

**INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP STRATEGIES ON  
COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT AMONG FAITH-BASED  
ORGANIZATIONS IN KAJIADO COUNTY, KENYA**

**MORRIS SAULO OPATI**

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER  
OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,  
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**

**NOVEMBER 2014**

## **DECLARATION**

I Morris Saulo Opati hereby declare that this is my original work and has not been presented for award of a degree in any other university or any other institution of higher learning for examination.

.....

**Date** .....

**Morris S. Opati**

**Reg.No.: D61/P/7008/05**

## **SUPERVISOR'S APPROVAL**

This research report has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor

.....

**Date** .....

**DR. JAMES GATHUNGU**

**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,**

**SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Several people have facilitated the successful completion of this project. Above all, I give thanks to the Almighty God for the alert mind, focus, diligence and grace that was needed in undertaking the programme. I am also indebted to my wife, Petroniller, and children, Joel and Abigail, for their unearned prayers, encouragement, moral and financial support, patience and sacrificed time. Their support has allowed success in this endeavor.

My sincere appreciation also goes to my supervisor Dr. James Gathungu for the scholarly guidance, keen and constructive criticism from the start to the completion of the study. Much gratitude also goes to the various lecturers who directly and indirectly contributed to the MBA studies journey. I also greatly appreciate the respondents for accepting and creating time to complete the questionnaires thus making the study successful. To all, mentioned and not mentioned, thank you very much and may God bless you.

## **DEDICATION**

This project is dedicated to my dear wife, Petroniller Wayua, children, Joel Kuya and Abigail Mutio, and parents, Vinson and Florence Kuya. To my wife, your encouragements have been an invaluable lifeline. To my children, I hope this little effort stirs in you a desire and determination to scale the highest echelons of life that God has ordained for you. To my parents, this is a humble attempt to appreciate the heavenly sacrifices you poured into every moment of my being.

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

<b>ANOVA</b>	-	Analysis of Variance
<b>BOP</b>	-	Bottom of Economic Pyramid
<b>CBO</b>	-	Community Based Organization
<b>CDS</b>	-	Community-based Development Strategy
<b>CE</b>	-	Community Empowerment
<b>CED</b>	-	Community Economic Development
<b>COS</b>	-	Community Organizing Strategy
<b>CSP</b>	-	Community-based Service Provision Strategy
<b>DF</b>	-	Degree of Freedom
<b>FBCO</b>	-	Faith Based Community Organizing
<b>FBO</b>	-	Faith Based Organization
<b>NGO</b>	-	Non Governmental Organization
<b>OECD</b>	-	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>SD</b>	-	Standard Deviation
<b>SPSS</b>	-	Statistical Package for Social Sciences

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.1.1 The Concept of Entrepreneurship.....	2
1.1.2 Social Entrepreneurship Strategies.....	3
1.1.3 Community Empowerment .....	4
1.1.4 Faith Based Organization in Kenya.....	5
1.1.5 Faith Based Organization in Kajiado County.....	6
1.2 Research Problem .....	7
1.3 Research Objective .....	9
1.4 Value of the Study .....	9
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Theoretical Foundation .....	11
2.3 Social Entrepreneurship and Community Empowerment .....	14
2.4 Empirical Studies .....	19
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	22
3.2 Research Design .....	22
3.3 Target Population.....	22
3.4 Sampling Design.....	23
3.5 Data collection .....	23

3.6 Data Analysis .....	24
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS .....</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	26
4.2 General Information.....	26
4.2.1 Response Rate .....	26
4.2.2 Demographic Characteristics.....	27
4.2.3 Community Empowerment .....	28
4.2.4 Resource Mobilization .....	29
4.2.5 Community-Based Service Development .....	29
4.2.6 Community-Based Service Provision.....	30
4.3 Relationship between Independent and Dependent Variable .....	31
4.4 Discussion of Findings.....	35
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
5.1 Introduction.....	37
5.2 Summary of the Study Findings .....	37
5.3 Conclusion of the Study.....	38
5.4 Recommendations of the Study .....	39
5.4 Limitations of the Study .....	40
5.6 Areas Suggested for Further Research.....	41
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>48</b>
Appendix 1: A Selection of Non-Governmental Organizations and Faith-Based organizations Activity Areas in Kenya.....	48
Appendix 2: List of Faith Based Organizations in Kajiado County.....	48
Appendix 3: Research Questionnaire .....	51
Appendix 4: Research Cover Letter .....	54

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 4.2.1:</b> Response Rate.....	27
<b>Table 4.2.2:</b> Demographic Characteristics.....	27
<b>Table 4.2.3:</b> Community Empowerment.....	28
<b>Table 4.2.4:</b> Effect of Resource Mobilization.....	29
<b>Table 4.2.5:</b> Effect of Community-Based Service Development.....	30
<b>Table 4.2.6:</b> Effect of Community-Based Service Provision.....	31
<b>Table 4.3.1:</b> Model Summary .....	32
<b>Table 4.3.2:</b> Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).....	32
<b>Table 4.3.3:</b> Coefficients.....	34



## ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship is a variation of entrepreneurship with the social mission explicit and central to its objective. The impact on society, rather than wealth creation is the primary aspiration. Social enterprises are emerging to be the most ideal avenues for community development and empowerment. These organizations address a myriad of issues ranging from physical needs to social development. As the Non Profit Organizations' inclination changes from 'hand-outs' to 'self- sustenance', the social enterprises have emerged as ideal means of facilitating this shift, being dominated by Faith-Based Organizations. In Kenya, as reflected in the African continent, 40 to 50% of all the health and education services are provided by Faith Based Organizations (FBO). The scenario is truer in Kajiado County, the area of study, where numerous FBOs are partnering and addressing a myriad of social issues. The objective of this study was to determine the influence of social entrepreneurship strategies used by the faith based organizations on community empowerment. The study adopted descriptive survey approach where the target populations comprised of 85 key faith based organizations registered in Kajiado County. Simple random sampling was used to select a sample of 42, half of the population. Questionnaires were dropped and later collected from these organizations. Collected data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation and regression statistics with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings were discussed and presented using tables and models. Study findings indicated a significant relationship between the social entrepreneurship strategies; community organization, community development and community service provision, and community empowerment. From the study finding the following recommendations were made; the social enterprises need to develop business growth strategies and governance structures that will reinforce the underlying goal of community empowerment. The government to create a framework that will facilitate effectiveness of social enterprises while mitigating potential costs and problems of formation and regulations.

**KEY WORDS:** Empowerment, Social Entrepreneurship, Community Organizing, Community-based Development

# CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background of the Study

Empowerment of individuals and communities is an integral component of sustainable development. Such empowerment entails involvement of the local communities in the provision of goods and services with the intent of reducing dependency and encouraging individual and group initiatives. According to Halpern (Halpern, 1995), poor communities are characterized by such problems as, lack of adequate access to capital, damaging effects of social exclusion, high school dropout rates, lack of social mobility, poverty and joblessness.

This study was anchored on the Empowerment Theory. Ledwith (2005) describes community empowerment as the process of gaining influence over conditions that matter to people who share neighbourhoods, workplaces, experiences, or concerns. He indicates that, that empowerment is more than providing the resources for one to help them out of poverty; it is the act of providing the necessary tools to shape the whole person and promote a critical way of thinking and consciousness.

Community empowerment, which targets the wellbeing of social groups, is seen to be achieved much better through grassroots social enterprises. Social enterprises play an important role in addressing the social, economic and environmental challenges in local communities by fostering inclusive growth and in increasing social inclusion. They focus mainly on pursuit of common interests and to benefit entire communities (Noya & Clarence, 2007). Social enterprises support vulnerable individuals; contribute to local economic development, fight social exclusion, enhance local social capital, support democratic participation and deliver quality welfare services (OECD, 1999).

Kenya has a vibrant private sector, employing around 1 million people, and a very large informal sector of around 10 million people (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2010), but links between the two sectors are limited. Social enterprises are increasingly seen at the strategic institutions to fill this gap. Economic restructuring in the 1980's and 1990's led to reduced government expenditure on social services and safety nets and encouraged a growth in service provision by non-state actors; Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) and commercial actors. As organizations and donors began to shift their attention towards the contribution of entrepreneurial approaches to poverty alleviation, social enterprise as a concept and practice became more prevalent in Kenya.

### **1.1.1 The Concept of Entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship can be defined as the exploitation of an opportunity in order to create value. It also involves mobilizing resources to achieve entrepreneurial objectives (Timmons, 2009). The distinguishing feature of the entrepreneur is alertness to disequilibrium, or asymmetry of information, in order to create profitable opportunities (Shane, 2000). The assumption of risk is the most essential function of the entrepreneur and that the rewards of enterprise primarily accrue to the owner due to the assumption of responsibility and risk (Casson, 2003). Later scholars (Dees, Haas, & Haas, 1998; Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000) applied the concept to innovative opportunity-seeking activity regardless of whether that activity is profit seeking or whether it takes place in large organizations, non-profit organizations, universities or governments. This extension to the traditional domain has led to social entrepreneurship.

Social entrepreneurship is a variation of entrepreneurship with the social mission explicit and central to its reason for being. Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by adopting a mission to create and sustain social value, recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission (Dees, 1998). They engage in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning, acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand. Thus, social enterprises are formally established, autonomous, value-based enterprises, established to achieve social, environmental and cultural objectives, and are set up, to serve unmet needs in the society. The impact on society, rather than wealth creation becomes the primary value created (Noruzi, Westover & Rahimi, 2010).

### **1.1.2 Social Entrepreneurship Strategies**

Strategy contains the basic objectives of an organization, which are based on various perspectives involving business goals, policies and action sequences underlying rational planning as a cohesive whole (Mintzberg & Quinn, 1992). The role of the social entrepreneur therefore is to uncover or create new opportunities through a process of exploration, innovation, experimentation and resource mobilization (Dees, 2007).

In promoting community empowerment, social enterprises utilise three key entrepreneurial strategies. The first one, resource mobilization and community organizing, involves mobilizing people to combat common problems and to increase their voice in institutions and decisions that affect their lives and communities. The community organizers build power to create change. They recruit, train and mobilize a large base of members directly affected by the organization's issue. The power base ultimately shifts to the members (Minieri and Getsos, 2007).

The second, community development involves neighbourhood-based efforts to improve community physical and economic infrastructure. These may include conditions such as, the financing, construction or rehabilitation of housing, businesses, parks, common amenities and other communal resources. The social enterprises will engage the 'community' in activities such as training them to acquire skills for business development and property management. Empowerment is gradually fostered by building community participation (Minieri and Getsos, 2007).

The third, Community service provision, involves neighbourhood-level efforts to deliver social services and meet immediate direct needs. The approach here is to provide goods such as food, clothing, or services such as job training, health care or counselling, parenting skills, immunization, and literacy) that will improve people's lives and opportunities. The constituents here are usually referred to as Clients or consumers (Minieri and Getsos, 2007).

### **1.1.3 Community Empowerment**

Gusfield (1975) distinguished between two major uses of the term community. The first is the territorial and geographical notion of community —neighbourhood, town, city. The second is "relational," concerned with the quality of how human relationship are without reference to the location – professional, sports, spiritual and so forth. 'Empowerment' refers to the process by which people gain control over the factors and decisions that shape their lives. It is the process by which they increase their assets and attributes, and build capacities to gain access, partners, networks and/or a voice, in order to gain control (Laverack, 2008).

Community empowerment thus refers to the process of enabling communities to increase control over their lives. Community empowerment, therefore, is more than the involvement, participation or engagement of communities. It implies community ownership and action that explicitly aims at social and political change. Community empowerment is a process of re-negotiating power in order to gain more control. It recognizes that if some people are going to be empowered, then others will be sharing their existing power and giving some of it up (Baum, 2008).

#### **1.1.4 Faith Based Organization in Kenya**

Kenya is a “Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) heaven,” as described by a long-time development worker in Nairobi. For both political and economic reasons, Kenya (and Nairobi in particular) has become the base for international NGOs in the region, and a multitude of secular and faith-based NGOs are also operating within the country. As such, Kenya is a fertile location for research in these areas. The Christian church is growing more quickly in Sub-Saharan Africa than anywhere else in the world (Hanciles 2008), and Kenya fits within this trend.

In Kenya, as reflected in the African continent, 40 to 50% of all the health and education services are provided by Faith Based Organizations (FBOs) (Tyndale 2006). There is a renewed interest by scholars, governments and mainstream development agencies in the work of FBOs, and other religious institutions, and their impact on development. According to Republic of Kenya open data project, 65 % of school sponsors in Kenya are faith organizations. It is also important to note that most of the religious sponsored school, around 967 are considered to be public schools, implying a collaboration between the public and FBOs. A total of 1042 secondary school are sponsored by CBOs.

In every province in Kenya there is a religious-based health facility; most are located in Rift valley (28.8%). The total number of religious sponsored health facilities in 1058, versus a total number of 4167 facilities across the provinces excluding Nairobi. (Kenya Government Open Data 2011). FBOs remain actively involved in all sectors of the country (see appendix 1), despite the increasing secularization of the nation, and are the most convenient vehicle in reaching and empowering the masses.

### **1.1.5 Faith Based Organization in Kajiado County**

Kajiado County has a population of 687,312 and covers an area of 21,292.7 km<sup>2</sup> (Kenya National Bureau of Statistic 2009). It has large tracks of idle land, which are gradually being occupied by a cosmopolitan population running away from the congestion in Nairobi. The County has a unique mixture of a very traditional society of pastoralists on the one hand and a very modern urbane society on the other (Kara-UNDP AmkeniWakenya Initiative, 2011). A myriad of challenges face this county including but not limited to low literacy levels, Female genital mutilation and dropping out of school, unemployment, marginalization, poor infrastructure, health issues and inaccessibility to clean reliable water.

According to the World Relief 2007 report on its activities in Kajiado County, "... local churches bring their time and resources to the table along with an intimate knowledge of their communities. They are the experts in what the needs are and how to best meet those needs..." World Relief and numerous FBOs are partnering in Kajiado County, offering technical and financial resources towards community empowerment. Community outreach campaigns are also being carried out through local churches, impacting the lives of people affected by AIDS, families in poverty and victims of disaster.

The grim and challenging scenario in Kajiado county as captured by Roto, Ongwenyi and Mugo (2009) is that the economic activities in the county are incapable of sustaining livelihoods, as 13.3% of all adults in marginalized areas live on help from local and international NGOs. According to Mulama (2006), “Education empowers girls today and saves children’s lives tomorrow.” (p. 3). Also, education becomes very important in giving people a voice and a language to air their needs.

## **1.2 Research Problem**

According to Ashoka/McKinsey and Company (2012), the benefits of social enterprises are increased when they are adequately facilitated and supported by government policies, public and private network enabling linkages. Therefore supporting social enterprise creation and development allows them to meet employment and other social and economic challenges in a more efficient and effective way than they are currently doing (Mendell, 2010). This is most likely to happen if public policies for the social economy are co-constructed by governments and the social economy itself, including social enterprises like faith based organizations which seek to uplift the economic status of their membership; through collective resource mobilization and engagement in microfinance business.

This study involved investigation of strategies used by social enterprises and whether or not they enhanced community empowerment. With over 50% of schools and health facilities in Kenya being sponsored by Faith Based Organizations (Kenya Open Data 2011), the study focused on selected FBOs in Kajiado County. FBOs are overtime emerging to be consistent in their activities, community-need driven and able to access the masses in all corners of the community.



Though social enterprises are increasingly playing a major role in Kenya, in addressing social gaps countrywide, very little is being done in creating supportive and enabling environment, models and frameworks that will facilitate optimum impact. Moreover, there is limited understanding of social entrepreneurship activities. Apart from the traditional view of creation of new venture or institutions, they are also involved in coming up with creative and innovative ways of addressing community social issues. Developing and applying innovation important to social and economic development and developing new goods and services. Fostering a more equitable society by addressing social issues and trying to achieve ongoing sustainable impact through their social mission rather than purely profit-maximization (Dees 1998; Haugh 2007).

According to Liston's (2007) research, 74 NGOs active in Kenya in 2005 were registered as faith based; these to date are involved primarily in mission and development work. The political, social and economic factors underlying the increase in FBO activity include "...poverty, civil strife, conflicts, internal displacements, and general degeneration of the socio-economic and political systems" (Kameri-Mbote 2000, 2). FBOs, such as World Vision, Catholic Relief Services, Heifer International, the Christian Children's Fund, World Concern, and many others also contribute significantly to this work. The begging question remains; the long term effectiveness of the strategies used by these and many emerging social enterprise in Kenya.

The lack of an enabling environment and clear policy framework has constrained the growth of social enterprises in Kenya and in the process, it has negatively affected their contribution to the economy. This is compounded by the fact that there is little said about social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs in the written literature in Kenya.

To effectively address the negative situation there is need to determine the particular issues, relationships and factors that either constrain or enhance the growth of social enterprises so that appropriate action can be taken. Thus, the study sought to fill this research gap by examining the influence of social entrepreneurship strategies on community empowerment. The study attempted to answer the research question, how do social entrepreneurship strategies influence community empowerment?

### **1.3 Research Objective**

The objective of the study was to determine the influence of social entrepreneurship strategies on community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County.

### **1.4 Value of the Study**

The findings of the study were expected to be significant to social enterprises within Kajiado County and even those in other counties in the country, as they were to help them understand and appreciate the role of social enterprise in the empowerment of local communities. The study was to help the social enterprises seek measures to strengthening the positive factors that enhance their growth while minimizing those that decrease their competitiveness. By identifying key impact strategies, the study was also to help the enterprises with knowledge of areas that would enhance effectiveness. The organizations would then structure themselves to be more efficient in their operations and have a higher impact to the community.

The research results were to provide the government with a basis of understanding the effects of social enterprises on the development of communities in the country. Through it the government was to have an opportunity to seek ways to enhance the

positive factors through provision of an enabling climate. Identify the influence in community empowerment was to help afford the government strategic and effective inroad in promoting nation cohesion and community growth and development, ultimately, the growth of the country as a whole.

Theoretically, the research would be significant to academicians and researchers as it would enable them add to the existing knowledge on social enterprise sector and also provide background information to research organizations and scholars who may want to carry out further research in this area. The study would also facilitate individual researchers to identify gaps in the current research and carry out research in those areas.

## **CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents an in depth review of literature related to and consistent with the objectives of this study. It starts with theoretical foundation, highlighting important theories on social entrepreneurship, bringing out important theoretical and practical challenges. Relevant literature on the aspects pertaining to the challenges affecting the growth of social entrepreneurship in Kenya is discussed and some of the contributions that have been focused on by other researcher and authors established.

### **2.2 Theoretical Foundation**

This study was anchored on the Empowerment Theory. According to Rappaport, (1987) empowerment refers to the process of gaining influence over events and outcomes of importance. This process may unfold at multiple and interconnected levels, including the individual, group or organization and community. Ledwith (2005) describes community empowerment as the process of gaining influence over conditions that matter to people who share neighbourhoods, workplaces, experiences, or concerns. He indicates that, that empowerment is more than providing the resources for one to help them out of poverty; it is the act of providing the necessary tools to shape the whole person and promote a critical way of thinking and consciousness. Empowerment can be attained through working together and forming a collective state of consciousness that promotes and encourages change (Zimmerman, 1995).

Empowerment is assumes a beneficiary-focus as opposed to organization-focus. It seeks to enhance local capacities for influencing conditions that facilitate business and development, giving and receiving support, contributing to the capacity of community

partnerships while learning from them. Where community is effectively enhanced, empowerment is increasingly a greater reality. It has been noted that rural communities draw upon traditional rural strengths – strong mutual knowledge, sense of community and social cohesion (Shucksmith et al., 2000). Social networks are denser in rural, as compared with urban settings, with resulting outcomes of high levels of trust and active civic participation (Dale, 2005) – key components of the social capital associated with social enterprise development. The existence of co-dependence, reciprocity and collective activity would also imply rural areas appear to represent a perfect nurturing ground for successful social enterprises (Granovetter, 2005; Shucksmith et al., 1996).

Fawcett et al (1995) identified four strategies for facilitating the empowerment process and related outcomes: (1) enhancing experience and competence of members and leaders, (2) enhancing group structure and capacity, (3) removing social and environmental barriers to participation, empowerment and development, (4) enhancing environmental support and resources for coalitions. Perkins et al (2007) present a three-dimensional framework of organizational learning and empowerment structures and processes in terms of first-order (incremental or ameliorative) and second-order (transformative) change at the individual, organizational, and community levels.

In community partnerships, individual leaders and the group as a whole may differ with respect to their experience and competence. The Empowerment Theory, and other studies have identified effective leadership as a facilitator of coalition action and sustainability (Butterfoss, Goodman, Wandersman, Valois, & Chinman, 1996). Leadership can consist of one or both of the following: the member organizations of a

coalition, and the individual leaders within a coalition. Research suggests that the convening or “lead” agency must have organizational capacity, commitment, and vision, among other characteristics to build an effective coalition.

In addition, leadership from individual staff members in the member organizations is also critical. Coalitions and partnerships with action-oriented leadership and competent, committed leaders are most effective. Hasnain-Wynia et al. (2003) found that partnerships with effective or ethical leadership were more likely to be perceived by their memberships as effective in achieving their goals. Wagenaar and Wolfson (1993) found that coalition leaders from diverse cultural groups, especially those that reflect the community, are more successful in obtaining community buy-in for coalition activities.

A model of community empowerment must represent interactions among factors assumed to affect outcomes associated with the empowerment process. Theories of empowerment include both processes and outcomes, suggesting that actions, activities, or structures may be empowering, and that the outcome of such processes result in a level of being empowered (Swift & Levin, 1987; Zimmerman, 1995). Both empowerment processes and outcomes vary in their outward form because no single standard can fully capture its meaning in all contexts or populations (Zimmerman, 1993). Discussions of empowerment indicate that it can exist at three main levels (Schultz, Israel, Zimmerman, and Checkoway, 1995). Empowering processes for individuals might include participation in community organizations. At the organizational level, empowering processes might include collective decision-making and shared leadership. At the community level might include collective action to access government and other community resources.

For-profit organizations have control as an underlying component in creation of value leading to profitability. The five forces strategy framework is an illustration of this approach (Porter, 1980). Contrary to this, Social entrepreneurship approach focuses on empowering their beneficiaries, users or partners. With challenges of limited resources, empowering beneficiaries becomes the ideal way to sustainability and achievement of their goals.

### **2.3 Social Entrepreneurship and Community Empowerment**

Community empowerment as a five point continuum is comprised of the following elements: 1. Personal action; 2. the development of small interest groups; 3. Community organizations; 4. Partnerships; and 5. Social and political action (Labonte, 1990). The continuum offers a simple, linear interpretation of what is a dynamic and complex concept and articulates the various levels of empowerment from personal, to organisational through collective (community) action. Each point on the continuum can be viewed as an outcome in itself, as well as a progression onto the next point. The process of community empowerment can begin when persons experience a high degree of 'relative powerlessness' that triggers an emotional response and a personal action. Then, by participating in small interest groups, individual community members are better able to define, analyze and act on issues of concern.

According to Halpern (1995), distressed communities are characterized by such problems as, lack of adequate access to finance capital, damaging effects of social exclusion, lack of and loss of jobs, immigration of rural poor and newly arrived foreign immigrants. There are challenges of loss of community due to the fragmenting effects of ethnic pluralism and urban life, coupled with the shift of social functions

from primary institutions, such as family, church, and neighbourhood, to bureaucratic ones. On a national scale, structural adjustment in the 1980s-1990s, alongside donor reluctance to channel aid through government, saw reduction in fiscal spending on social services and safety nets (Kanyinga and Mitullah, 2001).

By the 1990s there was an increase in support to non-government organizations (NGOs) to fill gaps in service provision to the poor (Poon, 2011), and NGO activities increased as a result. Fostered by an existing 'tradition of philanthropy and volunteerism', the NGO sector in Kenya grew significantly (Kanyinga and Mitullah, 2001). The aid paradigm pendulum has since swung back towards recognizing the role of the state; however, strong emphasis remains on the private sector – and in particular the attributes that enterprise models offer in terms of sustainability and responsiveness to consumer needs. This, combined with reduced donor funding to traditional NGOs, weak public service provision by government, and increasing support from a range of philanthropic organizations, has triggered a rise in the number of organizations identified as social enterprises in Kenya.

Social enterprises are instrumental in empowering local communities economically, socially and politically to address the above challenges. Social enterprises structures include faith and youth groups, community councils, cooperatives and associations. These are the organisational elements in which people come together in order to socialise and to address their concerns. They do so using three key social entrepreneurship strategies.

The first one, resource mobilization and community organizing seeks to build groups that are democratic in governance, open and accessible to community members, and concerned with the general health of a specific interest group, rather than the



community as a whole. Organizing seeks to broadly empower community members, with the end goal of "distributing" power more equally throughout the community. According to Chambers (2003), organizing groups often seek out issues they know will generate controversy and conflict, this allows them to draw in and educate participants, build commitment, and establish a reputation for winning.

The four basic types of community organizing are grassroots or "door-knocking" organizing, Faith-Based Community Organizing (FBCO), broad-based and coalition building. Political campaigns often claim that their door-to-door operations are in fact an effort to organize the community, though often these operations are focused exclusively on voter identification and turnout. Faith-based community organizing (FBCO) is a methodology for developing power and relationships throughout a community of institutions. It can be in form of unions, neighborhood associations, and other groups (Warren, 2001). Service delivery and community development are more effective when they are part of a community organizing strategy, especially when the tasks are clearly delineated within the organization (Traynor, 1993; Miller, 1992; Lenz, 1988).

The second strategic approach is Community Development. The United Nations (2014) defines community development as "a process where community members come together to take collective action and generate solutions to common problems". The argument that social entrepreneurs should be directly involved in economic development projects that contribute to poverty reduction is well captured by Midgley (2010). Lombard (2003) describes how social workers can shift from a general community development strategy to one that focuses on community economic development, and thus on integrated human, social, and economic development.

In their community development initiatives, most social enterprises focus on what is referred to as Community Economic Development (CED). This is an initiative that focused on activities that result in the strengthening of the economic, social, or cultural base of the community. They achieve this through activities that strengthen the local capacity to address local needs and enhance the community's ability to rebuild itself (Ron S et al.2004).

Faith-based CED initiatives can play an important role in revitalizing communities. A community planning process is an effective way to begin to mobilize a community and to build leadership capacity in the process. All successful faith-based community economic development projects share a common characteristic: They address a pressing need. In general, successful community-based enterprises share three traits: they address an existing problem or need; they participate in growing markets; and they do not require employees with extensive formal training. In asset-based community development, poor communities are mobilized to help themselves. As explained by Kretzmann and Mcknight (1997), the focus is on what human capacity and other resources, both individual and institutional, exist in the community rather than on what is absent.

A third approach to community empowerment is community –based service provision. The social entrepreneurs deploy and manage resources such as financial, human, technological, and information to produce public facilities or services under the direction of institutions of local governance (Aldrich & Zimmer 1986). They assume responsibility for providing the public infrastructure and facilities and the public services that contribute to human, social, and economic development.

Enterprises also benefit from a variety of supporting services to enable their ability to grow and prosper. Faith organizations provide the necessary support for skill development to help communities to identify and/or address their concerns (Warren, Mark, 2001). The goal is to build the capacity of the community to address their own challenges

Putnam (2001) speaks of two main components of the concept: bonding social capital and bridging social capital, the creation of which Putnam credits to Ross Gittel and Avis Vidal. Bonding refers to the value assigned to social networks between homogeneous groups of people and Bridging refers to that of social networks between socially heterogeneous groups. Typical examples are that criminal gangs create bonding social capital, while choirs and bowling clubs (hence the title, as Putnam lamented their decline) create bridging social capital.

Community-based service provision further involves neighbourhood-level efforts to deliver social services (such as job training, childcare, parenting skills, housing counselling, immunization, and literacy) that will improve people's lives and opportunities (often called "human capital) (Simkovic, Michael, 2013) within a neighbourhood. The success of the community development movement has over time positively impacted community organizing. Many of the ingredients contributing to the past decade's growth of community-based development can be seen in the community organizing sector as well. During the past decade, the field of community organizing has become more institutionalized and, to some extent, professionalized.

## **2.4 Empirical Studies**

Mwasa, Sira and Maina (2014) investigated social accounting practices among Kenyan firms: an empirical study of companies quoted at Nairobi Securities Exchange. The main objectives of the study was to establish the most popular themes of social accounting in Kenya, determine how and location for disclosure of social accounting information. The population of the study was fifty seven companies quoted in NSE and longitudinal study was carried from 2008-2010. Census method was used to collect data. Secondary data was collected from published annual financial statement of all listed companies. The population of companies is categorized into four market segment, Content analysis and descriptive analysis was used in analyzing data. It was established in the year 2008, companies practicing social accounting were 72%, while 2009 were 75% and in 2010 were 81%. It was also established that community involvement and environment themes was leading in practice of social accounting

Nthathi and Hetal (2013) study investigates social entrepreneurship in developing countries. The study built upon a multidimensional model in analysing how three social enterprises from India and Kenya create social value to address social problems. The findings suggest that whilst the social mission is central to all these organizations, they also create social value through innovation and pro-activeness. Additionally, the cultural and political environmental contexts hinder their attempt to create social value. Building networks and partnerships to achieve social value creation is vital for these organizations.

Gorgi (2012) study examined strategies in social entrepreneurship: depicting entrepreneurial elements and business principles in Social Entrepreneurial

Organizations (SEOs) from Germany and Bangladesh. The study showed that in both countries innovative models of product or service provision, usually developed by economic entrepreneurs, and business concepts such as ‘customer and competitor orientation’ or ‘unique selling propositions’ are as likely to be found in SEOs as a ‘vanguard role’ in developing social innovation and the striving for societal change of ‘non-economic entrepreneurs’

Orwa (2012) study gave a critical review of various theories of entrepreneurship and showed how the theories can be applied in the developing countries with emphasis on East Africa but focusing on Kenya’s entrepreneurial culture and practices. All these approaches are critically analyzed. The paper focused on various approaches of entrepreneurships such as classical theorists; the neoclassical theories; Schumpeterian approach; Kirzner, Knightian and Schutz approaches and other recent theorists. A review is also done on the sociological aspects of entrepreneurship with a view to solve social issues (social entrepreneurship).

Linna and Richter (2011) in their exploratory study, analyze the potential of technology entrepreneurship as an engine for social transformation in the mobile service sector in Kenya. They conducted thirteen open-end interviews with experts of the mobile phone sector, operating in Kenya and beyond. The study concluded that Kenya has developed a vibrant community of established players and young tech entrepreneurs focusing on overcoming the challenges at the BOP using mobile technologies.

Jeremy, Todd and Lumpkin (2009) reviewed literature pertaining to research in social entrepreneurship. The review established that conceptual articles outnumber empirical studies, and empirical efforts often lack formal hypotheses and rigorous methods.

These findings suggest that social entrepreneurship research remains in an embryonic state. The review also suggests that social entrepreneurship is informed by common areas of interest to management scholars like entrepreneurship, public/nonprofits management, and social issues, all of which represent fruitful venues for future research efforts.

The study by Dreier (1996) focused on the factors that lead to successful community organizing. The study established that community organizing, community-based development and community-based service provision are distinct community empowerment strategies. Hence, community organizing centres on mobilization of residents to address common problems. While many macroeconomic and social structural factors can promote or inhibit grassroots mobilization, this discussion emphasizes the importance of leadership development, strategic planning, and network building in mobilizing people to solve their common problems. The major obstacle to successful community organizing is the lack of training in leadership development and organizational capacity building. The primary strategy recommended for overcoming this obstacle is to help community organizations take advantage of intermediary organizations such as organizing networks and training centres that have emerged during the past several decades.

Zimmerman, (1995) in his study on community empowerment established that that empowerment assumes divergent forms and meanings across people, is contextually determined, and changes over time. These findings that empowerment is an individualized and dynamic experience indicates that different regions require different strategies of empowerment which are contextually relevant.

## **CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the different methods that were used to collect, analyze, present and discuss the findings of the study. This includes details on the research design, the target population, sampling design and data collection. In addition, the ways through which the different data sets were to be analysed and presented was discussed.

### **3.2 Research Design**

The study used a descriptive survey approach in collecting data from the respondents. Descriptive survey research portrays an accurate profile of persons, events or account of the characteristics, for example behaviour, opinions, abilities, beliefs, and knowledge of a particular individual, situation or group (Burns and Grove 2003). The descriptive survey method was preferred because it ensured complete description of the situation, making sure that there is minimum bias in the collection of data (Kothari, 2008).

The participants answered questions administered through questionnaires. Questions were evaluated to ensure a valid and reliable survey. A blend of open-ended, closed-ended, partially open-ended, or rating-scale questions (Jackson, 2009) was used to increase accuracy and reliability.

### **3.3 Target Population**

Target population refers to the entire group of individuals or objects from which the study sought to generalize its findings (Cooper and Schindler, 2008).). The target population comprised of eight five (85) faith based organizations in Kajiado county as indicated in the population frame provided by the department of social services in

Kajiado county. Managers of social entrepreneurial initiatives were drawn from each of the faith-based organizations making it, eighty five (85) managers.

This population comprised of established organizations that could provide sufficient data for successful research. They are well distributed in the county and all involved in community empowerment effort and activities.

### **3.4 Sampling Design**

Simple random sampling was done using the list of faith-based organizations in Kajiado County as provided by the department of social services in Kajiado County. The list consisted of 42 organizations, half of the study population. The reason for this was that they are all well established with elaborate policies and operations and are a fair representation of the county.

According to Chandran (2004), simple random sampling is a sampling method whereby every member of the population has an equal chance of being selected. This minimises bias and simplifies analysis of results. In particular, the variance between individual results within the sample is a good indicator of variance in the overall population, which makes it relatively easy to estimate the accuracy of results.

### **3.5 Data collection**

Primary data was employed in the study. The study used questionnaires to collect data. This consisted of a mixture of open-ended and close-ended questions. The study used questionnaires because they were flexible, easy to analyze, and cost effective. To achieve content validity, questionnaires mainly consisted of questions on the variables. Content validity was further be ensured by consistency in administering the questionnaires, which was on drop and pick basis.



A measure of reliability and validity was also guaranteed by discussion of the instrument with the research supervisor and by ensuring high precision and minimal errors in the data entry. To strengthen the reliability and validity, a pilot study was conducted in order to ascertain and detect any ambiguities, questions that were not easily understood or poorly constructed and even those that were irrelevant were corrected. The pilot study was conducted on seven respondents from the target population who were not included in the final sample. The questionnaires were administered to the group and thereafter the feedback was obtained through debriefing them individually and comparing the results. The results of the pilot study were reanalysed using Cronbach alphas with a set lower limit of acceptability of 0.60.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

The data collected was coded for easy classification in order to facilitate tabulation and interpretation. The tabulated data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation and regression statistics with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The following regression model equation was used:

$$Y = \alpha + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + \varepsilon$$

Y = Community Empowerment

$\alpha$  = constant

$b_{1-3}$  = Régression Coefficient

$X_1$  = Community Organizing Strategy

$X_2$  = Community-Based Development strategy

$X_3$  = Community-Based Service Provision Strategy

$\varepsilon$  = error term

Presentation of data is in form of Tables, Pie charts and Bar graphs only where it provides successful interpretation of the findings. Descriptive data is provided in form of explanatory notes.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the analysis of study findings on the influence of social entrepreneurship strategies on community empowerment among faith-based organizations in Kajiado County. The specific factors looked at included community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy, and their influence on community empowerment. This chapter gives the analysis of the variables involved in the study and estimates of the model presented in the previous chapter.

### **4.2 General Information**

The researcher presented the results in frequencies and percentages. The analysis of completed questionnaires was discussed. This would help give an interpretation of expectation of each question.

#### **4.2.1 Response Rate**

Out of the 85 issued questionnaires, 80 questionnaires representing 94.1% of the total questionnaires distributed were returned fully completed, while 5 questionnaires were not returned. This represents 5.9% of the total questions distributed to the respondents as shown in Table 4.2.1. It can be inferred that the response rate was good. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a response rate of 70% and over is excellent for analysis and reporting on the opinion of the entire population.

**Table 4.2.1: Response Rate**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Filled in questionnaires	80	94.1
Unreturned questionnaires	5	5.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>

**4.2.2 Demographic Characteristics**

Table 4.2.2 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents. It analyses the type of organization and the number of staff. Based on the study majority, (55.0%) and (56.3%) indicated respectively that they had registered a faith based organization which had 11-49 employees.

**Table 4.2.2: Demographic Characteristics**

<b>Demographic factors</b>	<b>Categories</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Form of organization	Non- Governmental organization	8	10.0
	Community based organization	28	35.0
	Faith based organization	44	55.0
Number of workers /staff/ employees	10 or less employees	6	7.5
	11-49 employees	45	56.3
	80-99 employees	24	30.0
	Above 100 employees	5	6.3

The findings regarding demographic patterns resonate with the literature review with 55% of enterprises being FBOs. From the study it was also noted that these are strongly attached to faith organizations and championed by the community members. The more than 80 % of the employees were residents of the community in which the organization was working.

### 4.2.3 Community Empowerment

The following study examined the views of the respondents as to what community empowerment entails. The study analysis indicated that most of the respondents (Mean=3.80; SD=1.084) approved that Community empowerment consists of forging beneficial Partnerships; whereas the least number of respondents (Mean=2.71; SD=1.127) agreed that Empowerment involves social inclusion of members of the community as shown in Table 4.2.3

**Table 4.2.3: Community Empowerment**

Community Empowerment Variables	N	(n=80)	
		Mean	S.D.
Community empowerment involve development of Social enterprises	80	3.09	.983
Community empowerment consists of forging beneficial Partnerships	80	3.80	1.084
Involvement in Social and political actions empower communities	80	3.01	1.258
Empowerment involve social inclusion of members of the community	80	2.71	1.127
Community empowerment involve access to financial resources	80	2.74	1.209

The organizations felt that their presence and establishments in the community constitutes community empowerment (mean=3.09; SD=.983). They also felt that networking with the community either in decision making or intervention approaches was a key component in empowerment (mean=3.8). There were more varied sentiments regarding financial resources (SD=1.209) and also a feeling that it least contributes to empowerment (mean=2.74). It was observed that these thoughts were influenced by sources and purpose of funds and type of work being done.

#### 4.2.4 Resource Mobilization

Table 4.2.4 shows to what extent the resource mobilization has impacted on community empowerment. According to the study, majority of the respondents (Mean = 3.16 and S.D =1.364) concurred that, social enterprises facilitate community access to finance, while the least number of respondents agreed that social enterprises enable the community to access appropriate technology, (Mean = 2.62 and S.D. = 1.286).

**Table 4.2.4: Effect of Resource Mobilization**

Resource Mobilization Variables	(n=80)		
	N	Mean	S.D.
Social enterprises facilitate community access to finance	80	3.16	1.364
Social enterprises enable the community to access necessary skills	80	2.85	1.294
Social enterprises facilitate access to business information	80	2.65	1.274
Social Enterprises enable the community to access appropriate technology	80	2.62	1.286

There was significant diversity in relations to resource mobilization reflecting the diversity in the goals and involvement areas of the various organizations (mean ranging from 1.286 to 1.364). Majority of the organizations agreed on access to finances as a key component of empowerment (mean =3.16) and building the skills of the residents as another important element (mean 2.85). Most of the organizations being located in the rural areas with limited technology, they felt that access to technology had least influence on community empowerment (mean=2.62).

#### 4.2.5 Community-Based Service Development

The study's aim was to examine whether community-based service development affects community empowerment. The study findings show that most of the

respondents agree that, social enterprises establish sustainable economic development initiatives (Mean = 2.95 and S.D. 1.301) whilst the least number of respondents represented by (Mean =2.64 and S.D. = 1.314) indicated that social enterprises attract investments as shown in Table 4.2.5.

**Table 4.2.5: Effect of Community-Based Service Development**

Community Development Variables	(n=80)		
	N	Mean	S.D.
Social enterprises strengthening of the economic base of the community	80	2.84	1.267
Social enterprises enhance the community's ability to rebuild itself	80	2.91	1.371
Social enterprises establish sustainable economic development initiatives	80	2.95	1.301
Social enterprises attract investments	80	2.64	1.314
Social enterprises enhance entrepreneurial skills and talents in the community for development	80	2.87	1.267
Social enterprises encourage entrepreneurship in the community	80	2.76	1.295
Social enterprises build community wealth	80	2.85	1.360

There was significant differences in views regards empowerment and community wealth (SD=1.360) and empowerment versus investments (SD=1.314). This was occasioned by nature of the work the organizations are involved in. Findings show that majority agree on long term sustained development as key to empowerment (mean = 2.95), while attracting investment was seen as the least influential element to empowerment with a mean of 2.64.

#### **4.2.6 Community-Based Service Provision**

The study sought to explore the effect of community-based service provisions on community empowerment. As shown in Table 4.2.6, majority of the respondents,

(Mean= 2.86; S.D= 1.270) agreed that Social Enterprise delivers social services in the community; while the respondents least agreed that; Social enterprises strengthen public infrastructure and facilities that provide public services that contribute to human, social, and economic development (Mean = 2.51 and S.D. = 1.322).

**Table 4.2.6: Effect of Community-Based Service Provision**

Service Provision Variables	(n=80)		
	N	Mean	S.D.
Social enterprises strengthen public infrastructure and facilities that provide public services that contribute to human, social, and economic development	80	2.51	1.322
Social provide the necessary support for skill development to help communities to identify and/or address their concerns	80	2.82	1.348
Social Enterprise delivers social services in the community	80	2.86	1.270
Social enterprise participates in growing business markets	80	2.85	1.303

Most of the institutions are involved in service delivery, thus the findings indicated strong agreement on social services delivery as a key components of empowerment (mean = 2.86). Development of community public infrastructure was seen as the responsibility of the local authorities as opposed to the organizations, with an indicative mean of 2.51.

### **4.3 Relationship between Independent and Dependent Variable**

The study sought to establish if there is a relationship between community empowerment and community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy. The study used significance level (alpha) of 0.05 (95%), Degrees of freedom (DF) of 5, and two-tailed test.



**Table 4.3.1: Model Summary**

<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>
	.497	.247	.207	0.020

As seen in Table 4.3.1 above, the degree to which community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy is related to community empowerment is expressed in the positive correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.497$ ) and coefficient of determination, ( $r^2 = 0.247$ ). This implies that the four variables together predict about 35.6% of community empowerment. On the other hand, the Adjusted R-square shows that 20.7% (Adjusted R-square=.207) of the variance in the community empowerment can be explained by the variations in community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy.

**Table 4.3.2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Regression</b>	3.147	5	1.087	3.504	.000
<b>Residual</b>	4.069	17	1.254		
<b>Total</b>	7.216	22			

As shown in Table 4.3.2, analysis of variance was used to test the significance of the regression model as pertains to differences in means of the dependent and independent variables. The ANOVA test produced an F-value of 3.504 which was significant at  $p=0.000$ . This depicts that the regression model is significant at 95% confidence level. That is, the model has a 0.00% probability of misrepresenting the relationship between community empowerment and the three independent variables, community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy.

The variation in the independent variables and dependent variable can be explained by the smaller significance of the F values of 0.000 which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05 implying that there is a (statistically) significant relationship between community empowerment and community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy hence the study model is significant.

The study sought to establish the significance of the relationship between dependent and independent variables by regressing Community Empowerment (CE) as dependent variable against Community Organizing Strategy (COS), Community-Based Development Strategy (CDS) and Community-Based Service Provision Strategy (CSP) as independent variables based on the following regression model:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon$$

Whereby

Y = Community Empowerment                       $\beta_0$ = constant term

$X_1$  = Community Organizing Strategy

$X_2$  = Community-Based Development Strategy

$X_3$  = Community-Based Service Provision Strategy

While  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  are coefficients of correlation

$\varepsilon$  = the error term

Hence the above regression model became:

$$CE = \beta_0 + \beta_1COS + \beta_2 CDS+ \beta_3CSP+\varepsilon$$

Where:

$\beta_0$ = constant term,  $\beta_{1-4}$  = Regression Coefficients,  $e$ = Error Term.

**Table 4.3.3: Coefficients**

Variables	Coefficients			T	Sig
	B	Standard Error	Beta		
Constants	2.132	.521	.000	4.092	.000
Community Organizing Strategy	1.225	.611	.189	2.004	.001
Community-Based Development Strategy	1.118	.545	.220	2.051	.003
Community-Based Service Provision Strategy	1.123	.551	.143	2.034	.005

The results of the study were:

$$CE = 2.132 + 1.225 \text{ COS} + 1.118 \text{ CDS} + 1.123 \text{ CSP} + \varepsilon$$

Therefore Table 4.3.3 above shows that community empowerment as a dependent variable against community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy, implying that these independent variables are directly proportional to community empowerment. Therefore taking all independent variables (community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy) constant at zero (0) community empowerment will be 2.132%. Therefore a unit increase in community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy, will lead to 1.225, 1.118 and 1.123 unit increases in community empowerment.

The results of the study further indicate that p-value of = (0.001) for community organizing strategy, (0.003) for community-based development strategy; (.005) for community-based service provision strategy are smaller than the significance level of 0.05. The implication of these results is that there is a significant relationship between community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy and community empowerment.

#### **4.4 Discussion of Findings**

Results of the study indicate that resource mobilization affect community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County. The findings are in line with the views of Chambers (2003) that social enterprises often educate participants, build commitment, and establish effective ways of resource mobilization so as to empower local communities. The findings also show that social enterprises mobilise local communities to access to finance and necessary skills; facilitate access to business information and enable the community to access appropriate technology. The study findings are in line with the views of Ron, et al (2004) who observed that most social enterprises focus on community economic development activities that result in the strengthening of the economic, social, or cultural base of the community.

Findings of the study show that community based development strategies influence community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County. The findings concurs with the findings of Lombard (2003) who established that social enterprises shifts from a general community development strategy to one that focuses on community economic development, and thus on integrated human, social, and economic development.

The results of the study also indicated that social enterprises strengthen the economic base of the community, enhance the community's ability to rebuild itself, establish sustainable economic development initiatives and mobilize investments. These findings are in line with the views expressed by Midgley (2010) that social enterprises facilitate communities to come together to take collective action so as to generate solutions to economic problems and are directly involved in economic development projects that contribute to poverty reduction

In addition the study revealed that social enterprises enhance entrepreneurial skills and talents in the community for development, encourage entrepreneurship in the community and build community wealth. The study findings agree with those of Minieri and Getsos, (2007) that established that social enterprises engage the community in activities such as training them to acquire skills for business development and property management.

Results of the study indicate that community based service provision strategies on community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County. The study findings concurs with the views of Simkovic Michael, (2013) that community-based service provision further involves neighbourhood-level efforts to deliver social services that will improve people's lives and opportunities within communities. The study findings also show that social enterprises strengthen public infrastructure and facilities that provide public services that contribute to human, social, and economic development. The study results are in line with both the views of Traynor, (1993) and Miller, (1992) that social enterprises enhance service delivery within the community, especially when the tasks are clearly delineated within the enterprise

The study also revealed that social enterprises also provide the necessary support for skill development to help communities to identify and/or address their concerns, deliver social services in the community and participate. These findings agree with those of Dees, (2007) that indicated that social entrepreneurs deploy and manage resources such as financial, human, technological, and information to produce public and deliver relevant services that contribute to human, social, and economic development in the community.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **5.1 Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to present summary, draw conclusions and recommendations on the findings of the main objective of the study which was to determine the influence of social entrepreneurship strategies on community empowerment among faith-based organizations in Kajiado County. The factors being researched on were community organizing strategy, community-based development strategy and community-based service provision strategy in relation to community empowerment.

### **5.2 Summary of the Study Findings**

The study established that resource mobilization affect community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County. The study also found out that social enterprises facilitate community access to finance and enable the community to access necessary skills, ease access to business information and enhance the community capacity to access appropriate technology.

The Study found out that community based development strategies influence community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County. It revealed that social enterprises strengthen the economic base of the community, enhance the community's ability to rebuild itself and establish sustainable economic development initiatives. In addition established that social enterprises enhance entrepreneurial skills and talents in the community for development, encourage entrepreneurship in the community and build community wealth.

The study established that community based service provision strategies affect community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County. It revealed that social enterprises strengthen public infrastructure and facilities that provide public services that contribute to human, social, and economic development. The study also found out that social enterprises also provide the necessary support for skill development to help communities to identify and/or address their concerns, deliver social services in the community

### **5.3 Conclusion of the Study**

Community organizing has a greater influence on community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County. In this case, social enterprises facilitated community empowerment as they influence community access to finance, technical skills, business information and enhance the community capacity to access appropriate technology.

Community based development strategies influence community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County as social enterprises strengthen the economic base of the community, enhance the community's ability to rebuild itself, establish sustainable economic development initiatives, and attract investments. Social enterprises enhance entrepreneurial skills and talents in the community for development, encourage entrepreneurship in the community and build community wealth.

Community based service provision strategies affect community empowerment among faith-based organization in Kajiado County since social enterprises strengthen public infrastructure and facilities that provide public services that contribute to

human, social, and economic development. Social enterprises also provide the necessary support for skill development to help communities to identify and/or address their concerns, deliver social services in the community

#### **5. 4 Recommendations of the Study**

There is need for management to effectively mobilize and control utilization of financial resources. This could be done through monitoring and reviewing enterprise financial needs on a regular and timely basis in order to identify financial resource variances and inefficiencies. Once the differences are identified, corrective action can be taken before the situation negatively affects enterprise growth.

There is need for social enterprises to develop and implement business growth strategies so as to be able to effectively cope with business changes. The enterprises are easily affected even by smallest changes in the marketplace such as changes in customers, new moves by competitors, or fluctuations in the overall business environment. Their goals being value addition as opposed to profit maximization, such changes can negatively impact their cash flow in a very short time frame and result in negative business growth.

There is need for social enterprise to establish governance structure that fits social enterprises and tailored to enterprise needs and other structure. Flexibility and dynamism should be infused in the structure to match the ever changing needs, environment and ensure relevance over throughout the organizations' life spans. Moreover social enterprises should evaluate and modify their governance structures regularly to adopt to the changing needs and business dynamics.



There is need for management of social enterprises to leverage on social partners' assistance, opportunities for training of staff in requisite specialized competencies. This is in areas such as leadership, change management, communication, negotiating, team building, decision making, and problem solving. The aim is to maintain the right skill mix and enhancing enterprise growth.

Government regulations have positive and negative effects on social enterprise. While recognizing the potential costs and problems which regulation might impose on social enterprises, there is a need for the government to balance these with the envisaged and actual benefits of regulation to social enterprises, hence the community. Effort must be taken to ensure a health trade-off between costs and benefits of regulation among social enterprise that promote entrepreneurial activities that promote community empowerment.

#### **5.4 Limitations of the Study**

Matters concerning enterprise operations status are more often regarded as confidential information. Some respondents did not provide full information for fear of being reprimanded by their seniors for giving out information that they might consider confidential in terms of effectiveness and resources possessed. However, the researcher assured the respondents of the confidentiality of the information that they provided and sought authority from management to undertake research in the institution.

Some respondents did not provide authentic information but instead provided general information making it difficult to obtain the required information. However the researcher alternated closed and open ended questions in order to get direct answers.

Some organization had poor record keeping hence there was scant information that could be accessed in terms of financial statements. The researcher addressed this by using other related documentation to collect the information required. This made the process take more time than anticipated.

In order to assure manageability of the collected data, the study used questionnaire that rely on self report responses. However the problem with using a questionnaire is that it is based on the assumption that participants would respond to the questions in an honest and accurate manner. Nevertheless, it is not always the case that participants answer in an honest manner. This is because participants often give answers that they believe to be desirable. However the researcher used qualitative data to complement the information obtained through the questionnaire

## **5.6 Areas Suggested for Further Research**

Due to the limiting factors mentioned earlier in this study, it was not possible to carry out a comprehensive research on the effects of social enterprises strategies on empowerment of communities in Kenya. There is need to widen the study by including more social enterprises that are spread all over the country. There is also room to include more study variables that have not been covered in this study. The study also recommends further research target the beneficiaries as opposed to the manager. This will allow an all rounded view on empowerment and effectiveness of social enterprise and strategies they employ. Studies could also be conducted with a focus on specific areas of empowerment and narrowing down to organizations in the specific categories. This will allow more specific findings and focused comparisons.

## REFERENCES

- Baum, J. A. (2008). *Network Strategy*. Bradford: Emerald Group Pub.
- Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo*. Los Angeles, Sage Publications Limited.
- Burns, N., & Grove, S. (2003). *Understanding nursing research* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia, Pa.: Saunders.
- Butterfoss, F. D., Goodman, R. M., & Wandersman, A. (1996). Community Coalitions for Prevention and Health Promotion: Factors Predicting Satisfaction, Participation, and Planning. *Health Education & Behavior*, 23(1), 65-79.
- Casson, M. (2003). *The entrepreneur an economic theory* (2nd ed.). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.
- Chambers, E. T., & Cowan, M. A. (2003). *Roots for Radicals: Organizing for power, action, and justice*. New York: Continuum.
- Chandran, S. (2004). *Adaptive antenna arrays: Trends and applications*. Berlin: Springer.
- Dale, A. (2005). *A dynamic balance social capital and sustainable community development*. Vancouver, B.C.: UBC Press.
- De Silva, S. (2002). *Communities Taking the Lead. A Handbook on Direct Financing of Communities Project*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Dees, J. (2007). Taking Social Entrepreneurship Seriously. *Society*, 44(3), 24-31.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). *The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship. A Case at Duke*. Stanford Graduate School of Business.
- Dees, J. G., Elias, J., & Bowie, N. E. (1998). The Challenges of Combining Social and Commercial Enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8(1), 165.
- Dongier, P. (2003). *Community Driven Development*. PRSP Sourcebook. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Dreier, P. (1996). Community Empowerment Strategies: The Limits and Potential of Community Organizing in Urban Neighborhoods. *A Journal of Policy Development and Research* Volume 2, Number 2
- Fawcett, S. B., Paine-Andrews, A., Francisco, V. T., Schultz, J. A., Richter, K. P., Lewis, R. K., ... & Lopez, C. M. (1995). Using empowerment theory in collaborative partnerships for community health and development. *American journal of community psychology*, 23(5), 677-697.

- GoK. (n.d.). *Kenya Facts and Figures 2011*. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved October 16, 2014, from <http://www.knbs.or.ke>
- Gorgi, K. (2012). Strategies in Social Entrepreneurship: Depicting entrepreneurial elements and business principles in SEOs from Germany and Bangladesh; *Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives* Vol. 1, Issue 1, p.61 – 96,
- Government. (n.d.). Health Facilities | Open Kenya | Transparent Africa. Open Kenya. Retrieved October 16, 2014, from <https://www.opendata.go.ke/Health-Sector>.
- Granovetter, M. S. (2005). *Getting a job: a study of contacts and careers* (2. ed.). Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Gupta, M. D., Grandvoinet, H., & Romani, M. (2003). *Fostering community-driven development: what role for the state?* (No. 2969). World Bank, Development Research Group, Public Services and Rural Development, and, Africa Technical Families, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management.
- Gusfield, J. R. (1975). *Community: a critical response*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Haas, M. E., & Philbrick, J. H. (1988). The New Management: Is It Legal? *Academy of Management Executive*, 2(4), 325-329.
- Halpern, Robert, 1951-. (1995). *Rebuilding the inner city: A history of neighborhood initiatives to address poverty in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hanciles, J. (2008). *Beyond Christendom: Globalization, African migration, and the transformation of the West*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books.
- Hasnain-Wynia, R. (2003). Overview of the community care network demonstration program and its evaluation. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 60(4 Suppl.), p.5–16.
- Haugh, H. (2007). Community-Led Social Venture Creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(2), 161-182.
- Heifetz, R. & Marty L. (2004). *Capacity Enhancement for Social Development: Building on Local Context and Process*. Washington, DC: World Bank Institute.
- Jenkins, J. C. (1987). *Nonprofit organizations and policy advocacy*. In W. Powell (Ed.), *The non-profit sector*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jeremy C. S., Todd W. M., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 3: 161–194

- Kanyinga, K. and Mitullah, W. (2001) *The non-profit sector in Kenya: What we know and what we don't know*. Institute of Development Studies, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Kingsley, G., & McNeely, J. (1997). *Community building: Coming of age*. Washington DC: Developing Training Institute.
- KNBS. (2011, October 10). *Open Kenya | Transparent Africa*. Open Kenya. Retrieved October 16, 2014, from <https://opendata.go.ke>
- KNBS. (n.d.). Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved October 16, 2014, from <http://www.knbs.or.ke>
- Kothari, D., & Nagrath, I. (2008). *Modern power system analysis*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1993). *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.
- Laverack, G., & Labonte, R. (2000). A planning framework for community empowerment goals within health promotion. *Health policy and planning*, 15(3), 255-262.
- Laverack, G., & Labonte, R. (2008). *Health promotion in action*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ledgerwood, J. (1999), *Sustainable banking with the poor. Microfinance handbook*, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Ledwith, M., & Ledwith, M. (2005). *Community development: a critical approach*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Linna, P., & Richter, U. (2011). Technology entrepreneurship-potential for social innovation? The case of Kenyan mobile industry companies. *International Journal of Business and Public Management* Vol. 1(1): 42-50
- Lombard, A., & Westheimer, M. (2003). *Parents making a difference: International research on the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) program : Publication in honor of Professor Avima D. Lombard*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Magnes Press.
- Mansuri, G. & Vijayendra, R. (2003). *Evaluating Community Based and Community-Driven Development: A Critical Review of the Evidence*. Development Research Group. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Mattessich, P., & Monsey, B. (1997). *Community Building: What Makes It Work: A Review of Factors Influencing Successful Community Building*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

- Mbote, P. (2000). *The operational environment and constraints for NGOs in Kenya: Strategies for good policy and practice*. Kampala: Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment.
- McKnight, John L. and John P. Kretzmann. (1997). "Mapping community capacity." Pp. 157-172 in Meredith Minkler (ed.) *Community Organizing & Community Building for Health*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- McNeil, M. & Michael, W. (2004). *Capacity Enhancement for Social Development: a Strategy for Building on Local Context and Process*. A paper prepared for CESI Technical Review Meeting, Paris, February 25-26,
- Microfinance Information Exchange, Inc. (2009-12-01). "MicroBanking Bulletin Issue #19, December, 2009, pp. 49". Microfinance Information Exchange, Inc.
- Midgley, J. (2010). "Community Practice and Developmental Social Work" in Midgley, J. and Conley, A. (Eds). *Social Work and Social Development. Theories and Skills for Developmental Social Work* New York: Oxford University Press, 167-204.
- Midgley, J., & Conley, A. (2010). *Social work and social development: Theories and skills for developmental social work*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Minieri, J., and Getsos, P. *Tools for Radical Democracy: How to Organize for Power In Your Community*, San Fransisco, The Chardon Press Series.
- Mintzberg, H., & Quinn, J. B. (1991). *The strategy process: concepts, contexts, cases* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Morino, M. (1994). *Assessment and Evolution of Community Networking*. Paper presented at Ties That Bind, at Apple Computer, Cupertino, CA.
- Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (1999). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nariobi, Kenya: African Centre for Technology Studies.
- Mwasa, I., Sira F. N. & Maina, L. (2014). Social Accounting Practices Among Kenyan Firms: An Empirical Study Of Companies Quoted At Nairobi Securities Exchange. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1 (11), 144-152.
- Noruzi, M. R., Westover, J. H., & Rahimi, G. R. (2010). An exploration of social entrepreneurship in the entrepreneurship era. *Asian Social Science*, 6(6), p3.
- Noya, A., & Clarence, E. (2009). Community capacity building: fostering economic and social resilience. *Organisation for economic cooperation and development*, 26-27.

- Nthati, R., & Hetal, S. (2013). Investigating Social Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries. *World Review of Business Research* Vol. 3. No. 2. Pp. 95 – 112
- OECD. (1999). *Aid Activities in Africa, 1997-1998*. Paris: Development Assistance Committee.
- Organization For Economic Cooperation and Development. (1998). *Aid Activities in Africa, 1997-1998 Creditor Reporting System Gazette Special Edition*. Washington: Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development.
- Orwa B., H. (2012). Evolution and Theories of Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review on the Kenyan Perspective. *International Journal of Business and Commerce* Vol. 1, No.11: Pp81-9
- Perkins, D. D., Bess, K. D., Cooper, D. G., Jones, D. L., Armstead, T., & Speer, P. W. (2007). Community organizational learning: Case studies illustrating a three-dimensional model of levels and orders of change. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(3), 303-328.
- Poon, D. (2011) 'The Emergence and Development of Social Enterprise Sectors'. *Social Impact Research Experience Journal*. Wharton Business School: University of Pennsylvania. <http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi>
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. New York: Free Press.
- Report of the 2010 baseline household survey. (2010). Nairobi: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.
- Sarah, A, H., David, L, B., and Christine, L, W. (2004). *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Transformation: An Exploratory Study*. Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations Working Paper No. 15. Retrieve from <http://ssrn.com/abstract>.
- Schechter, J. M. (1992). *The indispensable harp historical development, modern roles, configurations, and performance practices in Ecuador and Latin America*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- Shaffer, R., Deller, S., & Marcouiller, D. (2004). *Community economics: linking theory and practice* (No. Ed. 2). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The Promise Of Entrepreneurship As A Field Of Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shucksmith, M., & Philip, L. (2000). Social Exclusion in rural areas: A literature review and conceptual framework.
- Shulz, A. J., Israel, B. A., Zimmerman, M. A., & Checkoway, B. N. (1995). Empowerment as a multi-level construct: Perceived control at the individual,

- organizational, and community levels. *Health Education Research: Theory and Practice*, 10, 309-327.
- Sipos, S. (2004). Integrating and Empowering the Poor and the Excluded: The Roma and Other “Pockets of Poverty”, *Spectrum Magazine* (Summer Issue), Washington, DC: World Bank
- Sriramesh, K. (2009). *The global public relations handbook: Theory, research, and practice* (Expanded and revised ed.). New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- The Kenya Alliance of Resident Associations (KARA). (n.d.). The Kenya Alliance of Resident Associations (KARA). Retrieved October 16, 2014, from <http://www.kara.or.ke/>
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social Entrepreneurship. ‘A New Look At The People And The Potential. *Management Decision*’, 38(5), 328-338.
- Timmons, J. A., & Spinelli, S. (2009). *New venture creation: entrepreneurship for the 21st century* (Eighth ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Tyndale, W. (2006). *Visions of development: faith-based development*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Warren, M. (2001). *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zimmerman, M.A. (1995). Psychological Empowerment: Issues and Illustrations, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol.23
- Zimmerman, M.A. (1999). *Empowerment Theory: Psychological, Organizational and Community Levels of Analysis*. Michigan. University of Michigan



## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: A Selection of Non-Governmental Organizations and Faith-Based organizations Activity Areas in Kenya

Activity	Number of Organizations	Activity	Number of Organizations
Education	645	AIDS	71
Health	641	Refugees	48
Environment	414	Nature Conservation	27
Water and sanitation	277	Food Security/Nutrition	24
Rural development	215	Forestry	17
Relief	204	Peace and conflict	15
Women	129	Wildlife	13
Population	110	Social Policy	6
Pastoralists/Arid Zones	105	Energy	2
Agriculture/Livestock	74	Fisheries	2

Compiled by Dr. Vanessa Liston from the 2005 National Directory of NGOs in Kenya (Liston 2007).

### Appendix 2: List of Faith Based Organizations in Kajiado County

No	Organization
1.	ACT Development
2.	ACT International
3.	Action by Churches Together (ACT)
4.	ADRA Adventist Development and Relief Agency
5.	Africa Faith & Justice Network
6.	African Methodist Episcopal Church Service
7.	Aid to the Church in Need
8.	Al-Hakim Foundation
9.	All Faiths Receiving Home
10.	Anglican Aids and Healthcare Trust (AAHT)
11.	Association of Evangelical Relief and Development
12.	Baptist World Alliance

13.	Beacon of Hope
14.	Bishop Simeon Trust
15.	Bread for the World
16.	Bright Hope International
17.	Canadian Lutheran World Relief
18.	Capuchin Franciscan Friars
19.	Catholic Charities
20.	Christian Aid
21.	Christian Blind Mission
22.	Christian Children's fund
23.	Christian Community Ministries
24.	Christian Friends of Korea
25.	Christian Reformed World Missions
26.	Christian Rural Aid Network
27.	Christian Social Services committee
28.	Church Action on Poverty
29.	Church and Land Programme
30.	Compassion International
31.	Concern Worldwide
32.	Coptic Evangelical Organisation for Social Services
33.	Council of Religious AIDS Networks
34.	Cross International
35.	Dan Church Aid
36.	Development Agency, Inc.
37.	Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance
38.	Episcopal Relief & Development
39.	Eternal Hope Charity Mission
40.	Faith Development Dialogue
41.	Faith Fellowship's Social Action Project
42.	Food for the Poor
43.	Franciscan Mission Service
44.	Fresh Ministries
45.	Global Outreach Mission
46.	Grace Ministries
47.	Hearts of Hope
48.	Helping Hand for Relief and Development
49.	Holy Cross Associates
50.	HOPE International
51.	ImpACT Coalition
52.	Interchurch Organization for Development Cooperation
53.	Interfaith League against Poverty
54.	International Orthodox Christian Charities
55.	International Interfaith Investment Group
56.	Latter-Day Saints Charities
57.	Lutheran World Federation

58.	Mission Aviation Fellowship
59.	Mission of Mercy
60.	Missionary Ventures
61.	Muslim Aid
62.	National Christian Foundation
63.	Nazarene Compassionate Ministries
64.	Open Arms International
65.	Operation Blessing
66.	Operation Mobilization International
67.	Opportunity International organization
68.	Orthodox Church
69.	Pamoja
70.	Pan African Christian AIDS Network
71.	Partners International
72.	Religious Action Center of Reform
73.	Renew Faith
74.	Samaritan's Purse
75.	David's Relief Foundation
76.	The Salvation Army World Service
77.	United Evangelical Mission
78.	United People in Christ
79.	Women, Faith, and Development Alliance
80.	World Hope International
81.	World Relief
82.	World Vision
83.	Youth With a Mission

Source: Kajiado County; Education gender, youth, culture and Social Services Department (2013)

### Appendix 3: Research Questionnaire

**Dear Sir/ Madam,**

I am a university of Nairobi student conducting a research on the influence of social entrepreneurship strategies on community empowerment among faith-based organizations in Kajiado County. It is expected that my findings from the study will improve the FBO sector and social services delivery. The following questionnaire has section A and B and is designed to gather information to fulfill this purpose.

**Kindly do not write your name. Indicate your answer and tick (√) where appropriate. Your responses will be absolutely treated confidentially.**

#### SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What form of organization have you registered?

Non-Governmental Organization ( ) Community Based Organization ( )

Faith Based Organization ( ) Others (Please specify) .....

2. How long has the organization been in operation?

.....

3. What are the key areas the organization is involved in?

.....

4. How many workers /staff/ employees do you have?

10 or less employees ( )

11-49 employees ( )

50-99 employees ( )

Above 100 employees ( )

## SECTION B:

### B.I. Community Empowerment

*Please tick one choice for each of the following statements.*

*(1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = nor disagree nor agree, 4 =agree, 5 = strongly agree)*

	1	2	3	4	5
Community empowerment involve development of Social enterprises					
Community empowerment consists of forging beneficial Partnerships					
Involvement in Social and political actions empower communities					
Empowerment involve social inclusion of members of the community					
Community empowerment involve access to financial resources					

### B.II. Resource Mobilization

*Please tick one choice for each of the following statements.*

*(1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = nor disagree nor agree, 4 =agree, 5 = strongly agree)*

	1	2	3	4	5
Social enterprises facilitate community access to finance					
Social enterprises enable the community to access necessary skills					
Social enterprises facilitate access to business information					
Social Enterprises enable the community to access appropriate technology					

### **B.III Community-Based Development**

*Please tick one choice for each of the following statements.*

*(1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = nor disagree nor agree, 4 =agree, 5 = strongly agree)*

	1	2	3	4	5
Social enterprises strengthening of the economic base of the community					
Social enterprises enhance the community's ability to rebuild itself					
Social enterprises establish sustainable economic development initiatives					
Social enterprises attract investments					
Social enterprises enhance entrepreneurial skills and talents in the community for development					
Social enterprises encourage entrepreneurship in the community					
Social enterprises build community wealth					

### **B.IV Community-Based Service Provision**

*Please tick one choice for each of the following statements.*

*(1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = nor disagree nor agree, 4 =agree, 5 = strongly agree)*

	1	2	3	4	5
Social enterprises strengthen public infrastructure and facilities that provide public services that contribute to human, social, and economic development.					
Social provide the necessary support for skill development to help communities to identify and/or address their concerns.					
Social Enterprise delivers social services in the community					
Social enterprise participates in growing business markets.					

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION**

Appendix 4: Research Cover Letter



**UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**  
**SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**  
**MBA PROGRAMME**

Telephone: 020-2059162  
Telegrams: "Varsity", Nairobi  
Telex: 22095 Varsity

P.O. Box 30197  
Nairobi, Kenya

DATE 15/9/2014

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

The bearer of this letter MORRIS SAULO OPAJI



Registration No. D61/P/700A/05

is a bona fide continuing student in the Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree program in this University.

He/she is required to submit as part of his/her coursework assessment a research project report on a management problem. We would like the students to do their projects on real problems affecting firms in Kenya. We would, therefore, appreciate your assistance to enable him/her collect data in your organization.

The results of the report will be used solely for academic purposes and a copy of the same will be availed to the interviewed organizations on request.

Thank you.

  
  
**PATRICK NYABUTO**  
**MBA ADMINISTRATOR**  
**SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**