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Most of the existing literature on organisational greening, including that specifically addressed at small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), focuses on greening existing businesses (Hillary 2000; Hutchinson and Hutchinson 1997; Walley and Stubbs 2000). Academic perspectives on corporate environmental strategy and performance typically theorise stage models of corporate environmental improvement in which companies progress from a resistant or reactive stance to a sustainable, transcendent state (Roome 1992; Welford 1996), but, clearly, an additional and significant element of moving towards a sustainable future is the formation of new green businesses, or green start-ups. Although there is now more attention being paid to the greening of SMEs (Hillary 2000), there has until recently been surprisingly little written on green entrepreneurs. In this paper we aim to establish a framework for investigating the motives of, and influences on, entrepreneurs who set up green businesses.

The approach taken in this paper is to review current perspectives on the concept of entrepreneurship and existing approaches to classifying entrepreneurs in order to gain insights for developing a typology of green entrepreneurs. We also explore different conceptualisations of ‘green’, ‘greening’, ‘green-green’ and sustainability with a view to operationalising the concepts for the purposes of the proposed typology. Although research on green entrepreneurs is surprisingly thin, some recent perspectives on green entrepreneurs are reviewed. All these perspectives are utilised to identify the most pertinent defining criteria for the proposed typology from which various types of green entrepreneurs emerge. Examples are provided of these different types. Finally, we explore how this typology might contribute to further research on green entrepreneurs. Implicit in this research is the assumption that green and/or sustainability objectives are compatible with ‘business as usual’ in the medium term, notwithstanding the longer-term vision of a (probably radically different) future sustainable society.

**Entrepreneurs**

Within the entrepreneurship literature there is a great diversity of definitions of what constitutes an entrepreneur and there is no general agreement of what is and what is not entrepreneurship (Carter and Jones-Evans 2000). This diversity of (sometimes contradictory) theories of entrepreneurship is perhaps attributable to their having been developed in different academic disciplines—namely, economics, sociology and psychology (Blundel and Smith 2001). Very briefly, the origin of the concept is associated with the economist Joseph Schumpeter (1950) and the process of creative destruction and innovation leading to step changes in economic development. Then, in the 1960s and 1970s, much research focused on the link between entrepreneurial behaviour and psychological traits, such as ‘the need for achievement’ and an individual’s ‘locus of control’ (McClelland 1961; Kets de Vries 1977). In other words, in this school of thought entrepreneurship is viewed as a function of personality-determined characteristics. Finally, in the sociocultural approach it is assumed that entrepreneurship can be traced to special features of society or culture, such as ethnicity, gender, migration patterns, occupational background and so on.

Current approaches to understanding the nature of entrepreneurship tend to reject exclusive trait theory and instead take an integrated sociopsychological approach (Chell et al. 1994). In other words, these are studies that focus on entrepreneurial behaviour or activity, incorporating models of the way that people respond to experience. It has been suggested that the interaction between personality and such factors as past experience, existing competence and the immediate context have proved to be decisive (Blundell and Smith 2001).
Following the work of social theorist Anthony Giddens (1984), it has been argued that change (in this case, entrepreneurial and/or greening initiatives) cannot be understood by focusing exclusively on the actions taken by individuals nor solely in terms of the organisational structures that surround them (Walley and Stubbs 2000; see also Fig. 1). Rather, it has been argued that environmental initiatives should be seen in terms of order emerging from the mutually producing relationship between action and organisational or social structure. In other words, structure shapes the action of the entrepreneur, and entrepreneurial action in turn shapes structure. As individuals interact, aspects of one person’s way of seeing and doing are interpreted and thereby contribute to the notions of structure held by others.

Structure here is thus more dynamic and much broader than images typically conjured up by an organisational structure chart, as entrepreneurs are considered to be skilled actors who engage continually in reflexively monitoring their interactions with the world around them. This theory allows for prevailing structures to be either reinforced or changed through the day-to-day behaviour of individuals. In other words, individuals may reproduce the status quo or else choose to act entrepreneurially.

Entrepreneurship in the academic literature is generally accepted as extending well beyond the small business owner-manager sector, with which it is popularly linked. In other words, there can be entrepreneurial behaviour in large organisations—termed ‘intrapreneurship’—and in many walks of life, not just in business. For example, there is growing attention being paid to social, civic and artistic entrepreneurs (Leadbeater 1997; Thompson 1998). Entrepreneurship is also generally understood to imply a growth orientation, and some commentators suggest that initiatives that are not really different or distinctive—perhaps because they replicate something that exists in broadly the same format elsewhere—should not be thought of as entrepreneurial (Thompson 1998).

However, the challenge for appreciating ‘greening’ is to follow Giddens’s structure–action ideas beyond specific fleeting instants in which an individual action might either reproduce prevailing structures or perform something new. To appreciate the greening process, one must make the conceptual leap to see how a mutually producing model of structure–action would extend across time and space to account for widespread social phenomena: for example, the greening of organisations (Walley and Stubbs 2000) or, in a wider context, the greening of society in general. So, if we relate this perspective to the phenomena of green entrepreneurs, these individuals will be influenced by the evolving economic and social structures around them and, in turn, are influencing those structures.

It is assumed here that all types of new green businesses are relevant to the greening of society and therefore the scope for investigation should encompass all those starting up a green business. The fact that a potential organic food wholesaler or wind-farm...
operator may be replicating a business concept that exists elsewhere or may wish to stay small. Does not mean that that business will not make a valuable contribution to a sustainable society. So, for the purposes of this research, the word ‘entrepreneur’ refers to an individual who earns his or her livelihood by exercising some control over a business activity, intentionally producing more than can be personally consumed in order to profit from such enterprise (adapted from Dana 1995; McClelland 1961).

Typologies of entrepreneurs

Expressions such as ‘typology’, ‘taxonomy’, ‘frameworks’ and so on are often used interchangeably, although technically the actual meaning of the concepts differ (Doty and Glick 1994). The dictionary definition of typology is ‘the classification of objects according to type’ and taxonomy or taxology refers to the science of classification of living things (Garmonsway 1984). Kolk and Mauser (2002), drawing on the work of Doty and Glick (1994), examine the differences in more detail in connection with environmental management models and draw a clear distinction between classification schemes (or continuum models) and typologies. In their definition

classification schemes (continuum models) refer to systems that categorise phenomena into mutually exclusive and exhaustive sets with a series of discrete decision rules . . .
Unlike classification systems, typologies do not provide decision rules, . . . instead they identify multiple ideal types, each of which represents a unique combination of the organisational attributes that are believed to determine the relevant outcome. The more closely an organisation resembles an ideal type, the more effectively it will be described by the typology (Kolk and Mauser 2002: 22-23).

Examples of pure typology models are Steger’s (1993) environmental performance model and Porter’s (1980) generic strategy model. Unlike the classification or continuum models, in a typology more than one ideal strategy can lead to optimal performance. Kolk and Mauser also make the point that typologies are generally much more flexible than are continuum models, except that typologies do not (or should not) deal with development over time. The nature of the defining criteria indicates whether they are based on internal processes, the business environment or a combination of the two. Most environmental performance models focus on a combination of internal and external processes (Kolk and Mauser 2002).

The approach being taken in this paper is to review existing typologies of entrepreneurs that are seen to be relevant and useful to developing a typology of green entrepreneurs. In this review we do not include approaches based exclusively on trait theory, but rather focus on the integrated sociocultural–psychological approaches. To give as full a picture as possible, we list in Table 1 a range of approaches that appear in the general entrepreneurship literature.

Some aspects of the Dana (1995) typology warrant further explanation because the fourth and final (Barthian agent, and Kirznerian identifier) categories have potential application to green entrepreneurs.1 The Barthian agent category describes entrepreneurs who are active in the transformation of society; they act as essential brokers of contacts between two cultures, one more economically advanced than the other. The Kirznerian identifier category contains entrepreneurs who correctly identify where the next market imperfection will be and are also described as ‘arbitragers’. Dana (1995) sees this kind of entrepreneurship as therefore correcting socioeconomic waste or inefficiency. There are analogies here to the ‘natural capitalism’ approach to sustainability (Hawken et al. 1999). Interestingly, Dana sees the arbitrager as making a reactive

---

1 By way of context, Dana’s categories were devised to describe the motivation of entrepreneurs in a remote subarctic region, classifying Inuit and non-native entrepreneurs.
response—being a bounded entrepreneur who is less likely to exhibit the creative innovation and enthusiasm of other types of entrepreneur. This perspective would not necessarily be consistent with the natural capitalism vision.

However, it is Thompson’s (1998) four dimensions of entrepreneurship that can be seen as being particularly relevant to analysing green entrepreneurs (see Fig. 2). Thompson presents his entrepreneurs as emerging from a ‘well of talent’: ‘The well contains people who have a talent and an aptitude to become an entrepreneur, or at least behave in an enterprising way, but follow quite different paths when they do emerge from the well’ (Thompson 1999: 217). These paths are shown in Figure 2, with examples given of each type.

The defining criteria for this model appear to be personal and interpersonal style and type of paradigm or world-view. Thompson describes the style dimension as follows:

hard entrepreneurship represents the paradigm of the independent, pragmatic, opportunistic and competitive entrepreneur . . . whereas the softer styled entrepreneur operates in a more informal manner, they are strong on communication and sell their vision to engage and motivate others (1999: 217).

Moving to the paradigm dimension, Thompson describes the sea-change, visionary type as being characterised by

adventurous entrepreneurs who set out to change the world. These are people with a real ability to galvanise others; they work hard, play hard and operate at the leading edge (1999: 217).

They are energetic and charismatic. The opposite side, ‘innovation’, he describes as requiring imagination, creativity, passion and commitment to bring about change.
Thompson provides examples of each type of entrepreneur and of a fifth category—the designer-inventor—who lacks the business acumen or interest to build the business on his or her own. Thompson’s model is one of the building blocks that underpins the typology of green entrepreneurs presented below, but, before we move on to that, it is relevant to review the different interpretations of green businesses.

**Green and ‘green-green’ businesses**

It is important to understand what is meant by ‘green’ before going on to further delineate ‘green-green’ firms (Isaak 1998). Before we define what we mean in this paper by the expression ‘green entrepreneurs’, we would like to present various interpretations that have been offered. In popular usage, the expression ‘green’ is used in both a relative sense and an absolute sense. So a green business could refer to one that has been set up on a green basis, or one that has become relatively green. Greenness can also refer either to the product or to the process. The term ‘greening’ is used as a kind of shorthand for ‘moving towards environmental or ecological sustainability’. The terms ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable development’ themselves have a huge literature on meanings and interpretation (Pearce and Barbier 2000). It is not appropriate to expand on this further here other than to state how we interpreted it for the purposes of this research. The concept that is relevant to this analysis is that of the three pillars of sustainability—that is, the ecopreneur’s (Isaak 1998) simultaneous pursuit of economic prosperity, environ-
mental quality, and social and ethical equity (Elkington 1997). In this paper we adopt Isaak’s (1998) definition of green-green businesses as businesses that are founded on the principle of sustainability, and his definition of ecopreneurs as individuals who found or set up green-green businesses.

In the typology of green entrepreneurs presented below, it is assumed that founders of any type of green business all have economic (i.e. financial) profit-maximising or -optimising objectives. The not-for-profit sector (i.e. charities, voluntary and public-sector organisations) is excluded from this research. However, it is recognised that green and ethical entrepreneurs may well have mixed motivations; their motives may not be solely green but be a combination of green, ethical and social motives, and it is often difficult to separate these (as, indeed, the concept of sustainability reflects). For this reason, the scope includes socially and ethically motivated entrepreneurs who also have financial objectives. Conceptually, the scope could include existing (non-green) businesses that radically transform themselves into green-green businesses (e.g. a fossil fuel producer switching to a renewable energy product), as these businesses would equally well contribute to a sustainable society.

Another approach to scoping what is meant by ‘green’ is to identify the ‘green production sector’ or ‘environmental industry’ as it is variously described. Eastwood et al. (2001) arrive at 11 categories of green production: pollution control and treatment; waste disposal and collection; recycling and re-use; energy conservation; consultancy and monitoring; heritage and eco-tourism; research and education; forestry and organic farming; eco-capital equipment; alternative ‘green’ product production; and ‘in-firm’ green production. Clearly, this type of classification of green business focuses on the product rather than on the process. In other words, it does not include businesses that make or deliver everyday products and services but do so in a very green way. High-profile examples of the latter would be The Body Shop (cosmetics and toiletries) and Interface, a US manufacturer of carpet tiles that aims to be the first truly sustainable company. In this study we are interested in both types of green business: those founded on green products and/or those with green processes.

The intent is that the development of this framework for green entrepreneurs form a ‘broad church’ that includes most people’s common-sense understanding of what constitutes a significantly green business. The rationale for this is that all types of green entrepreneur—whether ethically driven, opportunistically driven or whatever—contribute to the move towards a sustainable society. So, it is not only Isaak’s green-green businesses (those that are founded on the principle of sustainability) that are included here under the heading ‘green entrepreneurs’ but also other new green start-ups, such as financially oriented entrepreneurs who happen to identify a green niche.

Perspectives on green entrepreneurs

Although much more attention is being paid to the greening of SMEs of late (Hillary 2000), there has, until recently, been surprisingly little on green entrepreneurs in the UK literature apart from numerous references to the high-profile success story of Anita Roddick and The Body Shop (e.g. Elkington 1997; Isaak 1998). Perhaps this lack of research is because, intuitively, environmentalism (which is collectivist and communitarian-oriented) and entrepreneurship (individualist, consumption-oriented) can be seen as intrinsically hostile (Anderson 1998), but Anderson (1988) argues that environmentalism and entrepreneurship actually share commonalities in terms of social process and attitudes; entrepreneurship is more likely to sustain environmentalism than any other form of imposed change. He argues that entrepreneurship is unique in that
it is the only business form that can directly incorporate and consolidate the values of
the individual, and that the moral dimension of environmentalism can empower
entrepreneurship. He provides examples of environmental entrepreneuring for which
the common factor is that they ‘sell’ immaterial goods or culture—they extract both
financial and moral value.

Ecopreneurs are increasingly being seen as crucial change agents, or champions,
driving the collective learning process in which society needs to engage (Anderson 1998;
and risk reduction for sustainable development’ that envisages society moving from
decadence (preoccupation with instant, present gratification and high risk-taking),
through reformism (the greening of existing businesses), creation (epitomising green
values, green screens, green careers), to green-green ecopreneurship (i.e. ‘radically
reducing risk to the natural environment by supporting only green-green ecopreneur-
ship and sustainable economic growth’).

The Body Shop and Ben & Jerry’s (ice cream manufacturers) are presented by Isaak
(1998) as the epitome of successful green-green businesses. That is, they started up
green from scratch and are system-transforming, socially committed and technolog-
ically up-to-date breakthrough ventures. Isaak’s ‘green logic’ argues that society needs
the synthesis of entrepreneurship (for the sake of economic growth and jobs), trustee-
ship (for the sake of maintaining the integrity of the natural environment) and spiritually
driven and socially responsible humanism. He suggests that ecopreneurs pursue social
and ecological goals by means of profit-oriented businesses. Turning this definition
around, we suggest in this paper that one can then logically distinguish ecopreneurs
from other types of green entrepreneurs who pursue profit goals by means of ecological
or socially oriented businesses.

On a more practical level, Hendrickson and Tuttle (1997) present (with use of US case
studies and a US context) an environmental classification scheme that can be used to
categorise the mission or market strategy for different environmental enterprises. Their
framework contains internal and external variables as defining criteria. With regard to
the external context, they draw on the work of Post and Altman (1994), who identified,
from a macro-sociological perspective, three drivers for change: (note that these are not
drivers or motivators of the entrepreneurs):

- Compliance-based environmentalism, improving the environment through govern-
ment regulation and sanctions
- Market-driven environmentalism, inducing more ecologically beneficial behaviour
  through various positive incentives
- Value-driven environmentalism, bringing about change through consumers’ will-
  ingness to act on their environmental values

These drivers need not be mutually exclusive at the organisational level, and an
environmental entrepreneur may take advantage of all three drivers to promote interest
in his or her product. Hendrickson and Tuttle (1997) use these drivers as one of the
criteria for their classification scheme. In total they use four factors to classify the
environmental focus of the market strategy adopted by the four case-study
environmental enterprises they analyse:

- The type of environmental business or businesses addressed (i.e. do the products
  or services relate to the inputs or resources, to the transformation process or to the
  output of goods?)
- The extent of the environmental emphasis of the overall product–service mix (e.g.
  the percentage of total business geared to environmental product)
The type of customer (i.e. is the customer an individual consumer, commercial and/or industrial, or institutional?)

The type of incentive (e.g. free-market or governmental) offered to customers to buy or use the product or service

The first two criteria are internal variables; the latter two are external. These form an example of a green framework that recognises the interplay of external context or influences with organisational characteristics.

Structural influences

Developing the theme of how the external environment impacts on potential entrepreneurs, it is clear that there is a wide range of external influences. The integrated sociopsychological approach to entrepreneurial behaviour outlined earlier in this paper (Chell et al. 1991) focuses, among other things, on the way people respond to experience and crucial dimensions of the business context. This approach resonates strongly with the structure–action perspective on greening outlined above. In other words, it is elements of the hard (e.g. economic) structure of society and/or softer structures (such as personal networks) that influences potential entrepreneurs to start a green business. It is because the external context is clearly an influential variable, but its influence can also take many forms, that it is represented in the green typology below as a range of structural influences from soft to hard. Included in hard structural influences are such things as government regulation and economic incentives, together with other market-driven and value-driven signals from green consumers (Post and Altman 1994). Soft structural influences are deemed to be such things as family and friends, past experiences, personal networks and education (Giddens 1984; Taylor and Pandza 2003).

A typology of green entrepreneurs

Drawing on the review of general entrepreneurship typologies and green entrepreneurship literature, the defining criteria presented in the typology below (see Fig. 3) reflects the view that the most relevant explanatory variables for characterising different types of green entrepreneurs are the external context (structural influences) and the entrepreneur’s personal orientation or motivation.

The ‘orientation’ axis arises from this paper’s earlier exploration of green and green-green businesses and is influenced by Thompson’s paradigm perspective (Thompson 1998). A profit orientation and some sort of green orientation are the minimum attributes assumed for the scope of this typology; the economic orientation end of the axis represents these minimum attributes. The green orientation could either be a motivation or a perceived market opportunity or both. As non-profit organisations are outside the scope of this framework, and, as green, ethical and social motives are seen as interrelated (therefore, no separate ‘social and economic’ category is identified), the only alternative set of orientations identified in the typology is one that combines all three motives—economic, green and social—ethical—and is represented in the typology as a sustainability orientation. The matrix formed by these two axes—motivation and influences—thus produces four ‘ideal types’ of green entrepreneurs.

To appreciate the ‘innovative opportunist’ type it is useful to make the connection with Thompson’s paradigm or world-view dimension. It is suggested that Thompson’s
description of the innovative paradigm is analogous to a financially oriented entrepreneur who spots a green niche or opportunity. Dana’s (1995) ‘arbitrager’ description also seems apposite. This type of entrepreneur is one who has been influenced mainly by hard structural drivers, such as regulation. A likely example of this type of entrepreneur is Evan Connell, of the Connell Group, who is building the first plant in the United Kingdom to recycle fridges safely. New European Union environmental legislation specifies that all chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) must be recovered. Connell has adopted some new technology, developed with the Manchester Metropolitan University, that will strip harmful CFC gases from the foam lining inside old fridges and leave them safe for scrap (MMYou 2002).

The ‘visionary champion’ type is consistent with Thompson’s ‘sea-change’ paradigm, in that this type of green entrepreneur is one who embraces a transformative, sustainability orientation. This champion of sustainability sets out to change the world, operates at the leading edge and has a vision of a sustainable future that envisages hard structural change. This type would also fit Isaak’s ‘ecopreneur’ description, because the business is founded on the principle of sustainability. There are analogies to Dana’s ‘Barthian agent’ in that these entrepreneurs are active in the transformation of society and act as the brokers of contacts between two cultures. In the case of visionary champions, the two cultures are characterised by ‘business as usual’ and a sustainable society. The classic example here is Anita Roddick of Body Shop fame, who clearly fits the visionary, energetic and charismatic descriptions (Roddick 1992).

The ‘ethical maverick’ type of green entrepreneur is characterised by a sustainability orientation and soft structural influences. In other words, the most significant influences on the business formation have been friends, networks and past experiences rather than visions of changing the world. With a sustainability, value-driven motivation, these people might tend to set up alternative-style businesses on the fringes of society.

---

2 This and the following examples are derived from secondary published data.
rather than establishing mainstream organisations. Apparent examples of this type of green entrepreneur are the founders of the ‘On the 8th Day’ vegetarian cafe and health-food shop in Manchester. The partnership was set up in 1970, ‘in the height of the hippie era’, with ethical and environmental values at the heart of the business (Hawthorne 2001). It later became a co-operative.

The final category—the ‘ad hoc enviropreneur’—is a kind of accidental green entrepreneur. The motivation of such people is financial not value-driven and they are influenced most by personal networks, family and friends. An example would be the fictional character Tom Archer in the long-running UK BBC Radio 4 drama The Archers. The child of an organic farmer, he sets up his own organic pork business. The fact that his parents are committed and fairly successful organic farmers provides a supportive sociocultural background. Tom wants some degree of independence and to prove himself as a successful businessman in his own right. Organic pork production happens to be a complementary activity to the rest of the family business. It is not a product for which development has been specifically encouraged by government subsidies or driven by environmental regulation or even particularly encouraged by the ‘market pull’ of consumer demand.

As quoted earlier, typologies, unlike classification systems, do not provide decision rules (Kolk and Mauser 2002). Instead, they identify multiple ideal types, each of which represents a unique combination of the attributes that are believed to determine the relevant outcome. If we assume that the same interpretations can be made of people-oriented typologies—in this case, green entrepreneurs—as with organisational typologies, then the more closely an entrepreneur resembles the ideal type, the more effectively he or she will be described by the typology. However, for this green entrepreneur typology one might challenge the Kolk and Mauser interpretation that typologies do not, or should not, deal with development over time. Given that entrepreneurs tend to ‘reinvent’ their businesses over time, the evolution of a particular entrepreneur might see him or her moving from one ideal type to another. For example, an examination of Anita Roddick’s business history (Roddick 1992) might suggest that the term ethical maverick and/or innovative opportunist could have been appropriate descriptions for her at different times.

Conclusions

Having reviewed the concepts of entrepreneurship and greening, approaches to classifying entrepreneurs and the literature on green entrepreneurs, a typology of green entrepreneurs has been constructed. In this paper we have argued that the definition of green entrepreneurs should be wide, encompassing not only ecopreneurs (individuals who set up businesses founded on the principle of sustainability) but also opportunist entrepreneurs who happen to have found a green niche. Although we support the view that ecopreneurs are crucial change agents driving the sustainability transformation process, we suggest that it is important to investigate the motives of all types of green entrepreneurs because—from structuration logic (Giddens 1984)—all green businesses contribute towards the move to a sustainable society. Secondary research has suggested that entrepreneurs are best characterised by a combination of internal motivations and external (hard and soft) structural influences. The resulting typology produced four ‘ideal types’ of green entrepreneurs: innovative opportunists, visionary champions, ethical mavericks and ad hoc enviropreneurs.

This typology is intended to provide a useful framework for further research into the influences on and motivations of green entrepreneurs. For example, to what extent do
new green entrepreneurs fit these theoretical types and (if they do), what is the relative proportion of opportunists, mavericks, champions and ad hoc enviropreneurs? Policy-makers interested in encouraging a greener society would find it useful to know to what extent potential green entrepreneurs are encouraged by economic incentives in comparison with intrinsic sustainability motivations. Similarly, the typology has potential value in understanding why existing businesses decide to become greener. This paper also points towards an interesting debate on the connections between entrepreneurship and Isaak's firm–society concept of green-green as a dominant production–consumption mode for a future society that would be vastly different than today's 'business-as-usual' mode. Dominant modes of production and consumption create and are created by the action of firms. The two-way nature of this relationship could either reinforce the status quo or be the engine of change. The role that green entrepreneurs and green SMEs play in this interactive relationship between firms and society warrants further investigation.
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