

Impact of Social Entrepreneurship on Youth Economic Empowerment in Kaduna Meropolis, Kaduna-Nigeria

Yusuf A. Hashim* Precious C. Ezeh Sanusi Lawal
Department of Business Administration, Federal University Gusau, Zamfara State, Nigeria

Acknowledgement: *The authors would like to acknowledge and graciously thank the Federal University Gusau and the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TetFund) for funding this research project under grant allocation number "TETFUND/DESS/UNI/GUSAU/RP/VOL.1"*

1. Introduction

There are certain kinds of people who garner enormous satisfaction from successfully taking on a "mission impossible" and, by so doing, actually manage to change the world, or wherever they live, sometimes in surprising ways. Such individuals are rare, and when we become aware of them and their astonishing achievements, we observe that they cannot easily be ignored. Such individuals are the products of rural as well as urban areas; of developing as well as developed countries; of large cities as well as remote areas; they may be Hausas/Fulanis from Northern Nigeria, or Yorubas from the South-Western Nigeria, or Igbos from the South-Eastern Nigeria, or other tribes like the Tivs, Gwaris and Nupes from north-central Nigeria, Kanuris from the northeastern Nigeria. They may be well-known figures, such as Gen. Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida, Gen. TY Danjuma, Gen. Aliyu Mohammed Gusau, Alhaji Atiku Abubakar (Wazirin Adamawa), Alhaji Aminu Dantata, Alhaji Aliko Dangote, or anonymous, unrecognized individuals from cities and small villages in Nigeria and elsewhere.

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as a contemporary issue in the social arena. It is a concept well suited for our age because it makes a call for entrepreneurial activities to spearhead the resolving of social issues in our communities; since many governmental and charitable efforts have failed to meet the existing social needs (Dees, 2001). Societies are dealing with social challenges such as youth unemployment, poverty, hunger, terrorism, floods, health care challenges, infrastructural inadequacies, and maternal mortality, among others. All these challenges are capable of affecting the social wellbeing of individuals. Life can only be interesting if there are tools and strategies readily available for dealing with these challenges. Social challenges at different levels (global, national or regional) require special strategies and tools for handling them. The complexities of social challenges experienced in most parts of Nigeria, especially Kaduna metropolis demands a more creative and innovative approach in balancing these pressures and constraints geared towards overcoming these challenges as well as initializing sustainable development in our communities.

Youth unemployment partly contributes to illicit activity, which increases insecurity. A study conducted in England and Wales on the link between unemployment and crime suggests that youth unemployment and the different types of crimes are significantly and positively correlated (Carmichael and Ward, 2001). Sustained unemployment could also cause young people to be hostile to the world of work and more receptive to drugs and crime (Nattrass, 2002). Lack of employment opportunities has contributed to increasing feminization of poverty all over Africa. It has also encouraged prostitution as a means of survival in several African towns and cities. Furthermore, it has encouraged human trafficking across international borders to engage in prostitution. Women migrants trafficked to Western Europe in Africa come mainly from Ghana, Nigeria and Morocco (Taylor, 2002; Aghatise, 2002).

Social entrepreneurship focuses on the identification of social challenges and the adoption of innovative and entrepreneurial approaches targeted at proffering short and long term solutions. Social entrepreneurship connotes selfless entrepreneurial efforts, undertaking, and strategy geared towards production of social impact. It is also important to note that while social improvement to beneficiaries and communities is the main focus and drive of social entrepreneurship, investors are hugely rewarded financially or socially as well. This ensures continuous availability of adequate funding as well as sustainability of the creation of social value and development (OECD, 2011).

Individuals, governments, Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Community Based Organisations (CBOs) and other interest groups have made several attempts in providing solutions to mankind/social challenges. However, despite these attempts by these organizations, problems persists in our communities, for example; youth restiveness, boko haram militancy, cattle rustling, kidnapping, political thuggery, youth unemployment, hunger, maternal mortality, broken homes, among other social vices. Against the backdrop of the afore-mentioned problems, this study is carried out to examine the contribution of social entrepreneurship to youth economic empowerment (through skills acquisition) in Kaduna metropolis. Specifically, the study uses Mallam Garba Foundation, Kaduna as a case study.

2. Literature Review

Social entrepreneurship began to attract interest as a field of learning in the academic and practitioner circles over

a decade ago, and a substantial volume of literature on it has emerged (Noruzi, Westover, Rahimi, 2010). The attention for social entrepreneurship originated from the non-profit sector, where entrepreneurial initiatives were increasingly seen as alternative funding schemes as public funding decreased substantially (Dees, 1998). Social entrepreneurs can become very powerful players in the national and international economy. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006 to Mohammad Yunus for founding the Grameen Bank, the world's largest microfinance organization, thrust social entrepreneurship into the global spotlight (Noruzi, Westover, Rahimi, 2010).

Social entrepreneurship differs from business entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs operate in the community and are more concerned about social issues affecting the community than “profit making” as is common in business entrepreneurship (Kao, 1993). Madhuka (2006) points out that a business entrepreneur may create changes in the society, but that is not the primary purpose of starting the venture. Similarly, a social entrepreneur may generate profits, but that may not be the primary reason for starting the venture. Being 'profitable' helps self-sustainability of the venture, and also works as a mechanism for self-monitoring. Madhuka illustrates with Grameen Bank; Grameen's central focus is to help poor borrowers move out of poverty, not making money. Making profit is always recognised as a necessary condition for success to show that they are covering costs. The volume of profit is not important in Grameen in moneymaking sense, but important as an indicator of efficiency (Madhuka, 2006).

Social entrepreneurship, as a concept, is developed out of the realization that the challenges of finding effective and sustainable solutions to many social problems are substantial, and that the solutions may require many of the features associated with successful business innovations. In simple words, social entrepreneurship is seen as a response to declining government involvement in the economy and society (Sharir and Lerner, 2006; Perrini and Vurro, 2006). Social entrepreneurial companies are those whose primary goal emphasizes social value and economic value creation as a necessary condition to ensure financial viability (Dorado, 2006; Schuler and Cording, 2006). Social entrepreneurship has been described as the simultaneous pursuit of economic, social, and environmental goals by enterprising ventures, and as a human response to social and environmental problems (Haugh, 2007).

Welsh and Krueger (2009), argues that the most important components of a definition of social entrepreneurship include social problems and needs to be addressed, innovation and innovative idea, community impact, mission based, tied with sustainable, outcome-based approach, ethical accountability, multiple stakeholders served, tied with not being limited by resources, economic value creation, scalable, and risk taking in defying the odds. This definition is look somewhat combersome in the sense that it introduces issues that are out of the scope of the subject matter, for example, ethical accountability.

In another attempt, social entrepreneurship is seen as the product of individuals, organizations, and networks that challenge conventional structures by addressing failures and identifying new opportunities in the institutional arrangements that currently cause the inadequate provision or unequal distribution of social and environmental goods (Nicholls, 2009). This definition acknowledges that social entrepreneurship can happen in any form be it for individuals, in organisations and within networks. However, for social entrepreneurship to be entrepreneurial; opportunity identification is paramount, as amintained by Shaw and Carter (2007) social entrepreneurship is a significant tool in addressing social problems including unemployment, poverty, and education.

According to Jafta (2013), social entrepreneurship can help solve some developmental problems and address the lack of social cohesion in society. Community development requires the involvement of social entrepreneurs who are able to mobilize community resources for the purpose of attaining their social mission (Dhesi, 2010). A social entrepreneur is an individual, group, network, organization or alliance of organizations that seek large scale change through pattern breaking ideas about how governments, non-profits and businesses can address significant social processes (Light, 2005).

Thumbadoo and Wilson (2007:21) assert that social entrepreneurs “look at the world with new eyes”; where others see doom they see boom. That is to say social entrepreneurs act as architects of community development, by creating spectacular value where others might see a worthless endeavour. Furthermore, as social entrepreneurs take part in community development they tend to raise awareness of the problems faced by the community therefore creating networks for communities so that more people can participate in developing communities (Farmer & Kilpatrick, 2009). Di Domenico, Haugh and Tracey (2010) argues that as social entrepreneurs strive to meet the needs of the community, they utilise resources that are usually considered to be useless to achieve their objectives. Similarly, social entrepreneurs play a major role in dealing with social ills and have made significant contributions in community development.

There is lack of understanding of the meaning and importance of social entrepreneurship, social enterprises and entrepreneurs in Nigeria. However, even with the unfavourable legal, economic and institutional framework, social entrepreneurship does exist in Nigeria. It currently appears in Nigeria in the form of individual initiatives or relatively organized sub-sectors (for example; Mallam Garba Foundation) which solve the problems such as; youth unemployment.

2.1 Brief about Mallam Garba Foundation (MGF)

A Nigeria-based innovative ‘Mallam Garba Foundation’ (MGF), established to uplift the living standard of *Those In Need*, has empowered over 2,900 less privileged Nigerians in various skills acquisition training programmes, and the programme still continues. Already, the humanitarian gesture has begun to yield positive results, making the foundation office, located at No 2, Ali Akilu Road Kaduna, a Mecca of sort and center of attraction on daily basis.

While it is free-of-charge, FOC, the over 35 skills acquisition training programmes provided by the foundation accommodates young and old, men and women, boys and girls and people with disability, for training and empowerment. Also in practice include donations and distribution food items to less-privileged people in IDP camps. The criteria adopted to recruit interested credible trainee include finding and contacting them through spirited individuals, traditional leaders, religious leaders, personal and non-personal contacts, respectively, as long as the person is a true less-privileged Nigerian and beyond.

The foundation is driving by the God for funding, the zeal and passion to improve the lives of the less-privileged Nigerians with the hope to extend it to other countries of the world. With a motto, *Help Those in Need by Finding Them*, the foundation said it has no invisible hand behind it from political cloud.

3. Methodology

The data for this study is primary in nature. The study adopts a descriptive research design. The survey design is used to gather data in order to establish the correlation between the variables of the study. The variables of this study are; social entrepreneurship and youth economic empowerment; social entrepreneurship is the independent variable while youth economic empowerment is the dependent variable. The study area is Kaduna metropolis in Kaduna State, Nigeria and MGF is the case study.

The population of the study consists of all the beneficiaries (2,900) of the various skills acquisition programme offered by Mallam Garba Foundation, Kaduna. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970) in Hashim (2010) a sample size of 341 is sufficient where the population of the study is at least 3,000. Similarly, random sampling technique is adopted in drawing the sample size and administering the research instrument. The instrument for data collection for the study is a structured questionnaire on a 4-point Likert’s scale. In addition, both descriptive and inferential statistics (logistic regression model) is used in analyse data collected.

This study hypothesised as follows:

Ho: That there is no significant relationship between MGF skill acquisition training and youth economic empowerment in Kaduna metropolis, Kaduna-Nigeria

3.1 The Model and Variable Description

A logistic regression predicts the probability that an observation falls into one of two categories of a dichotomous dependent variable based on one or more independent variables that can be either continuous or categorical. Generally, logistic regression is well suited for describing and testing hypotheses about relationships between a categorical outcome variable and one or more categorical or continuous predictor variables (Peng, Lee, and Ingersoll, 2002).

The simple logistic model has the form:

$$\text{logit}(Y) = \text{natural log}(\text{odds}) = L_i = (P_i \div 1 - P_i) = \alpha + \beta X \dots\dots\dots 1.1$$

Taking the antilog of equation 1.1 on both sides, one derives an equation to predict the probability of the occurrence of the outcome of interest as follows:

$$P_i = \text{Probability}(Y = \text{outcome of interest} \mid X = x, \text{ a specific value of } X) = \frac{L_i}{1 + e^{-L_i}} = \frac{\alpha + \beta X}{1 + e^{-(\alpha + \beta X)}} \dots\dots\dots 1.2$$

Where:

P_i = is the probability of the outcome of interest or “event,”

α = the Y intercept,

β = the regression coefficient, and

$e = 2.71828$ is the base of the system of natural logarithms

Source: Peng, Lee, and Ingersoll (2002).

X can be categorical or continuous, but Y is always categorical. According to equation 1.1, the relationship between $\text{logit}(Y)$ and X is linear. Yet, according to equation 1.2, the relationship between the probability of Y and X is nonlinear. The value of the coefficient β determines the direction of the relationship between X and the logit of Y . When β is greater than zero, larger (or smaller) X values are associated with larger (or smaller) logits of Y . Conversely, if β is less than zero, larger (or smaller) X values are associated with smaller (or larger) logits of Y . Within the framework of inferential statistics, the null hypothesis states that β equals zero, or there is no linear relationship in the population under study. Rejecting such a null hypothesis implies that a linear relationship exists between X and the logit of Y (Peng, Lee, and Ingersoll, 2002).

Extending the logic of the simple logistic regression to multiple predictors [say $X_1 = \text{MGF training period (MTP)}$,

X_2 = MGF trainers (MTR), X_3 = MGF skills acquired (MSKA), and X_4 = MGF training facilities (MTFAC)], one can construct a complex logistic regression for Y (Youth Economic Empowerment Programme) as follows:

$$L_i = P_i \div (1 - P_i) = 1 + e^{z_i} \div 1 - (1 + e^{z_i}) \dots\dots\dots 1.3$$

So that:

$$Z_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + U \dots\dots\dots 1.4$$

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ are the co-efficient of X_s

β_0 = intercept

U = disturbance term

Empirically: $L_i = e^{z_i} \dots\dots\dots 1.5$

Where; $Z_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 MTP + \beta_2 MTR + \beta_3 MSKA + \beta_4 MTFAC + U \dots\dots\dots 1.6$

Therefore, $L_i = e\beta_0 + \beta_1 MTP + \beta_2 MTR + \beta_3 MSKA + \beta_4 MTFAC + U \dots\dots\dots 1.7$

Then $L_i = e\beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln MTP + \beta_2 \ln MTR + \beta_3 \ln MSKA + \beta_4 \ln MTFAC + U \dots\dots\dots 1.8$

Now, $L_i = P_i \div (1 - P_i) \dots\dots\dots 1.9$

Where:

L_i = logit model (in this case is Youth Economic Empowerment)

e = exponential

Z_i = estimates

β_0 = intercept

β_1 = slope of MGF training period

β_2 = slope of MGF trainers

β_3 = slope of MGF skills acquired

β_4 = slope of MGF training facilities

U = error term

The P_i is once again the probability of the event (in this case; Youth Economic Empowerment in Kaduna Metropolis, Kaduna-Nigeria), β_0 is the Y intercept, β_s are regression coefficients, and X_s are a set of predictors. β_0 and β_s are typically estimated by the maximum likelihood (ML) method, which is preferred over the weighted least squares approach by several authors, such as Haberman (1978) and Schlesselman (1982) in Peng, Lee and Ingersoll (2002). The ML method is designed to maximize the likelihood of reproducing the data given the parameter estimates.

The null hypothesis underlying the overall model states that all β_s equal zero. A rejection of this null hypothesis implies that at least one β does not equal zero in the population, which means that the logistic regression equation predicts the probability of the outcome better than the *mean* of the dependent variable Y . On a-priori, $P_i < 1$ and the expected pattern of the structural behaviours of the independent variables [(MGF training period (MTP); MGF trainers (MTR); MGF skill acquired (MSKA); and MGF training facilities (MTFAC)] on the dependent variable (L_i , that is to say; Youth Economic Empowerment) is greater than 0 (zero).

On the overall the objective of the logit model in this study is to provide a statistical base for predicting the significant impact of MGF skill acquisition training on the dependent variable (Youth Economic Empowerment in Kaduna Metropolis, Kaduna-Nigeria). In addition, the independent variables for predicting the statistical significance of MGF skill acquisition training on Youth Economic Empowerment in Kaduna Metropolis are; the MGF training period, MGF trainers, MGF skill acquired, and MGF training facilities. Both the dependent and the independent variables are categorical variables, however, the dependent variable is assumed to be dichotomous in that an MGF skill acquisition beneficiary is considered to be either 'economically empowered' or 'not economically empowered' at the end of the MGF skill acquisition training.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section the field survey data is presented, analysed, and discussed. Tables 1 and 2 below provide the descriptive statistics of this study. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondent including the types of skill they acquired. In Table 2, the descriptive statistics of the respondent responses is presented.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondent

Parameter	Frequency	Relative frequency (%)
Sex:		
Male	90	30.72
Female	203	69.28
Total	293	100
Educational qualifications		
Primary school	198	67.58
Secondary school	95	32.42
Total	293	100
Apprenticeship area:		
Auto-mechanic work	25	8.53
Fashion designing/Tailoring	29	9.90
Electronic installation	16	5.5
Hair dressing saloon	31	10.58
Catering services	35	11.95
Glass work	17	5.80
Computer hardware & software management	13	4.43
Plumbing	12	4.10
Leather works	21	7.17
Hair barbing saloon	23	7.85
Welding works	19	6.50
Carpentry	11	3.75
Satellite installation	10	3.41
Air-condition installation and maintenance	10	3.41
Tiling	11	3.75
Total	293	100
Age (years)		
15-24	153	
25-34	140	
Total	293	100

Source: Field survey, 2017

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of MGF beneficiaries' responses with respect to adequacy of the MGF apprenticeship training they received

Variable	Most adequate (5)	More adequate (4)	Adequate (3)	Most inadequate (2)	Inadequate (1)	Total
Training period	86	116	67	23	11	293
Trainer	75	120	86	5	7	293
Skills acquired	98	79	94	11	13	293
Training facilities	51	99	102	21	20	293

Source: Field survey, 2017

4.1 Test of Hypothesis (Logistic Regression Results)

The null hypothesis stated in section 3 of this study is tested using logistic regression model specified in section 3. The results are presented thus:

Table 3: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	67.246	4	.000
	Block	67.246	4	.000
	Model	67.246	4	.000

Source: Data analysis using field survey data, 2017

Table 4: Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	306.212 ^a	.205	.285

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Source: Data analysis using field survey data, 2017

Table 5: Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
1	19.424	8	.013

Source: Data analysis using field survey data, 2017

Table 6: Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a Training period	-.051	.011	23.686	1	.000	.950	.931	.970
Trainers	-.027	.011	6.181	1	.013	.973	.953	.994
Training facilities	-.004	.010	.213	1	.645	.996	.977	1.015
Skills acquired	-.053	.011	23.995	1	.000	.949	.929	.969
Constant	3.382	.677	24.969	1	.000	29.423		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: training period, trainers, training facilities, skills acquired.

Source: Data analysis using field survey data, 2017

Table 3 above depicts the Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients, which give the overall indication of how well the model performs ('goodness of fit' test). For this set of results, the requirement is a highly significant value (the Sig. value should be less than 0.05) (Pallant, 2007). In this study, the value is 0.000 (which really means $p < 0.0005$). Therefore, the set of variables in the analysis fits the model. Similarly, the chi-square value is 67.246 with 4 degrees of freedom. Table 4 is the Model Summary and it contains the Cox and Snell R, and the Nagelkerke R Square values, which indicate the amount of variation in the dependent variable explained by the model (from a minimum value of 0 to a maximum value of approximately 1). These are described as pseudo R square statistics rather than true R square (Pallant, 2007). Therefore, the explained variation in the dependent variable based on the model of this study ranges from 20.5% to 28.5%, suggesting that between 20.5% and 28.5% of the variability in youth economic empowerment in Kaduna metropolis was explained by the set of MGF training variables.

In addition, Table 5 shows Hosmer and Lemeshow Test. The results in Table 5 support the model of this study as being worthwhile. For the Hosmer-Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Test, poor fit is indicated by a significance value less than 0.05, so to support our model we want a value greater than 0.05 (Pallant, 2007). For this study the chi-square value is 19.424 with a significance level of 0.013. Table 6 presents the Variables in the Equation which gives information about the contribution or importance of each to our predictor variables. The test that is used here is the Wald test, and the values in the Sig. column are used to indicate the significant contribution of each predictor variable in the model. The Sig. values of less than 0.05 are the variables that significantly contribute to the predictive ability of the model (Pallant, 2007). In the model of this study, three variables (training period, trainers and skills acquired) are significant, while one variable (training facilities) is insignificant. Therefore, based on the results of test of the hypothesis, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4.2 Discussion of Results

A logistic regression was performed to examine the impact of social entrepreneurship on youth economic empowerment in Kaduna metropolis. The model contained four independent variables (training period, trainers, training facilities, skills acquired). The logistic regression model was statistically significant, $X^2(4, N = 293) = 67.246, p < .0005$, indicating that the model was able to predict youth economic empowerment in Kaduna metropolis based on the intervention of Mallam Garba Foundation. The model as a whole explained between 20.5% (Cox and Snell R square) and 28.5% (Nagelkerke R square) of the variance in youth economic empowerment in Kaduna metropolis. Similarly, as shown in Table 6, three of the independent variables have a statistically significant

contribution to the model.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

From the results of this study it can be concluded that there is a significant relation between social entrepreneurship (Mallam Garba Foundation) and youth economic empowerment in Kaduna Metropolis. Therefore, this study recommend that there is the need to for additional enterprises to be formed so that they can mitigate the menace of youth restiveness and unemployment in Nigeria.

References

- Aghatise, E. (2002). Trafficking for Prostitution in Italy: Concept Paper". A paper prepared for the Expert Group Meeting on "Trafficking in Women and Girls, New York, pp. 18-22.
- Carmichael F, W ard R (2001). Male Unemployment and Crime in England and W ales. *Econ. Lett.*, 5(73): 111-15.
- Dees, J.G. (2001), 'The meaning of "social entrepreneurship"', conceptual note, Duke University: The Fuqua School of Business.
- Dees, J.G. (1998), 'Enterprising nonprofi ts', *Harvard Business Review*, 76(1), 54–66.
- Dhesi, A. S. (2010). Diaspora , social entrepreneurs and community development, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 37(9), 703–716. doi:10.1108/03068291011062498
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social enterprises, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 681–703. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00370.
- Dorado, S. (2006) Social entrepreneurial ventures: different values so different process of creation, no? *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 11,319-343.
- Farmer, J. and Kilpatrick, S. (2009). Are rural health professionals also social entrepreneurs? *Social Science & Medicine*, 69(11), pp.1651–1658. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277953609005814>
- Hashim, Y.A. (2010). Determining Sufficiency of Sample Size in Management Survey Research Activities, *International Journal of Organisational Management and entrepreneurship Development* 6(1); 119-130
- Haugh, H. (2007). Community-Led Social Venture Creation, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(2); 161-182
- Jafta, R. (2013). Social entrepreneurship can boost development in SA. <http://blogs.sun.ac.za/news/2013/02/07/socialentrepreneurship-can-boost-development-in-sa/>
- Kao, R.W.Y. (1993). Defining entrepreneurship: Past, present, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 2(1), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Light, P. C. (2005). Searching social entrepreneurs: who they might be, where they might be, what they do. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association for Researchers on Nonprofit and Voluntary Association, Nov. 17-18. <http://wagner.nyu.edu/performance/files/ARNOVApaper.pdf>
- Madhukar. (2006). Social vs. business entrepreneurship. <http://inspired-pragmatism.blogspot.com/2006/09/social-vs-businessentrepreneurship.html> [Accessed January 4, 2017]
- Natgrass N (2002). Should Youth Unemployment Be Targeted as Part of a Comprehensive W elfare Policy in South Africa?" *Soc. Dynam.*, 28(2): 207–236.
- Nicholls, A. (2009). Learning to walk: Social entrepreneurship–A research review. *Innovations: Special Edition Social Entrepreneurship*, pp.209-222.
- Noruzi, M. R., Westover, J. H. and Rahimi, G. R. (2010). An Exploration of Social Entrepreneurship in the Entrepreneurship Era. *Asian Social Sciences*, 6(6); 3-10
- ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD) (2011). Fostering innovation to address social challenges. Workshop proceedings. OECD Innovation Strategy, www.oecd.org/innovation/strategy
- Pallant, J. (2007). *Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Pen, C.J., Lee, K.L. and Ingersoll, G.M. (2002). An introduction to Logistic regression analysis and reporting. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(1), 1-14
- Perrini, F., & Vurro, C. (2006). Leveraging social change through entrepreneurship. In F. Perrini (Ed.), *The new social entrepreneurship: What awaits social entrepreneurial ventures?* (pp. 26–45). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Schuler, D. A. & Cording, M. (2006) A corporate social performance-corporate financial performance behavioral model for consumers. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 540-558.
- Sharir, M. and M. Lerner (2006), 'Gauging the success of social ventures initiated by individual social entrepreneurs', *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 6–20.
- Shaw, E. & Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of

- entrepreneurial processes and outcomes, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(3), pp.418–434. doi:10.1108/14626000710773529
- Taylor E (2002). Trafficking in Women and Girls”. A paper prepared for the Expert Group Meeting on “Trafficking in Women and Girls” New York. pp. 18-22.
- Thumbadoo, B & Wilson, G. (2007). *From dust to diamonds*. Johannesburg: Gordon Institute of Business Science.
- Urban, B., (2008). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa skills, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 14(5), pp.346–363.
- Welsh, Dianne H.B. and Krueger, Norris (2009) Social sustainable entrepreneurship: a first look at mental prototyping of social entrepreneurship. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 29(21), Article 5. Available at: <http://digitalknowledge.babson.edu/fer/vol29/iss21/5>

Appendix I: MGF Computer and Carpentry section

