

Influence Of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices On the Performance of Social Enterpreneurship Projects in Nairobi County

Author's Details:

⁽¹⁾Amos Kioko Kisilu-MSc Student, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, P.O Box 1617-00100 Nairobi, Kenya, ⁽²⁾Yusuf Muchelule, Ph.D., Lecturer, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

Abstract

This study aims to establish the impact M&E can have on social enterprise performance in Nairobi County. The study was informed by the resource dependency theory. The study used a descriptive research design. This study targeted a total population of 132 social enterprises located in Nairobi County and employed the simple random sampling technique to achieve a representative sample of 103 social enterprises. The study used questionnaires to collect data from respondents. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis was employed to generate insights on the problem under consideration. The study revealed that use M&E frameworks provide a bigger picture on the building blocks required driving the social enterprise's strategy and the pathway to achieve the desired results. The study recommended that it is critical for social enterprises to train the top leadership on M&E and allocate funds for training of staff in M &E process. Finally, social enterprises need to ensure that there is the dissemination of information to demonstrate accountability and earn client loyalty

Keywords; Frameworks, Social Enterprise, Performance, M&E, Project, Performance

Introduction

Performance of social enterprises is considered a key driver of a nation's economic growth (Chebii, 2016). Social enterprises are enterprises provide goods and services in their effort to attain social goals (Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, & Shulman, 2009). One of those goals is to make a profit through sustainable business models and to create value for society (Santos, 2012). This is a different approach from that of traditional charity organizations, which are not business oriented, but mainly rely on donations, grants or government support. One advantage over charitable organizations is that the beneficiaries of social enterprises are often their customers. Social enterprises distinguish themselves from traditional enterprises that focused on achieving a social good while having a viable business model. Thus, social enterprises have the ability make a great impact on the society, which the traditional and profit-oriented enterprises are not able to deliver (Lam, Prakash, & Tan , 2014; Zahra et al., 2009). However, to demonstrate that social enterprises are delivering social good, effective monitoring and evaluations practices need to be established.

Through performance measurement, is possible to determine if social enterprise projects have to achieve their objectives and impact on clients. Monitoring and Evaluation are critical processes in social enterprises projects (although often forgotten), and to get them right, you need to build them into the project from the outset (Santos, 2012). Because of the differences in the ideals and visions of their leaders, the nature and scope of the work of social organizations varies significantly. Lundström & Stevenson (2005) emphasize the importance of active monitoring evaluation practices for efficiency and effectiveness of social enterprise project to enhance their performance.

Thus, social enterprises must be geared towards employing Monitoring and Evaluation practices that will provide information on whether their plans and objectives are achievable and thereby evaluating whether their medium-term plans and long-term plans have been achieved. However, Kotanea & Kuzmina-Merlinob (2017) assert that scholars have not adequately contributed to a lot of publications on the given topic and there is there is a paucity in the knowledge area that is concerned with monitoring and assessing social enterprises'

performance. This study intends to critically examine how various M&E practices can be applied to determine the performance of social enterprises in Kenya.

The growth of established social enterprises in Kenya has been constrained even though the emergence of new ones has been on an upward trend. As such, their actual impact is lower than any estimates from other countries. Unfortunately, if the enterprise cannot raise enough resources for its survival, it becomes too expensive to run, and it eventually collapses. Consequently, this creates a public perception of their inability to create or inspire more significant changes in the livelihoods of the public unlike their counterparts in more developed nations (Salamon et al., 2010). As a result, not only does the government suffer from low revenue collections due to the underperformance of these companies, but it also contributes to the continuation of social problems because of the lack of addressing the high unemployment rates in the country. There is, therefore, need to assist these organizations to not only address the social problems according to the resources they have at hand but to do it sustainably (Koinonia Community, 2006). A need emerges therefore to identify M&E practices that enhance the performance of social enterprises. The process of M&E can assist SMEs in avoiding improper gaging of capacities on their success and performance. Monitoring will also prepare them in generating enough information and resources needed for auditing their strategy and manage results by comparing them with their plans and objectives.

In Kenya, studies on social entrepreneurship are not only scanty and descriptive but have either focused on highlighting the inadequacy of governmental programs (Chege, 2009; KSIX, 2011). Makori and Wanyoike (2015) examined the implications of developing knowledge and experience in planning and active performance evaluation against established initial results of both performance and impact on donor funded projects and programs in Kenya. Kimani, (2014) studied the effect of M&E planning in Kenyan SMEs (small and medium enterprises) and concluded that more studies need to be conducted in small firms. A study by Panum and Hansen (2014) focused on narratives of six successful social enterprises, outlined the route taken by the BoP social enterprises to achieve social impact while utilizing commercially feasible methods in Kenya. These few studies limit sources of information on how to build an aggressive third sector which together with other sectors will accelerate the achievement of development goals. The study by (Chege, 2009) suggested besides finance; there are other factors that were responsible for social enterprises' success, (Rono, 2014) study suggested a gap in M&E practices aspect of social enterprises staff to build unique capacity for the social enterprise's growth. There exists a knowledge gap on other M&E practices as determinants, when studied and applied will most likely contribute to the long-term success, sustainability of social enterprises and influence their strategies to improve performance. To bridge the knowledge gap on practical and scalable means by which the social enterprises can benefit the society, this research sought to assess the relationship between M&E practices and performance of social enterprises in Kenya.

Theoretical Literature Review

This theory is premised on the functions of organizations' boards which ensure that their firms have sufficient resources for the success of their activities. Directors play a key role in resource development because of their unique relationship between the companies they oversee and its external environment (Cannella and Pactzold, 2000). This argument is echoed by Ongore and K'Obonyo (2011) who demonstrated that the independence of boards members from the day-to-day running of the organizations, allows them to secure the required resources to ensure the organization achieves the desired goals and objectives. In addition, their independence from the running of activities increases their objectivity in decision making and evaluating performance. For instance, law firms capitalize on the expertise and experience of their non-executive partners to make effective decisions in the management of their operations and the execution of their mandate to their clients, at a less rate than the market rates. Therefore, a firm's ability to access a sustainable supply of resources is the cornerstone to its success and longevity (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). As a result, if a company constitutes its board of directors

properly, it can leverage on their networks and experience to cut the costs associated with gathering and analyzing market information and a competitive edge over their rivals (Hillman et al. 2000).

There are four classes of directors. First, there are insiders who mainly current or retired firm executives. They are subject matter experts in their fields and offer leadership and advice to their companies on issues relating to their expertise and experience. Their input plays an instrumental role in policy, strategy formulation and execution. Second, there are business experts who are current or former executives of external firms exhibit consistent high performance results and profits. This group has the tools design and drive strategy and decision-making processes that enhance a firm's flexibility and its performance. Third, there are support specialists who handle tasks specific to their areas of specialization and trade. Their active status in the practice of their trade makes them insightful on any changes that might affect the firm's performance which reduces the organization's lead time in effecting changes or taking advantage of new opportunities. Last, there are the communities influential. These are directors largely drawn from social and political domains because of their star appeal and recognition or because of their ability to deliver certain resources that cannot be purchased or leveraged (Coad, 2009). From Resource Dependency Theory, this study has confirmed that organizational resources are a key ingredient to the performance of social enterprises.

Literature review

Studies done in developing areas of the world indicate that social enterprises do indeed play a significant role in creating and inspiring change in the regions out of which they operate. Most of the change comes not from the interventions themselves, but from the increase in knowledge that broadens the perspective of the people they work with, therefore, increases their innate capacity and ability to analyze problems and develop their own practical and sustainable solutions. In addition, by allowing these people to see the possibilities around them, it helps them to see ways of commercializing the solutions they develop and earn themselves a living. Also, the knowledge that comes from these innovations plays an important role in inspiring more innovations and investment in social enterprises while providing future entrepreneurs with enough baseline information to develop more efficient and resilient companies (Jurgen, 2007).

M&E Frameworks

Monitoring and evaluation systems are instrumental in helping an organization focus on its long-term goals actively while pursuing its interim objectives and desired outcomes. They provide the basis for developing flexible and practical performance management strategies to enhance the continuity of their processes and achievement of success. In addition, they help in differentiating between the different levels of a firm's goals, therefore, facilitating objective planning and allocation of resources to ensure timely attainment of all goals. It does this by identifying and establishing clear links and patterns between program activities, resources and other factors necessary to ensure their successful conversion. Also, it helps a firm to optimize its production by planning for low seasons well so as to ensure it maintains the continuity of its products and processes (Bott, Guedes and Claramunt, 2004).

A good framework identifies and outlines all processes, roles and functions and their relationship with each other in relation to the attainment of the overall objectives and goals of a company. As such, it facilitates the analysis of the best way to leverage all the ingredients necessary to ensure high productivity and returns (UNHCR Guidelines, 2003). It also helps the company to establish a clear path between its individual functions and roles and its overall vision, mission, results, and objectives.

Outcome frameworks, on the other hand, work to visually represent the relationships between the mid-term achievements of roles and functions to the overall long-term goals and objectives of the company. As a result,

they facilitate the analysis and prediction of the cause and effect of the actions and strategies the organization makes in the hopes of achieving its overall objectives (UNIFEM, 2008).

Therefore, change as a concept in organizational growth refers to the sum of all the little interactions between resources, strategies and the external environment of the firm in its quest to achieve its goals. In addition, it accounts for all the interventions an organization takes to correct problems in the execution of its objectives and mandate to its clients to ensure its continuity and efficiency. These arguments are best described in the Theory of Change (WHO, 2004).

Logical frameworks work to visually represent the direct relationship between the different aspects of the resources necessary for production and the desired end products. As such, they make it possible for managers and stakeholders to establish performance outlooks fast through quick analysis. In addition, they make it possible for companies to determine the limits each resource or element of production can go without changing the quality of the desired end products or reducing the effectiveness of its functions and processes.

The dynamism of the business environments in which organizations operate necessitate that they develop more proactive systems to ensure their continued high performance. These challenges are compounded by the increasing competition, and the opening of markets brought about by globalization and the proliferation of the internet and web applications (Baraka, cited in Kibet, Makokha, & Namusonge, 2016). Actively evaluating performance from the early stages of project conceptualization allows firms to have higher control of the structures and processes involved in the successful attainment of their overall set goals (Waren, cited in Thuita & Kibati, 2016). While planning is important on maintaining project objectivity and focus, M&E enhances knowledge development by identifying challenges, problems, the conditions surrounding them and the interventions to resolve them.

M&E systems enhance organizational learning and development by facilitating the collection and representation of performance data in easily consumable formats such as graphs and tables to facilitate decision-making. However, for companies to benefit from the insights developed from the data they generate, they need to consciously develop frameworks to enable reporting so as to save on both time and costs (Otle & Van der Stede, cited in Kimani, 2014). It also enhances the establishment of the most objective sets of indicators to ensure that the company can both measure the effectiveness and impact of its processes and the aptness of the indicators through changing conditions in the environment (Hancock, 2009).

Kimweli (2013) analyzed the influence of the monitoring and evaluation framework for the success of donor funded food security intervention projects in Kenya. The purpose of the study was to find out the influence of the monitoring and evaluation of the success of donor funded food security intervention projects. The study targeted residents of Kibwezi district who have benefited from donor funded food security projects. The study utilized a case study design because it was considered a robust research method particularly when a holistic and in-depth investigation is required. A sample of 40 respondents was selected from four Locations; Makindu, Nzambani, Masongaleni, and Mtito Andei ; from the larger Kibwezi district through purposive sampling. Data was collected through a questionnaire with 10 questions where respondents indicated responses on statements on a Likert scale.

Performance management plans facilitate the systematic organization of both process and resource data and how they relate to each other (Hancock, 2009). As such, it facilitates faster analysis of M&E data and establishes problem points and their causes which is instrumental in advising the development of practical and sustainable solutions. In addition, it provides policies on how to ensure that these indicators continue to encourage productivity while enhancing transparency and accountability. Most organizations currently prefer to invest in ICTs to improve their response times to challenges and problems caused by both the changes in their

operating environment and the unforeseeable and unpredictable internal problems caused by the tweaking of their systems and functions (Otley & Van der Stede, cited in Kimani, 2014).

Research Gap

Theoretical and empirical literature shows that the use of M&E practices benefits social enterprises (Dees, 1998; Ernst, 2012; KSIX, 2011; Humbert, 2012; Bornstein, 2004). Therefore, there is an interdependent relationship between M&E practices and social enterprises performance. This is the case because entrepreneurial firms may generate value by shifting resources and focusing on social value creation. This notwithstanding, the focus has been given to the role of the community based organization, Non-Governmental Organizations and established business enterprises neglecting the social enterprise's contribute to social good as well making a return on investment. In addition, studies focusing on M&E practices in social enterprises are few in Kenya. There is a huge knowledge gap in empirical analysis on the link between employing M&E practices and their influence on the performance of social enterprises in Kenya and other developing countries. Assessing the influence of M&E practices on the performance of social enterprises is critical in demonstrating why such organizations should invest in employing M&E practices. This stimulates adoption of M&E practices by social enterprises as a viable tool for accountability to impact investors and beneficiaries as well as building credibility of social services and goods offered.

Methodology

The study employed descriptive research design to determine the relationship between M&E practices and performance of social enterprises. In this case, this study targeted 132 social enterprises located in Nairobi County (Registrar of Companies), (KSIX, 2018). Simple random sampling was used to obtain a sample population from a target population of 132 Social enterprises located in Nairobi County. The instruments of data collection collect both primary and secondary data. Data for the study was collected by administering questionnaires to respondents from the selected social enterprises. The number of respondents in the pilot study was 10 (10% of 92). Quantitative data collected from the questionnaire were analyzed statistically using the Statistical Package for Social Scientist (SPSS version 24). The study, therefore, conducted a regression analysis to show the relationship between the variables. The study tested the significance level of each independent variable against the dependent variable at a 95% confidence level using ANOVA, correlation and regression techniques. A 95% confidence interval reflects a significance level of 0.05.

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{3+} + \beta_2 X_{4+} + \epsilon$$

Where, Y = performance of social enterprises, β_0 = constant (coefficient of intercept), X_2 = framework, X_3 = Capacity Building, $B_1 \dots B_4$ = regression coefficient of four variables.

Findings and Discussion

In this study, 103 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents. After the questionnaires were filled, 93 were collected and verified. This means that there was 90.3% response rate. This response rate was high, and it enabled the collection of enough data whose analysis outcomes could be generalized to the whole population especially with regard to the phenomenon under investigation. the Cronbach alpha values range from 0.895 to 0.739. According to Hair *et al.* (2010), values of above 0.6 are acceptable.

M&E framework

The study sought to find out whether the use of M&E frameworks influences the performance of social enterprises in Nairobi County. Table illustrates the results from the study. In a bid to establish if enterprises use a Theory of Change to articulate desired outcomes and how their interventions interact to achieve the overall

goal, The findings demonstrate that social enterprises use the Theory of Change framework to demonstrate the desired results and the pathway to achieve impact. When asked if enterprises used a logical framework to demonstrate desired outcomes and how to measure them, of the respondents, were neutral an indication that enterprises use logical frameworks. The findings on whether social enterprises use result frameworks revealed that respondents were neutral. More of the than 50% of respondents strongly or agreed to the social enterprises use results framework to demonstrate how the project will achieve incremental results from intermediate results to achieve the project impact

Table 1: M&E framework

		SD	D	N	A	SA
Social enterprises use a Theory of Change to articulate desired results and the pathway to achieving impact	Freq.	3	7	17	40	26
	%	3.2	7.5	18.3	43	28
Social enterprises use a logical framework to illustrates desired results and means of verifying the result	Freq.	3	6	34	25	25
	%	3.2	6.5	36.6	26.9	26.9
Social enterprises use a result framework to illustrate achievement of incremental results from intermediate results to impact	Freq.	3	3	31	52	4
	%	3.2	3.2	33.3	55.9	4.3

Key: SD- Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, N-Neutral, A-Agree, SA-Strongly Agree
Capacity Building
Performance of social enterprises

The study sought to establish the performance of social enterprises in Nairobi County. illustrates the results., 12.9% (12) of the respondents noted that sales revenue had increased tremendously, 50.5% (47) of them noted that sales revenue has increased while 22.6% (21) of the respondents noted that there is no change. The results revealed that there was an increase in sales revenue. Further, 3.2% (3) of the respondents noted that operating capital had increased tremendously, 61.3% (57) of them stated that the operating income has increased, 6.5% (6) decreased while 26.9% (25) no change.

Table 2: Performance of social enterprises

		DT	D	NC	I	IT
Sales Revenue	Freq.	1	12	21	47	12
	%	1.1	12.9	22.6	50.5	12.9
Operating capital	Freq.	2	6	25	57	3
	%	2.2	6.5	26.9	61.3	3.2
Net Profit	Freq.	1	6	24	38	24
	%	1.1	6.5	25.8	40.9	25.8
Customer satisfaction	Freq.	1	12	37	29	14
	%	1.1	12.9	39.8	31.2	15.1
Market share	Freq.	0	9	6	48	30
	%	0	9.7	6.5	51.6	32.3

Key: DT-Decreased Tremendously, D – Decreased, NC – No Change, I- Increased, IT- Increased Tremendously.

In regards to whether the social enterprise made a profit, 25.8% (24) of the respondents noted that net had increased tremendously, 40.9% (38) increased, 6.5% (6) decreased, and 25.8% (24) no change. The results on customer satisfaction indicated that 15.1% (14) of the respondents noted that customer satisfaction had increased tremendously, 31.2% (29) noted that customer satisfaction has increased while 39.8% (37) noted that there is no change. Further, results in changes in the market share of social enterprises indicated that 32.3%

(30) of the respondents noted that the market share had increased tremendously, 51.6% (48) increased, 9.7% (9) decreased while 6.5% (6) no change.

Inferential Statistics

The findings demonstrate that the use of M&E frameworks has a positive and significant relationship with the performance of social enterprises, $r = 0.663$ at 0.01 level of significance. Although these findings do not imply a cause-effect relationship, they point to the existence of a cause-effect linear relationship. The results in **Error! Reference source not found.** revealed that the model has a positive correlation with the performance of social enterprises, $R = 0.734$. On the other hand, the value of R-square (0.734) and adjusted R-square (0.722) both indicate that 73.4% and 72.2% respectively of the variation in performance of social enterprises is accounted for by the independent variables in the model. The findings in above revealed that the mean square sum for the regression model was 11.64 while the one for the residuals was 0.192 giving an F statistic value of 60.658 which indicated that the regression model accounts for over 60 units in the change in performance of social enterprises compared to the residuals. The p-value indicates that the model is fit in predicting the change in the performance of social enterprises.

The findings revealed that M&E frameworks have a positive and significant effect on the performance of social enterprises where, $\beta_2 = 0.19$, p-value = 0.012 implying that performance of social enterprises will increase by 0.19 units given an increase in the use of M&E framework by a unit . This means that M&E frameworks have a positive and significant effect on the performance of social enterprises. In line with the results, Hancock, (2009) posited that the M&E framework contains the description of the functions required to gather the relevant data on the set indicators and the required methods.

Table 3 Correlation and Regression Statistics

	Unstandardized		Standardized Coefficients			correlation zero-order
	Coefficients	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	
(Constant)	0.451	0.225		2.009	0.048	.663**
M&E framework	0.183	0.072	0.19	2.55	0.012	
R	.857a					
R Square	0.734					
Adjusted R Square	0.722					
F	60.658					
Sig.	.000b					

a Dependent Variable: firm performance

Conclusion and Recommendations

M&E frameworks lay out the building blocks of required and the pathways to achieve the desired results. Through the M&E frameworks, the enterprises have the capability to increase the understanding of the desired outcomes, impact, objectives and goals. The implication is that M&E frameworks contribute positively to the performance of social enterprises.

M&E information use had a positive effect on the performance of social enterprises. It is therefore crucial for social enterprises to ensure that there is frequent data review to project performance. Moreover, the social enterprises need to ensure that there is the dissemination of information to demonstrate accountability to their investors and earn client loyalty to ensure the client base is retained.

This study expands our knowledge on the influence of M&E practices on the performance of social enterprises in Nairobi County. Though this study has fulfilled its aim and objectives, there are a number of areas for additional studies given the limitations of the research. On a geographical dimension, this study was primarily limited to social enterprises in Nairobi County. For this reason, further empirical investigations in different counties are needed. The methodology that has been chosen to achieve the research objectives was limited to questionnaires. As such, future research could build on this study by examining the influence of M&E practices on the performance of social enterprises with the use of different methodologies.

REFERENCES

- i. Bornstein, D. (2004). *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ii. Bott S., Guedes A., Claramunt M.C., Guezmes A. (2004). *Improving the Health. Sector Response to Gender-Based Violence: A Resource Manual for Health*.
- iii. Chege, C. (2009). *Factors influencing the development of social enterprises in Kenya*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Juja: Jomo Kenyatta University of Technology.
- iv. Coad, Alex (2009). *The growth of firms: a survey of theories and empirical evidence. New perspectives on the modern corporation series*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- v. Dees, J.G. (1998), *Enterprising non profits*, Harvard Business Review, Vol. 76 No. 1, pp. 42-51.
- vi. Defourny, J. and Nyssens, M. (2012). *Conceptions of Social Enterprises in Europe: A Comparative Perspective with the United States*, in B. Gidron and Y. Hasenfeld (eds.) *Social Enterprises: An Organizational Perspective*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillian, pp.
- vii. Defourny, Jacques & Nyssens, M. (2010). *Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences*. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 1. 32-53.
- viii. Ernst, L. (2011). *Heart over Mind-An empirical analysis of social entrepreneurship intention formation on the basis of theory of planned behaviour*. Wuppertal: University of Wuppertal.
- ix. Hancock, G. (2009). *Lords of poverty masters of disaster*. London, U.K.: Macmillan.
- x. Hillman, A.J., Cannella, A.A. and Paetzold, R.L. (2000). *The Resource Dependence Role of Corporate Directors: Strategic Adaptation of Board Composition in Response to Environmental Change*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37, 235-256.
- xi. Kibet, A. J., Makokha, E. N., & Namusonge, G. S. (2016). *Effects of management commitment on financial performance of private schools: A survey of selected schools in Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya*. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(30), 1-5.
- xii. Kimani, R. N. (2014). *The effect of budgetary control on effectiveness of non-govern mental organizations in Kenya (Unpublished master's thesis)*. University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- xiii. Kotanea, I. & Kuzmina-Merlinob, I. (2017). *Analysis of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises' Business Performance Evaluation Practice at Transportation and Storage Services Sector in Latvia*. *Procedia Engineering*, 178, 182 – 191.
- xiv. Lundström A., Stevenson L (2006). *Entrepreneurship policy: Theory and practice*. Springer Science Business Media: New York, 200516
- xv. Makori, J. O., & Wanyoike, D. (2015). *Assessment of result based monitoring and evaluation on performance of donor funded value chain projects in Kenya*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Juja: JKUAT
- xvi. Ongore V.O. and K'obonyo P.O. (2011). *Effects of selected corporate governance characteristics on firm performance: empirical evidence from Kenya*. School of Economics, University of Nairobi, 2011,
- xvii. Panum, K., & Wendelboe Hansen, M. (2014). *Successful Social Enterprises in Africa: Case Studies of Six Social Enterprises in Kenya*. Retrieved from Centre for Business and Development Studies:

- xviii. Rono, B. K., Wachilonga, L. K. & Simiyu, R. S. (2014). *Assessment of the Relationship between Interest Rate Spread and Performance of Commercial Banks Listed In Nairobi Securities Exchange*. *International Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(2), 98-112
- xix. Santos, F. (2012). *A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship*, INSEAD Faculty and Research Working Paper, 2012/23/EFE/ISIC.
- xx. Thuita, J. M., & Kibati, P. (2016). *Budget management practices and controls on effective management of finances in public universities in Kenya*. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 5(4), 372-377.
- xxi. UNHCR, (2003). *Sexual and Gender-based Violence against Refugees, Returnees and Internally Displaced Persons: Guidelines for Prevention and Response*.
- xxii. World Health Organisation (WHO). *Health systems strengthening – Glossary* (http://www.who.int/healthsystems/hss_glossary/en/index4.html). Accessed 15 December 2004
- xxiii. Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O. and Shulman, J. M. (2009), 'A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges', *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 519–532.