

Don't Give Them Bread: A Cooperative Plan for the Future ©

by Dr Lynne Wrennall

‘The Greatest good is in communion with others.’ Durkheim

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	2
<i>The Rationale</i>	4
Aspirations: How to Make a Difference	4
Why We Need Democracy	5
Why the Workplace must be Democratic	6
Political Democracy Cannot Survive Without Economic Democracy	7
The Strengths of Cooperatives	8
Cooperatives Worldwide: The Numbers	15
UK Cooperatives: The Numbers	16
Concepts and Definitions	16
<i>Cooperatives</i>	16
<i>Ownership</i>	17
<i>Economic Democracy</i>	17
<i>Participatory Democracy</i>	17
<i>Qualifiers</i>	17
<i>Mutualization</i>	18
<i>Universal membership of a Cooperative</i>	18
<i>Balanced Job Complexes</i>	18
<i>Economic Justice</i>	19
Abbreviations	19
<i>The Plan</i>	19
What is to be Done?	19
Aims	20
Objectives	20
Key Principles of Economic Democracy	20
The Scope	22
Who will benefit?	22
Structure	23
<i>The portfolios are:</i>	24
<i>The Requisite Skills and Expertise to Contribute to the Portfolios</i>	25
The Challenges allegedly faced by Cooperatives and how they might be addressed. ..	25
Strengthening Prospects and Reducing Risks for the Success of DGTB	32
The Value that is added by DGTB in Reducing Risks and Strengthening the Collectives’ Prospects for Success	34

Stages of Development	34
How can this project be assisted?.....	35
Recommendations.....	35
References.....	35
<i>Literature Search for the Economic Democracy Project</i>	35
Why Economic Democracy is Needed.....	36
Critiques of traditional forms of Charity.....	85
Literature on Charities.....	85
Videography	87
Relevant UK Legislation.....	88

Executive Summary

In these key points below, we outline the main features of what we are aiming to achieve and the main reasons that support the approach we are taking.

- The greatest challenges of our time threaten our species and our planet. *Quid Remedium?* We do what our species has always done to survive, we cooperate (Harari, 2015, 2016, 2018, 2022).
- The concept of polycrisis (Morin & Kern, 1999) refers to the mutually exacerbating relatedness of contemporary problems. It is inefficient, demoralising and even counterproductive to address problems in an unsystematic manner.
- Economic Democracy releases human creativity, serving as the pivotal point, a point of maximum leverage, offering the greatest potential to solve the multitude of problems plaguing our lives, from the merely annoying, to the catastrophic.
- Democracy is essential for quality assurance within a society.
- Economic Democracy is the only mechanism that we have to connect production decisions with people's needs, in a manner that cannot be distorted, corrupted or subverted.
- Decision-making around the entire process of production of goods and services, not only distribution, is crucial to human well-being. If we do not produce appropriate goods and services, it makes little sense to discuss distribution, equitable or otherwise.
- True sovereignty lies in production and consumption. It is only fitting that these irreducible interests of human beings become the fundamental organizing principles of society, forming the bedrock of a genuinely democratic society.

- Cooperatives are the institutional form of Economic Democracy. Ultimately what they produce, are lives worth living.
- Cooperatives stimulate greater motivation, because people are choosing for themselves, the aims they are working towards, and in turn they choose more noble aims, than merely serving the profit motive (Weber, Unterrainer & Höge, 2020; Autin *et al*, 2022; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Spear & Thomas, 1997).
- Organisations that are democratically run have proven themselves more able to produce public goods, merit goods and positive social impacts, reducing moral hazard and negative externalities (United Nations, 2014; Novković, Prokopowicz & Stocki, 2012; Spear & Thomas, 1997:466; Perotin, 2018; Arzeni, 2007:4).
- Political Democracy cannot survive without Economic Democracy.
- The way to return governments to democracy, is to establish democracy within the organisations that influence and control governments.
- Democratic procedures provide the means to resist hostile capture of organisations, corruption and predatory value extraction.
- Economic Democracy structures a democratic mechanism into the heart of economic activity, to produce outcomes that more closely align with the needs of people and the planet.
- Alienation in the workplace will be eliminated by work designs which provide Balanced Job Complexes, in which all roles equitably empower workers to make significant decisions and foster the development of a wide range of competencies, at different levels of complexity and desirability (Albert, *et al*. 2002; Albert, 2004; Albert, 2021; Albert & Hahnel, 1991; Albert & Hahnel, 2017; and Hahnel, 2022).
- Alienation is most able to be reduced in the Cooperatives envisaged in this plan because it operationalises the three sources of human happiness (Pink, 2010; Autin *et al*, 2022; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci, *et al* 2008):
 1. Self-management delivers autonomy;
 2. Balanced Job Complexes develop mastery and;
 3. Economic Democracy provides the opportunity to design work that can provide meaning and purpose.
- Our plan is to establish a strategic organisation that will transfer organisations from private or public ownership into cooperatives which would be democratically run by workers, and consumers/ service users or through universal membership.
- What makes this proposal unique, is that donations would be in the form of organisations, to be transferred into cooperatives. Hence the strategic

organisation will be termed *Don't Give Them Bread*, because doners will be donating the entire bakery.

- The beneficiaries rather than the doners will decide for themselves how their needs will best be met.
- Releasing people's potential and maximising productivity requires employee financial ownership and real participation in decisions (Summers & Hyman, 2005: 52; Logue & Yates 2005).
- The project is situated not only in changing the lives of its immediate participants but within the larger scale of developing organisations which can buttress the social organisation of democracy itself.
- The project focuses on developing the social architecture which extensive research has shown provides the basis of human happiness and fulfilment (Pink, 2010; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci, *et al* 2008) and indeed, provides the basis for human survival (Harari, 2016, 2018, 2022).

The Rationale

Aspirations: How to Make a Difference

The greatest challenges of our time threaten our species and our planet. *Quid Remedium?* We do what our species has always done to survive, we cooperate (Harari, 2015, 2016, 2018, 2022).

Imagine if the best of human ingenuity was focused on solving problems, rather than walking by, or being stifled by the effects, or worse, being manipulated into exploiting them. As Brené Brown beautifully expressed it: ‘We don’t have to do all of it alone. We were never meant to.’ Economic Democracy provides the means to structure cooperation into decision-making about what we produce, how we produce it, and how the produce is distributed. It provides the means to marshall the best of our abilities, from the greatest number of people. The greatest opportunities to contribute to problem solving are provided, they are built into the structure, rather than arriving or not, on an *ad hoc* basis.

We can, and must, develop democratic economic and social relationships that further our collective and individual interests. The current development of Artificial Intelligence makes economic democratisation both urgent and imperative (Stahl, 2024; Kasy, 2023; Acemoglu & Johnson, 2023). Cooperation is the reason that our species dominates the planet and is not yet extinct (Harari, 2015; Bowles & Gintis, 2011) and it is the best prospect for our continued survival (Harari, 2016, 2018, 2022).

The concept of polycrisis (Morin & Kern, 1999) is now widely accepted (Tooze, 2023). It draws our attention to the mutually exacerbating relatedness of contemporary problems. It is inefficient, demoralising and even counterproductive to address problems in an unsystematic manner. It risks merely moving the problems

around (Albert, 2024: 19). Rather than addressing problems one by one, ignoring the interconnections between them, Economic Democracy serves as the pivotal point, a point of maximum leverage, offering the greatest potential to solve the multitude of problems plaguing our lives, from the merely annoying, to the catastrophic. It clears from the field, the biases of vested interests. It summons the best within us, and calls upon us to serve our own best interests, as judged by our own assessments. But what does Economic Democracy entail? How can it be translated into practical structures?

Historically, the bases of power, have shifted from physical or military strength, to accident of birth, to possession of scarce skills, to geographical location, to gameship, to gerrymandered position, and finally, to the more rational struggling towards democracy. Where should power properly lie? Development involves two aspects: production and consumption. It is only fitting that these fundamental, irreducible interests of human beings become the fundamental organizing principles of society. This is where true sovereignty lies and forms the bedrock of a genuinely democratic society. Political democracy is not merely a travesty, although it has regrettably devolved into one, it acts as a precursor to a future society built on genuine democratic principles.

Economic Democracy and economic justice lean together in the same direction, towards human fulfilment. Cooperatives are the institutional form of Economic Democracy. Ultimately what they produce, are lives worth living.

Why We Need Democracy

Democracy is essential for quality assurance within a society. It serves as the feedback loop through which a society learns about itself. A society that fails to learn about its own shortcomings cannot effectively help itself. Without a clear understanding of the problems, they cannot be adequately addressed. This is why oligarchy is not sustainable.

A society without democracy is akin to an individual without a conscience—it becomes psychopathic. Why do such societies fail? Because, like psychopaths, they lack the ability to feel or sense. They cannot accurately diagnose their ailments and therefore cannot heal themselves. They struggle to relate to individuals because they lack knowledge and understanding of them. They lack judgment, due to a lack of empathy. Such societies cannot truly elevate humanity, only manipulate it as an exploitable tool fashioning the invisible suit for the Emperor's vanity.

Production decisions are adrift from human needs, and no fictioning about the hidden hand of the market can connect them. The hidden hand is the power of what money can buy and bribe, while the hands of the poor are underutilised, unfulfilled and empty. We produce infinite supplies of cruel unneeded means of destruction, while immense needs for sustenance, health and shelter, remain unmet. Voracious non-productive financialisation colonises vast economic resources that could be deployed to improve mortality and quality of life. Economic Democracy is the only mechanism that we have to connect production decisions with people's needs, in a manner that cannot be distorted, corrupted or subverted. It provides the setting where everyone gets to benefit from the best that each of us can produce. Insofar as we have democracy, we meet our needs. Where there is a lack of democracy, diverse needs remain unmet.

Why the Workplace must be Democratic

To create is to be human. Our capacity for productivity and creativity is the fundamental essence of our being. Being alive means interacting with our environment and effecting change. Work not only yields tangible products but also shapes the individuals carrying out the work (Graeber, 2006). Through work we change the world and the world changes us. This process begins from the moment of our conception and continues to infinity. We are born to become.

Creativity inherently involves problem-solving, yet the confines of traditional employment stifle the world's creative potential. It is no wonder that we find ourselves in the current state of affairs. Einstein working as a Patent Clerk, is the metaphor for wasted talent, but it was not entirely a waste of time, work exposed him to patents that would have stimulated his creativity and problem-solving skills. Work provides education and development throughout life, but if it is at a mediocre level, our capacity to develop as humans is stunted. One who is employed to produce widgets, becomes defined as a widget producer, limiting their access to their boundless creative capacity.

Reducing us to mere employees is to suppress our humanity. The more specialized the division of labour becomes, the more our creativity and fulfilment as human beings are stifled. Individuals find themselves unable to express their true selves as they are compelled to conform to limited roles, leading them to gradually lose, or never really develop, their sense of identity. The question of "Who am I?" is met with infinite potential until one steps through the doors of the workplace, at which point people are categorised within the narrow limits of the specified role within the division of labour. One becomes categorised, a tinker, tailor, soldier or spy.

While it is commonly advocated to "follow your dreams," the reality for many employees is that they exist within a system where they are expected to pursue someone else's aspirations, serve another's purpose, and contribute to someone else's benefit, to serve interests not of their choosing and often, not in their interests.

Too often, employees are made to labour under psychopathic bosses (Klaas, 2021; Babiak & Hare, 2006). The career most likely to be occupied by a psychopath is CEO (Dutton, 2012). We are suffering an epidemic of corporate destruction wreaked by psychopathic senior management (Boddy, 2011). Meta analysis of the Dark Triad (DT) personality traits- Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy- demonstrates that they are linked to counterproductivity and reductions in the quality of job performance, unless counteracted (O'Boyle, *et al*, 2011). Psychopathy adversely impacts individuals, the organisation itself and externalises adverse impacts as social costs in the form of environmental damage, consumer harms, unnecessary layoffs and increased taxation burdens (Boddy, 2005a, 2005b, 2006, 2010, 2011; Sutton, 2007).

People's emotional repertoires become warped and underdeveloped. Lives are often tainted with unacknowledged envy, leading to unhealthy competition that fractures our sense of belonging, community and intimacy. Though it is often thought that competition drives the best outcomes, there is contrary evidence that intrinsic motivations will stimulate the highest levels of genuine commitment to work of

quality (Hennessey & Amabile, 1998; Pink, 2010; Stewart, 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci, *et al* 2008).

The *World Economic Forum* (2021) reports that record numbers of people are leaving their jobs. The *World Health Organization* (2019) found that “Time pressure, lack of control over work tasks, long working hours, shift work, lack of support and moral injury are important risk factors for occupational stress, burnout and fatigue among health workers.” *Pew Research* (2023) reports that 67% of Americans are well satisfied with their relationship with their co-workers and 62% with their relationship with their managers, 51% are well satisfied with the day-to-day tasks at work, 49% with the benefits their employer provides, 44% with the opportunities for training/developing new skills, 34% with how much they are paid and 33% with their opportunities for promotion at work. Gallup, reports that worldwide, only 13% of employees are ‘engaged’ at work (Crabtree, 2013).

In theory, economic organisations can be run by anyone who supplies one or more, of the factors of production, those who supply the land/ capital, labour, raw materials or enterprise (Dow, 2018). They can theoretically, also be run by the consumers, by service users, by anyone who is impacted by the production process. On occasion they have been run by anyone with power to seize or requisition. The decisions can be made in a way that is democratic or autocratic. Power can be distributed hierarchically or heterarchically. The division of labour can be specialised or provide for complex distributions of tasks. Production can serve or diminish the producers and consumers. Products can enrich our quality of life or destroy us. The distribution of the produce can be concentrated among the few or shared by the many. Continuum stretch between each of these binary poles. Political democracy has failed to address many of these vectors, focusing only on distribution, the endpoint of production, whereas the entire process is crucial to human well-being.

For the last century or so, the dominant organisations have been run by the owners of capital as autocracies, but more and more our eyes are spanning broader horizons. Organisations can nurture our abilities, or extinguish our humanity. This plan contributes to the process whereby we build organisations with more thought and deeper agency so that they might better serve our needs.

Political Democracy Cannot Survive Without Economic Democracy

The need for Economic Democracy is crucial. Indeed it needs to be the fundamental organising principle of economic activity at all levels. The American Founding Fathers were undoubtedly committed to combating and preventing tyranny, authoritarianism, despotism, and similar oppressions. They rightly believed that dividing and balancing power was the way to achieve this. However, their efforts fell short. Democracy is undermined by economic inequality (Gilens, 2012; Gilens & Page, 2014, 2017; Page, Bartels & Seawright, 2013; Hacker & Pierson, 2011). Moreover, economic inequality is increasing at an exponential rate and along with it, it brings political inequality that increasingly replaces democracy with oligarchy (Piketty, 2017; Reich, 2020b). Political democracy has been increasingly undermined by oligarchy to the point where it has become little more than a thin veil of theatre, with puppeteers pulling the strings of real power.

The Founding Fathers endowed a democracy that was limited to the political sphere, where it cannot sustain itself. It is a castle in the air without foundations in the real. The numerous legislative actions in the US aimed at restricting voter rights are evidence of this. American academics have sent five letters to Congress, expressing concern about the state of American democracy (One Hundred Scholars of Democracy, 2021). Democracy is in grave danger (Runciman, 2018; Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018; Parker, 2018; Klaas, 2016; Munshi, 2017; Homer-Dixon, 2021). Rigging of elections is becoming increasingly commonplace (Cheeseman & Klaas, 2018). It is widely accepted that at least since the *Citizens United* and *Speechnow.org* legal precedents, which sanctioned unequal financialisation of politics, political democracy is a threadbare shield for Oligarchy (Kuhner, 2014; Formisano, 2017; Whitehouse, 2017; Gerdes, 2014; Street, 2011; Lessig, 2011; Palast, 2012). Unless the underlying economic structures of society are democratic, political democracy will not survive.

Economic Democracy provides both the cultural and structural elements that can work against these adverse influences. Furthermore, economic organisations exert the greatest influence over governments. They do not vote, though through lobbying, they exert far more influence than voters. Currently they are displacing democracy with Oligarchy. The way to return governments to democracy, is to establish democracy within the organisations that influence and control governments.

The Strengths of Cooperatives

The *Ownership Effect Inquiry* Chaired by Baroness Bowles of Berkhamsted determined that Workers Ownership was, “A Compelling Solution” because it: “offers a meaningful response to our many fundamental economic challenges, and does so by starting with a focus on the value and experience of the individual at work. It builds outwards from that nucleus to shepherd the creation of dynamic, successful firms that, together, drive a robust – and genuinely inclusive – national economy.” (2018:7).

The history of The *International Labour Organisation* (ILO) and Cooperatives has been covered by Sanchez Bajo (2019). The ILO is the agency in the *United Nations* responsible for advancing social and economic justice by setting international labour standards. The ILO’s *Decent Work Agenda* is charged with delivering on the *United Nations Sustainable Development Goals*. From its inception in 1919, the ILO was committed to supporting Cooperatives. In 1920 it was mandated to work with Cooperatives and Article 12 of the ILO constitution states that it shall work with Cooperatives. Right from the beginning, the organisation has had a unit specifically dedicated to cooperatives, currently known as the Cooperatives Unit. In 2002 it announced the *Promotion of Cooperatives Recommendation, 2002 (No. 193)*. In 2003 the United Nations, promulgated *Guidelines Aimed at Creating a Supportive Environment for the Development of Cooperatives, 2001, 2002* and the *United Nations General Assembly* declared 2012 as the *International Year of Cooperatives*. All of which indicates the high esteem in which the cooperative organisational form is held.

Numerous examples of successful cooperatives include *Mondragon* (Spain), *Dairy Farmers* (Australia), *COOP* (UK), *The Union Credit Union* (USA), *Canadian University Press*, *Edeka Zentrale AG & Co KG* (Germany), *EnerCoop* (France), *Mitre*

10 (New Zealand), *United Farmers of Alberta* and *Coop Norden* (Scandinavia). Many of these organisations were established, and are supported, by trade unions.

Cooperatives provide a broadly based politically palatable basis for the delivery of public and merit goods that can fill in the gaps when markets fail and public services are being squeezed. If well designed, they are likely to garner support because they have a more ethical and sympathetic presentation. Insofar as they act in the public interest, the public has an interest in supporting them. *NBIM* (2023a, b, c) for example, has taken a global role in opposing demerit goods, tackling climate change, supporting social benefits and opposing environmental harm. Cooperatives have more freedom to move to address market failures because they are not limited to the profit motive. Participation “ensures better, fairer and non-exploitative services,” avoiding moral hazard (Spear & Thomas, 1997:466).

Because members control what activity Cooperatives will undertake, they will only undertake the activities for which the members have a high level of motivation. This means that from the outset, there is commitment to the project. Due to this high level of commitment, quality assurance is not a burden. As workers generate the Cooperative’s capital from their own savings and collectively participate in the organisation’s economic success, they are sensitive to the quality of each other’s work (Dow, 2003 Hansmann, 1990b, Levin & Tadelis, 2005 in Wuisman & Mannan, 2016:493). Supervision and surveillance costs are therefore minimised. Mikami (2003) and Alessandrini & Messori (2016) are among the many sources in the literature which argue that Labour Managed Firms are more efficient because they don't need to spend as much time on worker monitoring and surveillance.

Democratic procedures provide the means to resist capture, corruption and predatory value extraction. The *Simple Useful Trust* reported to *The Ownership Effect Inquiry* (2018) that Workers Ownership “is inherently transparent.” Widespread participatory democracy inevitably provides for transparency of decision making which has the positive effects of creating accountability and providing protection against corruption.

From differing political perspectives, Economic Democracy can be seen as a form of capitalism, or an alternative to it. Both major political parties in the UK have supported Economic Democracy, both in their programmes and in economic subsidies to projects (Hillard & Coates, 1991:138-9) and cooperatives were supported by the British Empire as a development strategy (Rhodes, 2012). The *Nuttal Review* “provides a framework for promoting Employee Ownership and moving it into the mainstream of the economy” (2012: 1.22). Three recommendations of note are that The *Department for Business, Innovation and Skills*, should:

- “promote Employee Ownership as a business succession solution”, with external stakeholders (Recommendation H, p38).
- “promote the Business Finance Partnership to funds that support Employee Ownership and target employee owed companies.” (Recommendation I, p38).
- Co-operatives UK, and the Insolvency Service, “should assess the scope for a pilot scheme, running from 2013, to test the potential for employee buy outs as a solution in relevant business rescue situations. (Recommendation J, p39).

Economic Democracy provides the opportunity for a greater alignment between role and expertise than is provided by Capital ownership. So long as they are based on equal opportunities for training and development, there are no reasons in principle for qualifiers not being attached to candidacies for election.

It is easier to identify and respond appropriately to the inefficiencies of ‘B***S*** Jobs’ and other forms of wasted productivity in Cooperatives (Graeber, 2019) because ‘no jobs losses’ are likely to be guaranteed. Levin (2023) has collected evidence that Worker Cooperatives address the problems of unemployment and flagging productivity. Navara (2009) has collated extensive empirical evidence that Cooperatives play ‘a significant role in retaining employment, often because this is the reason that they were created, and they have retained a solidarity amongst workers that is committed to protecting one another's employment’.

It has been shown that “a system of producer cooperatives offers a wealth of advantages, including the potential for efficiency gains, the eradication of unemployment and the end of exploitation” (Jossa, 2014). Many workers Cooperatives have saved jobs in communities that would otherwise have suffered serious consequences from plant closures (Bradley & Gelb, 1980, 1983). Does this mean that Cooperatives produce more ‘B*** S*** jobs’? On the contrary, they tend to replace them with socially useful jobs and with more leisure time for workers.

They often pay more than the minimum wage, offer better working conditions (Wuisman & Mannan, 2016) and provide more egalitarian income distribution (Jossa, 2011; Perotin, 2018; Spear & Thomas, 1997:466). Inequality is reduced in Labour Managed Firms because the wage differentials are narrowed. The profits and benefits of technological developments are redeemed by workers rather than by a small number of investors in KMFs.

In the US, The *National Center for Employee Ownership* (2017) reports that among the sampled workers, all ages 28 to 34, worker owners have 92% higher median household wealth and 33% higher income, compared to workers who do not own the firms in which they work. This research also reported that Employee-owners are much more likely to have access to an array of benefits at work, including flexible work schedules, retirement plans, parental leave, tuition reimbursement and childcare benefits.

Cooperatives are more progressive regarding equal opportunities for women, ethnic groups and people with disabilities concerning wages, recruitment and promotion (Spear & Thomas, 1997:466). A study by Mukolo, Brisco & Salim (2006) of 105 adults with learning disabilities working in eight social enterprises in the UK and Ireland showed that there was a link between workplace democracy and the enhanced quality of life that resulted from social integration, manifested in numerous areas of life.

The cheap price of labour that has pertained since the 1970s has meant that technological development has been under incentivised (Srnicsek & Williams, 2015:112), whereas in Collectives, whether profits are reinvested into capital or increased wages, increased leisure, or some other form of expenditure, would be

decided democratically. If capitalisation is selected, it is likely that collectivization results in a more egalitarian distribution of the benefits of technology, in line with the more egalitarian distribution of income that has been shown to pertain to mutualization.

Owen (2011) has drawn on a range of literature which argues that the full benefits of increased productivity that follow from multi skilling and the delegation of decision making rights are not currently being achieved in Capital owned firms. Managers under-delegate because they fear losing bargaining power in relation to their subordinates. This is a problem that can be solved by Labour Managed Firms with appropriate work design because the distinction between worker and manager can be designed out - they are 'one and the same' - and so do not need to undermine themselves.

According to Bartlett, *et al* (1992) Cooperatives in North-Central Italy “apparently have higher productivity, more labour intensive production methods, lower income differentials, and a more tranquil industrial relations environment than the private firms.” In a study of British firms, DeVaro & Kurtulus (2006) found that firms in which there was a high level of worker financial participation benefited from higher financial performance, product quality and higher labour productivity. Evidence from Dow (2018), Defourney, Estrin and Jones (1985a, 1985b), Jones and Svejnar (1985) and Estrin, Jones and Svejnar (1987) shows that “worker participation in firm decision-making increases productivity” Spitzberg (2020) argues with supportive evidence, that in the cooperative sector, ‘better products are built faster,’ if members are more engaged in the process.

A study by Mirabel (2021) discovered that worker buyouts were more successful than newly created Worker Owned Firms, even if the pre-existing firm had been in difficulty. The study provides evidence that forming Worker Cooperatives from pre-existing firms, even those in difficulty, is a viable form of entrepreneurship.

Employee Ownership Wales (2023) reports that Employee Ownership is the fastest growing form of business ownership in the UK because it is more profitable and has increased productivity, higher levels of innovation and more economic resilience.

An empirical study by Defourney, Estrin, & Jones in 1985 on the effects of workers' participation on enterprise performance in French Cooperatives found that “ Value added is found to be an increasing function of participation in profits, in collective membership and in ownership, even when a wide assortment of enterprise specific and environmental factors are taken into account. This finding is very robust, surviving tests between alternative specifications of technology, for reverse causality, for simultaneous equation bias and for multicollinearity.” At that stage though, “The typical productivity effect from participation, however, [wa]s small, around 5% of output.”

More recently though, Eurofound (2019) found that Cooperatives provided good work/ life balance, skills development, job satisfaction, democratic governance, job security and a supportive working environment. Cooperatives deploy the sorts of human resources practises that lead to high performance and high productivity, such as job security, mutual gains, effective communication structures, generating

employee engagement, skills utilisation and greater task discretion, employee involvement in task-related decision-making and investing in workforce skills. After approaching 34 companies of which 17 responded, Bhatti & Qureshi (2007) found that worker participation increased productivity. Over 100 studies across many countries indicate that Employee Ownership is generally linked to better productivity, pay, job stability, and firm survival (Kruse, 2016). While the effects vary across institutional settings, the overall effect is found to be positive. Examining the productivity effects of worker participation in Producer Cooperatives in western economies, Estrin, Jones, & Svejnar, (1987) determined that “The positive effects are found most uniformly with respect to profit sharing and, to a slightly lesser extent, individual capital (share) ownership and participation in decision-making by workers.”

In 2018, the *Ownership Effect Inquiry* chaired by Baroness Bowles produced a report titled *The Ownership Dividend: The Economic Case for Employee Ownership*. The Inquiry found an “irrefutable consistency in outcomes reported,” including that Employee Owned firms, “Typically achieve greater levels of productivity and efficiency than Non Employee Owned firms.”

The *Ministère de l'Industrie et du Commerce* in Quebec found that overall, the survival rates of co-operatives exceed the rate for the private sector (Bond *et al*, 2000) and based on a comprehensive data set from Portugal, Monteiro & Stewart (2015), conclude that Cooperatives have “a more productive labour force” and “a markedly higher probability of survival than capitalist enterprises.”

There is “strong empirical evidence” that Cooperatives are “resilient and in some industries have proven to be more resistant to failure than conventionally organised firms.” (Arando *et al*, 2010:11; in Wuisman & Mannan, 2016:493; Sanchez Bajo & Roelants, 2011). Historically and recently, Cooperatives have thrived in times of crisis (Birchall, 2013; Birchall, & Ketilson, 2009).

They attempt to insulate their members from market shocks to a greater degree than Capital Owned Firms by, for instance, lowering earnings per member-worker rather than declaring redundancies (Pencavel, Pistaferri & Schivardi, 2006 in Wuisman & Mannan, 2016). The social banking sector- otherwise known as ‘Stakeholder banks’- has the “propensity to smooth their lending cycles” which “suggests that their presence in the economy has the potential to reduce credit supply volatility.” (Ferri, Kalmi & Kerola, 2014).

Cooperatives aim to “balance diverse goals such as job and income security, democratic control and participation, safety and health at the workplace, profit sharing and patronage dividends, and concern for the communities” (Logue & Yates, 2005). Because they are not fixated on the profit motive, Cooperatives are more able to produce public goods, merit goods and positive social impacts and to reduce negative externalities (Perotin, 2018). Cooperatives “typically deliver a combination of economic and social returns to their member owners and the community at large” (Logue & Yates, 2005).

Autonomy, mastery, and purpose are the basis of happiness (Pink, 2010; Stewart, 2013; Autin *et al*, 2022) and psychological well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci,

Connell & Ryan, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci, *et al* 2008) and they are most likely to be achieved in Cooperatives. Workers who control their own workplace are able to create meaningful work, producing an environment which reduces their alienation and increases their happiness (Jossa, 2014a; Whitehorn, 1974; O'Donohue & Nelson, 2014). The well-being deriving from the psychological satisfaction of the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness correlates with the extent to which the organisations within which they worked provided Total Participation Management (Mika, Stocki & Bożek, 2013). Similarly, Gallie *et al* (2017) established that direct participation was linked to employees' organisational commitment, job satisfaction and affective psychological well-being. Levels of substance abuse, self harm, exogeneous depression and other harms are therefore likely to be minimised.

A study by Shantz *et al* (2015) demonstrated that alienation occurred when there was a lack of task variety and the tasks were not connected in a meaningful way around a sense of purpose. The study "also revealed that an employee who is alienated is more likely to behave in a deviant way and under-perform at work relative to those who are not alienated." The Key Dimensions of meaningful Work are: "Broader purpose at work, serving some greater good or prosocial goals (the intrinsic value of work beyond the person in question). And self-realization as a sense of autonomy, authenticity and self-expression at work (the intrinsic value of work for the person in question)." (Martela & Pessi, 2018). There appear to be complementarities between multiskilling and Participatory decision making (Owan, 2011). Furthermore, Olivella (2006) found multiskilling to be practical and affordable.

Alienation is most able to be reduced in the Cooperatives envisaged in this plan because:

1. Self-management delivers autonomy;
2. Balanced Job Complexes develop mastery and;
3. Economic Democracy provides the opportunity to design work that can provide meaning and purpose.

Workers Cooperatives are well motivated to ensure good standards of Occupational Health & Safety, reducing the burden of ill health on the workers themselves, the organisation and upon the welfare state. Berry & Bell (2018) found that Worker Cooperatives provide opportunities for economic empowerment and for impoverished and marginalized workers to be protected against hazards in the workplace.

Consumer Cooperatives are motivated to ensure high levels of quality assurance for the products and services they produce, because product and service quality is their *raison d'etre*. Workers are themselves also consumers, and it was demonstrated by the *Lucas Aerospace* experiment, that when workers have a free choice about what products they wish to produce, they choose products which are socially useful and not those which are harmful (Jackson *et al* 2012). As Dave White (2020) contends, in the face of imminent ecocide, never has a transformation of production along the lines supported by the *Lucas Aerospace* workers, been more needed.

The distinction between workers and bosses is broken down, so that resources are not wasted on industrial relations problems. A combination of Group incentive pay, empowerment of workers and a positive workplace culture, reduces voluntary turnover and raises return on equity (Blasi, Freeman, & Kruse, 2011).

A meta-analysis encompassing 60 studies conducted by Weber, Unterrainer & Höge (2020) indicated that “the more employees participate directly in strategic and tactical organisational decisions, the more they individually exhibit value-based commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction and the more they experience a supportive climate.” Economic Democracy, engenders, more rights for workers, and more prosperity for the economy as a whole (Bua, A. 2018; Cumbers, 2018; Cumbers *et al* 2020; Cumbers *et al*, 2023; UK Research and Innovation, 2018).

Participatory democracy provides mechanisms within Cooperatives to remove harmful psychopathic management which Babiak & Hare (2006); Dutton (2012); Boddy (2005a, 2005b, 2006, 2010, 2011); Sutton (2007, 2011) and O'Boyle, *et al* (2011) have shown, is all too common in capital managed firms, adversely impacting individuals, the organisation itself and more broadly as social costs in the form of environmental damage, consumer harms, unnecessary layoffs and increased taxation burdens.

Cooperatives are a more sustainable form of business (Bibby, 2014) and are able to play a decisive role in sustainable rural development (Ovcharenko *et al*, 2022; Dana *et al*, 2023), providing sustainable and inclusive growth (Jacobs & Mazzucato, 2016). Cooperatives work in all 17 domains of the *United Nations Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) (ILO, ICA, 2015). Among many actors, including the United Nations, the International Labour Organization, and the International Co-operative Alliance, there is a widely held consensus that “the cooperative enterprise is the type of organization that best meets all dimensions of reducing poverty and exclusion” (ILO, ICA, 2015). More than 15 papers to the expert group meeting on the 2030 *United Nations Agenda for Sustainable Development* addressed the role that cooperatives can play in achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and as a result, the 2030 *Agenda for Sustainable Development* recognized the contributions of cooperatives and called on them to work together with other sectors of the international community towards the achievement of the sustainable development goals (*United Nations*, 2015).

Though Cooperatives differ in their positive impacts, they are at the heart of the Economy for the Common Good (ECG) model of Social Transformation, “when their purpose is to transform the existing economic relations and break the existing distribution channels (or ownership structures) that cause negative externalities, social injustice and unethical practices. These are the proactive cooperatives” (Novkovic, 2019). However, Cooperatives are inherently transformative due to their radical structures and purpose (Novković & Šimleša, 2023a).

In Capital Owned Firms, not all costs of production are captured in the price of the good or service (Helbling, 2023). Many costs are therefore not paid for by the direct consumers or producers, but are ‘externalised’ onto third parties. Such items are referred to as demerit goods and services. Environmental harms are a prime example of this. It can be argued that the main *raison d’être* of Cooperatives is to create organisations which will ‘internalize the externalities’ (Hjerpe, 1997).

There is clear evidence of Cooperatives prioritising ethical practice (Stearse *et al*, 2015). Cooperatives have played an important role in delivering public goods, merit

goods and ethical goods and services (Spear & Thomas, 1997:466). Social Funds such as *Norges Bank Investment Management (NBIM)* are particularly committed to the kinds of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) values that are represented and furthered, by Cooperatives (*NBIM*, 2023a, b, c), for example, *NBIM* stands opposed to companies that “fail to set a net zero emissions target, overpay their top leaders, or do not have sufficiently diverse boards.” (Wigglesworth, 2022) and they place investment embargoes on firms that produce demerit goods such as nuclear arms and cluster bombs (2023c).

The paradoxical term ‘resource curse’ has been coined to describe “the adverse effects of a country's natural resource wealth on its economic, social, or political well-being” (Ross, 2015). The democratic methods of Cooperatives, operating as Sovereign Wealth funds provide an obvious successful means of preventing the curse. The Alaskan and Norwegian experiences provide spectacularly successful examples (Wigglesworth, 2022; *NBIM*, 2023b; Bruenig, M. 2018b). Cornée, Kalmi & Szafarz (2015) found that asset growth rates are significantly higher in Social Enterprises. It could be argued that they could be made even more successful if the democratic quotient was increased.

A report commissioned by *Cooperatives UK* found that:

- “Worker co-operatives are larger than conventional businesses and not necessarily less capital intensive
- Worker co-operatives survive at least as long as other businesses and have more stable employment
- Worker cooperatives are more productive than conventional businesses, with staff working “better and smarter” and production organised more efficiently
- Worker co-operatives retain a larger share of their profits than other business models
- Executive and non-executive pay differentials are much narrower in worker co-operatives than other firms” (Perotin, 2018).

Cooperatives Worldwide: The Numbers

United Nations Global Census on Co-operatives (2014) showed that:

- ‘Overall there are 2.6 Million Cooperatives which have over 1 Billion memberships and clients.
- Their combined asset base is US\$19.6 trillion.
- The global cooperative economy is larger than France’s economy and places right behind Germany’s economy as the 5th largest economic unit if it were a united country.
- Cooperatives employ 12.6 Million Employees, roughly 0.2% of the world’s population (not including data from the 982,400 agricultural cooperatives in China).
- US\$20 Trillion in Cooperative Assets generate US\$3 trillion in Annual Revenue.

- Cooperative economic activity comprises 20% of the Gross Domestic Product in New Zealand, 18% in The Netherlands, 18% in France and 14% in Finland.
- 1 in every 6 people on average in the world has membership, or is a client of a Cooperative.'
- 'Worldwide, cooperatives are the second biggest banking network, serving 870 million people. 45 per cent of their branches are in rural areas, compared with an average of 26 per cent for all banks' (Birchall, 2013: 49).

UK Cooperatives: The Numbers

- There are 5,450 co-operative enterprises in the UK.
- Turnover of the UK co-operative sector is £33 billion pa.
- These enterprises are owned by 12.8 million members.
- There are more member owners of Co-operatives than individual shareholders investing in the stock market.' (*Cooperatives UK*, 2012)

Concepts and Definitions

The concepts and definitions that are operationalized here, take as their starting point the definitions of the *International Labour Organisation* (ILO), which is a branch of the *United Nations*, and the *International Cooperative Alliance* (ICA). They are then strongly influenced by the work of Albert, *et al.* (2002), Albert (2004), Albert (2021), Albert & Hahnel, (1991), Albert & Hahnel (2017) and Hahnel (2022), and more broadly by other research in the field. Not all firms that are called Cooperatives operating in the world will meet these definitions, but these definitions have been chosen for the Cooperatives that are envisaged in this plan.

Cooperatives

In the literature, Cooperatives are also at times referred to as Social Enterprises, or the social economy. Some types of Cooperatives are referred to as Producer Cooperatives, Workers Cooperatives, Member Owned Business, Labour Managed Firms or Labour Owned Firms.

The definition proposed to the *United Nations*, by the *International Cooperative Alliance* (ICA) on 2-4 June, 2021 reads: "The term cooperative means an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise" (Henry, 2021:3), to be understood as entities based on the cooperative values which the cooperative principles put into practice.

Logue & Yates (2005) state that a combination of employee financial ownership with real participation in decision making is necessary to improve labour productivity and other aspects of business performance. Summers & Hyman (2005: 52) warn that financial participation appears to exert an effect on employee orientations and behaviour, but only if a genuine 'ownership effect' has been established. Logue &

Yates (2005) also argue that the combination of Employee Ownership and participation generates “collateral benefits in terms of social participation and living standards.”

The term “Cooperative” which is used in the literature that is cited, has been defined by authors in diverse ways, however, the Cooperatives which are proposed in the current plan, are firms that are owned and controlled through participatory democracy by the workers that work within them; and/or the consumers that use their products or services; or “universally” by all the citizens within a nation. The definition of Cooperatives, and the values and principles of the ILO/ICA, are taken as a basis for the current proposal, with the following emphasis and refinements:

- Governance of the Cooperatives will be through Participatory Democracy, with voting weight proportional to the impact of the decision.
- Participatory Democracy will apply at all levels of the organisation and will prioritise Participatory Budgeting.
- Work designs will endow Balanced Job Complexes.
- Economic reward will be commensurate with sacrifice or effort, as assessed by 360 degree peer review.

Ownership

Ownership is defined here as ‘the possession of two rights: the right to control the firm and the right to appropriate the firm's net earnings’ (Hansmann, 1990b: 1156).

Economic Democracy

Economic Democracy is defined here as Participatory Democracy in the economic sphere, that is, in spaces where the production of goods and services, involving more than one person, takes place.

Participatory Democracy

The terms Participatory Democracy, Economic Democracy and Self-Management are often used interchangeably in the broader literature in the field.

One of the early classic studies on participation established the concept of ‘Total Participation Management,’ (Coch & French, 1948), anything less was thought to be ineffective in producing substantial changes in productivity. This particular study was criticised on methodological grounds by Gardner (1977), but a large body of work validating the thesis and operationalizing the theory has been produced, supporting the view that in order to increase organizational effectiveness, an entire set of psychological and structural conditions must be satisfied (Novković, 2012, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2021; Novkovic & Miner, 2015; Novković, Prokopowicz & Stocki, 2010; Novković, Miner, McMahan, 2023, 2023b; Novković, Prokopowicz & Stocki, 2012; Novković & Šimleša, 2023; Prokopowicz & Stocki, 2012; Novković, Prokopowicz & Stocki, 2012; Stocki, Prokopowicz & Zmuda, 2010; Stocki, Prokopowicz & Novkovic, 2012 and; Mika, Stocki, & Božek, 2013; Sandstrom *et al*, 2014). Research by (Park, 2012) also counsels that in order to maximise performance, participation should include both decision making and financial rewards.

Thus, the statement by The *International Cooperative Alliance (ICA)* (2021), that “participation must permeate all organizational and operational aspects of cooperatives”, is strongly evidence based. They also counsel that “new secure techniques, digital platforms etc., must be used to allow for a more effective participation and debates and vote taking might be replaced with consensus finding through deliberation, which might be a more adequate mode in a people-centered organization.” (Henry, 2021).

On what basis is the legitimacy of participation in decision making established? Or to phrase the question somewhat differently, who has standing to legitimately participate in decisions? In terms of furthering economic justice, it is important that the right to participate in decision making is spread as broadly as possible, on the other hand, not so broadly that one person's decision making could be obviated by another person who may not be as affected by the decision. Also, there are some practicalities involved in ensuring that democracy does not become discredited by perceptions that it could undermine productivity. For these reasons, the proposal by Albert, *et al.* (2002), Albert (2004), Albert (2021), Albert & Hahnel, (1991), Albert & Hahnel (2017) and Hahnel (2022) seems eminently practical. Therefore in accordance with this counsel, Participatory Democracy is defined here as a system of governance in the firm or entity, in which individual decision making power is proportion to the degree one is affected by a decision.

Qualifiers

In a democracy which seeks to meet technocratic and or meritocratic aims, requirements for credentials can be placed on either voters or on candidates for election. These credentials are termed qualifiers. They may take the form of educational achievements, types of experience, proof of knowledge or demonstrated skills. In this plan, the placement of relevant qualifiers on candidates for election rather than on voters is supported. So long as there is equality of opportunity to obtain qualifiers, they are not intrinsically anti democratic.

Mutualization

Mutualization is a set of processes which transforms an organisation into a Cooperative. It is a legal and social transformation of the organisation and in this plan, it involves establishing all the features of Participatory Democracy, Economic justice and Balanced Job Complexes that are intrinsic to the plan.

Universal membership of a Cooperative

This means membership of a cooperative by all citizens of a country.

Balanced Job Complexes

These are work designs in which the activities are balanced for empowerment, competency development and desirability (Albert, *et al.* 2002; Albert, 2004; Albert, 2021; Albert & Hahnel, 1991; Albert & Hahnel, 2017; and Hahnel, 2022). Balanced Job Complexes are seen as essential, for two reasons. First, just as education is essential for political democracy to function effectively, Balanced Job Complexes are prerequisite if all workers are to gain the necessary knowledge, skills development and empowerment to meaningfully participate in Economic Democracy. Second, equity in the distribution of desirable, competency developing and empowering activities is an essential part of economic justice.

Economic Justice

Economic justice is fair reward for effort (Sandstrom, 2014) assessed through 360° peer review. It occurs on at least three levels in Cooperatives:

- Economic reward is commensurate with sacrifice, or effort. Remuneration for work is assessed according to effort as judged by other workers in the firm who are in the position to make the relevant observations.
- Work activities are distributed according to Balanced Job Complexes, so that all workers have a similarly rewarding allocation of desirable, competency developing and empowering activities.
- The price that consumers pay to purchase goods or services produced by the Cooperative is determined democratically by the Cooperative.

Abbreviations

LMFs are Labour Managed Firms. KMFs are Capital Managed Firms.

The Plan

What is to be Done?

The plan benefits from critiques of the current charity model (Brecher, 2017; Editors, 2019; Gridharadas, 2019; Reich, 2020a). Most notably, Anand Giridharadas in *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World*, argues that philanthropy tends to serve the interests of the donors rather than the recipients. It is often used by the wealthy to avoid paying their fair share of taxes and to maintain their power and privilege. It is used to co-opt and silence dissent, and to promote a false narrative of progress. He cites the accurate Bahá'í perception that “social change is not a project that one group carries out for the benefit of another.”

Citing research by Isham *et al* (1995), Hjerppe (1997) reports that “An increasing number of development practitioners agree that the participation of the intended beneficiaries improves project performance” (Isham, Narayan and Pritchett, 1995). Participatory governance improves service provision, enhances decision-making, and assists organisations to achieve their objectives (Wellens & Jegers, 2011). The effects of participatory democracy on productivity, commitment and wellbeing are now well documented (Bartling, Fehr & Herz, 2014; Bó, Foster & Putterman, 2010).

Therefore the plan is to establish a strategic organisation that will transfer organisations from private or public ownership into cooperatives which would be democratically run by workers, consumers, service users or through universal membership. The beneficiaries rather than the donors will decide for themselves how their needs will best be met. What makes this proposal unique, is that donations would be in the form of organisations, to be transferred into cooperatives. Hence the strategic organisation will be termed *Don't Give Them Bread*, because donors will be donating the entire bakery.

Aims

It is essential that we establish a strategic organisation to accelerate our ability to address serious social problems and produce positive social impacts by developing organisations that:

- make participatory democratic decisions involving workers, consumers, service users or universal decision making, concerning what is to be produced, how it is to be produced and how the produce is to be distributed.
- can better achieve pro social outcomes.
- provide for more fulfilling work experiences for workers and higher quality goods and services for consumers.

Objectives

- To develop a strategic organisation which will facilitate the transitioning of public and private entities into Workers and/or Consumers Cooperatives or into cooperatives with ‘universal membership’.
- To promote the practical experience of Economic Democracy by structuring a democratic mechanism into the heart of economic activity, to produce economic outcomes that more closely align with the needs of people and the planet.
- To eliminate alienation in the workplace by implementing work designs which provide Balanced Job Complexes, thereby ensuring that all roles equitably empower workers to make significant decisions and foster the development of a wide range of competencies, at different levels of complexity and desirability (Albert, *et al.* 2002; Albert, 2004; Albert, 2021; Albert & Hahnel, 1991; Albert & Hahnel, 2017; and Hahnel, 2022).

Key Principles of Economic Democracy

- If we truly want to enhance lives, we must improve the opportunities available to individuals.
- The wellbeing of individuals is immensely affected by context, and particularly by the context in which they spend their working lives (Martela, & Pessi, 2018).
- Work design has a powerful influence on motivation and well-being (Gagné, & Panaccio, 2014; Mika, Stocki & Božek, 2013; Pink, 2010; Ryan, & Deci, 2000; Deci *et al.*, 2001).
- Democracy is an essential component of human needs, particularly in the economic sector, because it is the most effective means of ensuring that human needs are met.
- Economic Democracy must be established as the central organizing principle of society, forming a secure foundation for political democracy.

- True democratic sovereignty resides in production and consumption.
- Involving people in decision-making processes is the most effective way to safeguard their interests. Without democracy, exploitation becomes inevitable (Albert, *et al.* 2002).
- Production not only shapes goods, but also moulds human nature (Graeber, 2006).
- The most potent interventions are at the level of production, not at the level of distribution (Wolff, 2012; Rawles in O’Neil, 2008, 2022). If we do not produce appropriate goods and services, it makes little sense to discuss distribution, equal or otherwise.
- Real fulfilment comes from creation, not from consumption (Pink, 2010; Martela & Pessi, 2018; Autin et al, 2022; Martela, Ryan & Steger, 2017; Martela & Pessi, 2018; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci, *et al* 2008).
- It is crucial that we urgently place very significant means of production under democratic control to prevent, if possible, a situation where technological advancements surpass human oversight (Ludik, 2021). This is the imminent crisis posed by Artificial Intelligence.
- Participatory democracy should prioritise participatory budgeting within the organisations and should campaign for its adoption in the regulatory and governmental context.
- All technological and procedural means necessary should be applied to ensure electoral integrity in all elections (Henry, 2021; Dragonchain 2020).
- Work design should prioritise job enrichment, competency development and Economic Democracy by the inclusion into each role of a wide diversity of tasks and decisions, at differing levels of complexity, desirability and potential for empowerment, creating Balanced Job Complexes (Albert, *et al.* 2002; Albert, 2004; Albert, 2021; Albert & Hahnel, 1991; Albert & Hahnel, 2017; and Hahnel, 2022).
- Work remuneration should be assessed through 360° peer review of work contribution (Albert, *et al.* 2002; Albert, 2004; Albert, 2021; Albert & Hahnel, 1991; Albert & Hahnel, 2017; and Hahnel, 2022).
- As assessed through skills audits, Cooperatives should provide education and training to their members, linked to participatory decision making and to the technical-economic skills required to perform the work of the organisation (*International Cooperative Alliance*, 2015).

- Economic Democracy is the most powerful tool to address broad-based social issues.
- The way to return governments to democracy, is to establish democracy within the organisations that influence and control governments.
- Workers ownership with “real participation in decision making” are the two critical components with which to unleash enhanced productivity (Logue & Yates, 2005).
- Each of us benefits, when all of us benefit (Cumbers, 2018; Cumbers *et al*, 2020, 2023; UK Research and Innovation, 2018).
- Those who are most affected by the decision, should have a greater influence on the decision (Albert *et al* 2002).

The Scope

The scope of the project is international, commencing in at least three major anglophone countries, the first of which will be The United Kingdom.

Who will benefit?

The workers, consumers, service users or universal members who will become the owners of the organisations formed by DGTB will benefit from the project, economically and socially. They will participate in an exciting ground-breaking social experiment that fundamentally changes the way we organise our economic activity, involving decisions about how we determine what products and services we produce, how we produce them and how they are distributed.

The project is committed to so much more than the reduction of economic deprivation and inequality. In connecting production decisions with human needs, consumers, producers and others, benefit from the democratic input. Consumer participants gain input that can steer production decisions into the types and qualities of products or services, more in the direction of their requirements. Worker participants gain meaningful rewarding work, that is subject to their own democratic control. Universal members are able to influence decisions in ways that ensure more socially useful goods and services are provided, and negative externalities minimised.

Overall, because people are more able to meet their own needs, their dependence on state services is reduced and their potential to contribute socially is increased. The fiscal benefits therefore extend beyond the range of the immediate participants and accrue to all taxpayers.

Cooperatives have a good record in reducing the negative, and increasing the positive, externalities that follow from business decisions. When compared with Capital Owned firms, they are less likely to be limited to the singular objective of profit maximisation and are more likely to achieve positive social outcomes such as reduced unemployment, better material reward for workers, subsidisation of pro social production and less harmful environmental impacts (United Nations, 2014; Novković, Prokopowicz & Stocki, 2012). Research for the OECD found that “the social

economy plays a growing role in OECD countries in tackling the problems of socio-economic exclusion and poverty and in fostering active citizenship and solidarity together with democratic participation”; that it has the potential to contribute to sustainable development and more resilient and better performing economies; and that “social entrepreneurship is a key component of any strategy aimed at making our societies more entrepreneurial, innovative and competitive.” (Arzeni, 2007:4).

Donors benefit by finding a fitting legacy for the organisations that they have developed. Donors’ succession planning achieves the highest level of meaningfulness, because entrepreneurs have the satisfaction of knowing that their life’s work is being given to the best hands which can possibly receive the gift. The gift will be cared for by the best knowledge that consensual action is capable of producing and therefore the gift will benefit humanity to the greatest possible extent.

Most importantly, this project is situated not only in changing the lives of its immediate participants but within the larger scale of developing organisations which can buttress the social organisation of democracy itself. The project focuses on developing the social architecture which extensive research has shown provides the basis of human happiness and fulfilment (Pink, 2010; Stewart, 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci, *et al* 2008) and indeed, provides the basis for human survival (Harari, 2016, 2018, 2022).

Structure

One of the following could be selected as an appropriate structure of governance for the organisation: Charitable Incorporated Organisation, Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee, Community Interest Company, Community Benefit Society, Cooperative Society, Friendly Society.

Cooperatives UK (2020) provides model rules for: Consortium Co-operative Society Model, Consortia Co-operative Company Limited by Guarantee Model, Multi-stakeholder Co-operative Society Model, Multi-stakeholder Co-operative Company Limited by Guarantee, Worker Co-operative Society Model, Worker Co-operative Company Limited by Guarantee, Worker Co-operative Company Limited by Shares Model, Community Benefit Society Model, Charitable Community Benefit Society Model, and the Co-operative Community Interest Company Limited by Shares Model.

The British government has produced Guidance on how to implement Employee Ownership and has provided model Articles of Incorporation for Employee Owned firms (*Department for Business, Innovation and Skills*, 2013). The *Democracy at Work Institute* (2018) has produced, *A Small Business Toolkit for Transitioning to Employee Ownership*.

The new model rules for legal entities provide templates “in reframing business norms so that corporate citizenship either limits or replaces property rights as the basis of membership. Philosophically this represents a shift away from financial capital as primary, to financial capital as only one form of investment. The recognition of customers, producers and employees as investors (through their trading, producing and labour contributions) is a paradigm shift in business thinking” (Ridley-Duff, 2012: 115).

In Wales, the legal framework is currently in flux as the *Law Commission* has been invited by the Treasury “to undertake two projects to review the legal frameworks governing co-operatives and community benefit societies, and friendly societies. The Commission has been asked to consider whether the current statute law which governs these organisations is fitting to their nature and needs, and whether the current form of regulation is proportionate (*Law Commission, 2023*).

Depending on the structure taken by DGTB, it may be able to benefit from the recent UK legislation protecting Cooperatives against predatory asset appropriation and degeneration away from their objectives. Under the *Co-operatives, Mutuals and Friendly Societies Act, 2023*, DGBT may be able to adopt an “asset lock” to ensure that resources assembled for the greater good, are protected, and the mutual model preserved into the future.

Though committed to democracy, DGTB can embed technocratic knowledge into its organisational structure by forming a Board in which individuals are qualified in the specific skills and expertise required by the organisations’ portfolios. It is anticipated that there will be no distinction between the Board and the executive. All members of the Board will play an active role in the organisations’ work.

The role of forming the strategic organisation will be undertaken by Dr Lynne Wrennall, who will be the founding Managing Director and who will be responsible for the continuing establishment of the strategic organisation.

All other Directors will be an Executive Director of a specific portfolio and the Board as a totality will have oversight of all the portfolios. Each portfolio will petition the Board for resources. Selection of Directors will be on the basis of the skills set and expertise that each brings to contribute to the essential portfolios of the organisation.

Four Directors for each portfolio would probably be an ideal number, so that the role would not be onerous for Directors who would presumably have large responsibilities in other areas, yet it would be uncrowded enough so that lines of responsibility and accountability could be cleanly drawn.

The portfolios are:

1. Research and Development to support the work of *DGTB* and liaison with Local, National and International governments and third sector organisations, including Grant seeking; lobbying for contextual benefits and concessions; negotiating with government on offering welfare beneficiaries the opportunity to convert their welfare benefits into positions in the Cooperatives along the lines of the Capitalising of Unemployment Benefit schemes in Italy, Belgium and Spain; with other populations who may be recruited as members of the cooperatives; to elicit taxation benefits, subsidies and other forms of support.
2. Publicity and Marketing for the Recruitment and Intake of organisations for transitioning to Cooperatives.
3. Restructuring of organisations into a cooperative format.
4. Support, Mentoring, training and advisement for the new Cooperatives.

The Requisite Skills and Expertise to Contribute to the Portfolios

Specific skills include:

Commercial/ Organisational Law.

Sociology of work and organisations.

Support for Startups/ Entrepreneurship.

Business as philanthropy.

Work Design.

Operations Management.

Building an enlightened Corporate Culture.

Sales and Marketing.

Accounting.

Total Quality Improvement.

Building Workers/ Consumer Cooperatives.

The practical structures of Participatory and Economic Democracy.

Networking and Partnerships.

Social Capital enterprise.

Grant Writing and fundraising.

Political and governmental liaison.

Additionally, all Board members need to have generic People Management skills in the areas of emotional intelligence, communication, empathy, growth mindset, motivation, creativity, initiative, mentoring, negotiation, conflict resolution, giving feedback and self-awareness.

Multilingual communication would also be valued.

The Challenges allegedly faced by Cooperatives and how they might be addressed

The productivity of Labour Managed Firms compared to Capital Managed Firms has been extensively studied in the literature. However, many studies have examined firms which are only partially labour controlled, making the isolating of variables extremely difficult. The level and extent of labour control, and especially, in relation to the level and extent of remuneration and other rewards flowing to labour, need to be accounted into the analysis as well as a consideration of why the schemes were introduced. Insofar as they are lacking this minimal level of complexity they are considered “flawed” (Ben-Ner, & Jones, 1995). Moreover, the detail of the democratic structures is often also severely lacking, not distinguishing between the tokenism of merely electing a member of the Board of Directors, and genuine forms of empowerment through enlightened work designs and participatory democracy.

Conte & Tannenbaum (1978) ask of Employee-owned Companies, ‘Is the Difference Measurable?’ They found tentatively that Workers ownership was associated with a more positive attitude towards work. The Employee Owned companies that were studied appeared to be more profitable than Capital Owned firms, but to have an impact on profitability, the worker's stake needed to be considerable. The evidence base on Cooperatives and productivity that was subsequently produced tended to cohere around Logue & Yates’ (2005) finding that Employee Ownership and real participation in decision making are both necessary to substantially increase productivity. Therefore, the challenge is in ensuring that the quotient and detail of participatory democracy is sufficiently high to release people's potential.

Two early and somewhat similar critiques of democratic firms arising from Neoclassical economics were that, according to the Ward–Domar–Vanek model, democratic firms are alleged to suffer from the ‘perverse supply response,’ and according to the Furubotin- Pejovich effect, a branch of the ‘under-investment thesis,’ ‘horizon effects’ arise. The first alleges that Members will reduce their number so that the average revenue of each will be increased even though this may be disadvantageous to the firm. The second alleges that older members will be reluctant to invest in capital for the firm because for them, it will be an expense that they will not have the time to either benefit from, or to depreciate.

A study of self managing firms in Yugoslavia in the 1970s and 80s by Prasnikar, Svejnar, Mihaljek & Prasnikar (1994) found no evidence of the sort of perverse economic behaviour predicted by the Ward–Domar–Vanek model. The Sertel-Dow Model has also thoroughly dispatched the Ward–Domar–Vanek model, on theoretical, econometric and substantial empirical grounds (Dow, 1986, 2003, 2012; Sertel, 1982; 1986, 1987; Neary, 1988; and Putterman, 2008).

The under-investment thesis has been thoroughly undercut in the literature for example by Maietta & Sena (2008) and McCain (1977). Fakhfakh, Pérotin & Gago, (2009) found that “contrary to received wisdom, descriptive statistics indicate that workers’ cooperatives are not always smaller or less capitalized than conventional firms and grow at least as fast as conventional firms” in all the industries they studied. A Systematic Review of the literature by Camargo Benavides & Ehrenhard, (2021: 969-970) showed that despite earlier expectations from Neoclassicism, nowadays, based on empirical studies into efficiency, “there is no evidence to support the claim” that Investor Owned Firms are more efficient than Cooperative enterprises.

Novković (2012:296-7) has critiqued the Neoclassical theory of Cooperatives as “inadequate at best over the last fifty years.” The “assumed self-centered behaviour of co-op members lead to a misspecification of the model and misguided policy proposals to correct presumed inefficiencies.” These economic models were dealing with pecuniary incentives based on assumptions of egoistic behaviour, and did not recognise that Co-operatives balanced their economic and social goals.

The critiques of Cooperatives by the Neoclassical model of economics obviously lack overall validity. Nevertheless, there is a reasonable concern that situations may arise where a minority of the Cooperative's owners could allegedly benefit themselves at the expense of the interests of all the other owners and sacrifice the Cooperatives’ broader social objectives. This could particularly occur where current owners could enrich themselves at the cost of future owners. It is somewhat similar to the phenomenon of ‘state capture’ that occurs in relation to governmental entities described by Whitehouse (2017) and Monbiot (2001) and ‘Predatory Value Extraction’ that dis-enriches capital controlled firms (Lazonick & Jang-Sup, 2020; Koudehia & Esfahanian, 2022). However, these are problems which could arise with any type of organisation, as Ellerman (2020) has pointed out. Contrary to the Neoclassical view that democratic organisations are uniquely vulnerable to capture and other predatory behaviours, it is likely that democratic organisations would be better at protecting themselves against exploitation than would authoritarian firms, because the authoritarians would be perfectly placed to make decisions in their own interests and impose them upon the organisation. Ellerman (2020) outlines several

proposals which can better protect cooperatives, many of which lean in the direction of increasing democracy, such as rank choice voting, which would make it harder for a minority to dominate everyone else. It can logically be asserted that the more democratic the organisation, the better protected it will be against exploitative behaviours. Proportional representation, secret ballots, fair and equal access to voting, equal distribution of resources for campaigning, transparency and authenticity in voting through blockchain (Dragonchain 2020) can all contribute to election integrity, thereby making capture more difficult.

Recent legislative changes in the UK have also provided better protections for Cooperatives against appropriation of the society's assets for purposes that are not in accordance with their objectives. Under the *Co-operatives, Mutuals and Friendly Societies Act, 2023*, the Treasury may make regulations allowing Cooperatives to set up an 'asset lock' which ensures that their collective resources, in many cases built up over many generations and several centuries by members who sought the greater good in perpetuity, are not appropriated by those who may be motivated by the desire for short term personal gain.

Related to the expectation that democratic firms suffer from the 'perverse supply response', implicit in the Ward–Domar–Vanek model, the belief arose that “a wider extension of employee-managed firms in Western market economies is limited by three financially related internal obstacles”, namely that employees are: “relatively poor, risk-averse and opportunistic.” (Engberg, 1990). Because the members are likely to be less wealthy than other capital owners, it is not unreasonable to think that they may be risk averse. However, since there are likely to be larger numbers of workers or consumers invested in a Cooperative, than there would be capital investors in a Capital Owned Firm, it is likely that the risk per person in a Cooperative is far less than in a Capital Owned Firm. Also, confidence can be built by training and by building a strong workplace culture.

It was a common refrain in the earlier literature that Cooperatives may be hampered by small size, particularly since this makes it more difficult to defray risk through diversification. Because in LMF's capital has not been pre supplied, it is not part of the inherent structure of the firm. Capital may be more difficult to obtain, and more expensive. Difficulties in gaining access to capital are often cited in the literature. “Findings include evidence that cooperatives have a relatively inelastic short-run supply and a higher marginal cost of capital, despite fully transferable property rights.” (Berman & Berman, 1989).

However, over time as more Cooperatives develop, they are able to amalgamate and thus achieve economies of scale (Pokharel, *et al*, 2020). Dell (2018) has also contested the common allegations that Labour Managed Firms tend to be smaller and less capitalised. Similarly, these allegations are refuted by Perotin (2018). Hillary (2006) emphasises the importance of networks among cooperatives to facilitate their sustainability. Over the last few decades since the Neoclassical critiques of cooperatives emerged, considerable governmental support has developed across the political spectrum (Chaves Avila & Luis Monzón, 2018; Hillard & Coates, 1991:138-9; *The Nuttal Review*, 2012; All Party Parliamentary Group on Employee Ownership, 2011). To the extent that Cooperatives face challenges in gaining capital, difficulties are being diminished by the provision of governmental grants and loans.

Also significant is the growth of the social banking sector which has specialist knowledge on how to financially support Cooperatives (Cornée, Jegers, & Szafarz, 2022; Cornée, Kalmi & Szafarz, 2015a, 2015b; 2022; Ferri, Kalmi & Kerola, 2014) because many Social Banks are Cooperatives themselves. Furthermore there is widespread support for the development of Sovereign Wealth Funds or Social Investment Funds, which “attempt to build an institution for collective wealth and control over investment”, (Parker, 2018; Roberts & Lawrence, 2018; Hanson & Lonergan, 2017; Thomas, 2022), some of which have become immensely wealthy and powerful. The Norwegian fund, *Norges Bank Investment Management (NBIM)*, is worth \$1.3 trillion (Wigglesworth, 2022) and owns an average of 1.5% of all listed firms on the planet (NBIM, 2023a, b).

Three highly innovative means of financing for funds have been outlined in Lansley, McCann & Schifferes (2018) and Srnicek & Berry (2018). Currently, Sovereign Wealth Funds operating in the UK, enjoy immunity of corporate taxes on property and businesses (Parker & McDougall, 2023). Although Britain does not have its own Sovereign Wealth Fund yet, Cooperatives operating in Britain can avail themselves of other funds. These funds are now quite plentiful and it seems likely, especially with the imminence of AI, that they will become even more widespread, because they are seen as the basis for a Universal Basic Income that may be necessitated by the 4th Industrial Revolution.

The effective operation of Cooperatives also faces obstacles such as the lack of a common culture, decision-making norms, and a proper mix of skills. The development of legal, organizational, and financial expertise has historically lagged behind that of Capital Owned firms, but this gap is narrowing as specialized expertise grows (Ridley-Duff, 2012), particularly through international entities, such as the *International Labour Organisation* and the *United Nations* (Henrÿ, 2021). At the national level, significant governmental support has been developing, particularly in Europe (Chaves Avila & Luis Monzón, 2018; Benstead & Heneghan, 2022). The British government has produced Guidance on how to implement Employee Ownership and has provided model Articles of Incorporation for Employee Owned firms (*Department for Business, Innovation and Skills*, 2013). The *Democracy at Work institute* (2018) has produced, *A Small Business Toolkit for Transitioning to Employee Ownership*.

Macro culture has tended to place less confidence in Cooperatives than in Capital Owned Enterprises, although this is also something that is being addressed over time. The *International Year of Cooperatives* declared by the United Nations in 2012 was the type of initiative that can be helpful.

Michels’ ‘Iron law of Oligarchy’ has been refuted and effective ways of preventing the growth of Oligarchy within organisations have been developed (Diefenbach, 2018). These are based on deconstructing specialised divisions of labour. Balanced Job Complexes which are work designs which include a roughly equal amount of desirable, developmental and empowering tasks within all jobs, that have been built into the plan outlined in this paper are designed to prevent the re-emergence of Oligarchy in Cooperatives.

Motivation is another concern that has been raised in the literature, with arguments made that equal pay dulls incentives. Even in Cooperatives, where remuneration to workers is commensurate with effort/ability, if it arises that the median workers' output is less than the mean, Cooperatives may vote in a redistributive schedule and this is said to result in a dulling of incentives (Kremer, 1997). However, like many critiques of incentives in worker cooperatives, the assertion rests on outdated ideas about motivation and of what drives engagement. It is now well established that once basic needs are met, the three elements of true motivation are autonomy, mastery, and purpose (Pink, 2010; Autin, et al, 2022). Citing Gagné & Deci (2005), the *Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development* (CIPD) (2023) states that "One of the most established influences on motivation is autonomy or self-determination – that is, being empowered to shape one's job makes it more meaningful and enjoyable." They also cite the *CIPD Good Work Index* finding that "job complexity (how stimulating, interesting and novel one's work is) is most closely related to enthusiasm and effort."

A related concern is raised by Burdin (2016), which claims that since worker-managed firms have a more compressed compensation structure than conventional firms, high-ability members are more likely than other members to leave. As with the previous challenge, the application of more contemporary awareness of motivation and engagement, is able to ensure that good staff are retained. *Employee Ownership Wales* (2023) reports that Cooperatives in the UK are better able to attract and retain "quality staff" than other organisations.

The 'free rider' or 'shirking' problem has been much discussed in the literature. However, it seems likely that this also could occur in any type of organisation, but is less likely to occur where workers have chosen for themselves, the production, the working conditions and the type of work that they will undertake. Alchian & Demsetz (1972), argue that provision of ownership rights to workers engenders work effort and peer pressure by aligning employee and owner interests. Hanson Schlachter & Prushinskaya (2021) found that, "Workplace democracy benefits firms in terms of recruitment, retention, and reduced shirking."

Furthermore, the scale on which shirking could harm Cooperatives is infinitesimal when compared to the scale of predatory value extraction that has dis-enriched Capital Controlled firms (Lazonick & Jang-Sup, 2020; Koudehia & Esfahanian, 2022). In the plan proposed here, any propensity for the 'free rider' problem to develop is undercut by the initiatives proposed by Albert, *et al.* (2002), Albert (2004), Albert (2021), Albert & Hahnel, (1991), Albert & Hahnel (2017) and Hahnel (2022) including the use of Balanced Job Complexes, which ensures that all jobs have a roughly equal amount of desirable, developmental and empowering tasks within them, and remuneration on the basis of effort or sacrifice, assessed through 360° peer review.

Although the impact on workers of Cooperatives "is generally positive, mostly because of the establishment of democratic control, better working conditions and job security," the benefits may be limited "where social inequalities that disadvantage women and people of color are replicated in the cooperative", and by the external "logic of capitalist production for exchange." (Kaswan, 2019). The findings on inequality in Cooperatives along the lines of gender, ethnicity and disability have generally been promising (Spear & Thomas, 1997:466; Mukolo, Brisco & Salim

2006), but the first sector wide study of employee owned organisations in the United States (Reibstein & Hanson Schlachter, 2023), produced some disappointing results.

Though the study found “no evidence of wage gaps by gender, race or immigration status within worker cooperatives, with job type, tenure and worker ownership status instead explaining within-firm variation in pay”, it did document, “sector-wide disparities in material and non-material outcomes by gender, race and immigration status, reflecting differences in individual-level human capital and job characteristics as well as widespread occupational segregation and homophily.” The explanations for the inequalities here, do run along the lines that Kaswan (2019) was concerned about, namely, the likely impact of external socioeconomic structures. However, these types of disparities can be deconstructed.

Protections against inequalities can be provided in the Governing documents for the Cooperative, Codes of Practice, Job Descriptions, policy, training and compliance reporting. There is evidence collated in (Kaswan, 2019:24) that establishing “more egalitarian distributions of income and wealth, intentionally challenging gendered divisions of labor, and establishing distributed decision-making can make a difference” (Meyers 2011; Miller 2012; Sobering 2016). Specifically, the implementation of Balanced Job Complexes and remuneration for effort (Albert, *et al.* 2002; Albert, 2004; Albert, 2021; Albert & Hahnel, 1991; Albert & Hahnel, 2017; and Hahnel, 2022) promoted in this plan, are expected to be decisive.

The extent to which the economic context is supportive, neutral or obstructive to the work of the Cooperative, is the subject of political analysis in the literature. Whether Cooperatives would function best in a market, planned or networked economy is open to much debate (Dow, 2012; Drèze, 1993; Ivanovski, 2012; Bruenig, M. 2018; Gunn, 2000; Coutinho, 2016), however the position that is taken here, is that for now, Cooperatives can support themselves through their own networks, social funds and social banking and that state support through grants, tax incentives and other programmes can be beneficial.

Nevertheless, (Kaswan, 2019) has asserted further, that the interests of workers in Worker Cooperatives and the wider interests of the community, cannot be fully aligned, “as long as the two essential economic functions of production and consumption continue to be analytically separated, no true alignment of interests—real happiness—can be assured.” *Quid Remedium?* At least two solutions are available. In one, Cooperatives are composed of workers and consumers whose shared votes in their totalities, are equal to one another, tempered by the principle promoted by Albert & Hahnel (2002:8) that “decision-making power should be in proportion to the degree one is affected by a decision.” In the other, there is “a participatory planning procedure in which councils and federations of workers and consumers propose and revise their own activities under rules designed to guarantee outcomes that are both efficient and equitable.” (Albert & Hahnel, 2002:8). The remedy proposed in this plan, is for the former to apply in the short run, working towards a basis for building the latter in the long run.

When Workers Cooperatives fail, it can be due to the type of factors that would destroy any organisation, such as under-capitalization, excessive costs, inadequate marketing, poor customer service and so on, but failure can be due to problems

specific to Worker Cooperatives for example, if the Cooperative is very successful, workers may be tempted to sell out their ownership stake, resulting in the organisation reverting to the private Capital Ownership model (Lindenfeld & Wynn, 2022).

Workers Cooperatives allegedly may degenerate to where they are indistinguishable from KMFs, operating merely as profit seeking enterprises (Cheney, 1999; Gutierrez-Johnson, & Whyte William, 1982) and if they are very successful, they can demutualise entirely. There is a significant body of literature challenging the degeneration thesis, for example an empirical study by Langmead (2017) supported previous empirical literature which had argued “that ongoing processes of individual-collective alignment, understood as central to the practice of democracy, help cooperatives to: balance varying and conflicting needs and aims; challenge the assumption underpinning the degeneration thesis; and transform degenerative “risks” into creative and productive spaces where new meanings and practices can be formed.” Empirical work by Dean (2019) also produced evidence that was contrary to the thesis.

Cooperatives may have less political power than large Capital Owned firms. Debate exists on whether this can be resolved by forming Multistakeholder Cooperatives which include Capital Owned Firms, as proposed by Spear, Cornforth & Aiken (2009:256). Some negative experience with this model has led critics to propose multi stakeholder cooperatives that do not include large capital only stakeholders (*MSIntegrity* 2023a, b). ‘Co-creating’ involving consumer cooperatives and Capital Managed Firms may lead to co-option rather than the genuine empowerment of the consumer cooperative (Bonsu & Darmody, 2008) and single stake cooperatives have been thought to be at risk of degenerating into the sort of short sighted rentierism that characterises Capital Owned Firms. Ajates (2021) has outlined a variety of tactics that may prevent co-option, such as weighted voting and organising conviviality events. Novkovic (2020) however, has argued for multi stakeholder firms involving workers, the precariat, consumers and other groups with whom interests are shared and alliances may be formed. In the *FairShares* model, proponents advocate issuing a separate class of shares depending on membership type (Riddley-Duff, 2014). This may be one of those matters that needs to be resolved on a case by case basis.

Decisions around the balancing of social and financial goals can be difficult and may lead to conflict (Spear, Cornforth & Aiken, 2009:258). To some extent, this is perhaps inevitable in Cooperatives that are working effectively in terms of their objectives. The solution is to ensure that members are well trained in negotiation, de-escalation and conflict resolution and prioritise the forming of consensus.

Ensuring that the firm’s democracy remains vibrant and does not degenerate into Oligarchy is a particularly serious challenge which goes to the heart of what it means to be a Cooperative (Spear, Cornforth & Aiken, 2009:256). The refinements developed by Albert, *et al.* (2002), Albert (2004), Albert (2021), Albert & Hahnel, (1991), Albert & Hahnel (2017) and Hahnel (2022) including the use of Balanced Job Complexes, which ensure that all jobs have a roughly equal amount of desirable, developmental and empowering tasks within them, were developed precisely to address this issue and therefore are considered critical to the plan proposed here. The need for the full bevy of measures guaranteeing electoral integrity is relevant here.

Also, the importance of developing a joyful work environment cannot be underestimated in building member engagement.

A further issue concerns the baseline organisation that is selected for mutualization, not only may this factor bias research, suggesting a necessary caution in reviewing research findings, but also there is the concern that the wrong types of organisations might be selected. This is not to say that firms that are failing in one way or another cannot be made productive if changed into cooperative ownership, it is however to acknowledge the complexities that may accompany the diversity of organisations that may be considered for mutualization.

Because of the dependence of some Cooperatives on funding from Sovereign Wealth Funds and given the vast amounts of wealth that these funds administer, it is particularly important that they are governed meticulously by principles and procedures that are in accordance with Participatory Democracy (Cummine, 2016). Otherwise they are at risk of falling prey to the rentierism and Predatory Value Extraction that befalls Capital Managed Firms (Okpanachi & Tremblay, 2021; Lazonick & Jang-Sup, 2020). The Libyan fund for example, was subject to extensive looting by fraudster Wall St Hedge Fund banksters (Croft, 2023).

In regard to Consumer Cooperatives, it can be difficult to decide who is a consumer. Some potential members may not be interested in being involved. Some claims on membership may be spurious or nefarious. What about people who are too poor to buy necessary products and services, and so would be, but are not yet, consumers? One way around these problems is to make membership universal (Stout, Belinfanti & Gramitto, 2019) and this may be appropriate with Sovereign Wealth Funds that control vast swathes of wealth, but the matter is more difficult for smaller organisations. The options probably vary along a spectrum from completely open and voluntary to restricted by need. The options are however, made more feasible by modern technological democratic tools.

Strengthening Prospects and Reducing Risks for the Success of DGTB

1. The Executive Director model, linked to democratic selection among those who are technocratically qualified, maximises the benefits of democracy and technocracy. Compared to the capital owning model, where Directors are selected based on capital ownership, the model adopted in this plan ensures that the appropriate skill set and expertise is brought into the organisation to the greatest extent possible.
2. Four Executive Directors will be responsible for each portfolio.
3. One portfolio will be dedicated to Research & Development liaison, and to liaison with Local, National and International governments and third sector organisations, covering Grant seeking, lobbying for contextual benefits and concessions, legislative reform, taxation benefits, subsidies and other forms of support.
4. At all times an 'Action Needed' procedure will be in place, so that any person may give feedback to the Public Officer.

5. A Code of Practice will apply to all the Directors and staff.
6. A regime of continuous improvement will apply. All activities, tasks and procedures will be reviewed to see whether they are necessary, and if so, can they be improved upon.
7. A technique called Total Activities Analysis involving a systematic review of the main activities in the organisation, examining who should play what part in carrying them out, will contribute to Quality Assurance (Harris, 1993 in Cornforth, 2004).
8. Elections will simultaneously consist of paper votes and electronic voting using blockchain and any other technological and procedural means available, to ensure electoral integrity (Dragonchain 2020).
9. Fully participatory democratic decision making, which is and of itself, a form of 360 degrees Quality Assurance, will be in place.
10. An asset lock will be constitutionalized in the Articles of Incorporation, preventing predatory value extraction and other forms of ‘degeneration’ away from the organisational objectives.
11. These examples of initiatives in other countries compiled by Chaves Avila & Luis Monzón (2018), provide examples of the sorts of innovative support to Cooperatives that governments can provide:
 - The Capitalising of unemployment benefit scheme in Italy, Belgium and Spain provided for unemployment benefits to be converted into capital for cooperatives.
 - A percentage tax designation mechanism to finance social entities (Italy and Hungary).
 - Lotteries and games as a financial scheme: the cases of ONCE and RAY (Spain and Finland).
 - Social wealth Funds (Italy).
 - The *Social Investment Package (SIP)*, an initiative launched by the European Commission in 2013 includes the *European Social Fund* which facilitates the transfer and upscaling of innovative solutions to societal challenges in the fields of employment, education, skills and social inclusion.
 - The French ‘Hamon’ *Law on the Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) of 2014*. Solidarity based firms are those which provide for:
 - the pursuit of a purpose of social utility or of general interest;
 - democratic governance, involving the company's stakeholders;
 - the reinvestment of the majority of profits into the operation of the company to ensure its maintenance and development.
 These firms are able to set up employee savings funds to invest in the SSE, which benefit from substantial reductions in taxation. The statutory provisions

“grant a right for workers to create transitional co-operative societies as a vehicle for a worker buy-out, allowing employees a majority vote in decision making, without immediately having the capital to purchase a majority share” (Benstead & Heneghan, 2022).

- Measures focusing on business support (consultancy, networking, incubators, mentoring, etc.):’

The Value that is added by DGTB in Reducing Risks and Strengthening the Collectives’ Prospects for Success

1. The service is focused on transferring organisations through mutualization and providing the expertise to potentiate their success. Throughout the journey, before and after becoming collectives, expert support will be provided by DGTB. The providers of the service will have many years experience in furthering the development of their own organisations and in mentoring and supporting Startups, as well as having specialist experience of mutualization, all of which would be very relevant to the Cooperatives that DGTB is developing.
2. DGTB will play a strategic role, actively seeking to form cooperatives which can support one another, e.g. through vertical and horizontal integration. (Camargo Benavides & Ehrenhard, 2021:974)
3. Cooperatives will be linked into networks of support with one another and with social banks.
4. One portfolio of DGTB is fully committed to liaison with Local, National and International governments and third sector organisations, to negotiate support for the Collectives sector in general and specifically for the collectives that DGTB is developing. This will cover Grant seeking and lobbying for taxation reforms, subsidies, capitalisation and international trade support, streamlining of regulation and other programmic support.
5. In the Cooperatives that it develops, DGTB will be fully promoting the model in which member ownership and democratic control are equally weighted. The evidence presented here, is that member ownership and control, when equally prioritised, maximise the potential for releasing human productivity. The *International Labour Organisation*, the *Nuttall Review (2012)* and the *All Party Parliamentary Group on Employee Ownership (2008)* are among the eminent sources which emphasise the need for both.

Stages of Development

In broad terms the stages of development of DGTB are as follows:

- Stage 1:
- Attract seed funding.
 - Preparation of the Business Plan.
 - Setting up the strategic organisation.
 - Recruit the Directors.

Stage 2: The campaign to attract donations of organisations.

Stage 3: Intake of transitional organisations.

Stage 4: Restructuring of organisations into a cooperative format.

Stage 5: Support and advisement for the new organisations.

Stage 6: Liaison with, and Grant seeking from, Governments, Crowdfunding and third Sector organisations. Lobbying for tax concessions and other support.

How can this project be assisted?

Don't Give Them Bread will work with donations of organisations. However, it will require seed funding and support in its early stages. All forms of assistance will be gratefully received. These could consist of:

1. Cash donations to our upcoming Crowdfunding appeal.
2. Sending an email mailout informing people about the project and explaining how they may support the project. The text above can be used for the mailout, citing attribution.
3. Along similar lines to the mailout, articles on the project can be distributed in newsletters, through social media or other formats.
4. Provision of expertise in Commercial and Charity Law, Political and governmental liaison, support for Startups/ Entrepreneurship, Business as philanthropy, Building Cooperatives and Grant Writing.
5. Visiting or Honorary academic attachments for the organisers of *DGTB* which would provide access to Legal, Humanities and Social Sciences databases and other library resources.
6. Video equipment and associated production and editing software to produce videos for use in fundraising, marketing and publicity.
7. Conduct a fundraising activity, perhaps using social media, to raise funds for the project.
8. Propose organisations which will be transformed into Cooperatives.
9. Any other forms of assistance to progress the project.

Recommendations

1. There is considerable literature that has been amassed in the Literature Review, that focuses on why some Cooperatives succeed while others fail. This literature should be the subject of its own focused Systematic Review.
2. A Business Plan for *DGTB* should be prepared.
3. A Crowdfunding campaign should be established, to launch *DGTB*.

References

Literature Search for the Economic Democracy Project

Compiled by Dr Lynne Wrennall

Why Economic Democracy is Needed

Acemoglu, D. and Johnson, S. 2023 *Power and Progress: Our Thousand-Year Struggle Over Technology and Prosperity*, Public Affairs.

Ajates, R. 2021 Reducing the Risk of Co-Optation in Alternative Food Networks: Multi-Stakeholder Cooperatives, Social Capital, and Third Spaces of Cooperation, *Sustainability*, 13,11219. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132011219>

Albert, M. 2024 *Navigating the Polycrisis: Mapping the Futures of Capitalism and the Earth*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2024

Albert, M. 2021 *No Bosses: A New Economy for a Better World*, Winchester, John Hunt Publishing.

Albert, M. *et al.* 2002 In Defense of Participatory Economics, *Science & Society*, 66; 1; 7–28. *JSTOR*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249960062_In_Defense_of_Participatory_Economics

Albert, M. 2004 *Parecon Life After Capitalism*, New York, Verso.

Albert, M. & Hahnel, R. 1991 *Looking Forward: Participatory Economics for the Twenty-first Century*, Boston MA, South End Press.

Albert, M. & Hahnel, R. 2017 *Quiet Revolution in Welfare Economics*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

Alchian, A. & Demsetz, H. 1972 Production, information costs and economic organisation, *American Economic Review*, 62; 777–95.

Alkon, A. & Guthman, J. eds 2017 *The New Food Activism: Opposition, Cooperation, and Collective Action*, University of California Press.

Alessandrini, M. & Messori, M. 2016 Workers' Effort: A Comparison between Capitalist and Cooperative Firms, *Theoretical Economics Letters*, 28 June; 6; 3.
[https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(351jmbntvnsjtl aadkposzje\)\)/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=67757](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjtl aadkposzje))/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=67757)

All Party Parliamentary Group on Employee Ownership 2008 *Share value: how employee ownership is changing the face of business*. pp5-6.
<http://www.equityincentives.co.uk/resources/APPG-share-value-report.pdf>

Alleyne, M. 2020 *Exit to Community: A Community Primer*, Aug. 31.
<https://www.colorado.edu/lab/medlab/2020/08/31/exit-community-community-primer>

All Party Parliamentary Group on Employee Ownership 2011 *Sharing Ownership: The Role of Employee Ownership in Public Service Delivery*, June.
<https://employeeownership.co.uk/resources/reports/#:~:text=The%20All%20Party%20Parliamentary%20Group,and%20conditions%20and%20key%20challenges>

Alperovitz, G. 2011 *America beyond capitalism: Reclaiming our wealth, our liberty, and our democracy*. Boston, Democracy Collaborative Press.

Alperovitz, G. 2013 *What Then Must We Do?: Straight Talk about the Next American Revolution*, Vermont, Chelsea Green Publishing.

Altman, M. *et al eds* 2020 *Waking the Asian Pacific Co-operative Potential*, London, Academic Press.

Alvarado-Greenwood, W. *et al* 1978 *Organizing Production Cooperatives: A Strategy for Community Economic Development*. Berkeley, National Economic Development and Law Center.

American Psychological Association 2017-2022 *Work and Well-Being Surveys*.
<https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-well-being>

Arzeni, S. 2007 Foreword to Amin, A. *ed* 2007 *The Social Economy: International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity*, *OECD Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Programme*, London, Zed Books.

Aran, I. 2021 A Brief Cultural History of Work Sucking, *TNR*, 15 Jan.
<https://newrepublic.com/article/160896/brief-cultural-history-work-sucking>

Arando, S. Peña, I. & Verheul, I. 2009 Market entry of firms with different legal forms: an empirical test of the influence of institutional factors, *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal (IEMJ)*, 5; 77–95.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-008-0094-z>

Arando, S. *et al*, 2010 *Assessing Mondragon: Stability & Managed Change in the Face of Globalization*, Working Paper Number 1003, William Davidson Institute, University of Michigan.
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1726449

Aronowitz, S. Esposito, D. DiFazio, W. & Yard, M. 1998 The Post-Work Manifesto, in Aronowitz, S. & Cutler, J. *eds* 1998 *Post-Work*, New York, Routledge. 31-80

Arzeni, S. 2007 Foreword to Amin, A. *ed* 2007 *The Social Economy: International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity*, London, Zed Books.

Autin, K. L. Herdt, M. E., Garcia, R. G., & Ezema, G. N. 2022 Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction, Autonomous Motivation, and Meaningful Work: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 30; 1; 78–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10690727211018647>

Babiak, P. & Hare, R. D. 2006 *Snakes in Suits: When Psychopaths Go To Work*, New York: Harper Collins.

Back, N. Dury, P. & Hoffman, R. 2022 Co-determination at issue in Europe's top court, *Social Democracy*, 11th April
<https://socialeurope.eu/co-determination-at-issue-in-europes-top-court>

Bailly, F. Chapelle, K. & Prouteau, L. 2017 Wage differentials between conventional firms and non-worker cooperatives: Analysis of evidence from France. *Competition & Change*, 21; 4; 321–341. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1024529417713769>

Bain, P. & Taylor, P. 2000 Entrapped by the “electronic panopticon”? Worker resistance in the call centre, *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 15; 1; 2–18. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1468-005X.00061>

Baroness Bowles of Berkhamsted, Chair of The Ownership Effect Inquiry 2018 *The Ownership Dividend: The Economic Case For Employee Ownership*. [https://employeeownership.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/The Ownership Dividend The economic case for employee ownership.pdf](https://employeeownership.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/The_Ownership_Dividend_The_economic_case_for_employee_ownership.pdf)

Bartlett, W. Cable, J. Estrin, S. Jones, D. & Smith, S. 1992 Labor-Managed Cooperatives and Private Firms in North-Central Italy: an Empirical Comparison, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 46; 1; 103-118.

Bartling, B. Fehr, E. & Herz, H. 2014 The Intrinsic Value of Decision Rights, *Econometrica*, Nov; 82; 6; 2005-2039. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.3982/ECTA11573>

Battilani, P. & Schröter, H. G. 2012 *The Cooperative Business Movement, 1950 to the Present*, Cambridge University Press.

Bayo-Moriones, J. A. Galilea-Salvatierra, P. J. & de Cerio, J. M. 2003 Participation, Cooperatives and Performance: An Analysis of Spanish Manufacturing Firms’, in Kato, J. & Pliskin, J. 2003 *Determinants of the Incidence and the Effects of Participatory Organizations: Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labor-Managed Firms*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Behrouzi, M. 2006 *Democracy as the Political Empowerment of the People: The Betrayal of an Ideal*, New York, Lexington.

Bellas, C.J. 1972 *Industrial Democracy and the Worker-Owned Firm*. New York, Praeger.

Behrouzi, M. 2006 *Democracy as the Political Empowerment of the People: The Betrayal of an Ideal*, New York, Lexington.

Ben-Ner, A. 1984 On the Stability of the Cooperative Type of Organization, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 8, 247-260. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0147596784900556#:~:text=On%20the%20stability%20of%20the%20cooperative%20type%20of%20organization%E2%98%86&text=Producer%20cooperatives%20will%20maintain%20their,earnings%20exceed%20their%20opportunity%20wages.>

Ben-Ner, A. 1984 *A Theory of Worker Buy-Outs*. Mimeo, University of Haifa.

Ben-Ner, A. 1987 Producer Cooperatives: Why Do They Exist in Market Economies? In: Powel, W. ed. 1987 *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Yale University, New Haven.

Ben-Ner, A. 1988 Comparative Empirical Observations on Worked-Owned and Capitalist Firms, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 6; 7-31.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-7187\(88\)90003-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-7187(88)90003-3)

Ben-Ner, A. 1988 The life-cycle of worker-owned firms in market economies. A theoretical analysis, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 10; 3; 287-313.

Ben-Ner, A & Estrin, S . 1991 What happens when unions run firms? Unions as employee representatives and as employers. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 15; 1; 65–87.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0147596791901053?via%3Dihub>

Ben-Ner, A. & Jones, D. C. 1995 Employee participation, ownership and productivity: A theoretical framework, *Industrial Relations*, Oct; 34; 4; 532-554.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229526572_Employee_Participation_Ownership_and_Productivity_A_Theoretical_Framework

Berger, S. Pries, L & Wannöffel, M. 2019 *The Palgrave Handbook of Workers' Participation at Plant Level*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Berman, K.V. 1982 The United States of America: a Co-operative Model for Worker Management. In: Stephen, F.H. ed 1982 *The Performance of Labour-Managed Firms*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-05721-4_4

Berman, K. V. & Berman, M. D., 1989 An empirical test of the theory of the labor-managed firm, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 13, 281–300.

Benstead, S. & Heneghan, J. 2022 *Owning the workplace, securing the future: A plan to support worker buy-outs and expand employee ownership in Wales*, An independent report by the Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES).
<https://cles.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/ENG-Owning-the-workplace-FINAL.pdf>

Bernstein, P. Necessary elements for effective worker participation in decision making, in Lindenfeld, F. & Rothschild-Whitt, J. eds 1982 *Workplace Democracy and Social Change*, Manchester, New Hampshire, Extending Horizons Books.
https://www.academia.edu/12112718/ESSENTIAL_COMPONENTS_in_WORKPLACE_DEMOCRACY

Bernstein, P. 1976 Necessary Elements for Effective Worker Participation in Decision Making. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 10(2), 490–522.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4224502>

Berry, C. 2018 A Different Direction For The Fund, in Srnicek, N. & Berry, C. eds 2018 *The Social Wealth Fund*, *Autonomy*, May/ June, 03.

<https://autonomy.work/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Nick-Christine-Social-wealth.pdf>

Berry, D. & Bell, M.P. 2018 Worker cooperatives: alternative governance for caring and precarious work, *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 37; 4; 376-391.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-02-2017-0027>

Besser, L.L. & Oishi, S. 2020 The psychologically rich life, *Philosophical Psychology*, 33; 8; 1053-1071.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2020.1778662>

Bhalla, A. Lampel, J. & Jha, P. P. 2012 *The Employee Ownership Advantage: Benefits and Consequences*, Cass Business School, City University London, 1 July

<https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/16277/1/12-929-employee-ownership-advantage-benefits-and-consequences.pdf>

Bhatti, K. K. & Qureshi, T. M. 2007 Impact of Employee Participation on Job Satisfaction, Employee Commitment and Employee Productivity, *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3; 2; 54-68.

Bibby, A. 2014 Co-operatives are an inherently more sustainable form of business' In the fifth in our series: Andrew Bibby considers whether the co-operative business model is a more sustainable one, *The Guardian*, 14 March.

<https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2014/mar/11/co-op-business-sustainability>

Bibby, A. 2014 Co-op Bank crisis: what next for the co-operative sector? Andrew Bibby reports on the Ways Forward Co-operative movement conference, *The Guardian*, 21 Jan.

<https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2014/jan/21/co-op-bank-crisis-ways-forward>

Bibby, A. 2014 Can co-ops compete ... in capital? In the final instalment of our can co-ops compete series, Andrew Bibby discusses the difficult relationship between co-operative businesses and investors including those involved in the recent Co-operative Group upheaval, *The Guardian*, 18 March.

<https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2014/mar/18/can-coops-compete-capital-investors>

Bibby, A. 2014 'Co-operative businesses must be prepared to move with the times' The fourth in our 'can co-ops compete' series looks at the challenges co-ops face when scaling up and moving into new sectors of the economy, *The Guardian*, 4 March.

<https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2014/mar/04/co-operative-business-sector-growth-scale-up>

Bibby, A. 2014 Can co-ops compete ... in law? As new legislation removes many of the problems faced by those setting up co-operatives, we ask whether they will remain disadvantaged compared with their commercial counterparts, *The Guardian*, 25 Feb.

<https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2014/feb/25/cooperatives-mutuals-compete-law-commercial-competitors>

Birchall, J. 2005 *Co-operative Principles Ten Years On*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288884527_Co-operative_principles_ten_years_on

Birchall, J. 2011 *People-Centred Businesses: Co-operatives, Mutuals and the Idea of Membership*, New York, Springer.

Birchall, J. 2012. *Common Cause, Collective Action*, London, Consumer Focus.

Birchall, J. 2013 *Finance in an Age of Austerity: The Power of Customer-owned Banks*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing.

Birchall, J. 2013 *Resilience in a Downturn: The Power of Financial Cooperatives*, Geneva, International Labour Office.
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---coop/documents/publication/wcms_207768.pdf

Birchall, J. & Ketilson, H. L. 2009. *Resilience of the Cooperative Business Model in times of crisis*, Geneva, International Labour Office.
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_emp/@emp_ent/documents/publication/wcms_108416.pdf

Blakely, G. 2019 *Stolen: How to Save the World from Financialisation*, London, Watkins Media Limited.

Blasi, J. Freeman, R. & Kruse, D. 2011 *Do Broad-based Employee Ownership, Profit Sharing, and Stock Options Help the Best Firms Do Even Better?* Presented at Beyster Fellowship Symposium, June 28, 2011, and British Academy Seminar, “The Economics of Share Ownership and Gainsharing: Findings and Policy Implications,” Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, May 26, 2011.
https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/freeman/files/do_broad-based_ee-profit-sharing-so_help_best_firms_do_even_better_bjir-final-ms_5-10-15.pdf

Blasi, J. Freeman, R. & Kruse, D. 2013 *The Citizen's Share: Putting Ownership Back into Democracy*, Yale University Press.

Block, F. 2014 Democratizing finance, *Politics and Society*, 42; 1 3-28.

Block, F. & Hockett, R. 2022 *Democratizing Finance: Restructuring Credit to Transform Society*, London, Verso.

Blumberg, P. 1968 *Industrial Democracy: The Sociology of Participation*. New York, Schocken Books.

Bó, P. D. Foster, A. & Putterman, L. 2010 Institutions and Behavior: Experimental Evidence on the Effects of Democracy. *The American Economic Review*, 100; 5; 2205–2229.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41038760>

Boddy, C. R. 2005a The Implications of Corporate Psychopaths for Business and Society: An Initial Examination and A Call To Arms, *Australasian Journal of Business and Behavioural Sciences*, 1; 2; 30 – 40.

<http://www.stempeldrang.nl/uploads/4/8/5/5/4855530/psychopath.pdf>

Boddy, C. R. 2005b The Implications for Business Performance and Corporate Social Responsibility of Corporate Psychopaths, in ed. M. Hopkins, M. ed 2005 *2nd International Conference on Business Performance and Corporate Social Responsibility*, Middlesex University Business School, London.

Boddy, C. R. 2006 The dark side of management decisions: organisational psychopaths, *Management Decision*, 44; 10; 1461 – 1475

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/00251740610715759/full/html>

Boddy, C. R. 2010 Corporate Psychopaths and Productivity, *Management Services*, Spring, 26–30.

Boddy, C.R. 2011 *Corporate Psychopaths: Organizational Destroyers*, London, Palgrave.

Bond, L. et al 2000 *Survival Rates of Co-operatives in Québec*, Ministère de l'Industrie et du Commerce Direction des Québec, Co-operatives Secretariat Secrétariat aux Coopératives, Gouvernement du Canada.

<https://publications.gc.ca/Collection/A80-924-2-1999E.pdf>

Bonin, J.P. Jones, D.C. & Putterman, L. 1993 Theoretical and Empirical Studies of Producer Cooperatives: Will Ever the Twain Meet? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 31, 1290-1320.

Bonin, J. P. & Putterman, L. 1987 *Economics of Cooperation and the Labor-managed Economy*, New York, Harwood Academic Publishers.

<https://archive.org/details/economicsofcoope0000boni>

Bonin, J. & Putterman, L. 2013 *Economics of Cooperation and the Labour-Managed Economy*, Abingdon, Taylor & Francis.

Bonsu, S. K. & Darmody, A. 2008 Co-creating Second Life: Market—Consumer Cooperation in Contemporary Economy. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 28; 4; 355–368.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146708325396>

Bouchard, M. J. ed 2020 *Statistics on Cooperatives: Concepts, classification, work and economic contribution measurement*, International Labour Organisation, International Labour Office (ILO); Committee for the Promotion and Advancement of Cooperatives (COPAC); International Centre of Research and Information on the Public, Social and Cooperative Economy (CIRIEC), Geneva, ILO.

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---coop/documents/publication/wcms_760710.pdf

Bouchard, M. J. Le Guernic, M. & Rousselière, D. 2020 Conceptual framework for statistics on cooperatives, in Bouchard, M. J. ed 2020 *Statistics on Cooperatives: Concepts, classification, work and economic contribution measurement*, International Labour Organisation, International Labour Office (ILO); Committee for the Promotion and Advancement of Cooperatives (COPAC); International Centre of Research and Information on the Public, Social and Cooperative Economy (CIRIEC), Geneva: ILO. P6.

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---coop/documents/publication/wcms_760710.pdf

Bowden, M. & Teague, M. 2022 *The Steal: The Attempt to Overturn the 2020 Election and the People Who Stopped It*, New York, Grove Press.

Bowles, S. Gintis, H. & Gustafsson, B. 1993 *Markets and Democracy: participation, Accountability and Efficiency*, Cambridge University Press. Part III conditions for the success of the democratic firm.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. 2011 *A Cooperative Species: Human Reciprocity and Its Evolution*, Princeton University Press.

Bradley, K. 1980 comparative analysis of producer cooperatives: some theoretical and empirical implications, *British Journal of industrial relations*, 18 July; 155-168.

Bradley, K. & Gelb, A. 1980 Worker Cooperatives and Industrial Policy. *Review of Economics Studies*, 39; 665-678.

Bradley, K. & Gelb, A. 1983 *Worker Capitalism: The New Industrial Relations*, Heinemann, London.

Bradley, K. and Gelb, A. 1987 Cooperative Labour Relations: Mondragon's Response to Recession, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 25; 1; 77-99.

Brandel, J. 2020 A new chapter for Hearken, a new chapter for me, *Hearken blog*, 25 June.

<https://medium.com/we-are-hearken/a-new-chapter-for-hearken-a-new-chapter-for-me-af123d2ee4b7>

Branson, R. 2010 Sir Richard Branson makes a call for enlightened capitalism, *The Economist*, 26 Nov.

<https://www.economist.com/cassandra/2010/11/26/sir-richard-branson-makes-a-call-for-enlightened-capitalism>

Braun, S. S. 2021 Workplace democracy, exploitation, and liberalism: Why labor-managed firms are neither exploitative nor illiberal, *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 53; 2; 202-220.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/josp.12411>

Bregnan, R. 2020 *Humankind: A Hopeful History*, London, Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bregman, R. 2017 *Utopia for Realists: And How We Can Get There*, Bloomsbury Publishing.

Brown, J et al 2004 *Co-operative Capital: A new approach to investment in co-operatives*. Manchester, Co-operative Action.

Bruenig, M. 2018a The Marx Ratio and the Trouble with Coops, *People's Policy Project*, 22 May.

<https://www.peoplespolicyproject.org/2018/05/22/the-marx-ratio-and-the-trouble-with-coops/>

Bruenig, M. 2018b A Social Wealth Fund for America, *People's Policy Project*.

<https://www.peoplespolicyproject.org/projects/social-wealth-fund/>

Bua, A. 2018 Why Workers' Rights are Good for The Economy: A new index shows how greater economic democracy leads to more prosperity, *New Economics Foundation*, 29 Jan.

<https://neweconomics.org/2018/01/workers-rights-good-economy>

Bullinger, A.F. Melis, A.P. Tomasello, M. 2011 *Chimpanzees, Pan troglodytes*, prefer individual over collaborative strategies towards goals, *Animal Behaviour*, 82 pp. 1135-1141

[ArticleDownload PDFView Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Burdin, G. 2016 Equality under Threat by the Talented: Evidence from Worker-Managed Firms, *The Economic Journal*, Aug; 126; 594; 1372-1403.

<https://academic.oup.com/ej/article-abstract/126/594/1372/5078053?redirectedFrom=fulltext>

Burdín, G. & Dean, A. 2009 New evidence on wages and employment in worker cooperatives compared with capitalist firms, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 37; 4; 517-533.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0147596709000560>

Camargo Benavides, A.F. & Ehrenhard, M. 2021 Rediscovering the Cooperative Enterprise: A Systematic Review of Current Topics and Avenues for Future Research. *Voluntas* 32; 964–978. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-021-00328-8>

Canterbury, D. C. 2005 *Neoliberal democratization and new authoritarianism*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Casebeer, K. M. 2012 Community Syndicalism for the United States: Preliminary Observations on Law and Globalization in Democratic Production, *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 11 May; 2; 2.

<https://ssrn.com/abstract=2056256>

Charity Commission 2008 *The Hallmarks of an Effective Charity*.

Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) 2023 *Employee Engagement & Motivation Factsheets*.

<https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/factsheets/engagement-factsheet/>
And *CIPD Good Work Index*.

<https://www.cipd.org/uk/knowledge/reports/goodwork/>

Chaves Avila, R. & Luis Monzón, J. 2018, *Best practices in public policies regarding the European Social Economy post the economic crisis*, European economic and social committee. p15.

<https://www.eesc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/files/qe-04-18-002-en-n.pdf>

Cheeseman, N. & Klaas, B. 2018. *How to Rig an Election*, Yale University Press,

Cheney, G. 1999 *Values at Work: Employee Participation Meets Market Pressure at Mondragon*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Christophers, B. 2018 *The New Enclosure: The Appropriation of Public Land in Neoliberal Britain*, London, Verso.

Christophers, B. 2020 *Rentier Capitalism*, London, Verso.

Coch, L. & French, J. R. P. 1948 Overcoming resistance to change, *Human Relations*, 1; 512-532 .

https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/1769919/mod_resource/content/2/texto%208%20-%20Coch_Overcoming%20resistance%20to%20change.pdf

Cockshott, P. 2020 *How the World Works: The Story of Human Labor from Prehistory to the Modern Day*, NYU, Monthly Review Press.

Commisso, E. T. 1979 *Workers' control under plan and market*, Yale University Press: New Haven and London.

Conte, M. & Tannenbaum, A. S. 1978 Employee-owned Companies: Is the Difference Measurable?, *Monthly Labor Review*, 101; 7; 23-28.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41840795>

Cooperatives UK 2012 The case for consolidating co-operative legislation, *Coop News*, 19 Jan.

<https://www.thenews.coop/37190/sector/retail/case-consolidating-co-operative-legislation/>

Cooperatives UK 2023 *Model governing documents*, 10 Sept.

<https://www.uk.coop/resources/model-governing-documents>

Cooperatives UK 2023 *Starting a worker Co-op*.

<https://www.uk.coop/start-new-co-op/support/start-worker-co-op>

Cooperatives UK and The Cooperative Bank 2023 *Start a new co-op: step by step*.

<https://www.uk.coop/start-new-co-op/start>

Cornée S., M. Jegers, A. Szafarz, A. 2022 Feasible Institutions of Social Finance: A Taxonomy, *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 178; 3; 280-310.

https://www.mohrsiebeck.com/en/article/feasible-institutions-of-social-finance-a-taxonomy-101628jite-2022-0010?no_cache=1

Cornée, S. Kalmi, P. & Szafarz, A. 2015a Are Social Banks Really Different? The EMES International Research Network, in partnership with the Finnish Network on Social Enterprise (FinSERN), the 5th International Research Conference on Social Enterprise, “Building a scientific field to foster social enterprise eco-system” in July 2015 in Helsinki (Finland).

<http://programme.exordo.com/5emesconf/delegates/presentation/31/>

Cornée, S. Kalmi, P. & Szafarz, A. 2015b Selectivity and Transparency in Social Banking: Evidence from Europe, *Working Papers CEB 15-047*, ULB -- Université Libre de Bruxelles. Recipients of the 2016 Warren Samuels Prize.

<https://ideas.repec.org/p/sol/wpaper/2013-221488.html>

Cornée, S. Kalmi, P. & Szafarz, A. 2022 The Business Model of Social Banks, *Kyklos*, 73; 2; 196-226.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/kykl.12221>

Cornforth, C. 1983 Some Factors Affecting the Success or Failure of Worker Cooperatives: A Review of Empirical Research in the United Kingdom. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 4; 2; 163–190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X8342003>

Cornforth, C. Thomas, A. Lewis, J. & Spear, R. 1988 *Developing Successful Worker Cooperatives*, Sage, London.

Cornforth, C. 1996 *Governing non-profit organisations: heroic myths and human tales*, *Researching the UK Voluntary Sector*, National Council of Voluntary Organisations, London.

Cornforth, C. 2001 *Understanding the governance of non-profit organizations: multiple perspectives and paradoxes*, a paper for the 30th Annual ARNOVA Conference, November 29 – December 1, 2001, Miami, USA.

Cornforth, C. 2002 *The governance of public and non-profit organisations: a paradox perspective*, a paper for the Sixth International Research Symposium on Public Management, 8–10 April, 2002, University of Edinburgh, UK.

Cornforth, C. 2003 Introduction: the changing context of governance – emerging issues and paradoxes in Cornforth C. ed 2003 *The Governance of Public and Non-profit Organizations: What Do Boards Do?* Routledge, London.

Cornforth, C. 2004 The governance of cooperatives and mutual associations: A paradox perspective, *Annals of public and cooperative economics*, 75; 1; 11-32.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2004.00241.x>

Cornforth, C. & Edwards, C. 1998 *Good Governance: Developing Effective Board-Management Relations in Public and Voluntary Organisations*, CIMA, London.

Cornforth, C. 1999 Board roles in the strategic management of non-profit organisations: theory and practice, *Corporate Governance*, 7; 4; 346–362.

Coutinho, J. 2016 *Workplace Democracy, Well-Being and Political Participation*, A thesis submitted to The University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities, School of Social Science.

https://pure.manchester.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/54586161/FULL_TEXT.PDF

Crabtree, S. 2015 Worldwide, 13% of Employees Are Engaged at Work: Low workplace engagement offers opportunities to improve business outcomes, Gallup.

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/165269/worldwide-employees-engaged-work.aspx>

Crabtree, S. 2013 Worldwide, 13% of Employees Are Engaged at Work, *Gallup*, 8 Oct.

<https://news.gallup.com/poll/165269/worldwide-employees-engaged-work.aspx>

Craig, B. & Pencavel, J. 1992 The Behaviour of Worker Cooperatives, the Plywood Companies of the Pacific North-East, *American Economic Review*, 82; 5; 1083-1105.

Croft, J. 2023 Ex-bankers sentenced to jail for defrauding Libyan sovereign wealth fund

Hidden fees were paid to offshore companies by duo whose actions bring reputation of London's financial centre 'into disrepute,' *Financial Times*, 20 Feb.

<https://www.ft.com/content/62fc41fa-81b0-461a-a533-38bb166c152d>

Cumbers, A. 2018 Pioneering New Way To Measure Economic Democracy Makes Link To Equality, *University News*, University of Glasgow, 18 Jan.

https://www.gla.ac.uk/news/archiveofnews/2018/january/headline_568228_en.html

Cumbers, A. McMaster, R. Cabaço, S. & White, M. J. 2020 Reconfiguring Economic Democracy: Generating New Forms of Collective Agency, Individual Economic Freedom and Public Participation, *Work, Employment and Society*, 34; 4; 678–695.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017019875935>

Cumbers, A. Bilisland, K. McMaster, R. Cabaço, S. & White, M. 2023 The condition of European economic democracy: A comparative analysis of individual and collective employment rights. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 44; 1; 109–137.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X211064919>

Cummine, A. 2016 *Citizens' Wealth: Why (and How) Sovereign Funds Should be Managed by the People for the People*, Yale University Press.

Curl, J. 2009 *For All The People: Uncovering the Hidden History of Cooperation, Cooperative Movements, and Communalism in America*, Oakland, PM Press.

D'Art, D. 2002 *Economic Democracy and Financial Participation: A Comparative Study*, London, Routledge

Dana, L. et al eds 2023 *Cooperatives As A Catalyst For Sustainability: Lessons Learned From Asian Models*, Toh Tuck Link, World Scientific Publishing.

Dean, A. 2019 Do successful worker-managed firms degenerate?, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 47; 2; 317-329,
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2019.01.003>.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0147596719300216>

Deci, R. M. Connell, J. P. & Ryan, R. M. 1989 Self Determination in a Work Organisation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74; 580-590.

Deci, R. M. & Ryan, R. M. 2000 The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behaviour, *Psychological Inquiry*, 11; 227-268.

Deci, R. M. Ryan, R. M. Gagne, M. Leone, D. R. Usunov, J. Kornazheva, B. P. 2001 Need Satisfaction, Motivation, and Well-Being in The Work Organisations of a Former Eastern Bloc Country, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27; 930-942.

Deci, R. M. & Ryan, R. M. 2008 Hedonia, Eudaimonia, and Well-Being: An Introduction, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9; 1-11.

Defourney, J. Estrin, S. & Jones, D. C. 1985 The effects of workers' participation on enterprise performance: empirical evidence from French cooperatives, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 3; 2; 197-217.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0167718785900049>

Democracy at Work, 2019 *Economic Update: Social Movement for Economic Democracy*.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GERaWznNm4g>

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills 2013 *Guidance and model documentation for businesses about moving to employee ownership*. Guidance written by Pett, Franklin and Co. LLP.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/employee-ownership-company-model-documentation>

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills 2013 *Moving to employee ownership – guidance on model documentation*

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/210450/bis-13-949-moving-to-employee-ownership-guidance-on-model-documentation.pdf

DeVaro & Kurtulus 2006 What types of firms benefit from team production and how do they benefit, in Kalmi, P. & Klindinst, M. eds 2006 *Participation in the Age of Globalization and Information*, Advances in The Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labour Managed Firms, Volume 9, Oxford, Elsevier.

DeVaro, J. 2011 *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labor-Managed Firms*, Emerald Group Publishing.

Diefenbach, T. 2018 Why Michels' 'iron law of oligarchy' is not an iron law – and how democratic organisations can stay 'oligarchy-free', *Organisation Studies*, Feb; 40; 4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617751007>

Domar, E. D. 1966, The Soviet collective farm as a producer cooperative, *American Economic Review*, Part I, Sept; 56; 4; 743–757.

Domar, E. D. 2012 *Capitalism, Socialism, and Serfdom: Essays by Evsey D. Domar*, Cambridge University Press.

Dow, G. K. 1986 Control rights, competitive markets, and the labor management debate, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, March; 10; 1; 48–61.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0147596786901186>

Dow, G. K. 2000 Allocating Control Over Firms: Stock Markets Versus Membership Markets, Simon Fraser University, Department of Economics, Discussion Paper Series, #00-3, Jan.

Dow, G. K. 2003 *Governing the Firm: Workers' Control in Theory and Practice*, Cambridge University Press.

Dow, G. K. 2012 Democracy versus Appropriability: Can Labor-Managed Firms Flourish in a Capitalist World? In: Bowles, S., Gintis, H. and Gustafsson, B., eds 2012 *Markets and Democracy: Participation, Accountability and Efficiency*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 176-196.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511983580.012>

Dow, G. K. 2018 *The Labor-Managed Firm: Theoretical Foundations*, Cambridge University Press.

Downing, A, 2014 Without major structural reform, history suggests that mutualising the NHS is a bad idea, *SMF*, 4 Aug.

<http://www.smf.co.uk/mutualising-the-nhs-a-cautionary-tale-from-history/>

Dragonchain Community 2020 Transparency in Voting and Elections with Blockchain, *Dragonchain*, 12 Sept.

<https://dragonchain.com/blog/transparent-voting-elections-blockchain>

Dreze J. 1976 Some Theory of Labor Management and Participation, *Econometrica*, Nov; 44; 6; 1125-1139.

Drèze, J.H. 1993 Self-Management and Economic Theory: Efficiency, Funding and Employment. In: Bardhan, P. and Roemer, J.E. eds. 1993 *Market Socialism: The Current Debate*, New York, Oxford Economic Press.

Dubravcic, D. 1970 Labour as an Entrepreneurial Input: An Essay on the Theory of the Producer Cooperative Economy, *Economica*, 37; 297-310.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2551976>

Dutton, K. 2012 *The Wisdom of Psychopaths: What Saints, Spies, and Serial Killers Can Teach Us About Success*, Scientific American / Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Ellerman, D. 1975. The 'Ownership of the Firm' Is a Myth. *Administration and Society*, May; 7; 27–42.

Ellerman, D. 1984 Worker Cooperatives: The Question of Legal Structure, Jackall, R. & Levin, H. eds 1984 *Worker Cooperatives in America*, Chapter 11, University of California Press.

Ellerman, D. 1990. *The Democratic Worker Owned Firm: A New Model for East and West*. Boston, Unwin Hyman.

Ellerman, D. 1992 *Property & Contract in Economics: The Case for Economic Democracy*, Cambridge MA, Blackwell.

Ellerman, D. 2006 Whither Self-Management? Finding New Paths to Workplace Democracy, Kalmi, P. & Klinedinst, M. eds 2006 *Participation in the Age of Globalization and Information*, Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory & Labor-Managed Firms, Vol. 9; 321-355.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-3339\(05\)09011-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-3339(05)09011-3)

Ellerman, D. 2007 On the Role of Capital in "Capitalist" and in Labor-Managed Firms. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 39, 5-26.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0486613406296895>

Ellerman, D. 2015 On the Renting of Persons: The Neo-Abolitionist Case Against Today's Peculiar Institution, *Economic Thought*. 4; 1; 1–20.

<http://et.worldeconomicssociation.org/files/WEA-ET-4-1-Ellerman.pdf>

Ellerman, D. 2016 The Labour Theory of Property and Marginal Productivity Theory, *Economic Thought* 5; 1; 19– 36.

Ellerman, D. 2017 On the Labor Theory of Property: Is the Problem Distribution or Predistribution? *Challenge: The Magazine of Economic Affairs*, 60; 2; 171– 88.

Ellerman, D. 2018 The Case for Workplace Democracy, in Muldoon, J. 2018 *Council Democracy: Towards A Democratic Socialist Politics* Centre for the Study of Democracy, London, Routledge. pp211-227.

<https://philpapers.org/archive/ELLTCF-4.pdf>

Ellerman, D. 2020 On some alleged "problems" and alleged "solutions" in democratic firms *Journal of Participation and Employee Ownership*, 3; 23; 135-147.

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JPEO-04-2020-0012/full/pdf?title=on-some-alleged-problems-and-alleged-solutions-in-democratic-firms>

Ellerman, D. & Gonza, T. 2021 Less-known supporters of workplace democracy, *Journal of Participation and Employee Ownership*, 23 June; 4; 1; 63-85.

<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JPEO-06-2021-029/full/pdf?title=editorialless-known-supporters-of-workplace-democracy>

Elliott, M. S. & Boland, M. A. eds 2023 *Handbook of Research on Cooperatives and Mutuals*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing,

Elster, J. 1986 Self-Realization in Work and Politics, *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 3; 2; 97-126.

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/selfrealization-in-work-and-politics-the-marxist-conception-of-the-good-life/C29A5EE847BF50361C923E24CC99786F>

Employee Ownership Wales 2023 Did you know that employee ownership is the fastest growing form of business ownership in the UK?

<https://cwmpas.coop/what-we-do/services/employee-ownership/>

Engberg, L. 1993 Financing Employee-managed Firms: Some Problems of a Wider Extension. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 14; 2; 277–300.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X93142007>

Erixon, L. 2010 The Rehn-Meidner Model in Sweden: Its Rise, Challenges and Survival, *Journal of Economic Issues*, March; XLIV; 3; 677-705.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5097894_The_Rehn-Meidner_Model_in_Sweden_Its_Rise_Challenges_and_Survival

Estrin, S. 1983 *Self-management: Economic theory and Yugoslav practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Estrin, S. Jones, D. & Svejnar, J. 1987 The Productivity Effects of Workers' Participation, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 11.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0147596787900400>

Estrin, S. & Jones, D. 1993 *The determinants of workers participation and productivity in producer cooperatives*, European University Institute, working paper 87/284, San Domenico.

<https://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/22939>

Also in, Jones, D. C. & Estrin, S. eds 1993 *Advances in the economic analysis of participatory and labour managed firms*, Greenwich, JAI Press.

Estrin, S. & Uvalic, M. 2008. From Illyria towards Capitalism: Did Labour-Management Theory Teach Us Anything about Yugoslavia and Transition in Its Successor States?, *Comparative Economic Studies*, Dec; 50; 4; 663-696,

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/ces.2008.41#citeas>

Eurofound 2019 *Cooperatives and social enterprises: Work and employment in selected countries*, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.

http://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/39bade6a-adbe-11e9-9d01-01aa75ed71a1.0001.03/DOC_2

European Trade Union Congress (ETUC) *More democracy at work* .(Publications and video).

<https://www.etuc.org/en/more-democracy-work>

European Trade Union Institute (ETUI) *Democracy at Work*.

<https://www.etui.org/themes/worker-participation>

Fakhfakh, F. Pérotin, V. & Gago, M. 2009 Productivity, Capital and Labor in Labor-Managed and Conventional Firms. ERMES Working Papers Series 0910, University Paris 2.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236888727_Productivity_Capital_and_Labor_in_Labor-Managed_and_Conventional_Firms_An_Investigation_on_French_Data

Ferri, G. Kalmi, P. & Kerola, E. 2014 Does bank ownership affect lending behavior? Evidence from the Euro area, *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 48; 194-209.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S037842661400168X>

Footprint Workers' Co-operative Ltd and Seeds for Change Lancaster Co-operative Ltd 2015

How to set up a Workers' Co-op, Leeds, Radical Routes.

Foote Whyte, W. *et al* 1983 *Worker Participation and Ownership*, Ithaca, New York, ILR Press.

Formisano, R. 2017 *American Oligarchy*, University of Illinois Press.

Fottler, M. D. 1996 The role and impact of multi skilled health practitioners in the health services industry, *Hospital and Health Services Administration*, 41; 1; 55-75.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10154622/>

Frohlich, N. Godard, J. Oppenheimer, J. & Starke, F. 1998 Conventionally-Owned and Controlled Firms: An Experimental Analysis, *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 19; 311-326.

Furubotn, E. G. & Pejovich, S. 1972 Property Rights and Economic Theory: A Survey of Recent Literature, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 10; 4; 1137-62.

<http://www.jstor.org/fcgi-bin/jstor/listjournal.fcgi/00220515/.1-10>

Gabriel, S. Resnick, S. A. & Wolff, R. D. 2008 State Capitalism versus Communism: What Happened in the USSR and the PRC? *Critical Sociology*, 34; 4; 539–556.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920508090851>

Gabriel, S. Resnick, S. A. & Wolff, R. 2012 State Capitalism versus Communism: What Happened in the USSR? In Pollard, V. C. *ed* 2012 *State Capitalism, Contentious Politics and Large-Scale Social Change*, Leiden, Brill. 21-38.

Gagné, M. & Panaccio, A. 2014 The Motivational Power of Job Design, in Gagné, M. *ed* 2014

The Oxford Handbook of Work Engagement, Motivation, and Self-Determination Theory, Oxford University Press. 165-180.

Gagné, M. & Deci, E. L. 2005 Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26; 4; 331–362.
https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/2005_GagneDeci_JOB_SDTtheory.pdf

Gamson, Z. F. & Levin, H. M. 1984 Obstacles to the Survival of Democratic Workplaces in Jackall, R. & Levin, H. eds 1984 *Worker Cooperatives in America*, Chapter 11, University of California Press.
https://dynamics.org/Altenberg/PAPERS/BCLSFV/REFS/Gamson+Levin_obstacles-survival-democratic.1984.pdf

Gardner, G. 1977 Workers' Participation: A Critical Evaluation of Coch and French, *Human Relations*, 30; 12; 1071–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872677703001201>

George, R. E. 2001 Futures of Socioeconomic Democracy, *Journal of Futures Studies*, May; 5; 4; 31-48.
<https://jfsdigital.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/054-A02.pdf>

George, R. E. 2002 *Socioeconomic Democracy: An Advanced Socioeconomic System*, Praeger.

George, R. E. 2008 *A Democratic Socioeconomic Platform, in search of a Democratic Political Party*, Center for the Study of Democratic Societies.

George, R. E. 2012 Socioeconomic Democracy, *International Journal of Science*, February, 2012, pp.33-48.
http://issuu.com/ijosc.net/docs/ijosc_february_issue_volume_1?e=3793739/2712888

Gerdes, L. I. ed 2014 *Super PACs*, Farmington Hills, Greenhaven Publishing LLC.

Gerhart, B. & Fang, M. 2015 Pay, Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, Performance, and Creativity in the Workplace: Revisiting Long-Held Beliefs, *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10 April; 2; 1; 489–521.
[doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111418](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111418).

Gibson, C. H. 1973 Volvo Increases Productivity Through Job Enrichment, *California Management Review*, Summer; 15/4; 64-66.
<https://cmr.berkeley.edu/search/articleDetail.aspx?article=5035>

Gilens, M. 2012 *Affluence and Influence: Economic Inequality and Political Power in America*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton University Press.

Girard, J.-P. 2015 Governance in solidarity, in Novkovic, S. & Miner, K. eds 2015 *Cooperative Governance Fit to Build Resilience in the Face of Complexity*, Brussels, ICA. pp. 127-134.

Gonza, T. Ellerman, D. Berkopec, G. Žgank, T. & Široka, T. 2021 Marcora for Europe: How Worker-Buyouts Might Help Save Jobs and Build Resilient Businesses, *European State Aid Law Quarterly*, 20; 1.

<https://www.ellerman.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Marcora-Paper-EStAL.pdf>

Graeber, D. 2006 Turning Modes of Production Inside Out or, Why Capitalism is a Transformation of Slavery, *Critique of Anthropology*, 26; 1; 61–85.

https://libcom.org/files/graeber_2006a.pdf

Graeber, D. 2013 *The Democracy Project: A History, a Crisis, a Movement*, UK, Penguin.

Graeber, D. 2015 *The Utopia of Rules: On Technology, Stupidity, and the Secret Joys of Bureaucracy*. New York, Melville House.

Graeber, D. 2019 *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*, New York, Simon & Schuster.

Graeber, D. 2021 David Graeber vs Peter Thiel: Where Did the Future Go, May 8, 2020.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eF0cz9OmCGw>

Graeber, D. & Wengrow, D. 2018 How to change the course of human history. *Eurozone*, March 2

<https://www.eurozine.com/change-course-human-history/>

Graeber, D. & Wengrow, D. 2021 *The Dawn of Everything: a New History of Humanity*, Penguin.

Grant, M. G. 2021 The Beginning of the End of Meaningless Work: Ten years out from “The Problem With Work,” the theorist Kathi Weeks considers the current labor crisis, “essential” jobs, and post-pandemic futures, *TNR*, 21 Jan.

https://newrepublic.com/article/160836/beginning-end-meaningless-work?utm_source=internal&utm_medium=recirc_container&utm_campaign=Editor%E2%80%99s_Picks

Gregory, P. & Stuart, E. 2004 *Comparing Economic Systems in the Twenty-First Century*, Houghton Mifflin.

Grieco, D. & Bripi, F. 2022 Participation of charity beneficiaries, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, July; 199; 1-17.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167268122001573>

Gunn, C. 1992 Plywood Cooperatives in the United States: an Endangered Species, *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 13; 4; 525-534.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0143831x92134005>

Gunn, C. 2000 Markets against Economic Democracy, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 32; 448-460.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/048661340003200310>

Gurumurthy, A. 2020 In a new world order driven by AI, we need to rewrite the rules of data capitalism, *Open Democracy*, 3 March.
<https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/oureconomy/new-world-order-driven-ai-we-need-rewrite-rules-data-capitalism/>

Gutierrez-Johnson, A. & Whyte William F. 1982 The Mondragon System of Worker Production Cooperatives. In *Workplace Democracy and Social Change*. edited by Lindenfeld, Rothschild-Whitt.

Henry, H. 2012 Guidelines for cooperative legislation, International Labour Office. Geneva: ILO.
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_emp/@emp_ent/documents/publication/wcms_195533.pdf

Hahnel, R. 2005 *Economic Justice and Democracy: From Competition to Cooperation*, New York, Routledge.

Hahnel, R. 2006 Exploitation: A Modern Approach, *Review of Radical Political Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613405285421>

Hahnel, R. 2012 *Of the People, by the People: The Case for a Participatory Economy*, New York, AK Press.

Hahnel, R. 2021 *Democratic Economic Planning*, Abingdon, Routledge.

Hahnel, R. 2022 *A Participatory Economy*, New York, AK Press.

Hansmann, H. 1988 Ownership of the Firm, *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 4; 267-304.

Hansmann, H. 1990a When Does Worker Ownership Work? ESOPs, Law Firms, Codetermination and Economic Democracy, *Yale Law Journal*, 99; 8; 1762.
https://openyls.law.yale.edu/bitstream/handle/20.500.13051/16693/73_99YaleLJ1749_June1990_.pdf;js

Hansmann, H. 1990b The Viability of Worker Ownership: An Economic Perspective on the Political Structure of the Firm. In: Aoki, M. Gustafsson, B. & Williamson, O. eds 1990 *The Firm as a Nexus of Treaties*, London, Sage, 162-184.

Hansmann, H. 2013 Invited Paper: All firms are cooperatives – and so are governments, *Journal of Entrepreneurial and Organizational Diversity*, 2; 2; 1-10.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5947/jeod.2013.007>

Hanson, T. and Lonergan, E. 2017 Time for UK sovereign wealth fund, *Financial Times*, 23 Nov.
<https://www.ft.com/content/7bc111c1-de98-3857-a2a5-9156476e31a8>

Hanson Schlachter, L. & Prushinskaya, O. 2021 *How Economic Democracy Impacts Workers, Firms, and Communities*, Democracy at Work Institute.

<https://institute.coop/resources/how-economic-democracy-impacts-workers-firms-and-communities>

Harari, Y. N. 2015 *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*, HarperCollins.

Harari, Y. N. 2016 *Homo Deus*, Random House.

Harari, Y. N. 2018 *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*, Random House.

Harari, Y. N. 2022 *Unstoppable Us: How Humans Took Over the World*, Random House.

Harari, Y. N. Vandermeulen, D. & Casanave, D. 2020 *Sapiens A Graphic History, Volume 1: The Birth of Humankind*, Random House.

Harari, Y. N. Vandermeulen, D. & Casanave, D. 2021 *Sapiens A Graphic History, Volume 2: The Pillars of Civilisation*, Random House.

[AhVHTcAKHXEMA3EQ6AF6BAgIEAI#v=onepage&q=Sapiens&f=false](#)

Hare, B. & Kwetuenda, S. 2010 Bonobos voluntarily share their own food with others *Current Biology*, 20; R230-R231

[ArticleDownload PDFView Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Hare, B. Melis, A. Woods, V. Hastings, S. Wrangham, R. 2007 Tolerance allows Bonobos to outperform chimpanzees in a cooperative task, *Current Biology*, 17; 619-62.

[ArticleDownload PDFView Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Hari, Y. 2020 *Lost Connections*, London, Bloomsbury Publishing,

Hayes, N. 2020 *The Book of Trespass: Crossing the Lines that Divide Us*, London, Bloomsbury.

Helbling, T. 2023 Externalities: Prices Do Not Capture All Costs, *International Monetary Fund*.

<https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fandd/issues/Series/Back-to-Basics/Externalities>

Hennessey, B. A. & Amabile, T. M. 1998 Reality, intrinsic motivation and creativity, *American Psychologist*, 53; 6; 674–675.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.6.674>

Henrich, J. *et al.* 2010 Markets, religion, community size, and the evolution of fairness and punishment, *Science*, 327 pp. 1480-1484

<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1182238>

Henrÿ, H. 2021 *Cooperative Law – the translation of the cooperative principles into legal rules which respect the legal concept of sustainable development*, Prepared for the ICA, draws on the results of the virtual consultation on cooperative law organized by the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) on May 24, 2021 in view of this

submission to the United Nations for the elaboration of the 2021 Secretary General Report on Cooperatives in Social Development.

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2021/12/ICA-Cooperative-Law-Hagen-Henry.pdf>

Herrmann, E. Call, J. Lloreda, M. Hare, B. Tomasello, M. 2007 Humans have evolved specialized skills of social cognition: The cultural intelligence hypothesis, *Science*, 317; 1360-1366

[CrossRefView Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Hillary, I. 2006 Cooperatives in Globalisation: The Advantages of Networking, in Kalmi, P. & Klindinst, M. eds 2006 *Participation in the Age of Globalization and Information*, Advances in The Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labour Managed Firms, Volume 9, Oxford, Elsevier.

Hillard, J. & Coates, D. 1991. The Challenge to Industrial Democracy in Britain. In M. D. Hancock, M. D. Logue, J. & Schiller, B. eds. 1991 *Managing Modern Capitalism: Industrial Renewal and Workplace Democracy in the United States and Western Europe*. New York, Praeger.

Hjerppe, R. 1997 Provision of Public and Merit Goods: Towards an Optimal Policy Mix? *Research in Progress 10*, United Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics Research, Feb.

<https://www.wider.unu.edu/sites/default/files/RIP10.pdf>

HM Treasury 2022 HM Treasury is supporting Sir Mark Hendrick's Private Members' Bill on Co-operatives, Mutuals, and Friendly Societies, *Gov.UK*, 4 Nov.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/hm-treasury-supports-private-members-bill-on-co-operatives-mutuals-and-friendly-societies--2>

Hochner, A. et al 1988 Using Worker Participation and Buyouts to Save Jobs, in *Job-Saving Strategies: Worker Buyouts and QWL*, Chapter 1, pp. 1-12, Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research,

Holmstrom, M. 1985 How the Managed Manage the Managers: Workers Co-ops in Italy, *Anthropology Today*, Dec; 1; 6; 7-13.

Homer-Dixon, T. 2021 States of Emergency, *Globe and Mail*, 31 Dec.

<https://homerdixon.com/states-of-emergency/>

Horvat, B. 2000 *Social Ownership*. 10th Conference of IAFEP, Trient, 6-8 July 2000.

International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) 1995 ICA Statement on the Cooperative Identity in Wilson, A. et al 2021 *Examining Our Cooperative Identity*, Discussion Paper for the 33rd World Cooperative Congress, Seoul, Appendix A, 1-3 Dec.

https://icaworldcoopcongress.coop/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Congress_Discussion_Paper_Final_EN_2021-10-09.pdf

International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) 2015 *The Marcora Law supporting worker buyouts for thirty years*, 11 Sept.
<https://www.ica.coop/en/media/news/marcora-law-supporting-worker-buyouts-thirty-years>

International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) 2015 *Guidance Notes to the Co-operative Principles*, 5th Principle.

The ICA Statement on the Cooperative Identity Historical Context and Global Relevance for Today

International Labour Organisation (ILO) 2002 *R193 - Promotion of Cooperatives Recommendation, (No. 193)*.
https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_code:R193

International Labour Organisation (ILO), International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) 2015 *Cooperatives and the Sustainable Development Goals, A Contribution to the Post-2015 Development Debate*.
<https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/publications/1247ilo.pdf>

Ireland, J.N. & Law, P.J. 1981 Efficiency, Incentives, and Individual Labor Supply in the Labor-Managed Firm. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 5; 1-23.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-5967\(81\)90028-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-5967(81)90028-7)

Ireland, N.J. & Law, P.J. 1982 *The Economics of Labor-Managed Enterprises*, New York, St Martin's Press.

Ivanovski, S. 2012 Challenges of the Cooperative Movement In Addressing Issues of Human Security In the Context of a Neoliberal World: the Case of Argentina, A Thesis Submitted to the Honors Council For Honors in International Relations, Bucknell University, April.
https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1110&context=honors_theses

Irvine, M. 2021 Policing the Edge: An Historical Analysis supporting a Liminal Perspective on Policing, *Argument & Critique*.
<http://www.argumentcritique.com/publications.html>

Jackall, R. & Levin, H.M. 2023 *Worker Cooperatives in America*, University of California Press.

Jackson, F. *et al* 2012 Lessons from Lucas Aerospace, *The Guardian*, 5 Feb.
<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2012/feb/05/lessons-lucas-aerospace>

Jacobs, J. A. Kolb, A. M. & Taylor, C. R. 2021 Communities, Co-ops, and Clubs: Social Capital and Incentives in Large Collective Organizations, *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 13; 3; 29-69.
<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/mic.20180359>

Jacobs, M. & Mazzucato, M. 2016 *Rethinking Capitalism: Economics and Policy for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth*, John Wiley & Sons.

Jeffries, S. 2015 Interview. David Graeber interview: 'So many people spend their working lives doing jobs they think are unnecessary,' *The Guardian*, 21 March.
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/mar/21/books-interview-david-graeber-the-utopia-of-rules>

Jensen, A. 2012 *Saving business through worker co-operatives*, Manchester, Cooperatives UK.
<https://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Society/documents/2012/11/16/SavingBusiness.pdf>

Jensen, M.C. & Meckling, W.J. 1979 Rights and Production Functions: An Applications to Labor-Managed Firms and Codetermination. *The Journal of Business*, 52; 469-506.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/296060>

Jones, D. C. & Kalmi, P. 2009 Trust, Inequality and the Size of the Co-operative Sector: Cross-Country Evidence, *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 80; 2; 165-195.
<https://digitalcommons.hamilton.edu/articles/238>

Jones, D. & Svejnar J. 1985 Participation, Profit Sharing, Worker Ownership and Efficiency in Italian Producer Cooperatives, *Economica*, 52; 449-465.

Jossa, B. 2010 A Few Advantages of Cooperative Firms, *Studi Economici*, 65.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227435794_A_Few_Advantages_of_Economic_Democracy

Jossa, B. 2012 Cooperative Firms as a New Mode of Production, *Review of Political Economy*, 24; 3.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09538259.2012.701915>

Jossa, B. 2014a Alienation and the Self-Managed Firm System, *Review of Political Economics*, 46; 1.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0486613413488064>

Jossa, B. 2014b *A System of Cooperative Firms as a New Mode of Production*, Routledge, London.

Jossa, B. 2015 A Few Reflections on the Reasons Why Cooperative Firms Have Failed to Gain a Firm Foothold. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 3; 265-280. doi: [10.4236/ojbm.2015.33027](https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2015.33027).

Jossa, B. 2020 *The Political Economy of Cooperatives and Socialism*, Abingdon, Routledge.

Kaarsemaker, E. C. A. & Poutsma, E. 2006 The Fit of Employee Ownership with Other Human Resource Management Practices: Theoretical and Empirical

Suggestions Regarding the Existence of an Ownership High-Performance Work System. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 27; 4; 669–685.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X06069009>

Kalmi, P. & Klindinst, M. eds 2006 *Participation in the Age of Globalization and Information*, Advances in The Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labour Managed Firms, Volume 9, Oxford, Elsevier.

Karpf, A. 2012 Green jobs: a utopia we nearly had: Workers in a failing 1970s arms factory created a revolutionary jobs plan. We need their vision now, *The Guardian*, 31 Jan.
<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/jan/31/jobs-growth-workers-vision?guni=Article:in%20body%20link>

Kaswan, M. J. 2019 Happiness theory and worker cooperatives: A critique of the alignment thesis, *Journal of Labor and Society*, 22; 3; 637-660.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/wusa.12442>

Kasy, M. 2023 *The political economy of AI: Towards democratic control of the means of prediction*, INET Oxford Working Paper No. 2023-06, 14 April.
https://www.inet.ox.ac.uk/files/handbook_politicecon_ai.pdf

Kelly, M. & Howard, T. 2019 *The Making of a Democratic Economy: Building Prosperity for the Many, Not Just the Few*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Kester, G. & Pinaud, H. 1996 *Trade Unions and Democratic Participation: a Scenario for the 21 Century*, Averbury, Aldershot.

Klaas, B. 2016 *The Despot's Accomplice: How the West is Aiding and Abetting the Decline of Democracy*, Oxford University Press.

Klaas, B. 2021 *Corruptible: Who Gets Power and How it Changes Us*, London, Hachette.

Klarman, Michael J. 2020 *Foreword: The Degradation of American Democracy—and the Court*, 5 Aug.
<https://ssrn.com/abstract=3671830> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3671830>

Kleindorfer, P.R. & Sertel, M.R. 1993 The Economics of Workers' Enterprises. In: Bös, D. eds 1993 *Economics in a Changing World*. International Economic Association Series. Palgrave, London.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22988-8_5

Koudehia, A.A. & Esfahanian, H. 2022 Corruption and Privatization: The Efficiency of Worker Cooperatives, *Iranian Economic Review* 26; 4; 923-930.
https://ier.ut.ac.ir/article_90665_3ed6cec2c4665d9be4d26e6ca95b2a48.pdf

Kramper, P. 2012 Why Cooperatives Fail: Case Studies from Europe, Japan, and the United States, 1950–2010, in Battilani, P. & Schröter, H. G. eds 2012 *The Cooperative Business Movement, 1950 to Present*, Cambridge University Press.

Kremer, M. 1997 *Why are worker cooperatives so rare?*, NBER Working Paper 6118. Cambridge MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w6118/w6118.pdf

Krimerman, L. & Lindenfeld, F. eds 1992 *When Workers Decide: Workplace Democracy Takes Root in North America*, Philadelphia, New Society Publishers.

Krumper, P. 2012 Why cooperatives fail: case studies from Europe, Japan, and the United states, 1950 to 2010, in Battilani, P. & Schröter, H. G. 2012 *The Cooperative Business Movement, 1950 to the Present*, Cambridge University Press. pp126-149.

Kruse, D. 1991 Profit-Sharing and Employment Variability: Microeconomic Evidence on the Weitzman Theory, *Industrial and Labor Relation Review*, 44; 3; 437-453.

Kruse D. 2016 Does employee ownership improve performance? *IZA World of Labour*.

<https://wol.iza.org/articles/does-employee-ownership-improve-performance/long>

Kruse, D. L. Blasi, J. R. & Park, R. 2010 Shared Capitalism in the US Economy: Prevalence, Characteristics and Employee Views of Financial Participation in Enterprises, in Kruse, D. L. Freeman, R. B. & Blasi, J. R. eds 2010 *Shared Capitalism at Work: Employee Ownership, Profit and Gain Sharing, and Broad-based Stock Options*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kumar, S. Director of Legislation of the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) 2021 Brief summary: ICA (virtual) Consultation on Cooperative Law organized on 24 May 2021 in preparation of the UN Expert Group Meeting on 2021 Report of the UN Secretary General on Cooperatives in Social Development, Annex to Henry, H. 2021 *Cooperative Law – the translation of the cooperative principles into legal rules which respect the legal concept of sustainable development Prepared for the ICA*, draws on the results of the virtual consultation on cooperative law organized by the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) on May 24, 2021 in view of this submission to the United Nations for the elaboration of the 2021 Secretary General Report on Cooperatives in Social Development.

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2021/12/ICA-Cooperative-Law-Hagen-Henry.pdf>

Kuhner, T. K. 2014 *Capitalism v. Democracy: Money in Politics and the Free Market Constitution*, Stanford University Press.

Laloux, F. 2014 *Reinventing Organizations*, Nelson Parker.

Lampel, J. Bhalla, A. & Jha, P. P. 2010 *Model Growth: Do Employee-Owned Businesses deliver sustainable performance?* Cass Business School, City University London.

https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/16278/1/Model_Growth_Employee_Ownership_Report.pdf

Lampel, J. Banerjee, A. & Bhalla, A. 2013 *The Ownership Effect Inquiry Final Evidence Report*, Theaga Trust, Employee Ownership Association, John Lewis, June.
<https://www.assyntcf.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/EO-Inquiry-Final-Evidence-Report.pdf>

Langmead, K. 2017 Challenging the Degeneration Thesis: the Role of Democracy in Worker Cooperatives? *Journal of Organisational and Entrepreneurial Diversity*, 27 Feb; 5; 179-98.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314219167_Challenging_the_Degeneration_Thesis_the_Role_of_Democracy_in_Worker_Cooperatives

Lansley, S. McCann, D. & Schifferes, S. 2018 *Remodelling capitalism, how social wealth funds could transform Britain*, City University, Friends Provident Foundation.
<https://www.friendsprovidentfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Remodelling-Capitalism-Report-How-Social-Wealth-Funds-could-transform-Britain.pdf>

Lansley, S. McCann, D. & Schifferes, S. 2019 The case for citizens' wealth funds, *International Journal of Public Policy*, 15; 1/2; 136–152.
<https://www.inderscienceonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1504/IJPP.2019.099051>

Law Commission 2023 *Law Commission invited to review legislation on co-operatives and friendly societies*, Wales, 16 June.
<https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/law-commission-invited-to-review-legislation-on-cooperatives-and-friendly-societies/>

Lawrence, D. 2017 *The Third Way: The Promise of Industrial Democracy*, London, Routledge.

Lawrence, M. & Hanna, T. M. 2020 *Ownership Futures: Towards Democratic Public Ownership in the 21st Century: A year-long investigation into the politics of public ownership*, The Democracy Collaborative (in the US) and Common Wealth (in the UK).
<https://www.common-wealth.org/publications/ownership-futures-towards-democratic-public-ownership-in-the-twenty-first-century>

Lazonick, W. & Jang-Sup, S. 2020 *Predatory Value Extraction: How the Looting of the Business Corporation Became the US Norm and How Sustainable Prosperity Can Be Restored*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lederman, S. 2019 *Hannah Arendt and Participatory Democracy: A People's Utopia*, Haifa, Springer.

Lee, M. Y. & Edmonson, A. C. 2017 Self-Managing Organizations: Exploring The Limits of Less-Hierarchical Organizing, *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 37; 35-58.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2017.10.002>

Lengyel, P. & Kazancigil, A. eds 1984 Industrial Democracy: Participation, Labour Relations and Motivation, *International Social Science Journal*, by Unesco, XXXVI; 2.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000062053>

Lessig, L. 2011 *Republic, Lost: How Money Corrupts Congress--And a Plan to Stop It*. New York: 12, Hachette Book Group.

Levin, J. & Tadelis, S. 2005 Profit Sharing and the Role of Professional Partnerships, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120; 1; 131-171.

Levitsky, S. & Ziblatt, D. 2018 *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown.

Libcom, Lucas Aerospace.

<https://libcom.org/history/1976-the-fight-for-useful-work-at-lucas-aerospace>

Lindenfeld, F. & Wynn, P. 2022 Why Some Worker Co-ops Succeed While Others Fail: The Role of Internal and External Social Factors, *Grassroots Economic Organizing (GEO)*. <https://geo.coop/articles/why-some-worker-co-ops-succeed-while-others-fail>

And

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/016059769702100204>

Linville, C. B. 1993 an empirical investigation of the effect of workforce participation and ownership on technical efficiency and technical change in Italian producer cooperatives, in Mahalingam, S. et al eds 1993 *Labour Participatory Economy*, New Delhi, Mittal Publications.

Liotta, P.H. 2001 Paradigm Lost :Yugoslav Self-Management and the Economics of Disaster,

Balkanologie. Revue d'Études Pluridisciplinaires, V; 1–2.

<https://doi.org/10.4000/balkanologie.681>

Logue, J. & Yates, J. 2005 *Productivity In Cooperatives and Worker-Owned Enterprises: Ownership and Participation Make a Difference!* Ohio Employee Ownership Centre, Kent State University, prepared as a background paper for the World Economic report 2004-05 for the Employment Sector, International Labour Office, Geneva.

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---coop/documents/publication/wcms_746781.pdf

Ludik, J. 2021 *Democratizing Artificial Intelligence: to Benefit Everyone*, AI Sapiens Network, KDP Print.

Maaloe, E. 2006 Employee Ownership as a Joint Management Labour Drive Towards Caring and Sharing, in Kalmi, P. & Klindinst, M. eds 2006 *Participation in the Age of Globalization and Information*, Advances in The Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labour Managed Firms, Volume 9, Oxford, Elsevier.

Mackin, C. & Carey, R. 2015 Defining Employee Ownership: Four Meanings and Two Models, Institute for the Study of Employee Ownership and Profit Sharing, Rutgers University School of Management and Labor Relations, Working Paper No. 3. This paper was originally presented at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association, Boston, Jan.

<https://smlr.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/Documents/Working-Papers/Mackin-WorkingPaperNo3.pdf>

Mahalingam, S. *et al eds* 1993 *Labour Participatory Economy*, New Delhi, Mittal Publications.

Maietta, O. W. & Sena, V. 2008 Special Issue Paper: Shadow price of capital and the Furubotn–Pejovich effect: Some empirical evidence for Italian wine cooperatives, *Applied Stochastic Models In Business And Industry* Sept/Oct; 24; 5; 495-505.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/asmb.731>

Malach, S., Robinson, P., & Radcliffe, T. 2006 Differentiating legal issues by business type. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 44; 4; 563–576.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2006.00190.x>

Martela, F. Ryan, R.M. & Steger, M.F. 2017 Meaningfulness as Satisfaction of Autonomy, Competence, Relatedness, and Beneficence: Comparing the Four Satisfactions and Positive Affect as Predictors of Meaning in Life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19; 1261–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9869-7>

Martela, F. & Pessi, A. B. 2018 Significant Work Is About Self-Realization and Broader Purpose: Defining the Key Dimensions of Meaningful Work, *Frontiers of Psychology*, 26 March; 9; 363.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00363>

Martela, F. & Riekkari, T. J. J. 2018 Autonomy, Competence, Relatedness, and Beneficence: A Multicultural Comparison of the Four Pathways to Meaningful Work, *Frontiers of Psychology*, July; 9; 1157.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6048450/pdf/fpsyg-09-01157.pdf>

McQuaid, R. Brown, R. Summers, J. & Mawson, S. 2014 *Employee Owned Businesses: Access to Funding*, University of Sterling Report. Scottish Enterprise, pp. 47-69.

<http://www.aldermore.co.uk/media/3813/sme-future-attitudes-report.pdf>

Mason, R. 2014 Hand hospitals over to their staff, says Francis Maude: Cabinet office minister believes NHS services should increasingly be run as mutuals and taken out of public hands, *The Guardian*, 29 July.

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/jul/29/nhs-hospitals-hand-over-mutuals-francis-maude#start-of-comments>

Mason, P. 2015 PostCapitalism: The Economy Of The Future? *Social Europe*, 26 October

<http://www.socialeurope.eu/2015/10/postcapitalism-the-economy-of-the-future/>

Mauze, S. There Are Major Consequences to Giving Employees Autonomy If You Allow These 8 Things to Happen: The surprising dark side of granting autonomy can be avoided -- the effort is 1000 percent worth it, Inc.

<https://www.inc.com/scott-mautz/there-are-major-consequences-to-giving-employees-autonomy-if-you-allow-these-8-things-to-happen.html>

Mariana Mazzucato

<https://marianamazucato.com/>

Mazzucato, M. 2013 *The Entrepreneurial State: debunking public vs. private sector myths*, Anthem.

Mazzucato, M. 2018 *The Value of Everything: Making and Taking in the Global Economy*, London, Penguin.

Mazzucato, M. 2021 *Mission Economy: A Moonshot Guide to Changing Capitalism*, London, Penguin.

Mazzucato, M. 2021 Can Capitalism Solve Its Crises? | Interview with Mariana Mazzucato, Feb 9.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zptr-wzH94M>

Mazzucato, M. & Dosi, G. 2006 *Knowledge Accumulation and Industry Evolution: The Case of Pharma-Biotech*, Cambridge University Press.

Mazzucato, M. & Penna, C. C. R. 2015 *Mission-oriented Finance for Innovation: New Ideas for Investment-led Growth*, Rowman & Littlefield International.

McCain, R. A. 1977 On the Optimum Financial Environment for Worker Cooperatives. *Zeitschrift Für Nationalökonomie/ Journal of Economics*, 37; 3/4; 355–384. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41797910>

Meade, J.E. 1972 *The Theory of Labour-managed Firms and of Profit-sharing*, *Economic Journal*, 82; 402-428.

Meidner, R. 1993 Why did the Swedish model fail, in Miliband, R. & Panitch, L. eds 1994 *Real problems, False solutions*, Londres, Socialist Register, p.211-227.

<https://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/view/5630/2528>

Melis, A.P. Hare, B. & Tomasello, M. 2006 Chimpanzees recruit the best collaborators, *Science*, 311 pp. 1297-1300

[CrossRefView Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Melis, A.P. & Seemann, D. 2010 How is human cooperation different? *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 365, pp. 2663-2674.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2936178/?dom=prime&src=syn>

Melis, A.P. Hare, B. & Tomasello, M. 2006 Engineering cooperation in chimpanzees: tolerance constraints on cooperation, *Animal Behaviour*, 72 pp. 275-286.

Mellizo, P. Carpenter, J. P. & Matthews, P. H. 2011 Workplace Democracy in the Lab, 1 Jan, IZA Discussion Paper No. 5460.

<https://ssrn.com/abstract=1755998> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1755998>

Michel, C. 2021 *American Kleptocracy: How the U.S. Created the World's Greatest Money Laundering Scheme in History*, St. Martin's Publishing Group.

Mika, K. Stocki, R. & Bożek, A. 2013 Total Participation Management: Towards Psychological Determinants of Subjective Well-Being at Work, *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation, JEMI*, 17 March; 9; 4; 29-52.

<https://ssrn.com/abstract=2410541>

Mikami, K. 2003 Market Power and the Form of Firm: Capitalist Firms, Worker-Owned Firms and Consumer Cooperatives, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 52, 533-552.

[https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkozje\)\)/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=1792715](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkozje))/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=1792715)

Mill, J. S. 2006 *Principles of Political Economy*, New York, Cosimo.

Mirabel, T. 2021 Survival advantage of worker buyouts over newly created worker-owned firms, *Journal of Participation and Employee Ownership*, 4; 3; 212-234.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JPEO-08-2021-0006>

Miyazaki, H. 1984 On Success and Dissolution of the Labor-Managed Firm in the Capitalist Economy, *Journal of Political Economy*, 92; 909-931.

<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/261264>

Monbiot, G. 2001 *The Captive State the corporate takeover of Britain*, London, Macmillan.

Monteiro, N. P. & Stewart, G. 2015 Scale, Scope and Survival: A Comparison of Cooperative and Capitalist Modes of Production. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 47; 1; 91–118. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43550532>

Morgan, J. 2016 Power, property, the law, and the corporation – a commentary on David Ellerman's paper: The labour theory of property and marginal productivity theory, *Economic Thought*, 5; 1; 37-43.

Morin, E. & Kern, A. B. 1999 *Homeland Earth: A Manifesto for the New Millenium*, New York, Hampton Press.

MSIntegrity 2023a *Shifting Power: Assessing Worker- and Community-Centric Alternatives to Conventional Corporations*, Institute for Multi-Stakeholder Initiative Integrity

<https://www.msi-integrity.org/shifting-power/>

MSIntegrity 2023b *Not Fit-For-Purpose: The Grand Experiment of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives in Corporate Accountability, Global Governance and Human Rights*, Institute for Multi-Stakeholder Initiative Integrity.

<http://www.msi-integrity.org/not-fit-for-purpose/>

Full Report

https://www.msi-integrity.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/MSI_Not_Fit_For_Purpose_FORWEBSITE.FINAL_.pdf

Mukolo, A. Brisco, R. & Salim, A. 2006 Positive Externalities of Organisation Culture: The Social Integration of Working Adults with Learning Disabilities, Kalmi, P. and Klinedinst, M. eds 2006 *Participation in the Age of Globalization and Information*, (Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory & Labor-Managed Firms, Vol. 9), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 265-296.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-3339\(05\)09009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-3339(05)09009-5)

Muldoon, J. 2018 *Council Democracy: Towards A Democratic Socialist Politics* Centre for the Study of Democracy, London, Routledge. pp211-227.

Muldoon, J. 2020 *Building Power to Change the World: The Political Thought of the German Council Movements*, Oxford University Press.

Murray, A. 2013 Seven reasons why co-operatives promote happiness, *Coop News*, 20 March.

<https://www.thenews.coop/39463/sector/seven-reasons-why-co-operatives-promote-happiness/>

Musgrave, R.A. 1986, *Public Finance in a Democratic Society*; Collected Papers of Richard A. Musgrave, vol. I. Brighton, Wheatsheaf Books.

Department for Culture Media & Sport 2019 *Mutuals Support Programme 2: Guidance*, 24 June.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/mutuals-support-programme-2>

Näslund, B. 1988 Dynamic Behavior of a Labor-Managed Team. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 90(4), 575–584.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3440054>

National Centre for Employee Ownership 2017 *Employee ownership & economic well-being: household wealth, job stability and employment quality among employee owners Age 28 to 34*.

https://www.ownershippeconomy.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/employee_ownership_and_economic_wellbeing_2017.pdf

Navarra, C. 2009 *Collective accumulation of capital in Italian worker cooperatives: an empirical investigation on employment stability and income smoothing*. Paper presented at AISSEC XVII Conference on “Growth and Development Patterns: the Role of Institutions in a Comparative Perspective”, Perugia, Italy, June.

Neary, H. M. 1988 The comparative statics of the Ward-Domar labor-managed firm: A profit-function approach, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, June; 12; 2; 159-181.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0147596788900017>

Neary, H. M. 1990 A simple macroeconomic model of a labour-managed economy, *European Economic Review*, July; 34; 5; 1023-1039.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/001429219090021P>

Norges Bank Investment Management (NBIM) 2023a *About the fund*.

<https://www.nbim.no/en/responsible-investment/exclusion-of-companies/>

Norges Bank Investment Management (NBIM) 2023b Responsible investment.

<https://www.nbim.no/en/responsible-investment/>

Norges Bank Investment Management (NBIM) 2023c *Observation and exclusion of companies*.

<https://www.nbim.no/en/responsible-investment/exclusion-of-companies/>

Novković, S. 2012 The balancing act: Reconciling the economic and social goals of co-operatives, in Molina, E. & Robicheaud, M. eds 2012 *The amazing power of Co-operatives*, Publication of the International Summit of Co-operatives, Quebec City. pp. 289-300.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328462109_The_balancing_act_Reconciling_the_economic_and_social_goals_of_co-operatives

Novkovic, S. & Nembhard, J. G. 2017. The social impact of cooperatives. *The Cooperative Business Journal*, Fall issue, September, NCBA Washington DC: 12-22.

Novkovic, S. 2018 Are co-operatives transformative, or just businesses? *Cooperative Business Journal*, NCBA. Fall; 30-40.

<https://www.smu.ca/webfiles/ICCMWorkingPaper19-02.pdf>

Novković, S. 2019 Multi-stakeholder cooperatives as a means for jobs creation and social transformation, in Roelants, B. et al eds 2019 *Cooperatives and the World of Work*, Abingdon, Routledge.

Novković, S. 2021 Cooperative identity as a yardstick for transformative change, *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, June; 93; 2; 313-336.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/apce.12362>

Novkovic, S. & Miner, K. eds 2015 *Cooperative Governance Fit to Build Resilience in the Face of Complexity*, Brussels, ICA. pp. 127-134

<https://ica.coop/sites/default/files/basic-page-attachments/ica-governance-paper-en-2108946839.pdf>

Novković, S. Prokopowicz, P. & Stocki, R. 2010 Total participation in worker co-operatives: theory, measures and impacts, *Proceedings of the 40th Atlantic Schools of Business conference*, Saint Mary's University, pp 563-577.

https://library2.smu.ca/bitstream/handle/01/25407/asb_proceedings_2010.pdf#page=563

Novković, S. Miner, K. McMahon, C. 2023b Cooperative Governance in Context. In: Novković, S. Miner, K. McMahon, C. eds 2023 *Humanistic Governance in Democratic Organizations*. Humanism in Business Series. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17403-2_4

Novković, S. Prokopowicz, P. & Stocki, R. 2012 Staying True to Co-Operative Identity: Diagnosing Worker Co-Operatives for Adherence to their Values, in Bryson, A. ed 2012 *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labor-Managed Firms*, Bingley, Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.pp. 23-50.
[https://doi.org/10.1108/S0885-3339\(2012\)0000013006](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0885-3339(2012)0000013006)

Novković, S. & Šimleša, D. 2023 Measuring Transformational Impact of Cooperatives. In: Novković, S., Miner, K., McMahon, C. eds 2023 *Humanistic Governance in Democratic Organization*. Humanism in Business Series. Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17403-2_14

Nussbbaum, M. C. 2011 *Creating capabilities. The human development approach*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Nuti, D. M . 1992 On traditional cooperatives and James Meade's labor-capital discriminating partnerships., *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labor-Managed Firms*, 4: 1–26.
https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/23109/Nuti_1988_337_ECO.pdf;sequence=1

Nuti, D.M. 1993 *Alternative Employment and Payment Systems*, in Bowles, S. Gintis, H. & Gustafsson, B. 1993 *Markets and Democracy: participation, Accountability and Efficiency*, Cambridge University Press.

Nuti, D. M. 2002 Efficiency, Equality and Enterprise Democracy, in Pagano, U. & Rowthorn, B. eds 2002 *Democracy and Efficiency in the Economic Enterprise*, London, Routledge.

Nuttall, G. 2012 *Sharing success: the Nuttall review of employee ownership*. UK Gov. Crown Copyright.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/31706/12-933-sharing-success-nuttall-review-employee-ownership.pdf

Oakeshott, R. 1978 *The Case for Workers' Co-ops*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

O'Boyle, E. H. Forsyth, D. R. Banks, G. & McDaniel, M. 2011 A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work outcomes: A social exchange perspective, *The Journal of Applied Psychology* 97; 557–579.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22023075/>

O'Boyle, E. H. Patel, P. C. & Gonzalez-Mulé, E. 2016 Employee ownership and firm performance: a meta-analysis, *Human Resource Management Journal*, Nov; 26; 4; 425-448.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304459942_Employee_ownership_and_firm_performance_a_meta-analysis

O'Donohue, W. & Nelson, L. 2014 Alienation and managing human resources. *International Journal of Organisational Analysis*, 22; 3; 301-316.

OECD 2015 *In It Together: Why Less Inequality Benefits All*, OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264235120-en>.

OECD 2019, *Budgeting and Public Expenditures in OECD Countries 2019*, OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264307957-en>.

OECD 2020 *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*, OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/339306da-en>.

OECD 2021 *Eight ways to institutionalise deliberative democracy*, OECD Public Governance Policy Papers, No. 12, OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/4fcf1da5-en>. [20]

OECD 2022 *SUMMARY NOTE: Dispelling Myths about Participatory Budgeting across Levels of Government*, July. <https://www.oecd.org/tax/federalism/participatory-budgeting-note.pdf>

O'Hara, P. 2003 *Encyclopedia of Political Economy*, Volume 2. Routledge.

Oishi, S. & Westgate, E. C. 2021 A Psychologically Rich Life: Beyond Happiness and Meaning, *Psychological Review*, 12 Aug; 12; 129; 4; 790–811. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/rev0000317>

Oishi, S. *et al* 2020 Happiness, Meaning, and Psychological Richness, *Affective Science*, Jun 23; 1; 2; 107-115. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9383031/>

Okpanachi, E. & Tremblay, R. C. eds 2021 *The Political Economy of Natural Resource Funds*, Cham, Springer Nature.

Olivella, J. 2006 A Contribution Towards a Methodology for Managing Learning, Multi-Skilling and Performance on The Shop Floor. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, Special issue, 15 Sept; I-KNOW06; 411-419. <http://hdl.handle.net/2117/9602>

Olsen, E.K. 2013 The Relative Survival of Worker Cooperatives and Barriers to Their Creation, in Kruse, D. L. 2013 *Sharing Ownership, Profits, and Decision-Making in the 21st Century*, Bingley, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 83-107. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S0885-3339\(2013\)0000014005](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0885-3339(2013)0000014005)

O'Mahony, D. 1973 The Participatory Economy, *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 62; 245; 35–50. *JSTOR*.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/30088016?searchText=&searchUri=&ab_segments=&se_archKey=&refreqid=fastly-default%3A921704e57fca46531e9b825e2760812c

Oinas-Kukkonen, H. 2008 Network analysis and crowds of people as sources of new organisational knowledge. In: A. Koohang et al. Eds 2008 *Knowledge Management: Theoretical Foundation*. Informing Science Press, Santa Rosa, CA, US, pp. 173-189.

One Hundred Scholars of Democracy 2021 New America *Statement of Concern: The Threats to American Democracy and the Need for National Voting and Election Administration Standards*, June 1.

This is one of five letters sent by American academics to Congress, expressing concern about the state of American democracy.

<https://www.newamerica.org/political-reform/statements/>

O'Neill, M. 2008 Three Rawlsian routes towards economic democracy, *Revue de Philosophie Économique*, 8; 29-55.

<https://philpapers.org/archive/ONETRR.pdf>

Ostrom E. 1990 *Governing the Commons. The evolution of institutions for collective action*,

Cambridge University Press.

Ovcharenko, N.A. Asanova, N.A. Hut, S.Y. Isachkova, L.N. Sidorchukova, E.V. 2022 Consumer Cooperation as a Driver of Sustainable Rural Development. In: Bogoviz, A.V., Suglovov, A.E., Maloletko, A.N., Kaurova, O.V. eds 2022 *Cooperation and Sustainable Development. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, vol 245. Cham, Springer.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77000-6_190

Overell, S. 2008 *Inwardness: The Rise of Meaningful Work*, Provocation Series, 4; 2, London: The Work Foundation.

<https://barrierbreakers.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/2008-Inwardness.pdf>

Owen, H. 2011 Specialisation, multi skilling and allocation of decision rights, in DeVaro, J. 2011 *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labor-Managed Firms*, Emerald Group Publishing.

Ozaro, D. & Croucher, R. 2014 Workers' self-management, recovered companies and the sociology of work. *Sociology*, 48; 5; 989-1006.

Pagano, U. 1991 Property Rights, Asset Specificity, and the Division of Labour under Alternative Capitalist Relations, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 15; 315-342.

Pagano, U. & Rowthorn, B. eds 2002 *Democracy and Efficiency in the Economic Enterprise*, London, Routledge.

- Page, B. I. Bartels, L. M. & Seawright, J. 2013 Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans, *Perspectives on Politics*, 11; 1; 51–73.
<https://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/jnd260/cab/CAB2012%20-%20Page1.pdf>
- Page, B & Gilens, M. 2017 *Democracy in America? What Has Gone Wrong and What We Can Do About It*, University of Chicago Press.
- Palast, G. 2012 *The Best Democracy Money Can Buy*, London, Pluto Press.
- Pannekoek, A. 2003 *Workers' Councils*, Edited by Robert F. Barsky. Oakland, CA, AK Press.
- Park, R. 2012 Cognitive and affective approaches to employee participation: Integration of the two approaches, *Journal of World Business*, July; 47; 3; 450-458.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1090951611000708>
- Parker, G. & McDougall, M. 17 2023 Jeremy Hunt drops plans for sovereign wealth funds to pay UK corporation tax, *Financial Times*, 17 March.
<https://www.ft.com/content/b0e8c01d-9f6f-47c2-9c00-34f4ea3fab65>
- Parnell, E. 1995 *Reinventing the Co-Operative: Firms for the 21st Century*, Plunkett Foundation, Oxford.
- Parker, C. 2018 A Discussion of Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt's How Democracies Die. *Perspectives on Politics*, 16; 4; 1099–1100.
- Pateman, C. 1970 *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge University Press.
- Pejovich, S . 1992: Why has the labor-managed firm failed, *Cato Journal* 12; 2; 461–473.
- Pencavel, J. & Craig, B. 1994 The Empirical Performance of Orthodox Models of the Firm: Conventional Firms and Worker Cooperatives. *Journal of Political Economy*, 102; 4; 718–744. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2138762>
- Pencavel, J. Pistaferri, L. & Schivardi, F. 2006 Wages, Employment, and Capital in Capitalist and Worker-Owned Firms, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 60; 1; 23-44.
<https://docs.iza.org/dp2188.pdf>
- Pendleton, A. 2001 *Employee Ownership, Participation and Governance A study of ESOPs in the UK*, London, Routledge.
- Pendleton, A. McDonald, J. Robinson, A. & Wilson, N. 1996 Employee participation and corporate governance in employee-owned firms. *Work, Employment and Society*, 102 205–26.
<https://durham-repository.worktribe.com/output/1641455>
- Pendleton, A. & Robinson, A. 2017 Employee ownership in Britain Today. In Michie, J. Blasi, J. & Borzaga, C. Eds 2017 *The Oxford handbook of mutual and co-owned*

business. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199684977.013.30>

Pendleton, A. Robinson, A. & Nuttall, G. 2023 Employee ownership in the UK, *Journal of Participation and Employee Ownership*, Vol. No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPEO-11-2022-0030>

Pérotin, V. 2006 Entry, exit and the business cycle. Are cooperatives different? *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 34; 295–316. <http://educ333b.pbworks.com/w/file/54071946/Business%20cycle.pdf>

Pérotin, V. 2012 The Performance of Workers' Cooperatives. In: Battilani, P. and Schroeter, H. Eds, 2012 *The Cooperative Business Movement, 1950 to the Present*, Ch. 8, Cambridge University Press. 195-221. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Virginie-Perotin/publication/285356456_The_Performance_of_Workers'_Cooperatives/links/565d8d8808ae1ef92982d16b/The-Performance-of-Workers-Cooperatives.pdf

Perotin, V. 2018 *What do we really know about worker co-operatives?* Cooperatives UK, 19 Nov. https://www.uk.coop/sites/default/files/2020-10/worker_co-op_report.pdf

Pett, Franklin and Co. LLP 2013 *Moving to Employee Ownership: Guidance on Model Documentation*, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), 4 July. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/210450/bis-13-949-moving-to-employee-ownership-guidance-on-model-documentation.pdf

Pew Research Center 2023 *How Americans View Their Jobs*, 30 March. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2023/03/30/how-americans-view-their-jobs/>

Phelps, S. 2014 If You Love Your Employees, Set Them Free: Autonomy Is Key To Employee Engagement, *Forbes*, 24 Sept. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/stanphelps/2019/09/24/if-you-love-your-employees-set-them-free-autonomy-is-key-to-employee-engagement/>

Piketty, T. 2017 *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Harvard University Press.

Pink, D. H. 2010 *Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us*, Edinburgh, Canongate Books.

Podivinsky, J. M. & Stewart, G. 2007 Why is labour-managed firm entry so rare? An analysis of UK manufacturing data. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 63, 177–192.

Pokharel, K. P. Archer, D. & Featherstone, A. M. 2020 The Impact of Size and Specialization on the Financial Performance of Agricultural Cooperatives, *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management*, Dec; 8; 2. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2213297X19300187>

Popp-Madsen, B. A. 2021 *Visions of Council Democracy: Castoriadis, Lefort, Arendt*, Edinburgh University Press.

Powell, D. 2014 Strasbourg social enterprise conference: what did we learn? Dai Powell debates the success of last week's event hosted by the European Commission, and what it means for the sector, *The Guardian*, 20 Jan.
<https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2014/jan/20/strasbourg-social-enterprise-conference>

Prasnikar, J. & Svejnar, J. 1991 Workers participation in management vs. social government and ownership policies: Yugoslav lessons for transforming socialist economies, *Comparative Economic Studies*, 33; 4; 27–46.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/ces.1991.31>

Prasnikar, J, Svejnar, J, Mihaljek, D & Prasnikar, V . 1994 Behavior of participatory firms in Yugoslavia: Lessons for transforming economies, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 76; 4; 728–741.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2109774?origin=crossref>

Prokopowicz, P. Stocki, R. & Żmuda, G. A Cognitive Theory of Total Participation Management
https://www.academia.edu/3206550/Cognitive_Theory_Of_Total_Participation_Management

Putterman, L. 1982 Some behavioral perspectives on the dominance of hierarchical over democratic forms of enterprise, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, June–September, 3; 2–3; 139–160.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0167268182900154>

Putterman, L. 2008 Labour-Managed Firms. In: *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95121-5_2535-1

Pryor, F. 1983 The economics of production cooperatives – A readers' guide. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economy*, 54; 2; 133–172.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8292.1983.tb01866.x>

Reeves, S. Goulden, M. & Dingwall, R. 2016 The Future as a Design Problem, *DesignIssues*, Summer; 32; 3.

Reich, R. B. 2020a *Just Giving: Why Philanthropy Is Failing Democracy and How It Can Do Better*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

Reich, R. B. 2020b *The System: Who Rigged It, How We Fix It*, New York, Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Reichert, P. *et al* 2021 Crowding-in or Crowding-out? How Subsidies Signal the Path to Financial Independence of Social Enterprises, *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, Sept; 4; 3; 291–308.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvab014>

Rekers, Y. Haun, D.B.M. & Tomasello, M. 2011 Children, but not chimpanzees, prefer to forage collaboratively, *Current Biology*, 21 pp. 1756-1758

[ArticleDownload PDFView Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Rey, P. and Tirole, J. 2007 Financing and Access in Cooperatives, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 25, 1061-1088.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2007.05.005>

Rhodes, R. 2012 *Empire and Co-operation. How the British Empire used co-operatives in its development strategies 1900-1970*, John Donald Short Run Press.

Ridley-Duff, R. 2012 New frontiers in democratic self-management, in McDonnell, D. & Macknight, E. eds 2012 *The co-operative model in practice*, The Cooperative Education Trust Scotland (CETS) et al. 119-133.

https://www.smu.ca/webfiles/2012TheCo-operativeModelinPractice_InternationalPerspectives.pdf

Ridley-Duff, R. 2014 FairShares Model V2.0: a new model for self-governing social enterprises operating under Association, Company and Co-operative Law, in: *1st FairShares Association Conference*, Sheffield Business School, 1st July 2014.

Rifkin, J. 1995. *The End of Work: The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era*, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Roberts, C. & Lawrence, M. 2018 *Our Common Wealth A Citizens' Wealth Fund for the UK*, IPPR Commission on Economic Justice

<https://www.ippr.org/files/2018-04/cej-our-common-wealth-march-2018.pdf>

Robinson, A. & Wilson, N. 1993 Co-operative vs private firms: An empirical comparison of co-operative and private small firms in Britain, *International Business Review*, 2; 3; 281-296.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0969593193900220>

Ross, M. L. 2015 What Have We Learned about the Resource Curse? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18; 1; 239-259.

<https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-polisci-052213-040359>

Rothschild, J. & Ollilainen, M. 1999 Obscuring but not reducing managerial control: Does TQM measure up to democracy standards? *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 20, 583–623.

Rothschild, J. & Whitt, J. A. 1986 *The cooperative workplace: Potentials and dilemmas of organizational democracy and participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rothschild-Whitt, J. 1976 Conditions facilitating participatory-democratic organizations. *Sociological Inquiry*, 46; 2; 75–86.

Rothschild-Whitt, J. 1979 The collectivist organization: An alternative to rational-bureaucratic models, *American Sociological Review*, 44; 509–527.

Rothschild-Whitt, J., & Lindenfeld, F. 1982 Reshaping work: Prospects and problems of workplace democracy. In Lindenfeld, F. & Rothschild-Whitt, J. *Eds* 1982 *Workplace democracy and social change*, Boston, MA, Porter Sargent Publications. pp. 1–18.

Rowe, J. 2006 Cooperative Economy in the Great Depression, *Yes*, 8 March.
<http://jonathanrowe.org/money-cooperative-economy-in-the-great-depression>

Royer, J. 2014 The neoclassical theory of cooperatives”, in *Journal of cooperatives*, 28; 1-35.

Runciman, D. 2018 *How Democracy Ends*, London, Profile Books.

Rushkoff, D. 2003 *Open Source Democracy How online communication is changing offline politics*, Demos.
<https://demos.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/files/OpenSourceDemocracy.pdf>

Ryan, C. 2016 Co-operative Institutional Resources at the National and Regional Levels That Can Be Leveraged For Implementing the SDGs, Expert Group Meeting, *Ensuring That No One Is Left Behind: The Co-operative Sector as a Partner in the Implementation of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, 16-17 Nov.
<https://www.un.org/development/desa/cooperatives/what-we-do/meetings-and-workshops/egm-coops-2030agenda.html#:~:text=The%202030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20recognizes%20the%20contributions%20of,micro%2Denterprises%20to%20cooperatives%20to>

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. 2000 Self Determination Theory and The Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being, *American Psychologist*, 55; 68-78.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. 2017 *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*, New York, Guilford Press.

Sacks, S. R . 1983 *Self management and efficiency: Large corporations in Yugoslavia*. George Allen and Unwin: London.

Sanchez Bajo, C. 2019 A Century of ILO Interaction with the Cooperative Movement, in in Roelants, B. *et al eds* 2019 *Cooperatives and the World of Work*, Abingdon, Routledge.

Sanchez Bajo, C. & Roelants, B. 2016 *Capital and the Debt Trap: Learning from cooperatives in the global crisis*, London, Palgrave MacMillan.
<https://library.uniteddiversity.coop/Cooperatives/Capital and the Debt Trap-Learning from Cooperatives in the Global Crisis.pdf>

Sandstrom, A. Chrysostomou, C. Chrysostomou, J. Zollman, F. 2014 *Participatory Economics: A model for a new economy*.

<https://participatoryeconomics.info/>

Santos, L. R. 2011 Comparative Cognition: United We Stand, *Current Biology*, 21; 23; Dec. 6; R951-R953.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S096098221101195X>

Sauser, W.I. 2009 Sustaining employee owned companies: Seven recommendations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84:151-164.

Schneider, N. & Mannan, M. 2021 Let Users Own the Tech Companies They Help Build: Startups typically either go public or get acquired. but a more sustainable, accountable option would be to give the user base a stake. *Wired*, 19 June.

<https://www.wired.com/story/opinion-let-users-own-the-tech-companies-they-help-build/>

Schrenk, M. *et al* 1979 *Yugoslavia: Self-Management Socialism and the Challenges of Development, Report of a Mission Sent to Yugoslavia by the World Bank*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schwartz, J. 2011 Where Did Mill Go Wrong?: Why the Capital Managed Firm Rather than the Labor Managed Enterprise is the Predominant Organizational Form in Market Economies, *Ohio State Law Journal*, July 14;73; 2, 220-285.

<https://philarchive.org/archive/JUSWDM-2>

Sen, A. K. 1966 Labour allocation in a cooperative enterprise, *Review of Economic Studies* 33; 4; 361–371.

<https://academic.oup.com/restud/article-abstract/33/4/361/1543454?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false>

Sente, C. 2023 Democracy and the future of work: Anxiety about the state of democracy amid political polarisation should direct us to an unexpected answer—economic citizenship. *Social Democracy*, 4 Jan.

<https://www.socialeurope.eu/democracy-and-the-future-of-work>

Sertel, M. *ed* 1982 *Workers and Incentives*, Amsterdam, North - Holland .

Sertel. M.R. 1987 Workers' Enterprises Are Not Perverse, *European Economic Review*, 31; 1619–25.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0014292187800302>

Sertel, M. R. & Steinherr, A. 1984 Information, Incentives, and the Design of Efficient Institutions. *Zeitschrift Für Die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft / Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 140; 2; 233–246.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40750693>

Shade, S. 2021 Crying at Work Isn't the Answer: Rather than focus on normalizing weeping on the job, why not just make jobs suck less? *TNR*, 6 Jan.

<https://newrepublic.com/article/160761/crying-work-isnt-answer>

- Shantz, A. Alfes, K. Bailey, C. & Soane, E. 2015 Drivers and outcomes of work alienation: reviving a concept. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24; 4; 382- 393.
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35437527.pdf>
- Shantz, J. & Macdonald, J. B. eds 2013 *Beyond Capitalism: Building Democratic Alternatives for Today and the Future*, London & New York, Bloomsbury publishing.
- Shirky, C. 2008 *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*, London, Penguin.
- Simons, J. & Frankel, E. 2023 *Why democracy belongs in artificial intelligence*, Princeton University Press, 21 Feb.
<https://press.princeton.edu/ideas/why-democracy-belongs-in-artificial-intelligence>
- Smith, S. 2006 Employee Participation Rights in Corporate Governance: An Economic Rationale, a Test of a Leading Theory, and Some Initial Policy Proposals, *Participation in the Age of Globalization and Information*, 9; 105-146.
[https://www.emerald.com/insight/publication/doi/10.1016/S0885-3339\(2006\)9](https://www.emerald.com/insight/publication/doi/10.1016/S0885-3339(2006)9)
- Sintomer Y. Herzberg C. Röcke A. & Allegretti G. 2012 Transnational Models of Participation: The Case of Participatory Budgeting, *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8; 2. <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.141>
- Sintomer, Y. Röcke, A. & Herzberg, C. 2016 *Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Democracy and public governance*, Abingdon, Routledge,
- Somerville, P. 2007 Co-operative Identity, *Journal of Co-operative Studies*, April; 40; 1, 5-17.
https://www.academia.edu/68989319/Co_operative_identity
- Spear, R. 2000 The Co-operative Advantage. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 71; 4; 507-523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8292.00151>
- Spear, R. Cornforth, C. & Aiken, M. 2009 The governance challenges of social enterprises: evidence from a UK empirical study, *Annals of public and cooperative economics*, 80; 2; 247-273.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00386.x>
- Spear, R. & Thomas, A. 1997 Comparative Perspective on Worker Cooperative Development in Several European Countries, *Annals of public and cooperative economics*, 68; 3; 453 – 467.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-8292.00058>
- Spitzberg, D. 2020 *Cooperative Design: How Co-ops Center Their Members to Build Better Products, Faster*, MEDLab blog, 15 July.
<https://www.colorado.edu/lab/medlab/2020/07/15/cooperative-design-how-co-ops-center-their-members-build-better-products-faster>

Springer, N. 2018 *An Analysis of James Surowiecki's The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many are Smarter than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economics, Societies, and Nations*, Taylor & Francis.

Srnicek, N. 2018 The Social Wealth of Data, in Srnicek, N. & Berry, C. eds 2018 *The Social Wealth Fund*, *Autonomy*, May/ June, 03.

<https://autonomy.work/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Nick-Christine-Social-wealth.pdf>

Srnicek, N. & Williams, A. 2015 *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*, London, Verso.

Stahl, C-M. 2024 Democracy must set the standard: Standardisation of how artificial intelligence is deployed in the workplace is not a technical but a political matter, *Social Europe*, 29th April

<https://www.socialeurope.eu/democracy-must-set-the-standard>

Steele, D. 1992 *From Marx to Mises: Post-Capitalist Society and the Challenge of Economic Calculation*, Open Court Publishing Company. p. 323.

Stephen, F. H . 1976 Yugoslav self-management 1945–74, *Industrial Relations Journal*, 7; 4; 56–65.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2338.1976.tb00198.x>

Stephen, F.H. ed 1982 *The Performance of Labour-Managed Firms*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-05721-4_4

Stear, R. et al 2015 *The Moral DNA of Employee-Owned Companies: Ownership, Ethics and Performance*. Chartered Management Institute (CMI), Sept.

https://www.managers.org.uk/~media/Files/MoralDNA/The_MoralDNA_of_Employee-Owned_Companies.pdf

Stern, R. & Cornstock, P. 1978 *Employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs): Benefits for whom?* Ithaca, NY State School of Industrial and Labour Relations.

Stern, R. N. Haydn Wood, K. & Helland Hammer, T. 1979 *Employee Ownership in Plant Shutdowns*, W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Stewart, H. 2013 *The Happy Manifesto: Make Your Organization a Great Workplace*, London, Kogan Page Publishers.

Stocki, R. 2008 *Presentation at the CoopIndex Workshop for Worker cooperatives*, Halifax, Sept, Mimeo.

Stocki, R. P. Prokopowicz, P. & Zmuda, G. 2010 *Total Participation in Management, Critical Management Practice*, published in Polish by Wolters Kluwer in 2008 under the title: *Pełna Partycypacja w Zarządzaniu*. © 2010 For the translation Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu – National Louis University, Krakow.

Stocki, P. Prokopowicz, P. & Novkovic, S. 2012 *Assessing participation in worker cooperatives: From theory to practice*, in McDonnell, D. & Macknight, E. eds 2012 *The co-operative model in practice*, The Cooperative Education Trust Scotland (CETS) et al. 119-133.

https://www.smu.ca/webfiles/2012TheCo-operativeModelinPractice_InternationalPerspectives.pdf

Stout, L. Belinfanti, T. Gramitto, S. 2019 *Citizen Capitalism: How a Universal Fund Can Provide Influence and Income to All*, New York, Berrett Kohler.

Stout, L. & Gramitto, S. 2017 *Corporate Governance as Privately-Ordered Public Policy: A Proposal*, Cornell Law School Legal Studies Research Paper Series, 17-42.

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3042761

Street, P. 2011 *They Rule: The 1% v. Democracy*, Abingdon, Routledge.

Stubbs, A. 2017 *Automation, Artificial Intelligence, and the God/ Useless Divide, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 16; 700-716.

Sudmann, A. ed 2019 *The Democratization of Artificial Intelligence: Net Politics in the Era of Learning Algorithms*, Bielefeld, Verlag.

Summers, J. & Hyman, J. 2005 *Employee participation and company performance*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/1859352995.pdf>

Surowiecki, J. 2004 *The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter Than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies and Nations*, New York, Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Sutton, R. 2007 *The No Asshole Rule: Building a Civilised Workplace and Surviving One That Isn't*, New York, Sphere Books.

Sweren-Becker, E. 2021 *Filling the Voting Rights Hole Left by SCOTUS in Shelby County v. Holder The need for Congress to pass the For the People Act and the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act is acute.* Brennan Center for Justice, 22 June.

<https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/filling-voting-rights-hole-left-scotus-shelby-county-v-holder>

Széll, G. 2019 *Workers' Participation in Yugoslavia*, in Berger, S. Pries, L & Wannöffel, M. 2019 *The Palgrave Handbook of Workers' Participation at Plant Level*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 167-186.

Terkel, S. 2011 *Working: People Talk About What They Do All Day and How They Feel About What They Do*, New York, The New Press.

Thomas, D. 2022 *London's new lord mayor calls for UK wealth fund to back fast-growing businesses: Nicholas Lyons says joint private/state-backed scheme would benefit pension pots and boost economy*, *Financial Times*, 11 Nov.

<https://www.ft.com/content/a3f48c48-b2fd-4de5-92a2-bbbf921293e4>

Tomasello, M. Carpenter, M. Call, J. Behne, T. & Moll, H. 2005 Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition, *Behavioural Brain Science*, 28; 675-691.

[CrossRefView Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Tornquist, D. 1973 *Workers' Management: The Intrinsic Issues*. In: Hunnius, G., Garson, G.D. and Case, J., Eds., *Workers' Control*, Vintage Books, New York.

Tortia, E. 2002 *The internal organisation of labour managed firms: the problem of value added distribution and of capital accumulation*, PhD thesis, Universit. di Ferrara e Bologna.

Tortia, E. 2007 Self-financing in labor-managed firms: individual capital accounts and bonds, in Jones, D. & Svejnar, J. 2007 *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labour-Managed firms*, 10; 243-272.

Trigona, M. 2006 *Recuperated Enterprises in Argentina: Reversing the Logic of Capitalism*, Z, 27 March.

<https://znetwork.org/zblogs/reversing-the-logic-of-capitalism-by-marie-trigona/>

Twersky, F. Buchanan, P. Threlfall, V. 2013 Listening to those who matter most, the beneficiaries, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 11; 2; 40-45.

UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) 2018 *Transforming Public Policy through Economic Democracy*, Lead Research Organisation: University of Glasgow, ESRC Funded Grant, Principal Investigator: Andrew David Cumbers.

<https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=ES%2FN006674%2F1>

United Nations 2003 *Guidelines Aimed at Creating a Supportive Environment for the Development of Cooperatives, 2001, 2002*, Division for Social Policy and Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, UN doc. A/RES/54/123 and doc. A/RES/56/114; A/56/73-E/2001/68; Res./56.

https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/social/documents/coop_egm_report.pdf

United Nations 2014 *Measuring the Size and Scope of the Cooperative Economy: Results of the 2014 Global Census on Co-operatives*, For the Secretariat Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Social Policy and Development.

<https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/2014/coopsegm/grace.pdf>

United Nations 2015 *EGM on the Cooperative Sector and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

<https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/2014/coopsegm/grace.pdf>

Vanek, J. 1970 *The General Theory of Labor-managed Market Economies*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Vanek, J. 1974 *The Participatory Economy: An Evolutionary Hypothesis and a Strategy for Development*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Vanek, J. 1977 *The Labor-Managed Economy: Essays*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Vanek, J. 1973 The Yugoslav economy viewed through the theory of labor management, *World Development*, Sept; 1; 9; 39-56.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0305750X73901563>

Vanek, J. 1973 a system for worker participation and self management in western industrialised economies, in Stephen, F.H. ed 1982 *The Performance of Labour-Managed Firms*, London, Palgrave Macmillan. pp227-229.

Vanek, J. & Espinosa, J. G . 1972 The subsistence income, effort and development potential of labour management and other economic systems. *The Economic Journal*, 82; 1000–1013.
<https://academic.oup.com/ej/article-abstract/82/327/1000/5233200?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false>

Vanek, J. and Jovicic, M. 1975 The capital market and income distribution in Yugoslavia: A theoretical and empirical analysis, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 89; 3; 432–433.
<https://academic.oup.com/qje/article-abstract/89/3/432/1896699?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false>

Vieta, M. Depedri, S. Carrano, A. 2016 *The Italian road to recuperating enterprises: The Legge Marcora workers' buyouts in times of crisis*, A European Research Institute on Co-operatives and Social Enterprises Report, Trento, Italy.

Vieta, M. Quarter, J. Spear, R. Muskovskaya, A. 2016 *Worker co-operatives as participatory organizations*, in D. Horton Smith, C. Rochester, R.A. Stebbins, eds. 2016 *Palgrave handbook on volunteering and non-profit associations*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Vieta, M. 2020 *Workers' Self-Management in Argentina: Contesting Neo- Liberalism by Occupying Companies, Creating Cooperatives, and Recuperating Autogestión*, BRILL.

Vuppalapati, C. 2021 *Democratization of Artificial Intelligence for the Future of Humanity*, Boca Raton, CRC Press.

Waal de, F. 2009 *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*, Princeton University Press.

Waal de, F. 2009 *Good Natured*, Harvard University Press.

Waal de, F. 2011 *The Age of Empathy: Nature's Lessons for a Kinder Society*, Souvenir Press.

Ward, B. 1958 The Firm in Illyria, Market Syndicalism. *The American Economic Review*, 48; 4; 566-589.

Wales Co-operative Centre 2020 *Employee Ownership*.

Warneken, F. Hare, B. Melis, A.P. Hanus, D. Tomasello, M. 2007 Spontaneous altruism by chimpanzees and young children, *PLoS Biology*, 5 pp. 1414-1420
<https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.0050184>

Warneken, F. & Tomasello, M. 2009 The roots of human altruism, *British Journal of Psychology*, 100 pp. 455-471
[View Record in ScopusGoogle Scholar](#)

Weber, W.G. Unterrainer, C. & Höge, T. 2020 Psychological Research on Organisational Democracy: A Meta-Analysis of Individual, Organisational, and Societal Outcomes, *Applied Psychology*, 69; 1009-1071.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12205>

Webb, T. 2016 *From Corporate Globalization to Global Co-operation*, Halifax, Fernwood Publishing.

Weeks, K. 2011 *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*, Duke University Press.

Wellens, L. & Jegers, M. 2011 Beneficiaries' participation in nonprofit organizations: a theory-based approach, *Public Money Management*, 31; 3; 175-182.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540962.2011.573227>

Wheatley, D. 2017 Autonomy in Paid Work and Employee Subjective Well-Being, *Work and Occupations*, 44; 2.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888417697232>

Whyte, D. 2020 *Ecocide: Kill the corporation before it kills us*, Manchester University Press.

White, D. F. & Wilbert, C. eds 2011 *Autonomy, Solidarity, Possibility: the Colin Ward Reader*. Oakland: AK Press, pp. 285–294.

Whitehorn, A. 1974 Alienation and Workers' Self-Management, *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne Des Slavistes*, 16; 2; 160–186.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40866711>

Whitehouse, S. 2017 *Captured: The Corporate Infiltration of American Democracy*, New York, The New Press.

Whitten, S. 2016 This man sued his employer for \$400,000 because he was bored at work, *CNBC*.
<http://www.cNBC.com/2016/05/05/this-man-sued-his-employer-for-400000-because-he-was-bored-at-work.html>

Wigglesworth, R. 2022 The \$1.3tn contrarian wealth fund, *Financial Times*, 9 Dec.
<https://www.ft.com/content/ff1708be-c3a9-42d8-a32b-f0c4f238eabf>

Wilfred Martens Centre for European Studies 2022 *Artificial Intelligence and Democracy*, Vienna.

<https://www.martenscentre.eu/publication/artificial-intelligence-and-democracy/>

Wilson, A. *et al* 2021 *Examining Our Cooperative Identity*, International Cooperative Alliance (ICA), Discussion Paper for the 33rd World Cooperative Congress, Seoul, 1-3 Dec.

https://icaworldcoopcongress.coop/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Congress_Discussion_Paper_Final_EN_2021-10-09.pdf

Wilson, H. B. 1989 *Democracy in the Workplace*, Montreal, Black Rose Books.

Winther, G. & Marens, R. 1997 Participatory Democracy May Go a Long Way: Comparative Growth Performance of Employee Ownership Firms in New York and Washington States. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 18; 3; 393–422.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X97183003>

Woodsworth, W. Meek, C. & Foote Whyte, W. *et al* 1985 *Industrial democracy: strategies for community revitalization*, Sage, Beverly Hills.

Wolff, R. 2009 *Capitalism Hits the Fan*. Northampton Mass., Olive Branch Press.

Wolff, R. 2012 *Democracy at Work: A Cure for Capitalism*, Chicago, Haymarket Books.

Wolff, R. & Barsamian, D. 2013 *Occupy the Economy: Challenging Capitalism*,

Wolff, R. D. 2012 Yes, there is an alternative to capitalism: Mondragon shows the way, *The Guardian*, 24 June.

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/jun/24/alternative-capitalism-mondragon>

Woolcock, M. & Sweetser, A.T. 2002 Bright ideas: Social capital-the bonds that connect, *ADB Review*, 34; 2.

https://www.academia.edu/19993363/Bright_ideas_social_capital_the_bonds_that_connect

Worker-Participation. *EU European Participation Index (EPI)*

<https://www.worker-participation.eu/About-WP/European-Participation-Index-EPI>

World Economic Forum 2021 *What is 'The Great Resignation'? An expert explains*, 29 Nov.

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/11/what-is-the-great-resignation-and-what-can-we-learn-from-it/>

World Health Organization 2019 *Occupational stress, burnout and fatigue*.

<https://www.who.int/tools/occupational-hazards-in-health-sector/occup-stress-burnout-fatigue>

Wuisman, I. S. & Mannan, M. 2016 Mitigating the democratic entropy of worker cooperatives: a holacratic approach. In W. van Boom, C. Breedveld-de Voogd, A. G. Castermans, M. de Deugd-Dijkman, & J. Hijma *eds* 2016 Een kwart eeuw. Privaatrechtelijke opstellen, aangeboden aan prof. mr. H.J. Snijders, Deventer, Wolters Kluwer. pp. 491-509.

<https://hdl.handle.net/1887/46765>

Yanis Varoufakis in conversation with Michael Albert | DiEM25

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1ZqkFEIwExc>

Young, B. 2018 How To Build Tech With, Not For, Movements, *Civicist*, 4 Nov.

<https://civichall.org/civicist/build-tech-with-movements/>

Zhu, H., Wang, P., & Bart, C. 2016 Board Processes, Board Strategic Involvement, and Organizational Performance in For-profit and Non-profit Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136; 2; 311–328. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24736133>

Critiques of traditional forms of Charity

Anand Giridharadas on the elite charade of changing the world | The Ezra Klein Show.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FFGWnZwu980&list=PL587t1YcDK6U8r0xiwF BqCFzFUCw9JTgM&index=2>

Brecher, B. 2017 Against charity: Some preliminary considerations, *Ethics & Bioethics*, June; 7; 1-2). DOI:[10.1515/ebce-2017-0008](https://doi.org/10.1515/ebce-2017-0008)

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318184075_Against_charity_Some_preliminary_considerations

Editors, 2019 Should billionaires call the shots on solving global problems? In this week's podcast, we speak to Anand Giridharadas, an American author, *The Economist*, 30 Aug.

<https://www.economist.com/podcasts/2019/08/30/should-billionaires-call-the-shots-on-solving-global-problems>

Gridharadas, A. 2019 *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World*, London, Penguin.

Hancock, G. 1989 *The Lords of Poverty*, The Atlantic Monthly Press.

Raventos, D. & Wark, J. 2018 *Against Charity*, AK Press.

Literature on Charities

Baker, L. Harris, M. & Moran, R. 2012 *The impact of the public benefit requirement in the Charities Act 2006: perceptions, knowledge and experience*, A research report for the Charity Commission.

Bawtree, D. Kirkland, K. 2013 *Charity Administration Handbook*, London, Bloomsbury.

- Burns, E & Virgo, G. 2008 *Maudsley & Burn's Trusts and Trustees*, OUP.
- Christopher, C. & Mitchell, J. 2010 *Commentary and Cases on the Law of Trusts and Equitable Remedies*, London, Sweet & Maxwell.
- Clements, R. & Abass, A. 2018 *Complete Equity and Trusts: Text, Cases, and Materials*, OUP.
- Commission, Institute for Voluntary Action Research and Sheffield Hallam University.
- Cousins, M. *A Guide to Legal Structures for Voluntary and Community Organisations*, UK Combat Poverty Agency.
- Dunn, A. 2014 *Regulation Absent: The Chimera of Charitable Foundation Law in England and Wales*, in Prele, C. ed 2014 *Developments in Foundation Law in Europe*, London, Springer.
- Etherington, S. et al 2015 *Regulating fundraising for the future: Trust in charities, confidence in fundraising regulation*, A cross party review of fundraising regulation for the Minister for Civil Society.
- Halliwell, M, 2003 *Equity and Trusts Textbook*, Old Bailey Press.
- Hayton, D. J. 2018 *Underhill and Hayton, Law Relating to Trustees*, Butterworths.
- HMRC 2018 *The Taxation of Trusts: A Review*, Consultation document, 7 Nov.
- Hodgson, R. 2012 *Trusted and Independent: Giving charity back to charities*. Review of the Charities Act 2006, Presented to Parliament by the Minister for the Cabinet Office, pursuant to section 73 of the Charities Act 2006, London: The Stationery Office.
- House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee (PASC) 2013 *The role of the Charity Commission and "public benefit": Post legislative scrutiny of the Charities Act 2006*, Third Report of Session 2013–14, Volume I: Report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence.
- House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee (PASC) 2013 *Charities Act "critically flawed" on public benefit*, 6 June.
- Hudson, A. 2017 *Equity and Trusts*, London, Routledge
- Johnson, I. 2004 Conditions not to Dispute Wills and The Inheritance (Provisions for Family and Dependants) Act 1975, *Liverpool Law Review*, 25: 71–77.
- Law Commission 1998 *The Rules Against Perpetuities and Excessive Accumulations*, Item 7 of the Sixth Programme of Law Reform: The Law of Trusts, To the Right Honourable the Lord Irvine of Lairg, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain.

- Law Commission 2017 *Technical Issues in Charity Law*, Law Com No 375, 13 Sept.
- Law Commission *Draft Charities Bill*.
- Martin, J.E. 2012 *Modern Equity*, London, Sweet and Maxwell.
- McDonald, I. & Street, A. 2018 *Equity & Trusts Concentrate: Law Revision and Study Guide*, OUP.
- Moffat, G. Bean, G. & Probert, R. 2009 *Trusts Law: Text and Materials*, Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, G. G. 2012 Public benefit and charitable status: assessing a 20-year process of reforming the primary legal framework for voluntary activity in the UK, *Voluntary Sector Review*, March; 3; 1; 25; 67-91.
- National Audit Office 2013 *The Regulatory Effectiveness of the Charity Commission*.
- Oakley, A.J. 2008 *Parker and Mellows: The Modern Law of Trusts*, London, Sweet and Maxwell.
- Pearce, R. & Barr, W. 2018 *Pearce & Stevens Trusts and Equitable Obligations*, OUP.
- Pettit, P. 2012 *Equity and the Law of Trusts*, OUP.
- Reed, P. & Wilson J, *The Trustee Act 2000*, Butterworths.
- Riches, J. 2016 *Equity and Trusts: A Problem-Based Approach*, New York, Routledge.
- Rounds, Jr., C. E. & Rounds (III), C. E. 2016 *Loring and Rounds: A Trustee's Handbook, 2016*, New York, Wolters Kluwer.
- Summers, J. 2016 Wind Up, *PS Magazine*, Law Society.
- Thomas, M. 2017 *Blackstone's Statutes on Property Law 2017-2018*. OUP.
- Todd, P. Wilson, S. 2003 *Textbook on Trusts*, OUP.
- Turnour, 2011 Some Thoughts on the Broader Theoretical Basis for Including Political Purposes within the Scope of Charitable Purposes: The Aid/Watch Case, in *International J. Civil Society Law*, 9; 86.
- Watt, G. 2016 *Cases and Materials on Equity and Trusts*, OUP
- Watt, G. 2016 *Equity & Trusts Law Directions*, OUP.

Videography

Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us, RSAanimate.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u6XAPnuFjJc>

The puzzle of motivation | Dan Pink.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rrkrvAUbU9Y>

Worker Cooperatives by Unlearning Economics.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yZHYiz60R5Q>

The world's biggest problem? Powerful psychopaths. | Brian Klaas.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3eBN_9rMoVI

Re-Imagining Work - Dave Coplin.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HUgGo-U2Eig>

also on:

<https://www.thersa.org/video/animates/2013/09/rsa-animate---re-imagining-work>

Based on:

Dave Coplin 2013 Re-Imagining Work: Shifts in the digital revolution, RSA, 8 April.

<https://www.thersa.org/video/events/2013/04/re-imagining-work-shifts-in-the-digital-revolution>

Intro to Participatory Economics

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pd60nYW577U>

How to Manage for Collective Creativity" by Linda Hill

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DjcZrtcBZi4>

Relevant UK Legislation

Charities Act 2022.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2022/6/contents/enacted>

Co-operative Development Agency and Industrial Development Act 1984.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/57/introduction>

Industrial and Provident Societies Acts 1893-2021

Industrial and Provident Societies Acts 1965- Repealed. From 1 August 2014 it was repealed and replaced by the consolidating [Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014](#).

‘What the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 does

The CCBS Act:

- replaces the ‘industrial and provident society’ legal form with two new legal forms:
 - co-operative society
 - community benefit society

Industrial and provident societies remain registered but are now deemed 'pre-commencement societies' (generally referred to as 'registered societies').

The CCBS Act also:

- consolidates previous industrial and provident society legislation including:

- Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1965
- Friendly and Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1968
- Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2003'

Financial Conduct Authority 2016 *Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014*, 08/06/2016

<https://www.fca.org.uk/firms/registered-societies-introduction/co-operative-community-benefit-societies-act-2014>

Co-operatives, Mutuals and Friendly Societies Act, 2023

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2023/23/enacted>

To be a charity an organisation must have exclusively charitable purposes (i.e. a charity cannot have some purposes which are charitable and others which are not). The Charities Act 2006 lists thirteen charitable 'heads' under which a charity can operate. These are:

1. The prevention or relief of poverty
2. The advancement of education
3. The advancement of religion
4. The advancement of health or the saving of lives
5. The advancement of citizenship or community development
6. The advancement of the arts, culture, heritage or science
7. The advancement of amateur sport
8. The advancement of human rights, conflict resolution or reconciliation or the promotion of religious or racial harmony or equality and diversity
9. The advancement of environmental protection or improvement
10. The relief of those in need by reason of youth, age, ill-health, disability, financial hardship or other disadvantage
11. The advancement of animal welfare
12. The promotion of the efficiency of the armed forces of the Crown, or of the efficiency of the police, fire and rescue services or ambulance services
13. Any other purposes currently recognised as charitable and any new charitable purposes which are similar to another charitable purpose

To be 'charitable' under the meaning of the Act, the purposes of the charity must fall under one of the categories listed above. They must also, though, be demonstrated as being 'for the public benefit' (this is sometimes known as 'the public benefit test'). In particular, there are two key principles of public benefit:

- There must be an identifiable benefit or benefits
- The benefit(s) must be to the public, or section of the public

It is up to the charity to show explicitly that its activities fall under one or more of the heads listed above, *and* that they are being pursued for the public benefit in line with the requirements of the Act.

The 2006 Act also provides that charities whose turnover is under £5000 per annum need not register with the [Charity Commission](#), in order to cut administration costs for small charities (previously, this threshold was set at £1000). Such charities are instead regulated by [HMRC](#).

[The Charity Commission](#)

[The Charities Act 2006 - full text](#)

[HMRC](#)

[The Companies Act 2006](#)

[CIC and other legislation](#)

[Charitable companies](#)

[Charitable solutions](#)