

---

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT THROUGH SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

---

### **Antoinette Lombard**

Professor in Social Work and Head of Department of Social Work and Criminology, University of Pretoria  
antoinette.lombard@up.ac.za

### **Retha Strydom**

Lecturer in entrepreneurship in the Department of Business Management, University of Pretoria  
retha.strydom@up.ac.za

### **ABSTRACT**

*All sectors in South Africa, including the social welfare sector, are challenged to join efforts in finding new solutions to reduce the consistently high levels of poverty and unemployment which impact on citizens' economic and social freedom. Within the context of a developmental approach social entrepreneurship provides social work with an avenue to engage communities in their own development. This requires a refocus of social workers on their role in poverty reduction and social development, and hence in direct and indirect economic activities. This refocusing will be demonstrated by discussing how social work students had to shift their mindset and change their attitude with regard to their role in poverty reduction and social development before they could fully embrace and engage in social entrepreneurship projects that benefitted the community. In conclusion, it will be indicated how this learning experience challenges social workers to utilise social entrepreneurship.*

---

**Key words:** community development, entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, social work, social development, poverty

---

## INTRODUCTION

Poverty, unemployment, and the need for faster economic growth remain key challenges for development in South Africa (RSA, 2010a; 2010b). In the second quarter of 2010, the overall unemployment rate was 25,3% (Statistics South Africa, 2010) and the youth unemployment rate is currently 42% (RSA, 2011a). This is extremely disturbing given the fact youth unemployment is a worldwide phenomenon (Green, 2008), and of even more concern in South Africa, as recently emphasised by the Minister in the Presidency Planning Commission, Trevor Manuel, in view of the country's huge inequality in education and access to quality education (RSA, 2011a).

The progress made on poverty during the seventeen years of democracy is most visible in government's efforts in redistributive measures, including investments in services such as sanitation, electricity, and housing (RSA, 2010b), and in expenditure on the 'social wage', including access to health services and education, as well as social, transport, and municipal infrastructure (RSA, 2011b). The State President declared 2011 as "a year of job creation through meaningful economic transformation and inclusive growth" (RSA, 2011c:5). It is promising that this includes promoting entrepreneurship and youth employment (RSA, 2010a).

In the 2011 State of the Nation Address, the President called on all government departments to align their programmes with the job creation imperative. His plea was: "We cannot create these jobs alone. We have to work with business, labour and the community constituencies" (RSA, 2011c:5).

In the context of this paper, the 'inclusive approach, broad-based development path', engages all sectors, including social welfare and social work. Already in 2006, the Department of Social Development alluded to the lack of a proactive and deliberate strategy to link social grant beneficiaries to opportunities for economic activity: "A more holistic approach needs to be deployed that links social grants beneficiaries and the unemployed to poverty alleviation and economic activity" (Department of Social Development, 2006:7). If the intention was for it to be the Department of Social Development's responsibility alone to respond to delivering on this goal, it was made clear what government's sentiments now are in the profound statement by the President in the 2011 State of the Nation address: "Since we are building a development and not a welfare state, the social grants will be linked to economic activity and community development, to enable short-term beneficiaries to become self-supporting in the long run" (RSA, 2011c:3). This commitment is consistent with a rights-based approach to social

protection (Green, 2008), and provides a direct link with entrepreneurship. Botha (2009:30) states, “Due to low economic growth, high unemployment and an unsatisfactory level of poverty in South Africa, entrepreneurship becomes a critical solution [to the problem of unemployment]”.

The search for new anti-poverty strategies embedded in a human rights-based approach is in line with a developmental social welfare approach. The quest for inclusive, broad-based development refocuses social work’s attention on its role in poverty reduction and community development, and its position as social partner in development by utilising intervention strategies such as social entrepreneurship. It also focuses on the ongoing debate in social work on the role of social work in economic development. In this paper the discussion will focus first on social work and social and economic development in relation to poverty, then contextualise community development as a strategy for social development. This will be followed by a broad discussion of entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship, and how social entrepreneurship could be a means to address some of the challenges for social workers in community development. Next, it will look at how social entrepreneurship can be promoted through its introduction at the student level in the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) programme at the University of Pretoria. This discussion will include how students had to shift their mindset and change their attitude with regard to their role in poverty reduction and social development before they could fully embrace and engage in social entrepreneurship projects that benefitted the community. The conclusion will include challenges and recommendations for social work.

## **SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Social workers hold different opinions as to their responsibility in economic activities (cf. Midgley, 2010). The debate on the role of social work in economic development is important to contextualise social entrepreneurship as a strategy for community development. With the adoption of the developmental approach to social welfare as mandated by the White Paper for Social Welfare (RSA, 1997), social workers have, in principle, committed themselves to social development, which implies “... promoting people’s welfare in conjunction with a comprehension process of economic development” (Midgley, 1995:25).

Whether or not social work has a role in economic development is no longer a debate. Social programmes have come a long way since they were accused of consuming scarce public resources (Raheim, 1996), and are now recognised as having a social investment function that contributes positively

to development (Midgley and Conley, 2010). The debate now is rather how involved social work is, or should be, in direct economic activities. Midgley and Conley (2010) outline how social workers can influence human, social, and economic capital development in both a direct and indirect manner. Indirect influencing of the economy includes empowering and supporting local people in communities to handle problems of racism, discrimination, and exploitation by educating them about these issues; challenging exploitative and oppressive power structures; supporting the expansion of education, nutrition, health, access to medical care, maternal and child health services, and family planning; and providing adequate day care services that not only facilitate the employment of parents, but generate human capital through preschool education, nutrition, and medical services (Midgley and Conley, 2010). Social workers can contribute to direct community economic development by supporting local people in establishing a variety of economic projects, including cooperative micro-enterprises, savings associations, after-school homework classes, adult literacy classes, day-care centres, job training, and job referral programmes provided by non-profit organisations (Midgley and Conley, 2010).

Many NGOs and social workers engage in both direct and indirect economic activities. From the perspective of integrated social and economic development, the creation of economic opportunities for the poor includes the provision of basic social services in the areas of healthcare, education, family planning, nutrition, and primary education (Hall and Midgley, 2004). A research study by Lombard (2008) indicated that social work has made inroads in contributing to economic development, and hence in integrating human, social, and economic development. In a study by Engelbrecht (2008) social workers indicated that 41 percent of the households they handled were over-indebted and that service beneficiaries borrowed money and incurred debts that they were unable to manage. This is exacerbated by their access to credit and due to their vulnerability of being exploited by business sales techniques under the guise of assistance and services (Engelbrecht, 2009). Most social workers indicated that they tried to teach service beneficiaries some form of budgeting skills; however, this was done mainly on an individual basis (Engelbrecht, 2008).

Social workers' view of poverty is both central to and a determining factor for their involvement in economic activities. This was confirmed by Engelbrecht (2009) in a study of social workers regarding their view of economic literacy and poverty. He concluded that the social workers' attitude to poverty determined their views on intervention; overall they did not believe that economic development was part of the social work task

(Engelbrecht, 2009). The social workers believed that there was no clear mandate as to their role in social service delivery to service users living in poverty (Engelbrecht, 2009). They were, in fact, “highly sceptical” of their role in promoting economic development (Engelbrecht, 2009:170). What is of significance is that none talked specifically about the relationship between social and economic development (Engelbrecht, 2009). Although this only reflects the view of social workers in one NGO in one province, it is significant for the argument in this paper that social workers will engage much more easily in social and economic development activities, community development, and introducing new innovative strategies such as social entrepreneurship if they understand their role in poverty reduction.

## **SOCIAL WORK, POVERTY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Historically, the social work profession has been committed to eradicating poverty (Midgley, 1996). Social work is at the frontline in working with people confronted with poverty, and thus the vulnerable and at-risk. (Engelbrecht, 2009; Lombard, 2003). Unemployment has increased the vulnerability of many households, and because people do not have secure and sustainable livelihoods, many turn to the welfare system for food security, income maintenance, and social support (Lombard, 2003).

Poverty is both a social issue and an economic phenomenon (Thin, 2002), and requires economic growth that will facilitate integrated social and economic development programmes. Economic growth in itself is no guarantee that poverty will be eradicated (Hall and Midgley, 2004). According to Green (2008:189), “economic growth is an essential way to tackle poverty and inequality, but the quality of that growth matters as much as the quantity. Development strategists can seek to manage growth so that it maximises human welfare.” Sen (2007:3-4) captures this relationship aptly:

*“We have every reason to want economic growth, not for its own sake, but as Aristotle put it, for the sake of something else, to wit, the bettering of human lives. We have to look beyond economic advancement. This is where social development provides a fuller and more far-reaching perspective than economic development seen on its own can possibly provide... if we do not pay adequate attention to social development, then the rewards of even very high rates of economic growth can be far less than they could have been with well aimed social policies and practices.”*

Clearly, as Minister in the Presidency and chairperson of the National Planning Commission, Trevor Manuel, says, to tackle and overcome the

ravages of poverty and underdevelopment, “we will have to be conscious of the fact that poverty is far more than the lack or deficiency in income” (RSA, 2011a:2). Sen (2008:xiii) refers to a shortage of income as the “classic view” of poverty, and argues that poverty has ultimately to be seen as “unfreedoms” of various kinds, such as the lack of freedom to achieve minimally satisfactory living conditions; the absence of health facilities; the subjugation of women; hazardous environmental features; and the shortage of jobs. In this context, the Minister of Finance refers in his Budget speech to all South Africans aspiring to freedom from poverty (RSA, 2011b).

These freedoms imply rights; however, rights alone are not enough (Green, 2008). Individuals need capabilities, and thus rights and the ability to exercise those rights (Sen, in Green, 2008). Having a right but not the opportunity to exercise that right increases vulnerability, which, according to Green (2008), describes the reduced ability of some communities or households to cope with the events and stresses to which they are exposed. Reducing vulnerability is thus “crucial in the fight against poverty and inequality” (Green, 2008:201). To make sure that deficiencies are removed and opportunities utilised, requires “enhancement of the power of people, especially of the afflicted people” (Sen, 2008:xiii). According to Green (2008) there is no single policy path for poor countries to achieve welfare-enhancing growth. The risks that poor people encounter can best be managed through a combination of protection (by the state or the international community) and empowerment of the individuals concerned, a combination known as ‘human security’ (Green, 2008). Human security involves the same two core elements as the fight against poverty: active citizens who organise to assert their rights, and effective states that work to fulfil those rights (Green, 2008). Active citizens can mobilise their empowerment through community development.

## **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

As a strategy for social development (Midgley, 1995), community development provides a pathway for social workers who work in communities to extend their focus on social programmes to include economic development activities and programmes. The argument that community social workers should be directly involved in economic development projects that contribute to poverty reduction is well captured by Midgley (2010:176) when he says “After all, this was a primary goal of the professions’ founders more than a century ago”.

Lombard (2003) describes how social workers can shift from a general community development strategy to one that focuses on community economic development, and thus on integrated human, social, and economic development. Harris (1998) adds that about 90 percent of successful community (economic) enterprises have first gone through a community development process, and therefore, in his view, “the distinction between community business oriented groups and those with a social-service function is largely one of degree” (Harris, 1998:36).

The local community has long been regarded as a vital resource for the development effort (Hall and Midgley, 2004:73). Inclusive growth and a broad-based path to development imply the involvement of those who are supposed to benefit from anti-poverty strategies. This requires participatory and inside-out community approaches (Wilson, 1996; Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993) that look holistically at development. Community development is based on the idea that local people, supported by external resources, can implement programmes that significantly reduce the extent of poverty and social deprivation (Hall and Midgley, 2004). It is thus the focus on community participation which stresses the importance of an activist style of intervention that relies less on the provision of services than on the active involvement of the poor in these interventions (Midgley, Hall, Hardiman and Narine, 1986, in Hall and Midgley, 2004) that makes community development an attractive strategy for integrated social and economic development. It promotes empowerment, self-determination, and community-based poverty eradication programmes that place greater emphasis on economic activities to raise the incomes and standards of living of the poor (Hall and Midgley, 2004).

Sachs (2005:239), after meeting with slum dwellers in an urban poor community in Mumbai, India, affirmed the importance of empowerment in social and economic development as follows:

*“The overarching theme of our discussion is not latrines, running water and safety from the trains, but empowerment: specifically, the group is discussing how slum dwellers who own virtually nothing have found a voice, a strategy for negotiating the city government. What they need is skills to negotiate for what they want...”*

It is the participatory and empowerment imperative that “social [and] not just economic development is central to the progress of humanity” (Sen, 2007:1) that makes social entrepreneurship an avenue for social work to actively

engage the poor and the vulnerable to use opportunities and exercise their ability according to their right to find a voice and human dignity.

## **SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

This paper focuses on social entrepreneurship, which is not a new phenomenon, although it is new “in language” (Botha, 2009:43). Social entrepreneurs have always been part of communities, even if they were not called by that name (Dees, 1998 in Botha, 2009). But what differentiates social entrepreneurial initiatives from other social initiatives and other entrepreneurial initiatives? There are numerous contemporary definitions for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs (Herrington, Kew and Kew, 2009). For the purposes of this paper, the following definition will apply: “An entrepreneur is a person who sees an opportunity in the market, gathers resources and creates and grows a business venture to meet these needs. He or she bears the risk of the venture and is rewarded with profit if it succeeds.” (Nieuwenhuizen and Nieman, 2009:9).

Social entrepreneurship is still poorly defined and the boundaries with other fields of study are still vague (Mair and Marti, 2005). It means different things to different people. “It can be viewed as a process of creating value by combining resources in new ways” (Stevenson, Roberts and Grousbeck, 1989, and Schumpeter, 1934, in Mair and Marti, 2005:3). These “resource combinations can be used to exploit opportunities to create social value by stimulating social change” (Alvord, Brown and Letts, 2004, in Mair and Marti, 2005:3) or meeting social needs. From a process perspective, social entrepreneurship involves the offering of services and products, and can refer to the creation of new organisations (Mair and Marti, 2005).

Social entrepreneurship is driven by social entrepreneurs, who are defined by Dees (1998, in Botha, 2009:43) as follows:

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

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),
- Recognising and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,
- Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,
- Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and
- Exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.



Social work is always confronted with a lack of resources. In the true spirit of social entrepreneurship, social workers and organisations are change agents who can associate with efforts to combine resources so as to exploit opportunities in search of new anti-poverty interventions that will impact on social and economic development. The key challenge for social work is to mobilise communities to seek opportunities, since opportunity recognition lies at the heart of entrepreneurship, be it social or commercial (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillem, 2006, in Corner and Ho, 2010; Mair and Marti, 2005). Business entrepreneurs see value in the creation of new markets, while social entrepreneurs find value in the “form of transformational change that will benefit disadvantaged communities and ultimately society at large” (Botha, 2009:43).

Entrepreneurial activity is seen as important for economic development through job creation, innovation, and its effect on welfare (Herrington, et al., 2009). However, research by Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) has shown that, in comparison to the rest of the developing world, South Africa lags behind in promoting early-stage entrepreneurial activity; in other words, the start-up phase where the activity is less than three months old (Herrington et al., 2009). In 2008 South Africa’s early-stage entrepreneurial rate was 7,8 percent, compared to other developing countries, which averaged 13 percent (Herrington, Kew and Kew, 2008, in Herrington et al., 2009). This is not favourable for job creation and employment. In contrast, in a global comparison of social entrepreneurial activity, it was found that early-stage social entrepreneurship activity in South Africa was 1,8 percent, which was the same as the average rate across all 49 GEM countries, where it ranges from 0,1 percent to 4,3 percent (Herrington et al., 2009). The profile of the average social entrepreneur in South Africa indicates that there is no significant difference in social entrepreneurial activity in the different population groups. On average, social entrepreneurs seem to be well educated, with 47 percent having completed high school, 8 percent having obtained a post-matric qualification, and 4 percent having obtained a tertiary qualification (Herrington et al., 2009). Education is thus important for generating more social entrepreneurs. What is a concern is the male-to-female ratio, which is 2.6:1, showing that women are under-represented in social entrepreneurial activities (Herrington et al., 2009). Another concern is the age group with the greatest number of social entrepreneurs, namely the 25 to 44 age group, which is in contrast with other developing countries, where most entrepreneurs are aged 18 to 24 (Herrington et al., 2009). This is a direct reflection on the high unemployment rate of South African youth, which interrelates with inadequate education, and a lack of skills and confidence in their capabilities. The lower social entrepreneurial activity

amongst adults in the rural areas, namely 1.5 compared to 1.8 in the metro cities and 2.6 in other urban areas (towns), is also of concern, and could be the result of more constraints in terms of lack of infrastructure, distance from markets, small and poor communities, lower education levels, and lower technology-related skills (Herrington et al., 2009). The GEM South Africa Report (Herrington et al., 2009) clearly shows the multi-faceted face of poverty and the challenges that it poses for entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship.

A low level of early-stage entrepreneurial and social entrepreneurial activity is an indication that the creation of jobs is low, which has an impact on the economic development and social welfare of communities. Dees (2007) argues that social and business entrepreneurs can create new opportunities through innovation and resource mobilisation. He is of the opinion that social entrepreneurs can tailor their efforts according to different communities or markets in ways that it is difficult for government programmes to achieve, because “Independent social entrepreneurs have access to private resources [voluntary gifts of money, time, in-kind donations...social investment, or earned income from their business ventures], while contributions to government are relatively rare” (Dees, 2007:26). As social partners, social entrepreneurs have an important role to play that will complement government’s efforts. According to Dees, (2007:27): “They are better positioned to innovate and experiment than government agencies”. This is in line with the plea of the State President in the State of the Nation Address: “We urge *every sector* [own emphasis] and every business entity, regardless of size, to focus on job creation.” (RSA, 2011c:5). Although some social workers already incorporate entrepreneurial and social entrepreneurship activities into their work in communities, this did not come about without either formal training or the utilisation of self-inspired learning opportunities linked to their entrepreneurial characteristics (cf. Lombard, 2008). Prigoff (2000) affirms that, aside from having the vision and the right attitude to engage in sustainable livelihood practice through economic development activities, social workers are also challenged to build their capacity in business management and increase their entrepreneurial, financial, and marketing skills. The best place to start this learning process, however, is on the student level.

## **SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

The University of Pretoria saw an opportunity to do just this when the minimum standards for the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW), registered on the National Qualification Framework since 2003, included *Economics* as an

elective option. In accordance with the developmental social welfare approach, the University of Pretoria decided to include modules with an economic focus as core modules rather than electives in its BSW programme from 2002. It is thus imperative that all students in the BSW programme take two business management modules, one of which focuses on entrepreneurship.

In their third year, entrepreneurship students in the Faculty of Economic and Business Management Sciences are exposed to a reality-based active learning process in conjunction with a conventional teaching approach. The Faculty presents the subject entrepreneurship both to their own students and to students of other faculties as an elective module. The entry requirement for students from other faculties, including social work students, who wish to take the subject entrepreneurship in their third year is a first-year level semester module in business management. The learning outcomes of the elective entrepreneurship module are focused on idea generation, gathering of resources, and the starting-up and running of a small entrepreneurial business. The aim of the student entrepreneurship programmes is to produce more competent entrepreneurs who possess the ability to develop new ventures with a high growth potential, and the students have to start real business ventures in class as group projects. The long-term goal for the groups is to develop businesses that could be part of their future when they leave university (Strydom and Adams, 2009); however, some students, including social work students, continue with their business whilst they are still studying.

Initially there was strong resistance from the social work students to having to take the business management modules, which resulted in very low student engagement and, in turn, poor performance in the modules. Chapman (2003, in Zepke and Leach, 2010:168) defines student engagement as the students' "cognitive investment in, active participation in and emotional commitment to their learning". For the first three years the students lacked all these elements. This was exacerbated by the initial third year group transferring their negativity to the following third year groups, which resulted in a systemic negativity around the modules. It was at this juncture when the two departments involved realised the real extent of the collective nature of the problem amongst the students. Because both the then Department of Social Work and the Department of Business Management realised the importance of the modules for the social work students' future tasks in community development, they decided to intervene by exploring the origins of the students' negativity rather than discarding the modules as the students demanded. They identified the main issues as the students' lack of

confidence in their own competencies in terms of business management and their failure to see the value of the courses in their future careers. It was only then that the departments realised that the third year students had to be orientated with regard to how the module fits within the broader social work curriculum and what a developmental approach to the social work profession means with regard to social workers' role in poverty reduction and social development. It was not sufficient to orientate the students on the composition of the social work curriculum only in their first year level of study; for the business module in entrepreneurship, it had to be done at the commencement of their third year of studies as well. These issues were addressed by both departments. It was, however, necessary to orientate both the social work students and staff on the importance of the module so that they could work in partnership to achieve the learning outcomes of the module and prepare the students for their future role in community development. Third year students' field placement supervisors played a particularly important role in inspiring students to select relevant social entrepreneurial activities that they could link with community development interventions, which is one of the outcomes of their social work practice module. To further motivate the students, they were allowed to start social entrepreneurial projects or ventures instead of pure business projects. Much emphasis was put on motivating and supporting the students in order to build their confidence.

Since the initial inclusion of the business management modules in the social work syllabus, the projects or business ventures the students undertake have changed from small-to-average businesses to ventures where unique opportunities are identified. The students are now creative in gathering their resources to exploit these opportunities, which has contributed to the welfare of the communities. Examples are an aftercare centre that was organised around an existing church centre, with resources from the community; a painting project to beautify schools; a hub for young people to gather socially to express themselves in art; and ventures with the potential to create jobs. The latter category includes, amongst many others, creating beadwork greeting cards in indigenous languages in rural areas, toffee apples with messages, and extravagantly decorated umbrellas. New products were also developed, such as a board game for skill development and a trash bin for informal settlements, where people are rewarded when discarding trash, which required an impressive level of involvement from different sectors of the community, confirming that community development can be achieved through social entrepreneurship. Most importantly, the students learned how to identify social problems in the community and to respond to these problems in a way that is beneficial for the community.

From the above examples, it is evident that the turn-around in attitude and performance was remarkable in how it changed the students' approach. Zepke and Leach (2010:170) support the collaborative and reality-based active learning approach by stressing that "self-determination is enhanced where supportive social-contextual conditions exist to promote feelings of competence... When institutions provide opportunities for students .... to develop their sense of competence, students are more likely to be motivated". Furthermore, Zepke and Leach (2010) support the notion of active learning in groups, as the "student gains in personal and social development, practical competence, greater effort and deeper engagement" (Zhao and Kuh, 2004, in Zepke and Leach, 2010:171). Most important, though, is that the reality-based active learning approach helps "the students [to] become aware of themselves and their potential to effect change in a world that is open, fluid and contested" (Zepke and Leach, 2010:173).

The learning environment in the entrepreneurship module turned into a very positive experience where the social work students brought a wealth of knowledge and experiences from their discipline to every class, which enriched the module and created awareness about the possibilities in social entrepreneurship. Once the students understood the importance of their contribution in class and that they could have an influence on the future through social entrepreneurship, their performance in class improved remarkably. Since 2007, every year social work students have featured in the top five students in the module, as reflected in the annual results of the Department of Business Management. More important than this, however, is the fact that the students will be able to transfer the learning that they have acquired to the broader world (Smith and Van Doren, 2004:67).

## **CONCLUSION**

Social entrepreneurship can create opportunities for employment and income generation, especially amongst the youth. It provides the opportunity for an inclusive model for economic development through which vulnerable people can become empowered to have a voice in their own development and live with human dignity.

As change agents, social workers are well positioned to utilise community development as an avenue to integrate social and economic development projects within their roles in community development. In order to succeed, however, social workers are challenged in the following ways:

Social entrepreneurship requires that social workers refocus on their primary goal and role in poverty reduction and social development. This requires that they develop a positive attitude towards their role in both direct and indirect economic activities, and that they actively engage communities, seeking opportunities for social entrepreneurship.

Modelled on the social work students' experience, it is clear that social workers can successfully combine a reality-based active learning process in community development to seek opportunities for social entrepreneurship. By engaging student social workers in entrepreneurship training, universities can produce more competent entrepreneurs who possess the ability to develop new ventures with a high growth potential.

Social workers in practice should allow new practitioners with a business management and entrepreneurship background to engage in community development activities where they can transfer their skills to communities. In addition, they can mobilise their organisations and their colleagues to embrace a broader vision of the social work profession's role in development, one that integrates human, social, and economic development, irrespective of the specialised field in which they are working.

Social workers should engage in training opportunities in entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship to broaden their perspective on development "as a process of expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy" by focusing on human freedoms, in contrast with "narrower views of development..." (Sen, 1999:3).

In view of the positive link between social entrepreneurs and level of education, social workers play a major role in human development by mobilising communities to negotiate and advocate for adequate resources for education. Furthermore, communities can promote human development by encouraging school children to complete their secondary level of education and inspire them to actively engage in entrepreneurial and social entrepreneurship activities, which will, in return, give them the skills and confidence to seek opportunities for employment.

Although the private sector plays a huge role in job creation, government and its social partners also play a major role in addressing unemployment and poverty (cf. RSA, 2011c). Social work has an important role in promoting people's right to protection, alongside their right to development, which facilitates 'human security' (Green, 2008). A major challenge for social work is to engage in facilitating links between social grants and economic

activities. Is it possible to achieve this through social entrepreneurship? If “Effective states and active citizens offer the best guarantee that the market can deliver both wealth creation and improved human welfare” (Green, 2008:191), community development provides a compelling avenue for social work to mobilise citizens to actively engage in economic and social activities that will empower them to seek opportunities to start their own initiatives, and, in the process of combining their own resources and negotiating for government resources towards this effort, hold the State accountable to provide a conducive environment to facilitate their independence.

## REFERENCES

Botha, M. (2009). “The Entrepreneur” in Nieman, G. and Nieuwenhuizen, C. (Ed.). *Entrepreneurship: A South African Perspective* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers, Second Edition, 29-51.

Corner, P.D. and Ho, M. (2010). “How Opportunities Develop in Social Entrepreneurship” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 34:635-659.

Dees, G. (2007). “Taking Social Entrepreneurship Seriously” *Society* 44(3):24-31.

Department of Social Development. (2006). *Linking Social Grants Beneficiaries to Poverty Alleviation and Economic Activity*. Discussion Document, 1 November.

Engelbrecht, L. (2008). “Economic Literacy and the War on Poverty: A Social Work Challenge” *International Journal of Social Welfare* 17(2):166-173.

Engelbrecht, L. (2009). “Indebtedness of Financially Vulnerable Households: What Do Social Workers Do?” *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk* 45(2): 154-170.

Green, D. (2008). *From Poverty to Power: How Active Citizens and Effective States Can Change the World* Auckland Park: Jacana Media with Oxfam International.

Hall, A. and Midgley, J. (2004). *Social Policy for Development* London: SAGE Publications.

Harris, K. (1998). "Problems in Community Enterprise and Community Economic Development" in Twelvetrees, A. (Ed.). *Community Economic Rhetoric or Reality?* London: Community Development Foundation, 36-42.

Herrington, M., Kew, J. and Kew, P. (2009). "Tracking Entrepreneurship in South Africa: A GEM Perspective",  
<http://www.gemconsortium.org/download/1304097516821/GEM%20SA%202009%20-%20Tracking%20Entrepreneurship....pdf>  
 (Accessed on 15/4/2011).

Kretzmann, J.P. and McKnight, J.L. (1993). *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets* Chicago: The Asset-based Community Development Institute.

Lombard, A. (2003). "Entrepreneurship in Africa: Social Work Challenges for Human, Social and Economic Development" *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk* 39(3):224-239.

Lombard, A. (2008). "Social Work: A Social Partner in Economic Development" *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk* 44(2):121-142.

Mair, J. and Marti, I. (2005). "Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight" *Working Paper* University of Navarra IESE: Business School, 1-17.

Midgley, J. (1995). *Social Development: The Developmental Perspective in Social Welfare* London: SAGE Publications.

Midgley, J. (1996). "Involving Social Work in Economic Development" *International Social Work* 39(1996):13-25.

Midgley, J. (2010). "Community Practice and Developmental Social Work" in Midgley, J. and Conley, A. (Eds). *Social Work and Social Development. Theories and Skills for Developmental Social Work* New York: Oxford University Press, 167-204.

Midgley, J. and Conley, A. (2010). "Introduction" in Midgley, J. and Conley, A. (Eds). *Social Work and Social Development. Theories and Skills for Developmental Social Work* New York: Oxford University Press, xiii-xx.

Nieuwenhuizen, C. and Nieman, G. (2009). "The Nature and Development of Entrepreneurship" in Nieman, G. and Nieuwenhuizen, C. (Ed.) *Entrepreneur-*



*ship. A South African Perspective* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers, Second Edition, 3-28.

Prigoff, A. (2000). *Economics for Social Workers: Social Outcomes of Economic Globalisation with Strategies for Community Action* Belmont: Brooks/Cole.

Raheim, S. (1996). "Micro-Enterprise as an Approach for Promoting Economic Development in Social Work: Lessons From the Self-Employment Investment Demonstration" *International Social Work* 39(1996):69-82.

Republic of South Africa. (1997). Ministry for Welfare and Population Development. White Paper for Social Welfare. Notice 1108 of 1997. *Government Gazette* 386(18166) Pretoria: Government Printers.

Republic of South Africa. (2010a). *Budget Speech* by Pravin Gordhan, Minister of Finance. Joint sitting of Parliament. Cape Town, 17 February.

Republic of South Africa. (2010b). *Millennium Development Goals Country Report*, [http://www.statssa.gov.za/news\\_archive/Docs/MDGR\\_2010.pdf](http://www.statssa.gov.za/news_archive/Docs/MDGR_2010.pdf) (Accessed on 15/01/2011).

Republic of South Africa. (2011a). "The Role of Legislatures in Achieving the MDGs – Overview of South Africa's Progress". Address by Trevor Manuel, Minister in the Presidency Planning Commission, at the Legislative Sector 2011 Consultative Seminar. Parliament. Cape Town, 16 March, <http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/pebble.asp?releid=3679> (Accessed on 15/04/2011).

Republic of South Africa. (2011b). *Budget Speech* by Pravin Gordhan, Minister of Finance. Joint sitting of Parliament. Cape Town, 23 February.

Republic of South Africa. (2011c). *State of the Nation Address* by his Excellency J.G. Zuma, President of the Republic of South Africa. Joint sitting of Parliament. Cape Town, 10 February.

Sachs, J. (2005). *The End of Poverty: How We Can Make it Happen in Our Lifetime* London: Penguin Books.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom* New York: Anchor Books.

- Sen, A. (2007). "Unity and Discord in Social Development". *Keynote Address by Nobel Laureate in Economics*. The 15<sup>th</sup> Symposium of the International Consortium for Social Development. Hong Kong, 16-20 July.
- Sen, A. (2008). "Foreword" in Green, D. *From Poverty to Power: How Active Citizens and Effective States Can Change the World* Auckland Park: Jacana Media with Oxfam International.
- Smith, L.W. and Van Doren, D.C. (2004). "The Reality-Based Learning Method: A Simple Method for Keeping Teaching Activities Relevant and Effective" *Journal of Marketing Education* 26:66-74.
- Statistics South Africa. (2010). "Unemployment: Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS)", <http://www.statssa.gov.za/PublicationsHTML/P03022010/html/P03022010.html> (Accessed on 27/07/2010).
- Strydom, R. and Adams, M. (2009). "Evaluating the Learning Experience of Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Students Exposed to an Unconventional Teaching Approach: A South African Case Study" *Southern African Journal for Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management* 2(1):50-67.
- Thin, N. (2002). *Social Progress and Sustainable Development* Bloomfield: Kumarian Press.
- Wilson, P.A. (1996). "Empowerment: Community Economic Development From the Inside Out" *Urban Studies* 33(4-5):617-630.
- Zepke, N. and Leach, L. (2010). "Improving Student Engagement: Ten Proposals for Action" *Active Learning in Higher Education* 11:167-176.