# Institutional Voids: An Impediment to Social Enterprises in the Achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in South Africa

**Abstract**

This paper examines institutional voids as a possible impediment to harnessing and articulating the contributions of social enterprises towards the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in South Africa. It focuses on municipalities as sites for the implementation of development goals and the services of social enterprises. The findings show that institutional voids in the Integrated Development Plan which stem from the *Constrained Development Focus* of municipalities manifest in a *Deficient Sector Engagement and Deficient Accountability* for social entrepreneurship. These run counter to the policy and institutional coherence that is needed to successfully implement the SDGs. There is, therefore, a need to rethink the IDP process and incorporate the services of social enterprises.

**Key Words:** Social enterprises, Institutional voids, SDGs, municipalities, South Africa

**Introduction**

This paper examines institutional voids as a possible impediment to articulating and harnessing the contributions of social enterprises towards the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in South Africa. It uses municipalities and the integrated development plan (IDP) of municipalities in South Africa as frames of reference. There is, presently, no consensus on what constitutes social enterprises. However, the term generally constitutes a range of organizations with a primary social purpose that engage in activities that directly and indirectly address socio–economic needs in communities. Social enterprise organizations are active in a variety of areas such as food security, poverty eradication, health care, job creation, skills development, education, security, inequality and gender related issues, environmental protection and sustainability, among others (Haugh, 2006; Haugh and Talwar, 2014; Littlewood and Holt, 2018; Mair and Marti, 2009; Seelos et al., 2006; Steinman and van Rooij, 2012; Visser, 2011). These development issues align, on various levels, with the SDGs and potentially expand the opportunity space for social enterprises and the role they can play in the achievement of the SDGs.

In South Africa, social enterprises exist in diverse organizational forms that can incorporate as a non–profit, for–profit or hybrid model. This paper focuses on the non–profit models. The relevance of such organizations to the achievement or implementation of the SDGs lies, first, in their embeddedness within communities in the municipality and secondly, on the role of non–state actors in the implementation of the SDGs (Goal 17) (United Nations, 2014). South Africa's system of wall–to–wall local government wherein every geographical space or 'Territory of the Republic' (Republic of South Africa, 1996: 77) is located within a municipality invariably places every organization in the social enterprise sector within a municipal space.

As such, these organizations play an important role on the ground in delivering various socio–economic programmes in many poor communities (Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality, 2015; City of Cape Town, 2015; City of Johannesburg, 2015; Republic of South Africa, 2013). This, therefore, makes them part of the development ecosystem of the municipality. It also makes social enterprise activities (social entrepreneurship [SE]) a potential mechanism that can be used to address the numerous wicked sustainable development challenges facing the country (Littlewood and Holt, 2015).

Municipalities, themselves, play a crucial role in the development process as they carry significant developmental responsibilities to ensure that the quality of life of citizens improve (Department of Provincial and Local Government [DPLG], 2000; Republic of South Africa: Department of Constitutional Development, 1998). As shown in figure 1, municipalities are linked to the SDGs through the alignment of the IDP to provincial plans which are aligned to the National Development Plan (NDP). The NDP is the long–term development vision that guides the development trajectory of the country. It is aligned to the SDGs and flows down through national plans and strategies to the provincial level of government and then down to the municipality/local level. This, by implication, makes municipalities implementation sites of the SDGs as well. That means, the successful implementation of the SDGs can be said to be a reflection of what is going on at the local level.

**[Figure 1 near here]**

Due to the shared development objectives of social enterprises and municipalities to improve the lives of people, IDPs recognize organizations in the social enterprise sector as strategic development partners. However, available evidence suggests that in practical terms the institutional framework for the integration of the contribution of social enterprises (as

3

development partners) and SE into the development and planning process at the municipal level is deficient. That means, the IDP which is the tool for local developmental planning, implementation, and coordination of the activities of other spheres of government and sectors within the municipality, does not incorporate the services of organizations in the social enterprise sector into its framework for planning and implementation. The institutional framework for the IDP includes, for example, the participatory processes for the IDP, identifying priority needs in communities and issues that are planned for, the actors to implement development programmes, coordination as well as monitoring and evaluation of the programmes/actors. As developed in this paper, this suggests the presence of institutional voids in the development context in which social enterprises operate.

Institutions serve an important role of providing a framework that shapes and governs the behaviour of actors within a given context towards a desired direction (North, 1991; Scott, 1995; Scott, 2005). They create an enabling environment for the realization of potential gains from the interactions that occur within a given context (North, 1991). If, however, the institutions that are necessary to govern or support the behaviour and proper functioning of actors within a given environment are deficient or absent, it creates institutional voids which engender constrains and impediments (Khanna and Palepu, 1997; Mair and Marti, 2009).

The IDP, as the institutional framework for local development planning can, therefore, serve as an important tool to govern and organize SE towards the desired direction of realizing the SDGs as municipalities are at the coalface of the development challenges that South Africa faces. It can provide a framework for aligning SE with other development programmes in the community. Conversely, deficiencies in the IDP can constrain the ability of government to articulate and harness the contributions of social enterprises in achieving the SDGs. As Karanda and Toledano (2012) argue, in South Africa, the definition of social enterprises and the concept of SE are flexible and have a local sense wherein social enterprise practices are

characterised by using relationships and links within communities to create social value and address local problems. As such, it becomes important for SE to be guided by developmental institutional frameworks so that the social value created by social enterprises to address problems in communities does not occur in isolation from other development goals.

So, while the literature on social enterprises tends to focus on issues such as organizational forms, how they create social value and contribute to addressing socio–economic needs in communities, not much attention has been paid to issues that can impede the social value created by social enterprises in terms of development gains. This paper draws on insights from institutional theory and the concept of institutional voids to identify the institutional voids in a development planning framework, using the IDP as an example. It then identifies the source of the institutional voids and how they manifest to impede social enterprises in the achievement and successful implementation of the SDGs.

The question this paper seeks to answer, therefore, is *how the institutional voids in the IDP process of municipalities impede social enterprises in the achievement of the SDGs?* The paper focuses, not on any specific SDG but, on the broad understandings of the role that social enterprise organizations, as non–state actors, play in the implementation of development programmes, and the institutional challenges that constrain their contributions towards the achievement of the SDGs. It contributes to the discourse on SE by providing insights into the institutional and broader development context in which social enterprises operate and 'the other side of the coin'. That means, a departure from focusing on the (heroic) achievements and opportunity context for social enterprises, to explaining the possible factors that can constrain the articulation and harnessing of the contributions of SE towards the implementation of national as well as global development goals, such as the SDGs.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: in the next section, social enterprise organizations and their links to the SDGs will be discussed. Next, institutions, institutional voids and the IDP of South African municipalities will be discussed to frame our understanding of institutional voids within the larger context of institutional theory. Then the method used for the paper will be presented, followed by the findings and then the paper will conclude, proposing some policy recommendations.

**Social Enterprises and the Sustainable Development Goals**

There remain controversies around the definitional boundaries of what constitutes social enterprises and social entrepreneurship (SE) (Karanda and Toledano, 2012; Mair and Marti, 2006; Seelos et al., 2006; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006). A detailed definitional exercise of social enterprises is outside the scope of this paper, however, the term has been conceptualized as diverse organizational forms with primarily a social mission to address social challenges, produce goods and services that are related to their social mission (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010). This view accommodates a broad spectrum of organizations ranging from NGOs, not-for-profit organisations to organisations with a mix of commercial and social mission (hybrid forms) (Austin et al., 2006; Seelos et al., 2006) and those that occur within the business and government sector (Austin et al., 2006). Social enterprises are also viewed as organizations that seek business solutions to social problems (Thompson and Doherty, 2006) blending methods from the world of business and non–profit sector to create sustainable social value (Dees and Anderson, 2006).

In South Africa, there is no specific legal form for social enterprises. The term, 'social enterprise' is used to describe a variety of organizational forms and practices such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), non-profit organizations (NPOs), non-profit companies (NPCs) co-operatives, community-based organizations, voluntary associations, trusts as well as small, medium and micro-sized enterprises (SMMEs). They can incorporate under three

legal forms viz: non–profit (NPO), for–profit and a hybrid model (for–profit with social interests) (Claeyé, 2017). As mentioned earlier, this paper is concerned with the non–profit models. While the definitional controversies remain, there is concurrence that the contributions of social enterprises bring about positive social change that can influence the overall development of the community (Achleitner et al., 2009). In South Africa, Visser (2011), for example, uses case studies to show the role of social enterprises in employment creation, skills development and education. Similarly, Steinman and van Rooij (2012) found that social enterprises, as part of the larger social and solidarity economy, have a significant potential for job creation in South Africa, but that the regulatory policy environment is not conducive for them to flourish.

Works directly linking social enterprises to development goals, and specifically the SDGs, are scant. Existing studies, for example, show how social enterprise activities address economic and social development problems such as income generation opportunities, employment in communities (Haugh, 2006) and poverty among rural women (Haugh and Talwar, 2014; Mair and Marti, 2009). The analysis of these studies demonstrates that social enterprise activities help to remove the barriers that constrain women from participating in socio–economic activities through access to microfinance, acquiring skills and vocational training. Linking social enterprises to the SDGs, Wanyama (2014) and Gicheru (2016) expound the possible ways in which cooperatives can contribute to the implementation of the SDGs, and specifically in the Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Littlewood and Holt (2018) offer a conceptual framework that explains how social enterprises can contribute to the achievement of the different SDGs. This draws a parallel with work of Seelos et al. (2006) on the contributions of social enterprises to the Millennium Development Goals which laid the foundation for the SDGs). While the importance of these works is acknowledged, questions about institutional frameworks in the development planning context in which these various development activities

occur, and how they are translated into development gains remain. This paper argues that the deficiencies in the institutional framework of the development plans, especially at the local level can constrain the articulation and harnessing of the contributions of social enterprises towards the achievement of the SDGs.

**Institutions, Institutional Voids and the Integrated Development Plan**

Institutions are 'humanly devised constraints that structure political, economic and social interactions' (North, 1991: 97). These consist of 1) formal rules (North, 1991) or regulative institutions (Scott, 1995; Scott, 2005). That means, government's regulation of the actions of individuals and organizations through, for example, constitutions and laws and 2) informal constraints (North, 1991) which refers to normative and cognitive institutions (Scott, 1995; Scott, 2005) relating to socially constructed roles, values and norms. Institutions do not exist in a vacuum; they are located within specific contexts. They serve an important role of shackling arbitrary behaviour among actors, providing a framework that shapes and governs transactions and the social behaviour of actors within a given context towards a desired direction (North, 1991; Scott, 1995; Scott, 2005). Effective institutions create order and reduce uncertainty; they increase the benefits of cooperative solutions to problems and create an enabling environment for the realization of potential gains from the transactions and interactions that occur within a given environment. Furthermore, the activities of individuals and organizations are a reflection of the institutional framework and the effectiveness of its enforcement within the said environment North (1991).

Nevertheless, when the institutional frameworks and institutions necessary to support the proper functioning of activities within a context or environment are absent, weak or deficient, it indicates the presence of institutional voids (Khanna and Palepu, 1997; Khanna et al., 2005). According to Khanna and Palepu (1997) institutional voids stem from information problems as well as misguided and inefficient regulatory implementation mechanisms. They engender

constraints and impediments (Khanna and Palepu, 1997; Mair and Marti, 2009) and create opportunity spaces for differentiated and autonomous actors (Mair and Marti, 2009) who develop disparate systems and strategies (Khanna et al., 2005) to enable participation within a context.

The concept of institutional voids originated in the field of business operations but has found its way into SE research. Research on SE and institutional voids has dealt, mostly, with the role of institutions on SE and the role social enterprises play in filling the voids created by inadequacies in government institutions and market deficiencies. As Defourny and Nyssens (2010) point out, various understandings of social enterprises are deeply rooted in the social, economic and political contexts in which these organizations emerge and operate. And so, they often operate, especially in developing countries, in contexts bedevilled by social challenges which provide the opportunity context for SE. When the institutional arrangements to address these issues are absent, weak or fail to accomplish the role expected of them, it creates institutional voids (Mair and Marti, 2009) which lead to demands for social entrepreneurial activity (Estrin et al., 2013). This paper follows Khanna and Palepu's (1997) formulation which is concerned with deficiencies or weaknesses in formal or regulatory institutional frameworks; in this case, the IDP of South African municipalities. It shows how the inadequacies and voids (or gaps as some people prefer to call it) that exist within the IDP can constrain social enterprise organizations in the implementation of the SDGs.

The IDP is the institutional framework for strategic planning, spanning a five-year period (revised annually). It informs and guides all planning, management, budgeting and decision-making in municipalities in South Africa (Department of Provincial and Local Government [DPLG], 2000). The constitution confers on municipalities the status of developmental local government, with the developmental mandate and obligation to:

(a) *'structure and manage its administration and budgeting and planning*

*processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community, and to*

*promote the social and economic development of the community; and*


(b) *participate in national and provincial development programmes'*

*(Republic of South Africa, 1996: 77)'*.

The constitution then goes further to outline functions and duties (Republic of South Africa, 1996: , see schedule 4B and 5B of the Constitution of South Africa) for municipalities which include issues relating to municipal planning, infrastructure, works and facilities, utilities such as water and electricity, sanitation, trading regulation (among others). The developmental mandate and functions are supposed to be animated through the IDP, which is also expected to coordinate the activities of agencies from other levels of government and those of the private sector, organizations in the social enterprise sector (loosely referred to in government documents as NPOs and civil society), as well as corporate service providers (Department of Provincial and Local Government [DPLG], 2000).

A core process in the development of an IDP is community and stakeholder participation. This involves the municipality, at the instance of the Mayor, meeting and interacting with different communities and stakeholders within them to determine priority needs in communities which need to be addressed to achieve improved quality of life (Republic of South Africa, 2000). Such participatory or consultative processes occur at the ward level and the municipality level in the IDP Representative Forum. The main components of the IDP include the municipality's vision, situational analysis of existing level of development, priorities and objectives, budget projection, performance management system, key performance areas, key performance indicators and targets, monitoring and review systems (Republic of South Africa, 2000). These development frameworks should shape and guide the developmental operations of both the

municipality and those of external organizations, which include organizations in the social enterprise sector (Republic of South Africa, 2000). What then, are the institutional voids in the IDP?

*Spotting institutional voids in the IDP*

To spot institutional voids, questions relating to the context need to be asked (Khanna et al., 2005). And so, the contextual questions being asked, here, relate to how the IDP framework guides and shapes the participation of social enterprises and accounts for SE in the development and development planning process. For example, 1) how does the IDP incorporate social enterprise activities since they also contribute to promoting socio–economic development? 2) How do municipalities coordinate the activities of the social enterprise sector? 3) How does the planning framework outlined above apply to the social enterprises as external organizations? An analysis of various IDPs indicates that these questions remain unanswered. Evidence from various IDPs and the Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan (SDBIP), which is the implementation framework for the IDP shows that the developmental priorities and objectives outlined in IDPs are not directly related to social enterprise activities. Consequently, such activities are not accounted for in the key performance areas and key performance indicators, targets, monitoring and review systems as well as the annual reporting of the IDP. This indicates the presence of institutional voids in the SE–development context. So, while municipalities consider the social enterprise sector to be important stakeholders and actors in terms of being an extension of government's arms and/or development partners in the provision of services, their contribution to the achievement of development goals is hardly planned for or documented. Also, the tools for oversight and coordination of social enterprise activities are severely limited (if not absent).

**Method**

This paper set out to identify the ways in which the institutional voids in the IDP of South Africa's municipalities may impede the articulation and harnessing of the contributions of the social enterprise sector in the achievement of the SDGs. The relevance of this lies in the conceptual considerations of what social enterprises and SE represent in the development process and South Africa's development trajectory that funnels from the SDGs down to the municipalities where development is guided by the IDP. A qualitative research approach, using the grounded theory (GT) method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), was adopted to answer the research question.

The GT method involves systematically analysing data to develop a theory that is grounded in the data about a social process. In a more general sense, GT is used to denote the method itself, as used in the social research process (Bryant and Charmaz, 2007) to generate theoretical concepts or constructs from qualitative data (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). The latter was adopted in this paper, however, adhering to the cyclical and iterative GT process of theoretical sampling and data collection, constant comparison, memo writing and data analysis (which involves open coding, selective or focused and theoretical coding).

The GT method is valuable for generating a parsimonious and conceptual explanation of what is going on in the substantive research area (Glaser, 2002). It is often suitable in 'investigations of relatively uncharted waters, or to gain a fresh perspective' (Stern, 1980: 20). The notion of 'uncharted waters' and 'fresh perspective' are relevant here because, the place of social enterprises in a development planning context appears under researched. It is important to note that the GT method as employed in this paper was not of a purely inductive form, but an abductive one or what Thornberg (2012) refers to as 'informed GT'. Abduction lies within the continuum of inductive and deductive reasoning as it extends into the realm of insight and pre–existing knowledge, and theory on the one hand, and the generation or discovery of new

knowledge from data (Reichertz, 2007) on the other. It consists of drawing inspiration and insights from pre–existing knowledge, not for the purpose framing the current research or deriving hypotheses, but to explore and explain the new data and discovering new ideas and concepts that were not hitherto explained by pre–existing knowledge (Thornberg, 2012: see also Reichertz, 2007 for a detailed dicussion on abduction in GT research). With insights from social enterprises literature and their role in development, institutional theory, and the notion of institutional voids as well as the IDP framework in municipalities in South Africa, the authors were able to explore and generate new knowledge in the substantive area of SE and development to explain the source and manifestations of institutional voids in the SE–development and planning nexus.

*Sampling, Data Collection and Analysis*

Primary qualitative data were collected from two metropolitan municipalities and three local municipalities. There are three main categories of municipalities in South Africa, namely metropolitan, district and local municipalities. Metropolitan municipalities constitute metropolitan areas, typically, with a high population density, industrial areas and multiple business districts, high movement of people, goods and services and featuring a diverse economy. A district municipality is made up of a conglomeration of local municipalities, while local municipalities comprise of secondary cities, large towns, small towns and rural populations (typically smaller populations) (Republic of South Africa, 2000; Statistics South Africa, 2016). District municipalities share certain executive and legislative authority with and coordinate the local municipalities within its area. Metropolitan and local municipalities have wards which are crucial for development planning and the IDP as well as the purpose of this paper. A ward, in the South African municipal structure, is a subdivision or an area with defined boundaries within a metropolitan or local municipality for governance and electoral purposes. This paper focuses on metropolitan and local municipalities.

It is important to note that the Municipal Systems Act sets out the procedures for the IDP process. Therefore, planning across municipalities is mostly uniform, albeit with adaptations to the needs of the specific municipality.

Data were collected from the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality (NMBM), a metropolitan municipality, Amahlathi and Ngqushwa local municipalities (which constitute part of the Amathole District Municipality) in the Eastern Cape Province, and the City of Cape Town (metropolitan) municipality and George (local) municipality (which is with the Eden District Municipality) in the Western Cape Province. The main reason for collecting data in these two categories of municipalities is that metropolitan municipalities are bigger, urban areas, better resourced and independent, while local municipalities are comparatively smaller, more rural and less resourced than the metros. Collecting data from metropolitan and local municipalities allowed for comparative analysis. As such, the municipalities are used as examples in an IDP process that is guided by the Municipal Systems Act. The examples are used in a broader sense such as Flyvbjerg's (2006) interchangeable use of examples and cases that allow the researcher to understand the depth of the phenomenon being studied, to evaluate it as it unfolds in practice and to gain new insight. Along the same line, Siggelkow (2007) notes that cases (examples in our case) allow the researcher to ground and illustrate the phenomenon being studied in real life and in practice. The examples from different municipalities, thus, allowed the researchers to show how the institutional voids in the IDP manifest to impede the contributions of social enterprises to the SDGs. According to Baxter and Jack (2008) collecting data across multiple settings enables the researcher to have a holistic understanding of the process being studied and that the evidence that is generated from multiple settings is generally robust and reliable. It allowed us to explore how these two categories of municipalities variously contemplate organizations in the social enterprise sector in the IDP process and development, even though they are guided by the same procedures set out in the Municipal Systems Act.

The data were collected through semi–structured interviews with open–ended questions. This allowed for contextual, descriptive and detailed answers (Wisker, 2008). The initial respondents were purposively selected, and then subsequent respondents were selected through a combination of the purposive and snowball sampling methods. Sampling continued until theoretical saturation was achieved, i.e, when additional data did not provide new insights or new leads. A total of 55 respondents were interviewed. These include the director/principal or a manager from 25 social enterprises (which are here designated SEMs) and 30 key informants (designated as KIs). The key informants were drawn from relevant government departments/directorates and the IDP offices in the sampled municipalities and ward councillors. The key informants are individuals who are knowledgeable and/or involved in the development planning process at the municipality level.

All the social enterprise organizations in which interviews were conducted are registered as a NPO and/or NPC. They indicated that they contribute to the development of the municipality such as offering poverty eradication programmes, educational services such as early childhood development centres and after school educational and extracurricular activities, food gardens, food parcels, healthcare services, skills development, and training programmes, among others. Across the various organizations they employ between 2 to 55 full–time staff. Some organizations have income–generating activity (or activities), in addition to funds, grants or any assistance received from funders. Those that do not already have income generating activities are considering doing so, due to the shrinking funding space. Additional information was derived from field notes taken during IDP Representative Forums and secondary sources such as published government documents, development plans and relevant supplementary documents; adhering to the GT dictum that 'all is data'. The supplementary information, however, were mostly used to validate the primary data during the data analysis process.

The data analysis process was mainly inductive. While a preliminary review of relevant literature and development planning documents was conducted prior to data collection and analysis, this served mainly to gain some insight into the development planning framework in South Africa as well as insights into the concepts of SE, institutions, and institutional voids. Focusing on the research question, the data was then inductively analysed to explain the source of the institutional voids and how they manifest to impede social enterprises in the achievement of the SDGs.

The data analysis commenced with a verbatim transcription of the interviews and a line–by–line *in vivo* open coding, from which several initial substantive categories were generated. Then, a more focused and selective coding was conducted, wherein some substantive categories were extracted from the initial categories and elevated to a theoretical level due to their relevance to the study (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 1978). These include *Municipality duties*, *Daily operations* of the municipality, *No framework to engage* with organizations in the social enterprise sector, *Sector neglect*, multiple and differentiated *Autonomous entities* within the space and *Poor oversight* on social enterprises and SE in the municipality. The substantive categories were further refined and abstracted into three theoretical concepts, viz Constrained Developmental Focus*,* Deficient Sector Engagement and Deficient Accountability. The concepts are presented as a set of propositions (Glaser, 1965; Glaser and Strauss, 1967) because propositions are more straight forward and they can provide a roadmap for further qualitative (and even quantitative) research (Gioia et al., 2013).

To ensure the validity of the data analysis process, as mentioned above, the initial open coding process adopted an *in vivo* approach in order to preserve the respondents' views (Charmaz, 2006) and to stay close to the data. In that light, most of the categories were also developed *in vivo* before finally abstracting them into concepts. In a GT study, this process of ensuring

validity relates to the *fit* of the data to the study. That means that the codes, categories, and conceptualization must not be forced on the data but must reflect the data from which they emerged. The constant comparison process was used to ensure the reliability of the data. Constantly comparing the data across cases, across properties of categories and across categories allowed for the integration of the data and to draw out the relationships between them, refine the categories and generate concepts. The primary data were also compared with documentary sources such as policy and planning documents. This strengthened the basis on which the concepts were developed.

**Findings**

The data analysis showed that the institutional voids that impede the articulation and harnessing of the contributions of social enterprises towards the achievement of the SDGs emanate from the Constrained Developmental Focus of municipalities. The institutional voids manifest as Deficient Engagement with organizations in the social enterprise sector and Deficient Accountability for SE and social enterprises and their contribution to the development gains of the municipality. Table 1 shows a sample data matrix indicating how the data were reduced from open/raw codes → substantive categories/codes → theoretical concepts. The concepts, as mentioned above, are presented in the form of propositions below.

**[Table 1 near here]**

*Proposition 1: Constrained Developmental Focus of municipalities can impede the contributions of social enterprises towards the achievement of the SDGs*

Constrained Development Focus relates to the relatively narrower understanding and interpretations of what *Municipality duties* are, as opposed to the broader constitutionally

mandated role of municipalities as developmental local government that needs to promote the social and economic development of communities. In interpreting and describing their duties or role in the development process, municipalities tend to focus mainly on specific areas which relate to the more restricted functions outlined in Schedule 4B and 5B of the constitution. In so doing they, as the level of government where national and provincial development plans are implemented, do not incorporate the services of other development actors that contribute to the socio–economic development of communities into the IDP. In other words, in planning for development, municipalities mostly focus on and construct their role around a relatively narrower set of *Municipality duties* to the exclusion of other sectors and development actors such as, in this case, the social enterprise sector. And so, the development mandate of the municipalities is often expressed thus:

> *The municipality is mandated to focus on a specific direction and the social enterprises, these social development partners, NGOs and NPOs are doing stuff that are not necessarily within the mandate of a municipality* (KI).

> *So, the social ills, and therefore the response to the socio–economic or from the social enterprises is mostly in relation to hunger, health services, education and so forth. So, it is not directly linked to the municipality per se, but to the provincial government, but in terms of the IDP, the municipality is supposed to capture the roles of the provincial sector… that are fulfilled by the social entrepreneurs. However, it is not captured that way in our IDPs (KI)*

This understanding and interpretation of *Municipality duties* appear to influence what then becomes the *Daily operations* of municipalities, what the municipality directly plans for and the issues that eventually make it into the IDP, as indicated in the statements below:

> *First and foremost, municipalities are responsible for various things, in terms of service delivery, housing, cleansing or cleaning, road infrastructure, removal of*

*waste, provision of water, electricity, amongst others. The social space is normally an extension, not of municipal services, but provincial* (KI).

*In the daily operation of the municipality, it has not been structured particularly to look at the non–profit organizations because it* [municipality] *has been more service delivery-orientated in terms of your hard–core projects like water and electricity and all of those things* (KI).

*When the IDP meetings are being held in the community our programmes, I can say, are not necessarily the main problems. What the IDP meetings cover are the budget for your specific ward … housing, stone water pipes, repairing streets, streetlights, and those kinds of things* (SE).

The Constrained Developmental Focus of municipalities suggests the existence of deficiencies or institutional voids in development planning at the municipality level. It indicates a discrepancy between their actual focus and constitutionally mandated role as developmental local government which is to address the socio–economic challenges in communities and account for as well as coordinate the activities of other spheres of government and sectors. This constrains municipalities from adequately integrating social enterprise activities into the planning framework of the IDP and the SDBIP (which is the implementation and monitoring tool of the IDP). In other words, the services provided by social enterprises organizations are not considered within the *Municipality duties* and *Daily operations* of the municipality. As such municipalities are not able to articulate and harness the contributions of social enterprises to the development process and indeed the SDGs. The manifestations of the deficiencies are evident in other relevant processes of the IDP. These include: Deficient Sector Engagement and Deficient Accountability.

*Proposition 2: Deficient Sector Engagement can impede the contributions of social enterprises towards the achievement of the SDGs*

Deficient Sector Engagement relates to the inadequacies in the processes of engagement and participation which suggests that there is *No framework to engage* with organizations in the social enterprise sector in the development planning and broader development processes. Community engagement, consultation or public participation is a key governance process in the development of the IDP. It creates opportunities for the municipalities to engage and consult with the communities about their development needs and to set priorities towards the preparation, implementation, and review of the IDP. These participatory meetings take place at the ward and municipality level. The Municipal Systems Act defines 'community' to include organizations in the social enterprise sector and other bodies which are involved in affairs within the municipal area. The analysis, however, revealed that during IDP meetings, both at the ward and municipality level, the participation of social enterprise organizations, and government's engagement with them is poor. Also, their programmes and the issues they address are usually not constituents of the agenda:

> *Normally, sectors get to be engaged at the metro level when the IDP goes on. The sector is not really catered as a critical sector that needs to be called and engaged with…. We don't have something that says, 'How do we deal with organizations that deal with issues of social concern, like social entrepreneurs'? The thinking is that, that responsibility falls outside the mandate of the municipality* (KI).

> *As a municipality, the space should be, we should be part and parcel of plans towards IDP. Either we are not being invited or are not entering that space, but as organizations there is not that opportunity to engage on that level…. At the moment, we are working at opposite ends. The municipality is driving its own issues in a space where we are a resource to the communities and the municipality. We as organizations would like to participate, but where is the opportunity? Where is the space for us to get in? That is the problem (SE).*

*There are no specific frameworks that guide how we should engage together, government and the social enterprises ... without that framework it is going to be very difficult (KI).*

The lack of a framework or other organized processes for engaging with organizations in the social enterprise sector in the development and planning processes is driven by municipalities' conception of the programmes implemented by social enterprises vis à vis the municipalities' development focus (as indicated above). The nature of services provided by social enterprise organizations in areas such as health care, education, hunger, environment, skills development, among others are considered to be within the competence of the national and/or provincial government. This is in spite of the wall–to–wall principle of local government which implies that every social enterprise organization operates within the jurisdiction of a municipality (and a ward) and the services they provide are mostly to people or communities within a specific municipality. However, due to the Constrained Development Focus and thinking that social enterprise activities are outside of it there is, therefore *No framework to engage* with social enterprises and their role in the achievement of the development objectives of communities which eventually translates to the SDGs.

The lack of a framework to engage with organizations in the social enterprises sector engenders *Sector neglect* wherein social enterprise organizations do not adequately participate in the dialogical or consultative processes of development planning in the municipality. Consultative processes and interactions provide stakeholders with opportunities to engage in discussions and make inputs into the development planning and decision–making process. While municipalities consider organizations in the social enterprise sector as stakeholders and partners in the development process, the data suggests that the sector is not sufficiently engaged in the planning process and that the consultative processes are sort of 'information session' as indicated in the statements below:

*The municipality, I don't even know if they know we exist. They have other priorities. The political leaders are not interested; I don't think they are interested in services like ours…. I have never been invited to the IDP forum. I don't know any social enterprise or any NPO, I can't mention any two or three that can say, 'Oh, we were invited to this IDP Forum meeting or whatever'. I have never heard any of them saying they had a part in an IDP Forum. There is no interaction between the municipality and us (SE).*

*We need to talk about invited platforms. You invite me, you've already got an agenda. When do I come to a meeting where I can bring my agenda? So, my points are never ever heard because you already have an agenda and so the entire meeting is about you telling me about your agenda. And so, even the IDP planning processes, they have the stakeholder Representative Forum, but when we go, they already have a plan. We've not actually participated in the plan* (CO 3).

These manifestations of institutional voids can constrain municipalities from having a deeper understanding of the critical role of key non–state actors, such as social enterprise organizations and how to harness their contributions, especially as municipalities are implementation sites for the SDGs.

### *Proposition 3: Deficient Accountability can Impede the Contributions of Social Enterprises towards the Achievement of the SDGs*

Deficient Accountability refers to the inability of municipalities to account for the multiple and differentiated *Autonomous entities* within the SE–development space and the *Poor oversight* on SE and the social enterprise sector. Within the SE and development space in a municipality, there are multiple actors such as the social enterprise organizations, municipality itself, other government departments, the private sector, international organizations and so on. They forge partnerships with organizations in the social enterprise sector, create and maintain opportunities/funding for some organizations in the provision of services. As mentioned earlier, there are several social enterprise organizations that generate their own funds. However,

because of the Constrained developmental Focus of municipalities, there is a lack of an institutional framework to guide the participation of social enterprise organizations in the development process. Therefore, these *Autonomous entities* develop diverse and autonomous strategies and as situational adaptations through which social enterprises participate in the development process:

> *There is a whole lot of agreements with different agencies. So different directorates identify different types of social enterprise organizations that do work in line with the work they do, and they support them in whatever way that can help the social enterprise organization to function well in that area* (KI).

> *Our interaction is with the provincial government, which is the Department of Education within the Western Cape. We also interact with the Department of Health who we collaborate with. These are the two main Departments…. We don't really engage with the local because the work that we are doing is especially to Department of Education. We provide a service to them so, there isn't much engagement really as such with the local government* (SE).

> *The jewellery projects have been successful, both for funding and sustainability…. We engage with DTI* [Department of Trade and Industry]*, but they don't fund us or support our activities. We are self-funded we had shares in a big refinery here in South Africa, we sold those shares. For instance, in the job shop, skills training for the private sector, we've invested R7 million of our own money. So, we're self-funded (SE).*

The strategies are differentiated and autonomous in the sense that they are developed and implemented by the multiple entities but without any organizing framework set out by the municipality. The data analysis suggests that the autonomy that inheres in the differentiated entities and strategies is due to municipalities' *Poor oversight* on social enterprise organizations and SE. *Poor oversight* relates to municipalities' inability to count, account for and coordinate the actors and activities in the SE–development space. For example, identifying the social enterprise organizations in their space in terms of who is doing what, where and how.

As mentioned earlier, coordinating the activities of other sectors and spheres of government operating within the municipality is one of the responsibilities of a municipality. However, the data shows that the activities in the SE–development ecosystem are fragmented. For instance, there are multiple data bases of social enterprise organizations, diverse and uncoordinated monitoring processes which are conducted by different funders and the organizations themselves, information generation processes and other mechanisms that are maintained within the various partnerships. These statements provide a glimpse into the nature of the fragmentation and municipalities' lack of oversight on SE:

> *It is not the municipality's primary objective to go from door to door to find out what social enterprises are doing. They* [municipalities] *have their mandate* (KI).

> *So, we are not dealing with these social enterprise organizations from a performance side. We don't have oversight on these organizations…. What are the focus areas of the city? What the city wants to achieve in the next five years which is linked to mayor. There is no oversight. The oversight will be at the directorate level not at the corporate level of IDP. Maybe if they give some funding to organizations (KI).*

> *These organizations, they work independently. They are working on their own. There are many people in that space. There are some that are willing to come on board with the municipality. A lot of them are on their own so, they don't give you their details, they work independently, and they do their own thing at their own time* (KI).

These deficiencies in counting and accounting for SE is engendered by the lack of institutional framework on SE in the development and development planning process in municipalities due to their Constrained Development Focus. It can, therefore, constrain the articulation and harnessing of the achievement of social enterprises in achieving the country's development goals which are linked to the SDGs.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

This paper demonstrates that the institutional voids or deficiencies in the IDP of municipalities in South Africa manifest in various ways to impede the articulation and harnessing of the contributions of the social enterprise sector towards the implementation of the SDGs. Research on social enterprises often focus on definitional issues, organizational forms and practices, and the role social enterprises play in addressing problems and bringing change to communities. This paper provides insights into the broader development context in which social enterprises operate. Linking social enterprises to development and planning is based on the understanding social enterprises do not operate in a vacuum, but in various social, economic and political contexts (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010). In South Africa, they operate in a context of persistent development challenges where various policies and plans seeking to address the challenges are being enacted by the state. The shared development objective (with state actors) to bring change to communities, thus makes social enterprises a part of the development ecosystem. However, the deficiencies in the institutional framework for development planning in the space in which they operate constrains the articulation and translation of their own contribution to development.

Our analysis of the South African context indicates that these deficiencies emanate from the Constrained Development Focus of municipalities as municipalities interpret their role in development mostly in terms of hardcore issues, infrastructure, utilities, and the like, but hardly in relation to the services provided by social enterprises. This narrow focus, therefore, conditions the IDP process and what the municipality incorporates into the IDP. The framework for development planning is not applied to non–state actors, such as social enterprises and the services, even though they also contribute to addressing the development challenges in communities.

The findings are in line with previous research that suggests that when an important formal institutions are limited or absent, this deficit undermines efficient transactions and operations (Khanna and Palepu 1997). While most of the literature has focused on how this results in institutional voids at the country or market-level (McMullen and Bergman 2017; Webb, Khoury, and Hitt 2020; Davies and Torrents 2017) and how this may be overcome through engaging in social entrepreneurial activities (Estrin et al., 2013; Mair and Marti, 2009), we contribute to the literature by providing a sub-national perspective by focusing on the level of municipalities. As such our findings suggests that the ways in which municipalities construe and enact their development mandate has concrete consequence for how it engages with non-state actors in conceiving and implementing local development initiatives and ultimately works towards achieving the SDGs.

Our data also show how the social construction of a municipality's mandate and more specifically the reductionist view of its mandate can lead to institutional voids when this mental representation excludes certain actors from the development process. One of the manifestations of this exclusion is the Deficient Engagement of social enterprises by the municipality. A consequence of this Deficient Engagement with organizations in the social enterprise sector is that the potential contribution of social enterprises to the development gains of the municipality is not optimised.

A further corollary of this Constrained Development Focus and Deficient Engagement is a Deficient Accountability of what these organisations are contributing toward achieving the SDGs. As local municipalities fail to engage with social enterprise organisations in a systematic way, many of these organisations are working outside of the government system. While this is not a problem per se, it does raise questions regarding issues such as duplication of activities

and accountability for the achievement (or not) of development outcomes. This impedes the articulation and harnessing of their contribution towards the achievement of SDGs.

This paper contributes to the literature by bringing into focus the other side of the opportunity coin for social enterprises and SE. Rather than focusing on examples of the social value and changes that social enterprises bring to communities, the paper showed that deficient institutional frameworks for planning can obscure the changes social enterprises bring to communities. Scholars have identified ways in which social enterprises can contribute to the SDGs (Gicheru, 2016; Littlewood and Holt, 2018; Wanyama, 2014). This paper offers insights into how deficiencies in institutional frameworks for planning in the context in which they operate can constrain these contributions and keep them obscure and unaccounted for towards the SDGs. Analysing social enterprises within a development and planning context, thus, represents a shift in thinking of social enterprises only as private organizations, to one in which they are considered as actors within a broader development context where their services need to be considered alongside other development programmes.

Also, the conceptualization of the sources and manifestations of institutional voids in the SE–development context responds to concerns for the need to link and further SE research with constructs from other disciplines (Mair et al., 2006). The majority of the existing literature on social enterprises have drawn on constructs and theories from business entrepreneurship and management studies. In analysing social enterprises from a development and planning perspective, the paper offers an additional perspective to social enterprise research.

The issues raised in this paper can provide lessons for other contexts. As the literature on social enterprises and SE show, the role social enterprises play in addressing socio–economic challenges are not peculiar to South Africa. Within different settings social enterprises address a variety of problems. This paper used GT concepts to explain how the institutional voids can

impede the state's ability translate the services of social enterprises into development gains. Because GT concepts are abstract of time, place and people the conceptualization of SE and institutional voids in development planning is transferable (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) to other settings. That means, if the settings and institutional contexts in which social enterprises operate are similar to those identified in South Africa, then it is possible that the findings from this study can find expression in other contexts. Thus, highlighting the need to develop mechanisms that can be used to harness and maximise the services of social enterprises.

**Implications**

The institutional voids in the IDP are relevant to discussions on the means of implementation of the SDGs (Goal 17) as proposed by the Open Working Group (OWG) for SDGs, specifically, those relating to the *Systemic Issues* of *Policy and institutional coherence, Multi–stakeholder partnerships* and *Data, monitoring and accountability* (United Nations, 2014).

Constrained Development Focus of municipalities aligns with issues of policy and institutional coherence which highlights the need, in a post–2015 context, for each country to adjust their domestic policies and institutions (OECD, 2015) and domesticate the implementation of the SDGs. The post–2015 context is the period from 2015 to 2030 which is the target timeline within which the SDGs are expected to be achieved. Constrained Development Focus of municipality indicates a seeming lack of coherence between the constitutionally mandated developmental role of municipalities and the interpretation of *Municipal duties*. This constrains the integration and articulation of the activities of an important sector such as social enterprises into the IDP towards the achievement of the SDGs and runs counter to the policy and institutional coherence that is needed to successfully implement the SDGs.

The Deficient Sector Engagement with organizations also has implications for the multi–stakeholder partnership that are necessary for the implementation of the SDGs. Rhodes et al.

(2014), for example, found that effective stakeholder engagement leads to partnerships and collaborations (with NGOs), and co–creation of value outcomes that bring about sustainable development. At a planning level, stakeholder engagement in an interactive, dialogical, and inclusive process plays a crucial role in shaping communities (Huxley and Yiftachel, 2000; Innes, 1995; Healey, 1992). Conversely, when critical stakeholders such as organizations in the social enterprise sector (the 'so called' development partners) are not effectively engaged during the planning processes, and their activities not integrated into the development plan, communities will suffer and achieving the SDGs stands the risk of being a mission impossible.

Furthermore, Deficient Accountability for SE means that the processes of data generation, monitoring and accountability that is needed to gauge how other stakeholders are performing towards the achievement of the SDGs are absent. This deficiency is evident in the lack of a comprehensive data base of social enterprises and the absence of an organized process for monitoring and coordinating the services of social enterprises. The data bases and monitoring processes are held and conducted respectively within various partnerships between social enterprises and the multiple and differentiated autonomous entities in the municipality space. The institutional void of Deficient Accountability, thus, makes it challenging for municipalities to generate information and account for partners and stakeholder such as organizations in the social enterprise sector. This raises questions of how claims about the contributions of organizations in the social enterprise sector to development goal and the SDGs can be validated.

Figure 2 provides a conceptual framework that shows the institutional voids in the social enterprises and local development context as well as measures to address the voids. These steps reemphasise the value of effective institutions and implementation mechanisms in increasing

the benefit of cooperative solution to a common problem with a given environment (North, 1991).

[Figure 2 near here]

To address the institutional voids and enhance the role of social enterprise organizations towards the achievement of the SDGs, an integrated development planning approach that incorporates all sectors should not only be an aspiration but one that needs to be implemented. There is, therefore, a need for a shift in the IDP framework of municipalities in South Africa. This would mean that municipalities would recalibrate the thinking and interpretations around their mandate as developmental local government and incorporate social enterprise activities into the development planning process to reflect the present realities within communities. This should then cascade down to effectuate other processes, for example, 1) strategically engaging social enterprises by expanding and deepening the invited spaces for the participatory processes of the IDP and effectively incorporating discussions on SE. Such spaces can provide opportunities for discussions about the alignment of the objectives, activities, and actual outcomes of social enterprise activities on one hand and the priority sustainable development goals of communities on the other hand, for planning purposes. Herein also, social enterprise organizations can participate in the planning process as actual partners in development and provide feedback on the value of their activities to the stakeholder groups they serve. 2) Social enterprise organizations themselves need to take a proactive step of reaching out and engaging government in an organized way. Due to the amorphous nature of the sector, this can be done through communities of practice or coalition groups.  3) Having a dedicated office in the municipality for the coordination and organization of the activities of the various differentiated autonomous entities as well as the various clusters of partnerships (whether funded by any

government entity or not) in the SE–development space. This can assist in developing a comprehensive data base of, and information gathering process on social enterprise organizations and their services as well as enhance their contributions towards the implementation of the SDGs.

## References

Achleitner AK, Bassen A and Roder B. (2009) An integrative framework for reporting in social entrepreneurship. *Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1325700*.

Austin J, Stevenson H and Wei-Skillern J. (2006) Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 30: 1-22.

Baxter P and Jack S. (2008) Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report* 13: 544- 559.

Bryant A and Charmaz K. (2007) Grounded Theory Research: Methods and Practices. In: Bryant A and Charmaz K (eds) *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory.* London: SAGE Publications.

Charmaz K. (2006) *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

City of Cape Town. (2015) Five Year Integrated Development Plan 2012 - 2017.  2015/2016 Review and Amendments. Available at: http://www.capetownpartnership.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/IDP-2015-2016-review.pdf.

City of Johannesburg. (2015) Integrated Development Plan 2012 - 2016.  2015/2016 Review. Available at: https://joburg.org.za/images/stories/2015/June/Council%20approved%202015-16%20IDP%20Review_29May2015.pdf.

Claeyé F. (2017) A typology of social entrepreneuring models in South Africa. *Social enterprise journal* 13: 427-442.

Corbin J and Strauss A. (2008) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory,* Los Angeles: Sage Publication.

Dees JG and Anderson BB. (2006) Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought. *Research on social entrepreneurship: Understanding and contributing to an emerging field* 1: 39-66.

Defourny J and Nyssens M. (2010) Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of social entrepreneurship* 1: 32-53.

Department of Provincial and Local Government [DPLG]. (2000) Integrated Development Planning: guide pack. Available at: ftp://gega.org.za/pubs/localgov/idp.pdf

Estrin S, Mickiewicz T and Stephan U. (2013) Entrepreneurship, social capital, and institutions: Social and commercial entrepreneurship across nations. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice* 37: 479-504.

Flyvbjerg B. (2006) Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative inquiry* 12: 219-245.

Gicheru E. (2016) The Role of the co-operative enterprise model in implementing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Available at: https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/egms/docs/2016/Coops-2030Agenda/Gicheru.pdf.

Gioia DA, Corley KG and Hamilton AL. (2013) Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods* 16: 15-31.

Glaser BG. (1965) The Constant Comparison Method of Qualitative Analysis. *Social Problems* 12: 436-445.

Glaser BG. (1978) *Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory: Theoretical sensitivity,* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser BG. (2002) Conceptualization: On theory and theorizing using grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 1: 23-38.

Glaser BG and Strauss A. (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory,* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Haugh H. (2006) Social Enterprise: Beyond Economic Outcomes and Individual Returns. In: Mair J, Jeffrey R and Hockerts K (eds) *Social Entrepreneurship.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Haugh H and Talwar A. (2014) Linking social entrepreneurship and social change: The mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Business Ethics*: 1-16.

Healey P. (1992) Planning through debate: the communicative turn in planning theory. *Town planning review* 63: 143.

Huxley M and Yiftachel O. (2000) New paradigm or old myopia? Unsettling the communicative turn in planning theory. *Journal of planning education and research* 19: 333-342.

Innes J. (1995) Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of planning education and research* 14: 183-189.

Karanda C and Toledano N. (2012) Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: a different narrative for a different context. *Social enterprise journal* 8: 201-215.

Khanna T and Palepu K. (1997) Why focused strategies may be wrong for emerging markets. *Harvard business review* 75: 41-48.

Khanna T, Palepu KG and Sinha J. (2005) Strategies that fit emerging markets. *Harvard business review* 83: 4-19.

Littlewood D and Holt D. (2015) Social Enterprises in South Africa. *International Comparative Social Enterprise Models (ICSEM) Projects. Working papers No. 2. Available at:* http://repository.essex.ac.uk/14144/1/South%20Africa%20-%20.

Littlewood D and Holt D. (2018) How social enterprises can contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)–A conceptual framework. In: Apostolopoulos N, Al-Dajani H, Holt D, et al. (eds) *Entrepreneurship and the Sustainable Development Goals.* Emerald Publishing Limited, 33-46.

Mair J and Marti I. (2006) Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of world business* 41: 36-44.

Mair J and Marti I. (2009) Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: A case study from Bangladesh. *Journal of business venturing* 24: 419-435.

Mair J, Robinson J and Hockerts K. (2006) Introduction. In: Mair J, Robinson J and Hockerts K (eds) *Social Entrepreneurship.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality. (2015) Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality Integrated Development Plan 2011-2016

North DC. (1991) Institutions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5: 97-112.

OECD. (2015) Better Policies for Development 2015: Policy Coherence and Green Growth. Paris.

Reichertz J. (2007) Abduction: The Logic of Discovery of Grounded Theory. In: Bryant A and Charmaz K (eds) *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory.* London: SAGE Publications.

Republic of South Africa. (1996) The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Available at: https://www.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/za/za107en.pdf.

Republic of South Africa. (2000) Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000. Available at: http://www.msukaligwa.gov.za/MsukWeb/Documents/Acts/LOCAL%20GOVERNMENT%20MUNICIPAL%20SYSTEMS%20.

Republic of South Africa. (2013) National Development Plan 2030. Available at: https://www.poa.gov.za/news/Documents/NPC%20National%20Development%20Plan.

Republic of South Africa: Department of Constitutional Development. (1998) The White Paper on Local Government. Available at: http://www.cogta.gov.za/cgta_2016/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/whitepaper_on_Local-Gov_1998.pdf.

Rhodes J, Bergstrom B, Lok P, et al. (2014) A framework for stakeholder engagement and sustainable development in MNCs. *Journal of Global Responsibility*.

Scott WR. (1995) *Institutions and organizations. Foundations for organizational science,* London: Sage Publications.

Scott WR. (2005) Institutional theory: Contributing to a theoretical research program. *Great minds in management: The process of theory development* 37: 460-484.

Seelos C, Ganly K and Mair J. (2006) Social entrepreneurs directly contribute to global development goals. In: Mair J, Robinson J and Hockerts K (eds) *Social entrepreneurship.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 235-275.

Siggelkow N. (2007) Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal* 50: 20-24.

Stake RE. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research,* Thousand Oaks: SAGE

Statistics South Africa. (2016) Community Survey 2016. Available at: http://cs2016.statssa.gov.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/NT-30-06-2016-RELEASE.

Steinman S and van Rooij J. (2012) Developing Public Policies for the Social and Solidarity Economy in South Africa. *Universitas Forum. Available at: http://ww2.universitasforum.org/index.php/ojs/article/view/124/411*.

Stern PN. (1980) Grounded theory methodology: Its uses and processes. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 12: 20-23.

Thompson J and Doherty B. (2006) The diverse world of social enterprise: A collection of social enterprise stories. *International journal of social economics* 33: 361-375.

Thornberg R. (2012) Informed grounded theory. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 56: 243-259.

United Nations. (2014) Open working Group Proposal for Sustainable Development Goals. Available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/1579SDGs%20Proposal.pdf.

Visser K. (2011) Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: context, relevance and extent. *Industry and Higher Education* 25: 233-247.

Wanyama F. (2014) Cooperatives and the Sustainable Development Goals: A Contribution to the Post-2015 Development Debate. Available at: http://repository.mut.ac.ke:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/87/.

Weerawardena J and Mort GS. (2006) Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of world business* 41: 21-35.

Wisker G. (2008) *The postgraduate research handbook,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.