

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH AND STUDIES

www.ijcrs.org

ISSN-0249-4655

## THE MEDIATION EFFECT OF ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERVENTIONS AND BENEFICIARY POVERTY REDUCTION BY FAITH BASED ENTERPRISES WITHIN SLUMS IN NAIROBI CITY COUNTY, KENYA

**Charles Nalyanya Nyungu MBA**

PhD Candidate, School of Business, University of Nairobi

**Prof. Bitange Ndemo PhD**

Associate Professor, Entrepreneurship  
School of Business, University of Nairobi

**Dr. James M. Gathungu PhD, CPS (K)**

Senior Lecturer, Strategy and Entrepreneurship  
School of Business, University of Nairobi

**Prof. Ganesh P. Pokhariyal PhD, DSc**

Professor, Applied Mathematics  
School of Mathematics, University of Nairobi

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*The study interrogated the mediated relationship between interventions and entrepreneurial orientation in beneficiary poverty reduction by FBEs within the slums of Nairobi. It tested the hypothesis that there was a significant mediating effect of entrepreneurial orientation on the relationship between interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction. Data was collected from 72 FBEs and had a response rate of 79.9 percent. The study established that entrepreneurial orientation had a significant mediating effect on the relationship between interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction. The study contributes to new knowledge as it demonstrates that EO is vital in the making of decisions to deliver social value. The finding assists to explain the inconsistencies and doubts raised by scholars on the EO mediating role. The paper suggests FBES embrace social innovation to exploit change and generate diverse income activities to sustain beneficiary poverty reduction activities. The study findings are important to build theory and new methods on the infancy Faith based entrepreneurship sector that impacts positively to the society.*

**Keywords:** *Beneficiary poverty reduction, Entrepreneurial orientation, Interventions, Faith based Enterprises.*

## INTRODUCTION

Faith-based entrepreneurship as a concept under social entrepreneurship is an emerging innovative approach of creating economic wealth for social change (Raskin, 2000). Globally, Faith Based Enterprises (FBEs) assist in providing solutions to voids in welfare and social good by providing survival needs such as water, food, shelter, soft loans, trainings, business development services and employment creation for better living (Tadros, 2010, Bovaird, 2006). To achieve this, it entails proper decision making by the management teams based on the contexts of entrepreneurial orientation.

Lumpkin & Dess (1996) define entrepreneurial orientation (EO) as processes, policies, practices and decision making activities that lead to new discovery like research for new social value venture activities. Krueger et al., (2000) asserts that entrepreneurial orientation dimensions shape the entrepreneurial intent in an enterprise and reinforce other human capital attributes such as individual skills for propensity to deliver in poverty reduction activities. According to Gupta and Batra (2015) social network forces in the environment may have positive linkages to performance of an enterprise influenced by entrepreneurial orientation factors. Weerawardena and Sullivan (2006) describe EO as a multidimensional construct involving key dimensions of proactiveness, innovativeness, risk taking and competitiveness for an enterprise to perform such as bringing forth a poverty reduction idea and carry it to completion.

Okeyo, Gathungu and K'Obonyo (2016), Walter, Aver and Ritter (2006), Covin and Slevin (2006) submit that the enterprise's degree of entrepreneurship is the extent it mediates or applies to the EO dimensions to deliver in social value. Resatsch & Faisst (2003) posit that with EO knowledge, the performance of the enterprise is coordinated and efficiently managed for stakeholders to realize value of their investments. Similarly, Gathungu *et al.*, (2014) contend that relationships between entrepreneurial orientation and the enterprise incline the management to take risks and favor novelty for competitive edge to deliver. However, information on the mediation processes of entrepreneurial orientation between Interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction by FBEs within the slums was limited and not clear. This lack of clarity is demonstrated Haugh (2007) & Ndemo (2006) acknowledgement that direct relationships between interventions and beneficiary's poverty reduction through networking raise resources without focus on EO dimensions in the relationship giving doubt to its mediating effect.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Lumpkin & Dess, (1996) conceptualize mediating role of entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) to capture processes, practices and decision making by top management. For an enterprise to deliver, Prabhu (1998) and Sullivan *et al.* (2003) posit that entrepreneurial orientation dimensions of innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking, competitive aggressiveness and autonomy are central in the making of FBEs decisions to achieve its mission of beneficiary poverty reduction targets. Gathungu, Aiko and Machuki (2014) posit that characteristics of the individual and the enterprise profile are the backbone of EO decisions for an enterprise to competitively perform. Correspondingly, Walter, Aver and Ritter (2006) posit that EO has close relationship with the environment from which enterprises through networks accumulate resources for poverty reduction activities.

According to Walter et al. (2006) EO is inclined to the innovations theory for instance new products and services and the human capital theory for skills and resources. Reynolds (1991) asserts that social networking and environment factors are catalysts to entrepreneurial opportunities for business to excel. According to Johannison & Monsted (1997), innovativeness is a key ingredient of Entrepreneurial Orientation that enables the start of utilities that generate incomes for beneficiary poverty reduction levels.

Similarly, the factors of education and experience synonymous to the human capital theory are driving interventions in social value delivery (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Becker, 1975). Anderson & Miller (2003) contend that under Entrepreneurial orientation component, education and experience relationships are

critical enablers in decision making by an enterprise for beneficiaries to discover and exploit income generating opportunities. Krueger *et. al.*, (2000) hold that experience and education coupled with creativity, innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking are EO dimensions with relationship to the enterprise intervention exploitation of opportunities for improved standards of living to the people. Essentially, experience is necessary in startups to reduce business failure (Gartner, 1988).

Furthermore, innovativeness reflects the enterprise tendency to intervene and support new ideas, discarding old beliefs and explores new alternatives novelty, experimentation and creative processes that may result in technological processes for new products and services (Lumpkin & Dees, 1996). Additionally, Dees (1998) note that for social mission to be embedded by an enterprise, there has to be relentless pursues of new opportunities in continuous innovation for enterprise delivery.

Miller (1983) attributes the enterprise's degree of entrepreneurship to the extent it innovates, acts proactively and takes risks. Given the turbulent business environment and the resultant competition, enterprise interventions have to place great emphasis on innovation, proactiveness, risk taking and competitiveness for robust performance in social value delivery (Jabeen & Mohamood, 2014, Lumpkin & Dees, 1996). Additionally, Dees and Battle (2006) argued that innovativeness, proactiveness and risk taking are central to the enterprise's efforts to mitigate problems of the poor such as creation of employment, income generating activities and better nutrition levels. Gathungu (2018) contend that there are various levels of innovations based on uniqueness of the idea. However enterprises' willingness to adopt innovative processes are often influenced by both internal and external environmental factors.

According to Lumpkin & Dess (1996), application of EO dimension of proactiveness is a response to opportunities in dynamic environments by any enterprise in terms of new products, technologies, emerging markets and community social needs. The findings by Prabhu (1998); Weerawadena and Sullivan (2006) incline to EO underpinnings in influencing enterprise to deliver in social value. However, the extent of the mediation by EO between interventions and the enterprise social value delivery was not clear which cast doubt on the EO mediating role thus justification for this study.

On the other hand, Hambrick, (2007) describes autonomy as independent actions by the enterprise team to bring forth an idea or vision and carry it through to completion while the risk-taking factor relates to the taking of bold actions that commit large amounts of resources to programmes with uncertain outcomes. In difference to the other EO dimensions, competitive aggressiveness may refer to FBEs response to threats and doing things differently. It may reflect the way FBE engages with its competitors, outperforming the sector rivals while responding to the trends and social welfare needs of its members for changed lifestyles.

## **Research Objective**

To establish effect of entrepreneurial orientation on the relationship between interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction by Faith based enterprises within slums of Nairobi.

## **Research Hypothesis**

**H:** The entrepreneurial orientation has a significant intervening effect on the relationship between interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction by Faith based enterprises within slums of Nairobi.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study used the descriptive cross-sectional survey research design. Russel, (2000), Sekaran, (2007) illustrate that descriptive Cross-sectional research design involves description of the population, testing and analyzing the hypothesized relationships quantitatively and qualitatively. This study adopted the mixed method as it used quantitative and qualitative approaches for comprehensive research findings. The study used

the census method with the FBE as the unit of analysis. The study population consisted of 72 FBEs spread in the slums of Nairobi namely Kibera, Mukuru, Mathare, Korogocho, Huruma, Majengo Pumwani, Kariobangi, Dandora and Kangemi. Berthoud (2000) posit 0.5 as satisfactory rate to determine the internal consistency of the research instrument. Factor analysis was used to test convergent and discriminant validity. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, coefficient of variation) and multiple regression.

### Stepwise analysis

Four step mediation methodology Baron and Kenny (1986)

$$\text{Step 1: } \text{BPR} = \alpha + (\beta_1 X) + \varepsilon_2$$

$$\text{Step 2: } \text{EO} = \alpha + (\beta_1 X) + \varepsilon_3$$

$$\text{Step 3: } \text{BPR} = \alpha + (\beta_1 \text{EO}) + \varepsilon_4$$

If the relationship is significant then proceed to step 4

$$\text{Step 4: } \text{BPR} = \alpha + (\beta_1 X) + \beta_2 \text{EO} + \varepsilon_5$$

$$Y = \alpha + (\beta_1 X) + \beta_2 \text{EO} + \varepsilon_5$$

Y = Beneficiary poverty reduction (BPR)

X = Interventions

EO = Entrepreneurial Orientation

## RESULTS

This study conceptualized EO as a mediator of the relationship between Interventions and BPR by FBEs within the slums of Nairobi, Kenya. The study data was reliable as Entrepreneurial Orientation had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.764. This value was above the recommended cut off 0.5 Berthoud (2000). The study response rate was 79.9% (115 respondents out of the expected 144). This was a good representation of the population as it passed the minimum 50% recommended by Graham (2002). The study conceptualized entrepreneurial Orientation to have innovation, proactiveness and risk taking. To measure EO the study investigated 9 descriptive statements using a five point Likert type scale. The result was as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Entrepreneurial Orientation with Faith Based Enterprises**

Statement	N	Mean	Std. dev	CV %
<b>Innovativeness</b>				
Adopt a variety of new ways of doing things	115	3.92	0.909	23.2
We implement new technologies with superior services	114	3.68	1.192	32.4
Change products or services quite dramatically	114	3.41	1.211	35.5
<b>Risk Taking</b>				
We explore new ideas periodically to reduce poverty levels	115	3.92	0.975	24.9
We take bold aggressive measures to remain relevant in situations of uncertainty	115	3.60	1.130	31.4
We have strong tendency for low risk poverty projects	115	3.58	1.162	32.4
<b>Proactiveness</b>				
Initiates changes in social support services	114	3.85	0.914	23.7
We lead in new social value product development to attract	115	3.39	1.190	35.1

funding				
We survive by avoiding competition	115	3.36	1.285	38.3
<b>Grand Mean &amp; Std. dev</b>		<b>3.64</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>30.76</b>

Note: N is number of observations, SD is standard deviation, and CV is coefficient of variation

Where N is below 115, it indicates that information was missing or subjects did not answer.

The new ideas and different ways of doing things to reduce poverty levels had the highest mean score of 3.92 and a low coefficient variation of 23.2 percent. This means that there was a high rate of value on social innovation for new ideas to generate incomes for beneficiary poverty reduction. Explicitly, the low coefficient of variation of 23.2 percent indicates that social innovation is practiced by FBEs that result in new products, services and markets to reduce poverty levels. This result concurs with Gathungu et al. (2014) that relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and the enterprise favour innovations for competitive advantage to deliver in targets. Changes in social support services had a response mean score of 3.85 with a low coefficient variation of 23.7 percent. This indicates that FBEs initiating such changes and delivery in social value for beneficiary poverty reduction. Further, implementation of new technologies with superior services recorded a mean score of 3.68. This implies that new superior products and services by FBEs may be attributed to new technologies adopted. However, the same factor had a high coefficient variation of 32.4 percent, which implies that technology had negative effects. Evidence from the qualitative data analysis indicates that the use of internet affects morals of youth beneficiaries. Majority of the FBEs youth beneficiaries spent most time on phonography, neglecting school work to the point their final exam scores go low. Bold aggressive measures to ensure the FBEs remain relevant in all situations had a mean score of 3.60 meaning that FBE management applied tact to raise resources like attracting funding through the congregants for competitive edges in the markets.

Strong tendency projects for low risk poverty projects had a mean score of 3.58 with a coefficient variation of 32.4 percent. This indicates that FBE beneficiaries prioritized projects with low risk investment to reduce poverty levels. The high coefficient variation of 32.4 percent implies that the investments were not performing well. The dramatic change of products or services had a low mean score of 3.41 with a high coefficient variation of 35.5 percent. This implies that dramatic change targets were not well achieved probably due to the limitations in the knowhow.

FBEs leadership in new social value product development to attract funding scored a low mean of 3.39 with a high coefficient variation of 35.1. This implies that the FBEs may not be leaders in social value product development though it occupies some noticeable space. The high variation may indicate the lack of leadership and management capabilities by FBEs. Surviving by avoiding competition had the lowest mean score of 3.36 with a coefficient variation of 38.3 percent. This implies that beneficiaries lacked the capacity to compete leading to FBEs hands off for competition. The high variations is indicative of the varied response ratings implying that they were in disagreement that beneficiaries survive by avoiding competition to reduce poverty levels.

### Regression Analysis

Further, the study sought to establish the intervening effect of Entrepreneurial Orientation on the relationship between Interventions and Beneficiary Poverty Reduction by FBEs within the slums of Nairobi. To achieve this, step wise regression analysis was computed to test the hypothesis that there was a significant Entrepreneurial Orientation mediating effect on the relationship between Interventions and Beneficiary Poverty Reduction by FBEs within the slums of Nairobi. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Relationship between Interventions, Entrepreneurial Orientation and Beneficiary Poverty Reduction by FBEs within the Slums of Nairobi**

Model Summary <sup>c</sup>										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.494 <sup>a</sup>	.244	.235	2.92874	.244	26.742	1	83	.000	
2	.639 <sup>b</sup>	.408	.394	2.60673	.164	22.772	1	82	.000	1.608
ANOVA <sup>a</sup>										
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.				
1	Regression	229.382	1	229.382	26.742	.000 <sup>b</sup>				
	Residual	711.932	83	8.577						
	Total	941.314	84							
2	Regression	384.118	2	192.059	28.265	.000 <sup>c</sup>				
	Residual	557.195	82	6.795						
	Total	941.314	84							
Coefficients <sup>a</sup>										
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics			
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF		
1	(Constant)	7.491	2.002		3.741	.000				
	Interventions	.585	.113	.494	5.171	.000	1.000	1.000		
2	(Constant)	5.116	1.850		2.765	.007				
	Interventions	.104	.142	.088	.728	.469	.499	2.003		
	Entrepreneurial orientation	.593	.124	.574	4.772	.000	.499	2.003		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Interventions										
b. Predictors: (Constant), Interventions, Entrepreneurial orientation										
c. Dependent Variable: Beneficiary poverty reduction										

The results in Table 2 show the correlation coefficient (R) value was .639 which indicates that there was a strong positive relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and BPR. The results show that there was full mediation since the intervening variable had p-value of 0.000 less than 0.05. The results show Interventions explained 24.4 percent of the variation in BPR. However, when Entrepreneurial Orientation was introduced in model 2, there was an improvement by 16.4 percent which explains the variation from 24.4 percent to 40.8 percent. This implies that EO mediated the relationship between Interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction thus the hypothesis was supported.

This means that Entrepreneurial Orientation mediates the relationship between Interventions and BPR. This relationship can be expressed by the estimated linear regression equation:

$$\text{BPR} = 5.116 + 0.104 \text{ Interventions} + 0.593 \text{EO}$$

This indicates that a unit increase in the factor of Interventions would mean increase in BPR by 0.104 units. Likewise, increasing the factor of entrepreneurial orientation by 1 unit would increase BPR by 0.593 units. The results show EO had a stronger influence than Interventions. Overall the finding confirms the study hypothesis that entrepreneurial orientation had a significant intervening effect on the relationship between interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction by FBEs within the slums of Nairobi. Further to the stepwise regression analysis, a correlation matrix computed confirmed the existence of mediation by assessing the influence of EO on the relationship between Interventions and BPR (Table 3 and 4 respectively). The first step assessed the correlation between Interventions and Entrepreneurial Orientation (Table 3). In step two, the correlation between EO and BPR was tested Table 3.

**Table 3: Correlations between Interventions and Entrepreneurial orientation**

		Interventions	Entrepreneurial orientation
Interventions	Pearson Correlation	1	.652**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	96	95
Entrepreneurial orientation	Pearson Correlation	.652**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	95	113

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In step 1, the results in Table 3 indicate that there was a positive and significant correlation ( $r = 0.652$ ) between Interventions and EO.

In step 2, Table 4 shows the results of correlation analysis between EO and BPR.

**Table 4: Correlations between Entrepreneurial orientation and beneficiary poverty reduction**

		Entrepreneurial orientation	Beneficiary poverty reduction
Entrepreneurial orientation	Pearson Correlation	1	.613**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	113	99
Beneficiary poverty reduction	Pearson Correlation	.613**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	99	100

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results in Table 4 show that there was a significant and positive correlation ( $r = 0.613$ ) between EO and BPR. A comparison of correlation results in Table 3 and 4 shows that in all cases the coefficient sign was positive and significant. This further indicates that the mediating influence of EO on the relationship between Interventions and BPR thus the hypothesis supported.

### Discussion of Results

The study objective was to establish the mediating effect of Entrepreneurial orientation on the relationship between interventions and Beneficiary Poverty Reduction by Faith Based Enterprises (FBEs) within the slums of Nairobi. The results of the descriptive statistics show that EO aspects of novelty, risk taking and proactiveness chiefly shaped activities for delivery in beneficiary poverty reduction. This result is consistent

with previous findings Noble, Sinha & Kumar (2002); Utsch and Rauch (2000) that enterprise's success is through innovative strategic processes and has a significant effect on performance of an enterprise to reduce poverty. Further, the result corroborates Gupta and Batra (2015); Walter et al. (2006) assertions that the enterprise's robust performance can be achieved by implementing activities hinged on the EO dimensions of innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking and competitiveness.

It is also evident from the regression findings that interventions were strong when EO was high and weak when EO was low. The regression analysis showed that EO strengthened the relationship between Interventions and BPR from 24.4 percent to 40.8 percent by an additional contribution of 16.4 percent. This implies that EO positively influenced Interventions in beneficiary poverty reduction thus confirming its mediation effect. This implies that EO is relevant in decision making to spur beneficiary poverty reduction. This finding concurs Okpara (2009) posit on SMEs exports in Nigeria that enterprises with managerial decisions that hold up proactiveness, novelty, risk taking and aggressively market competitively edge competitors for business success. This finding positively reflects Krueger et al. (2000) posit that entrepreneurial orientation dimensions shape the entrepreneurial intent in an enterprise and reinforce other human capital attributes like skills and internal locus of control for an enterprise to deliver in social value.

To build greater competencies in beneficiary poverty reduction by FBEs, this study encourages skills building for leadership development and management capacities. This concurs Perren and Grant (2001) that building skills and on job experience promotes leadership and management capacities for enterprise delivery. In addition, this study suggests practitioners consider skewed trainings for apprenticeships as the graduates could easily secure employment based on the skills such as carpentry and plumbing. Further, innovative solutions to social problems should be the norm for FBEs to remain relevant in beneficiary poverty reduction. Technology drives all aspects of the economy. In order to avoid obsolescence, the study suggests practitioners put emphasis on adoption and use of the latest technologies for quality products and services to increase incomes for beneficiary poverty reduction. On this note, this study suggests development of a deliberate policy to promote technological advancements for FBEs and other SMEs to bridge the digital divide as it is absent.

From the qualitative data, the study observed that through novelty practices, FBEs produce quality products but lack markets. This emerging business limitation needs heuristic approaches by practitioners such as encouraging beneficiaries to learn and discover by themselves markets both locally and outside the country to derive high earnings from the sale of products and services for poverty reduction sustainability. This trajectory relates positively to Jabeen and Mahmood (2014) that applying novelty, proactiveness and risk taking in enterprise operations elicits superior quality products and services for more incomes. Exquisite mineral water FBE in Kibera Soweto slum packages water and its products are on high demand within the environment. This paper suggests other FBES embrace such social innovations to birth diverse income generating activities to sustain beneficiary poverty reduction.

## CONCLUSION

The study findings provide evidence that entrepreneurial orientation mediates the relationship between interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction. This implies that managerial practitioners could put emphasis on social innovation, risk taking and proactive management for improved quality services to enhance beneficiary poverty reduction. From the findings, it can be concluded that EO exhibits a strong mediating effect on the relationship between interventions and beneficiary poverty reduction and is vital in making of decisions to achieve the desired poverty reduction targets. Overall, there is need for more of these studies to be undertaken in this innovative Faith based entrepreneurship sector though still in infancy to build theory, and new methods for social value delivery to improve the welfare of the people.

**REFERENCES**

- Anderson, A. & Miller, C. (2003). "Class matters: Human and social capital in the Entrepreneurial process" *The Journal of Socio-Economics*. 32, 17-36.
- Becker, G. S. (1975). *Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*, second edition. NBER, London: New York.
- Berthoud, R. (2000). *Introduction: The dynamics of social change*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Bovaird, T. (2006). *Developing new relationships with the "Market" in the procurement of public services*. *Public administration*, 84(1), 81-102.
- Covin, J. G. & Slevein, D.P. (2006). Strategic process effects on the entrepreneurial orientation – sales growth rate relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1) 57 – 81.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). "The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship." Stanford University; Draft report for the Kauffman Centre for Entrepreneurial Leadership; 6 pp.
- Dees, J. G. & Battle, A. B. (2006). Framing a theory of entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought. *ARNOYA Occasional Paper Series: Research on Social Entrepreneurship: Understanding and Contributing to an Emerging Field* 1(3), 39-66.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4):11-32.
- Gathungu J.M. (2018). Application of E- banking, Technological Innovations as a Strategic Approach for Performance Improvement among Banks and Financial Institutions in Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Social Science* Vol 5 (6) 19-28.
- Gathungu, J. M., Aiko, D. M. & Machuki, V. N. (2014). Entrepreneurial orientation, networking, external environment, and firm performance. *European Scientific Journal* 10(7).
- Graham, H. (2002). Market Making: Internationalization and Global Water Markets. *Journal of Indexing and Metrics*, 34(5): 791-807.
- Gupta, V. K. & Batra, S. (2015). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance in India SMEs: Universal and contingency perspectives. *International Small Business Journal*, 1-23.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2007). Upper echolons theory: An update. *Academy management Review*, 32(2), 334-43.
- Haugh, H. (2007). Community led social venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31 (2) 161-182.
- Jabeen, R. & Mahmood, R. (2014). Effect of external environment on entrepreneurial orientation and business performance relationship. *Social and Basic Sciences Research Review*, 2(9), 394 -403.
- Johannison, B., Monsted, M. (1997). Contextualizing entrepreneurial networking. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 27(3): 109-137.
- Krueger, N.F., Reilly, M.D., & Carsrud, A.L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15. 411-432.
- Lumpkin, G. T. & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21 (1) 135-172.

- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research a source of explanation, prediction and delight. *Journal of World Business* 41(1): 36- 44.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29: 770-791.
- Ndemo, B. (2006). Assessing the sustainability of faith based enterprises in Kenya. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33 (5/6):446-462.
- Noble, C.H. Sinha, R. K. & Kumar, A. (2002) Market orientation and alternative strategic orientations: A longitudinal assessment of performance implications. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(4), 25 -39.
- Okeyo W.O, Gathungu J.M. & K'obonyo P. (2016). Entrepreneurial Orientation, Business Development Services. Business Environment and Performance. A Critical Literature review. *European Scientific Journal* Vol 12 (28) 188-218.
- Okpara, J. O. (2009). Strategic choices, export orientation and export performance of SMEs in Nigeria. *Management Decision*, 47(8), 1281-1299.
- Perren, L. & Grant, P. (2001). *Management and leadership in UK SMEs: Witness testimonies form the world of entrepreneurs and SME managers*. London: Council for Excellence in Leadership and Management.
- Prabhu, G. N. (1998). Social entrepreneurial management. Leadership in management. [www.mcb.co.uk/services/conferenc/Sept98/lim/paper\\_a2.htm](http://www.mcb.co.uk/services/conferenc/Sept98/lim/paper_a2.htm).
- Resatch, F. & Faisst, U. (2003). Measuring the performance of knowledge management initiatives. *Discussion Paper*. W-135, Germany: University of Augsburg.
- Reynolds, P. D. (1991). "Sociology and entrepreneurship: Concepts and contributions" *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 16 (2): 47-67.
- Russel, H. B. (2000). *Social research method: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Sekaran, U. (2007). *Research methods for business: Skills building approach*. New Delhi: Wiley.
- Shane, S. A & Venkataraman, S. (2000). "The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research". *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1):217-226.
- Tadros, M. (2010). *Faith based organizations and service delivery-(some Gender Conundrums)* United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Utsch, A. & Rauch, A. (2000). Innovativeness and initiative as mediators between achievement orientation and venture performance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 9(1), 45-62.
- Walter, A., Aver, M. & Ritter, T. (2006). The impact of net capabilities and entrepreneurial orientation on university spin – off performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21 (4); 541-567.
- Weerawardena, J. & Sullivan, M.G, (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business* (41) 21-35.