery from the Euro crisis. *Perspectives on*
476 *Politics*, 15(2), 411–427. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592717000093>.
- 477 Burton, L. J., Ní Shé, É., & Olliver, S. (2015). Embedding an empowerment
478 framework to create a “win–win” engaged research partnership with commu-
479 nity. *The Australasian Journal of University-Community Engagement*, 10(2),
480 63–81.
- 481 Cabinet Office. (2010, May 1). *Building the Big Society*. Retrieved from [https://](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-the-big-society)
482 www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-the-big-society
- 483 Callan, T., Nolan, B., Keane, C., Savage, M., & Walsh, J. R. (2014). Crisis,
484 response and distributional impact: The case of Ireland. *IZA Journal of*
485 *European Labor Studies*, 3, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-9012-3-9>.
- 486 Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American*
487 *Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement), S95–S120.
- 488 Considine, M. (2000). Contract regimes and reflexive governance: Comparing
489 employment service reforms in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, New
490 Zealand and Australia. *Public Administration*, 78(3), 613–638.
- 491 Considine, M. (2001). *Enterprising states: The public management of welfare-to-*
492 *work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 493 Coote, A. (2011). Big Society and the new austerity. In M. Stott (Ed.), *The Big*
494 *Society challenge*. Thetford: Keystone Development Trust Publications.
- 495 Dees, J. G. (1998). *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Retrieved from [http://](http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-dees.pdf)
496 [community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/](http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-dees.pdf)
497 [paper-dees.pdf](http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-dees.pdf)

Eaton, G. (2017, June 9). Why the election result marks the end of austerity. *New Statesman*. Retrieved from <http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/june2017/2017/06/why-election-result-marks-end-austerity> 498
499
500

Elliott, L. (2017, June 9). After seven years of pain, the austerity experiment is over. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/jun/09/seven-years-of-pain-austerity-experiment-over-general-election> 501
502
503
504

Elvidge, J. (2014). *The enabling state: A discussion paper*. London: Carnegie UK Trust. 505
506

Grieco, C. (2015). *Assessing social impact of social enterprises: Does one size really fit all?* Cham: Springer. 507
508

Grover, C., & Piggott, L. (Eds.). (2015). *Disabled people, work and welfare: Is employment really the answer?* Bristol: Policy Press. 509
510

Higgins, M. D. (2017, June 30). *Speech at a garden party to celebrate care and solidarity in the community*. Retrieved from <http://www.president.ie/en/media-library/speeches/speech-at-a-garden-party-to-celebrate-care-and-solidarity-in-the-community> 511
512
513
514

Hogan, A., & Young, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Rural and regional futures*. Abingdon: Routledge. 515
516

Jessop, B. (2016). State theory. In C. Ansell & J. Torfing (Eds.), *Handbook on theories of governance* (pp. 71–85). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. 517
518

Klein, N. (2017). *No is not enough*. London: Allen Lane. 519

Mayrl, D., & Quinn, S. (2016). Defining the state from within: Boundaries, schemas, and associational policymaking. *Sociological Theory*, 34(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275116632557>. 520
521
522

McInerney, C. (2014). *Challenging times—Challenging administration: The role of public administration in promoting social justice*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 523
524
525

Mnganga, P. (2014). *Towards a theoretical framework for social enterprise in South Africa*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy thesis, Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, Wits Business School, Witwatersrand University, Johannesburg, South Africa. 526
527
528
529

Morris, R., Gooding, A., & Molloy, L. (2015). *Local government growing regional Australia* (Vol. 1). Sydney, NSW: Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government, University of Technology Sydney. 530
531
532

O’Flynn, J. (2007). From new public management to public value: Paradigmatic change and managerial implications. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(3), 353–366. 533
534
535

O’Flynn, J., Dickinson, H., O’Sullivan, S., Gallet, W., Currie, K., Pettit, M., et al. (2014, May). *The prime provider model: An opportunity for better public service delivery?* (Social policy working paper no. 18). Melbourne, VIC: Brotherhood 536
537
538

- 539 of St Laurence and University of Melbourne. Retrieved from [http://library.](http://library.bsl.org.au/jspui/bitstream/1/4212/1/JO'Flynn_The-Prime-provider-model_BSL.2014.pdf)
540 [bsl.org.au/jspui/bitstream/1/4212/1/JO'Flynn_The-Prime-provider-](http://library.bsl.org.au/jspui/bitstream/1/4212/1/JO'Flynn_The-Prime-provider-model_BSL.2014.pdf)
541 [model_BSL.2014.pdf](http://library.bsl.org.au/jspui/bitstream/1/4212/1/JO'Flynn_The-Prime-provider-model_BSL.2014.pdf)
- 542 O'Shea, É., & MacDonald, L. (2015). Editorial: Civic roles, random callings:
543 Discerning the university mission. *Social Alternatives*, 33(2), 3–6.
- 544 Portes, A. (2014, December 30). Downsides of social capital. *Proceedings of the*
545 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(52),
546 18407–18408. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1421888112>.
- 547 Posner, S. (2017, March). Want to know what 'deconstruction of the administra-
548 tive state' looks like? Look at Trump's staffing. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from
549 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2017/03/09/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2017/03/09/want-to-know-what-deconstruction-of-the-administrative-state-looks-like-look-at-trumps-staffing/?utm_term=.7c666920e1a6)
550 [want-to-know-what-deconstruction-of-the-administrative-state-looks-like-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2017/03/09/want-to-know-what-deconstruction-of-the-administrative-state-looks-like-look-at-trumps-staffing/?utm_term=.7c666920e1a6)
551 [look-at-trumps-staffing/?utm_term=.7c666920e1a6](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2017/03/09/want-to-know-what-deconstruction-of-the-administrative-state-looks-like-look-at-trumps-staffing/?utm_term=.7c666920e1a6)
- 552 Postle, G. D., Burton, L. J., & Danaher, P. A. (Eds.). (2014). *Community capacity*
553 *building: Lessons from adult learning in Australia*. Leicester: National Institute
554 of Adult Continuing Education.
- 555 Postle, G. D., & Garlick, S. (2014). Community engagement and community
556 service: Changing perspectives in regional universities? In G. D. Postle, L. J.
557 Burton, & P. A. Danaher (Eds.), *Community capacity building: Lessons from*
558 *adult learning in Australia* (pp. 24–44). Leicester: NIACE.
- 559 Putnam, R. D. (1995, January). Bowling alone: American's declining social capi-
560 tal. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65–78.
- 561 Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American com-*
562 *munity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- 563 Ryan, F. (2017, June 13). The Tories must now bear the brunt of their own aus-
564 terity policies. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from [https://www.theguardian.com/](https://www.theguardian.com/commentsfree/2017/jun/12/tories-brunt-austerity-policies)
565 [commentsfree/2017/jun/12/tories-brunt-austerity-policies](https://www.theguardian.com/commentsfree/2017/jun/12/tories-brunt-austerity-policies)
- 566 Shaw, K. (2012). The rise of the resilient local authority? *Local Government Studies*,
567 38(3), 281–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2011.642869>.
- 568 Social Mobility Commission. (2017, June). *Time for change: An assessment of gov-*
569 *ernment policies on social mobility 1997–2017*. London: Author. Retrieved from
570 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/622214/Time_for_Change_report_-_An_assessment_of_government_policies_on_social_mobility_1997-2017.pdf)
571 [data/file/622214/Time_for_Change_report_-_An_assessment_of_govern-](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/622214/Time_for_Change_report_-_An_assessment_of_government_policies_on_social_mobility_1997-2017.pdf)
572 [ment_policies_on_social_mobility_1997-2017.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/622214/Time_for_Change_report_-_An_assessment_of_government_policies_on_social_mobility_1997-2017.pdf)
- 573 Steele, F. (2009). *Knowledge networks, secondary schools and social capital*.
574 Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy thesis, Centre for Educational Research,
575 University of Western Sydney, Sydney, NSW.
- 576 Sullivan, H. (2012, October 17). Will a smaller state create a bigger society in
577 Australia? *The Conversation*. Retrieved from [https://theconversation.com/](https://theconversation.com/will-a-smaller-state-create-a-bigger-society-in-australia-9913)
578 [will-a-smaller-state-create-a-bigger-society-in-australia-9913](https://theconversation.com/will-a-smaller-state-create-a-bigger-society-in-australia-9913)
- 579 Toowoomba Regional Council. (2014). *Toowoomba region economic profile*.
580 Toowoomba, QLD: Author.

- Vasilopoulou, S. (2017, June 12). May wanted a Brexit mandate, but voters want a strong welfare state. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/may-wanted-a-brexit-mandate-but-voters-want-a-strong-welfare-state-79210> 581
582
583
584
- Whelan, J. (2012, March). *“Big Society”: How the UK government is dismantling the state and what it means for Australia*. Sydney, NSW: Centre for Policy Development from https://cpd.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/BigSociety_Essay.pdf 585
586
587
588

Uncorrected Proof