PRE-PUBLICATION VERSION

Social development and the status quo: professionalisation and Third Way cooptation¹

Mel Gray

University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Abstract

Social development is a massive undertaking, which has spawned a multitude of organisational forms. It nevertheless remains an ambiguous term and ill-defined area of work though some social development practitioners have succeeded in making small-scale, local differences, in particular situations. While largely a tool of the status quo, some believe that social development has transformative potential and provides valuable space to confront inequalities and deprivation. In this article, I argue that in contemporary neoliberal environments social development is being coopted by Third Way politics and professionalisation processes. As it professionalises through the creation of professional structures and educational systems, it is becoming increasingly like social work, despite arguments that it is as an alternative approach to poverty and social exclusion. In the process, it is losing its transformative, critical edge and morphing into a neoliberal, social investment approach that absolves government of its responsibility for the welfare of citizens.

Key words: development, modernisation, professionalisation, social development, social work, social investment

---

¹ Published in *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 19(4), 463-470, 2010

Social development, like social work, is a product of modernity, part of the modernisation process as African and Asian nations moved from an agricultural to an industrial economy. In the West, modernisation had brought with it the detraditionalisation and secularisation of society in the wake of the Enlightenment, and the move towards democracy based on liberal capitalism. Hence, as nations modernised, they moved from authoritarian – monarchical government – to a legitimate government based on the will of the people as laws were set in place to define the boundaries between church, state, and the private domain of individual freedom and choice. Subjects became citizens. While colonisation was an attempt to take the West to the rest, and indigenisation – as a product of modernisation – sought to put a brake on ensuing cultural homogenisation processes (Gray, Coates & Yellow Bird, 2008), nowadays modernisation is no longer synonymous with Westernisation as many countries in the East are modern industrial countries and capitalist systems with high rates of economic growth (Inglehart, 1997). Modernisation brought with it a process of urbanisation as people flowed into urban industrial centres in search of paid employment. In the 1950s, development focused on rural, agrarian populations that tended to be concentrated in the poorest regions (Chambers, 1983). They were seen as populations en route to modernisation until urban centres grew outwards to accommodate them. Inglehart (1997) claims that, in time, the majority of the world's population will be urbanised, as industry requires a high degree of infrastructural development, and trade depends on road and sea routes to transport goods to key markets. For the most part, the rural communities of early development efforts survived on subsistence agriculture, which began to break down as men moved to work in the urban centres while women and children remained on the farm, as it were. This led increasingly to the feminisation of poverty. In contrast, as urban centres modernised, the need for services and professionals arose and most developed highly bureaucratised planning, educational, welfare, legal, commercial, transport, and housing and health services. They developed

bureaucracies that were inimical to rural development. Nevertheless, development became an extension of centralised government delivered through highly bureaucratic systems that sought to extend the modernisation process. It was top-down and met a great deal of resistance from local people who held fast to their traditional ways of life and thus was, for the most part, ineffective in solving the poverty problem. Today, however, population mobility and structurally induced inequality has seen the rise of urban poverty such that development is not merely a rural activity. These, then, are the conditions which saw the emergence of social development, which has always had a broader focus than social work and sought non-materialist and non-individualist solutions to poverty, i.e. it arose as an alternative to the welfare system built on material benefits and individualistic professionalised social services.

Advocates of social development are especially critical of institutionalisation and extol community-based solutions. They have positioned social development as an alternative form of service provision that seeks developmental rather than remedial solutions. However, as social development becomes more and more formalised, i.e. professionally organised and supported by an educational system and scholarly literature, it is becoming increasingly like social work, drawing on similar theories and approaches, despite its community focus. Further, it is becoming increasingly coopted by Third Way welfare reform policies similarly resistant to conventional welfare approaches which are seen to lead to passive dependency on welfare. In the process, social development is losing its institutional or statist focus, its critical edge, and its focus on structural inequalities, for strengths and empowerment approaches which favour personal and community responsibility, yet differ markedly from the transformatory 'pedagogy of the oppressed' (Freire, 1972) which sought to bring power and self-determination to communities bearing the brunt of capitalist-induced inequalities. Importantly, the under-theorisation of social development has resulted in little attempt to

interrogate the diverse discourses that constitute its ‘theoretical mix’, which comes mainly from four related sources: welfare, social development, social work and neoliberalism (see Table 1).

From *welfare* comes talk of social rights and social justice which it shares with professions like social work (Ife, 2001). From *social development* comes its positioning as a whistleblower on the fallout from economic development most associated with measuring the rise in people’s standard of living. It counters the idea that economic development is the best solution to poverty, highlighting that economic growth is selective and comes at a cost (Midgley, 1995). However, this focus on structural inequality is fast subsiding as social development begins to be more strongly aligned with *neoliberal* notions of active citizenship, with non-statist, communitarian, social investment and social enterprise approaches, and with antiprofessional strengths and empowerment Third Way social capital style (Harriss, 2002). From *social work* comes the professional model and professional organisation, including university-based professional education. Social development juxtaposes itself against social work as its nearest role model, taking pains to demonstrate how it differs from professional social work – seen as remedial and individualistic – while adopting its holistic, integrated models of practice when, in fact, it has sought to influence and forge closer links with social work (Billups, 1990, 1994; Elliott, 1993; Gray, 2006; Midgley, 1995).

Social development’s diverse theoretical and ideological roots coalesce into a confusing discourse of rights, redistribution and participation. Social development linked to rights and justice intimates a statist response that carries a mixed message in today’s neoliberal environment of minimal state intervention and increased family and community responsibility. This has led to a decreased focus on structural ‘redistribution’ and less talk of centralised economic planning in the social development discourse to ‘non-government’ solutions. High on the list is community-based social and micro-enterprise development

supported by micro-financing rather than government funding. Hence, there remains a strong communitarian ‘participatory’ emphasis which, too, is in danger of being tainted by neoliberal devolution of responsibility onto families and communities.

Table 1: Diverse discourses of social development

Welfare	Social development	Social work	Neoliberal policy
• Welfare state discourse led to social rights as a means to address inevitable inequalities in society, following the hugely influential work of Marshall and Titmuss • Gives rise to a discourse of social rights and social justice • Neoliberal reform reconfigures welfare from a right to which people are entitled to one which comes with responsibilities – individuals and the state have a mutual obligation • Seeks to target welfare to the most needy, inducing those able to work into employment through welfare-to-work programmes • Originally redistribution and consumption oriented, now increasingly participation and service-user or consumer oriented	• Seeks to position itself as a counterpoint to economic growth • Highlights the social costs of economic development • Positions itself at an intermediary level working between communities and governments to highlight the problem of a one-sided focus on economic growth • Leads to definition of social development as a process designed to harmonise social policies with economic development measures • Operates in a value domain where social and economic survival is paramount and modernisation is the key to economic development • Social work and social development share similar roots and social justice goals but social development positions itself as an alternative to remedial social work with productivist, proactive community-based solutions • Advocates investment strategies to create employment, raise incomes, and improve living standards • Productivist and investment oriented	• Follows a professional model, which includes a university-based professional education qualification and nationally and internationally based organisational structures of professional regulation • Operates largely in government agencies • Practice is mainly remedial and individualistic • Heavily bound by context of practice and related government policy • Adopts a human rights and social justice approach and the language of strengths and empowerment, which favours participatory approaches • Increasingly constrained by neoliberal welfare reform which is undermining professional autonomy and values • Service oriented	• Uses a social integrationist – social inclusion – discourse which emphasises paid work – economic participation – and personal responsibility • Reintroduces the Poor Law morality discourse of the deserving and undeserving poor and stresses coercive responses to those seen as passively dependent on welfare whose poverty is seen to stem from moral and behavioural deficits • Promotes active citizenship and highlights ways in which people draw on their strengths and capabilities to take responsibility for their own development; collectively this constitutes human and social capital formation • Gives rise to a communitarian discourse of strengths and empowerment whereby people and communities can lift themselves out of poverty through their own effort • Seeks targeted social welfare provision • Consumer oriented

Neoliberal cooptation

In the mid-1990s, Midgley (1995) stated that social development was a theory that had yet to be developed fully. At that time, he described it as an *approach to welfare* with clear development goals, i.e. an institutional and developmental approach that shared the goals of welfare statism and held national governments primarily responsible for individual welfare and social development. However, the times have changed and welfare reform has brought a complete shift to the notion of responsibility for welfare and a major restructuring of the welfare state. Hence, social development must think carefully about its theoretical underpinnings and guard against neoliberal contamination. For example, in Australia, the term ‘social investment’ suggests development of an independent third sector, one that does not depend on government funding. It is centrally concerned with developing social enterprises that can sustain themselves. In neoliberal terms, social investment implies a business approach. Neoliberal social enterprise has little faith in the state’s propensity to meet social needs through welfare programmes and argues that welfare encourages dependency. Solutions must be found from within communities and social enterprises developed that draw on local resources and plough the benefits back into local communities. It stands in stark contrast to social development as a statist intervention (Gray, Healy & Crofts, 2003).

Within social development, the influence of neoliberalism is evident in its increasing adoption of the language of human and social capital, self-help and strengths and empowerment (Berner & Phillips, 2005; Coleman, 1988; Cox, 2007; Mowbray, 2004). However, where social deprivation is a major problem, i.e. in modernising contexts, economic development remains a major priority. The key to social development remains economic development that accompanies modernisation, industrialisation and urbanisation, and this remains the best antidote or solution to poverty. If, by implication, development is a modernising process, then the ‘end of development’ will come when all societies are

modernised. Inglehart (1997) believed, however, that Modernization is not the end of progress, noting a value shift in highly developed societies where materialist values, i.e. economic survival, is no longer an issue. He discerned a stage of Postmodernization heralding a shift to postmaterial values like subjective wellbeing and quality of life. Social development operates in a value domain where social and economic survival is paramount and where modernisation is the key to economic development and the main route out of poverty. As Inglehart (1997) noted, modernisation is no longer merely a Western phenomenon, as today it extends to many non-Western nations in Asia, for example. One might, therefore, conclude that, despite the claims of social development, development remains linked to economic growth and that this has been empirically shown to be the most effective way out of poverty (Inglehart, 1997). Thus, social development has to avoid confusing the values of Modernizing societies with those of Postmodernized societies where subjective wellbeing and quality of life is linked to individualised choices rather than the benefits to be gained from collective approaches to poverty reduction. It must not confuse Third Way citizenship participation (Beresford, 2001; Carey, 2009) – an essentially individualistic approach – with the transformatory ends of participatory politics it inherits from community development (Freire, 1972) nor Third Way cooptation of strengths and empowerment whereby individuals and communities become primarily responsible for social inclusion and wellbeing (Stepney & Popple, 2008). Third Way communitarianism is a far cry from the emancipatory community action envisaged by social development.

Cornerstones of social development

Social development is said to occur variously through human capital formation and mobilisation, asset accumulation and investment, employment creation and micro-enterprise in poor communities (Burrus, n.d.; Schreiner & Woller, 2003; Sherraden, Sanders, & Sherraden, 2004; Sherraden, Ssewamala, & Sanders, 2003). Human capital formation

concerns finding ways to prepare people for employment, to help them develop the skills needed for productive economic participation, i.e. paid work. For many, this entails self-employment or cooperative social or micro-enterprises. Social capital formation involves the strengthening of local networks that support local social or micro-enterprises.

Social investment approach

Social investment moves social development from its earlier links with rural – agricultural – development, where it was strongly associated with subsistence farming, a move that has had a direct impact on food security in many parts of the developing world. In the contemporary neoliberal environment, emphasis has shifted to programmes that make a positive contribution to economic growth and offer ‘a new rationale for redistribution by advocating the allocation of collective resources for social investments that return resources back to the economy’ (Midgley, 1999: 4) rather than drain them as does welfare. In other words, it is thought that resources expended on social development constitute an investment that will produce returns through capacity-building programmes that ‘invest in people and enhance their capacity to contribute to the productive economy’ (Midgley, 1999: 8), i.e. that help them develop the skills needed to become economically active or, in neoliberal terminology, to participate economically. Social investment thus promotes human capital formation by ‘creating employment opportunities and providing supports that ensure economic integration’ (Midgley, 1999: 9). This often involves self-employment, micro-enterprise or small business development. Sherraden (1991) defined micro-enterprise as ‘self-employment by the poor’. It is bolstered by *microcredit*, i.e. small loans to help the poor engage in productive activities or businesses, and *microfinance*, i.e. microcredit plus other financial products, including savings, remittances and insurance designed for use by the poor. Both are strategies that recognise the poor as economic actors. Thus, the social investment approach provides people with tangible social investments that enhance their capabilities and facilitate their

participation in the productive economy by producing goods or services as marketable commodities.

Assets-based development

Assets-based development, as developed by international organisations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and United Nations, and heavily promoted in the USA by academics at the Center for Social Development at the University of Washington, conceptualises assets as infrastructural or financial resources and comprises programmes to encourage the poor to generate an income and save. As such, assets are what people accumulate and hold for security over the long-term. Sherraden (1991) argued that more than a focus on micro-credit or micro-enterprise is needed. The poor need saving strategies to build and conserve assets for their long-term wellbeing. They need financial literacy, financial support and access to financial institutions and low-cost financial products. Assets-building is said to lead to improved economic and social outcomes, including social empowerment and increased civil and political engagement. Mahoney (2006: 1) noted that its focus is:

sustainable livelihoods ... It views the poor as strategic managers of their limited asset base and underscores ... the importance of [their] ... active participation ... in civic affairs to ensure that their interests are reflected in decision-making processes affecting the future of their communities.

Community-development approach

In social work, community-based practice interventions are non-residential or non-institutional, where the latter refers to children's homes, mental institutions and nursing homes, in other words, contexts where people with high-level needs are cared for. Hence, developmental social work eschews institutionalisation for independent community living. In

this respect, it is fully consistent with neoliberal welfare programmes that shift responsibility for personal wellbeing onto individuals, families and communities. Community development, however, does not end with shifting responsibilities onto communities, but goes further to lobby and advocate for policies and processes that promote and build upon an asset base in the community (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). Within the social development literature, Sen's (1999) capabilities approach is extolled as promoting maximum freedoms in keeping with the economic rational-choice model from which it is derived. Economist Sen sought to divest development of its association with economic growth and reinvest it with an association with freedom defined as the capacity for choice. In so doing, he successfully shifted development from its structural focus to a focus on human capabilities defined as the amount of agency an individual might exercise. For the most part, however, enhanced choice derives from the accumulation of assets. Hence, the social investment approach works through assets-based community development, with the local community being seen as the locus for social, political and economic engagement.

Anti-professional stance

In community development, the practitioner is no longer the expert, and client self-determination and participation is highly valued. This fits perfectly with neoliberal consumer choice and service-user participation policy which is increasingly being used to undermine the need for professional intervention. These policies have led to the increasing deprofessionalisation and deskilling of the social services workforce with detrimental consequences for professionally trained social workers. This antiprofessional stance, however, is out of kilter with the drive towards the professionalisation and formalisation of social development through its international organisational structure and conferences and professional university-based education programmes (Gray & Rennie, 2007; Meinert, 1991).

Strengths and empowerment perspective

Rather than an exclusive focus on problems and deficits, strengths and empowerment approaches highlight and draw upon the assets or strengths of people and communities. They fit well with the neoliberal, capabilities focus on individual choice and responsibility rather than on government responsibility for poor and marginalised citizens, the main focus of (developmental) social work. In so doing, they gloss over the structural inequalities and barriers and obstructions to accessing services which the bulk of the poor experience, and place the weight of self-betterment firmly onto individuals and communities who collectively become social capital. There is thus a strong connection between neoliberal welfare ideology and the individualistic and communitarian self-help agenda extolled by strengths and empowerment approaches.

Social enterprise model

The social enterprise model continues this focus on self-help, promoting individual or cooperative entrepreneurship and lauding asset accumulation without government investment. It seeks an alternative to the welfare charity model. Hence, for example, the Centre for Civil Society in Australia is highly critical of the neoliberal branding of charities or welfare organisations as ‘social enterprises’. They define a social enterprise as a business with a social cause that is not in any way reliant on government funding. They see social enterprises as independent third sector organisations. Thus, the third sector is different from the voluntary or non-government sector comprising government-funded NGOs. The third sector seeks to be independent from government, free from the bureaucratic red tape that constrains government-funded NGOs. This means that social enterprises can be innovative and flexible and directly responsive to the needs of their communities of interest. They have

developed their own value systems built around fair-trading principles. This is the sector to which contemporary social development seeks to hitch its wagon.

The centralised economic planning model

Midgley (1995) conceptualised social development as a statist intervention that provided an alternative approach to welfare which sought to harmonise social policies and programmes with measures designed to promote economic development. The model of integrated planning that this early view of social development entails ties it to government and government-linked human service agencies within education, public works, housing, welfare, health, transport and so on, which are characteristic of modernised societies. Furthermore, integrated planning requires highly efficient institutional structures. It requires the horizontal integration of programmes delivered by separate ministries and government departments, as well as vertical integration between the national, state or provincial, and local or municipal, and grassroots community levels. As has been demonstrated in South Africa, this level of integrated planning is extremely difficult to achieve, and the absorption of developmental social workers into the state apparatus makes them agents of the state rather than change agents advocating for social justice (Gray, 2006; Gray & Lombard, 2008).

The development model

As Burkett (2001) noted, ‘working developmentally’ means working via non-state organisations with local communities in First and Third World countries struggling with the impact of economic globalisation. It involves a model that understands the global–local nexus and the way in which Third World resources are appropriated to serve the ends of neoliberal global capitalism. This is a critical perspective which has been developed by postcolonial feminists (Mohanty, 1988, 1997) who have been highly critical of the over-ambitious claims of Grameen Bank inspired women’s empowerment programmes (Izugbara, 2008; Karim,

2008; Rozario, 1997, 2001, 2002; see also Cruikshank, 1999). Burkett and McDonald; (2005) noted that social development seeks to address questions of sustainability, justice, self-determination, freedom and quality of life in the face of poverty, injustice and oppression. It uses broad economic and political frames of reference that link national policies into a wider international or global system, i.e. local communities and non-government organisations become subject to global bodies, such as the World Bank, the United Nations and the World Trade Organisation, through development aid and donor arrangements.

Some limitations of social development

Uncritical adoption of the language of neoliberalism

The language of productive engagement in contemporary social development discourse might easily be confused with the neoliberal notion of active citizenship. Both construe welfare as a form of investment and eschew passive welfare as encouraging dependency. Social development theorists need to engage more realistically with contemporary neoliberal human services environments and adopt a critical theoretical stance. Investment-oriented interventions fit well with the neoliberal notion of positive, productive or active citizenship where ‘independent contributors’, i.e. economically active people, are held as the example against passive, dependent welfare recipients. These are often people who are marginalised and oppressed by the dominant system, increasingly migrants and refugees. Social development discourages long-term engagement with remedial social services as they are seen as antithetical to its productivist, social investment approach which recognises strengths, self-determination and meaningful participation. There is a great deal of rhetoric here. Realistically, this community development orientation is costly, and resource and time intensive. It is extremely difficult to get people to ‘participate meaningfully’ in development programmes which, in any way, require significant external investment or start-up capital,

especially since often ‘the people’ are poor and marginalised populations. Further, as already mentioned, there is a growing body of literature critiquing this empowerment approach which does little to lift people out of poverty or to move them up a rung of the social ladder.

Uncritical acceptance of the discourse of ‘community’

Social development’s uncritical acceptance of the discourse of ‘community’ gives cause for concern, since it disregards critiques of community being used to mask poor government resourcing of social programmes in fields such as mental health, aged care and disabilities (Bryson & Mowbray, 1981, 2005). Rose (1999) noted how the peculiar morality of advanced liberalism constructs a seductive community that binds people to particular identities and commitments seemingly beyond the sphere of the state, in which they are ostensibly free to make choices. At the same time, however, the welfare reform discourse is heavily patriarchal, with strong condemnation of fatherless families and lone parents, and policies on strengthening families that often result in cuts to benefits to those who do not conform to its stringent conditions of eligibility (Stepney & Popple, 2008). Cleaver (1999: 604) noted that:

Development practitioners excel in perpetuating the myth that communities are capable of anything, that all [that] is required is sufficient mobilisation and the latent and unlimited capacities of the community will be unleashed in the interests of development ... [when] there is significant evidence of very real structural and resource constraints ... impacting [most severely] on those who may need development the most.

The community of social development theory is presented as an entrepreneurial space where people draw on their own creative resources to better their lives and where investments in human and social capital are made. As already noted, the social investment approach of social development needs to be disentangled from the social enterprise and social

entrepreneurship of Third Way neoliberal welfare reform (Gray et al., 2003) and the multitude of state-inspired programmes and processes operating at the community level:

[T]he generalised wish to achieve a new social consensus in the community based on justice and mutual responsibility makes no mention of the need for wider economic reform or any changes to the social structure .... [hence] recognitions of wider divisions of class, race, gender, and so on ... [are] missing (Stepney & Popple, 2008: 92).

Furthermore, inequalities between communities resulting from the impact of globalisation and other forces are seriously underplayed. Communitarianism is ambivalent about the need for economic reform and redistribution, opting instead to gloss over structural inequalities for an optimistic notion of the power of communities to heal themselves. Welfare reform introduces market mechanisms into welfare in its social investment approach: the more communities put, in the more they will get out. However, in reality, community interventions are time and resource intensive and non-material goods, like participation and social capital, can be of little benefit if communities lack basic infrastructure and resources, not to mention access to services and benefits:

... the community self-help paradigm needs to be refined by a recognition that the poor cannot be self-sufficient in escaping poverty, that communities are systems of conflict as well as co-operation, and that the social, political and economic macro-structure cannot be sidestepped (Berner & Phillips, 2005: 334).

While the self-help and capability approach does remind experts of the importance of community participation, bottom-up community development is likely to prove just as futile as top-down community development unless strategies of economic redistribution are introduced to balance the one-sided approach of strengths, capabilities and assets building.

Access to economic resources is pivotal alongside micro-credit and self-help initiatives: ‘In recognizing the capabilities of poor people to act as “agents” in their own empowerment, we should not fall into the neo-liberal trap of seeing all assistance to that process as both undeserved and demeaning’ (Berner & Phillips, 2005: 334–335).

Conclusion

This article voices concern about the cooptation of social development by Third Way politics and professionalising processes, which mimic social work and, indeed, try to convert social workers to social development as an alternative approach to poverty alleviation. In so doing, it argues that social development, as an alternative to welfare, is morphing into a neoliberal social investment approach that absolves government of its responsibility for the wellbeing of its citizens.

References

- Beresford P (2001). Service users, social policy and the future of welfare. *Critical Social Policy* 21(4): 494–512.
- Berner E, Phillips B (2005). Left to their own devices? Community self-help between alternative development and neo-liberalism. *Community Development Journal* 40(1): 17–29.
- Billups JO (1990). Towards social development as an organizing concept for social work and related social professionals and movements. *Social Development Issues* 12(3): 14–26.
- Billups JO (1994). Conceptualizing a partnership model between social work and social development. *Social Development Issues* 16(3): 68–90.
- Bryson L, Mowbray, M (2005). More spray-on solution: Community, social capital and evidence-based policy. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 40(1): 91–106.

- Bryson L, Mowbray M (1981). Community: The spray-on solution. *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 16(4): 255–267.
- Burkett I (2001). Traversing the swampy terrain of postmodern communities: Towards theoretical revisionings of community development. *European Journal of Social Work* 4(3): 233–246.
- Burkett I, McDonald C (2005). Working in a different space: Linking social work and social development. In: Ferguson I, Lavalette M, Whitmore E, eds. *Globalisation, global justice and social work*, pp. 173–188. London Routledge.
- Burrus W (n.d.). Innovations in microenterprise development in the United States. Available at http://www.microcreditsummit.org/papers/Workshops/12_Burrus.pdf [date last accessed 7 September 2009].
- Carey M (2009). Happy shopper? The problem with service user and carer participation. *British Journal of Social Work* 39(1): 179–188.
- Chambers R (1983). *Rural development: Putting the last first*. London, Longman.
- Cleaver F (1999). Paradoxes of participation: Questioning participatory approaches to development. *Journal of International Development* 11(4): 597–612.
- Coleman J (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 95–120.
- Cox E (2007). The functional value of social capital. *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 42(4): 503–512.
- Cruikshank B (1999). *The will to empower: Democratic citizens and other subjects*. Ithaca, Illinois, Cornell University Press.
- Elliott D (1993). Social work and social development: Towards an integrative model for social work practice. *International Social Work* 36(1): 21–36.
- Freire P (1972). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. London, Penguin.

- Gray M (2006). The progress of social development in South Africa. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 15(Suppl. 1): S53–64.
- Gray M, Coates J, Yellow Bird M, eds. (2008). *Indigenous social work around the world: Towards culturally relevant education and practice*. Aldershot, Hants, Ashgate.
- Gray M, Healy K, Crofts P (2003). Social enterprise: Is it the business of social work? *Australian Social Work* 56(2): 141–154.
- Gray M, Lombard A (2008). The post-1994 transformation of social work in South Africa. *International Journal of Social Welfare* (Special Issue) 17(1): 132–145.
- Gray M, Rennie G (2007). International social work: Bodies with organs. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work Review* 19(2): 42–58.
- Harriss J (2002). *Depoliticizing development: The World Bank and social capital*. London, Anthem Press.
- Ife J (2001). *Human rights and social work: Towards rights based practice*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart R (1997). *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, N.J, Princeton University Press.
- Izugbara CO (2008). Gendered micro-lending schemes and sustainable women's empowerment in Nigeria. In: Craig G, Popple K, Shaw M, eds. *Community development in theory and practice: An international reader*, pp. 315–324. Nottingham, Spokesman.
- Karim L (2008). Demystifying micro-credit: The Grameen Bank, NGOs, and neoliberalism. *Cultural Dynamics* 20(1): 5–29.
- Kretzmann J, McKnight J (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path towards finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. Chicago, ACTA Publications.

- Mahoney TM (2006). An asset-based approach to poverty reduction. *Social Development Issues* 28(2): 1–10.
- Meinert R (1991). A brief history of the IUCISD: From informal interest group to international organisation. *Social Development Issues* 13(3): 1–13.
- Midgely J (1995). *Social development: The developmental perspective in social welfare*. London, Sage.
- Midgley J (1999). Growth, redistribution and welfare: Toward social investment. *Social Service Review* 73(1): 3–21.
- Mohanty C (1988). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review* 30: 61–88.
- Mohanty C (1997). Women workers and capitalist scripts: Ideologies of domination, common interests and the politics of solidarity. In: Mohanty C, Alexander MJ, eds. *Feminist Genealogies: Colonial legacies. Democratic futures*, pp. 3–29. London, Routledge.
- Mowbray M (2004). Beyond community capacity building: The effect of government on social capital. Observatory PASCAL: Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions. Available at <http://www.obs-pascal.com/node/296/> [date last accessed 25 April 2008].
- Rose N (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Rozario S (1997). Development and rural women in South Asia: The limits of empowerment and conscientization. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 29(4): 45–53.
- Rozario S (2001). Women and Poverty: Is Grameen Bank the Answer? *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies* 6(2): 60–82.
- Rozario S (2002). Grameen Bank-Style Microcredit: Impact on Dowry and Women's Solidarity. *Development Bulletin* 57: 67–70.

- Sen A (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York, Anchor Books.
- Sherraden M (1991). *Assets and the poor: A new American welfare policy*. Armonk, NY, M. E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Schreiner M, Woller G (2003). Microenterprise development programs in the United States and in the developing countries. *World Development* 31(9): 1567–1580.
- Sherraden MS, Sanders CK, Sherraden M (2004). *Kitchen capitalism: Microenterprise in poor households*. New York, State University of New York Press.
- Sherraden MS, Ssewamala FM, Sanders CK (2003). Microenterprise performance: A comparison of experiences in the United States and Uganda. *Social Development Issues* 25(1–2): 219–234.
- Stepney P, Popple K (2008). *Social work and the community: A critical context for practice*. Basingstoke, Palgrave.