

The Influence of Entrepreneurial Culture on Social Transformation by Social Enterprises in Kiambu County, Kenya

Njenga, Francis Kigo

Ph.D. Candidate, Tangaza University College – Catholic University of Eastern Africa

Email: kigonjenga@gmail.com

Kitonga, Daniel M.

Tangaza University College – Catholic University of Eastern Africa

Email: dankitonga@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Several studies indicate that social enterprises have contributed tremendously to social transformation in different ways. The impact of social entrepreneurship in Africa links correctly to Ubuntuism, which emphasizes a culture of interdependence and reciprocity over individualism and self-interest, to a cultural belief in community/societal interest above individual gain. This paper sought to investigate the influence of entrepreneurial culture on social transformation in Kiambu County, Kenya. The study used a descriptive survey design with a sample size of 322 social enterprises from a target population of 1944 social enterprises spread over 12 sub-counties of Kiambu. The study used several sampling techniques. First, the study used purposive sampling to select Kiambu County; secondly, the study used stratified sampling technique to stratify the social enterprises according to the 12 sub-counties belonging to Kiambu County. Finally, the study used simple random sampling to pick respondents from each strata for the study. From the findings, entrepreneurial culture by social enterprises was found to predict social transformation as indicated by $F(3, 281) = 55.990, p < .05$. Likewise, the results from the p-values shows there is a positive significant correlation between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises ($r = 0.448, p = 0.000$) in Kiambu County. The study concludes that entrepreneurial culture, when applied properly, has a positive effect on social transformation by social enterprises. These findings are useful to different stakeholders; most importantly, the national and county governments and the academia in Kenya. Future studies can extend the sample size and diversify the variables for better understanding of the field of social enterprises in social transformation.

Key Words: Entrepreneurial culture, social enterprises, social transformation.

Introduction

Entrepreneurial culture is the way social enterprises interpret their existence and perform their activities. The focus of social entrepreneurship is on solving social problems without concern for the self. According to Brownson (2013, p. 146) entrepreneurial culture is a catchy concept fronted by scholars and several governments in their bid to promote entrepreneurship for unemployment reduction via job creation. This viewpoint is important for a country like Kenya, which hopes to realize its Vision 2030 through job creation through industry creation and other means. The magnitude of social problems which include unemployment, extreme poverty, diseases, and the inability of government to solve these societal problems, has led to the emergence of the concept of entrepreneurship which is considered a central force of economic and social development through job creation, innovation and social transformation for many citizens in

different countries in the developing world. In the same line of thought, Brownson (2013, p. 146) observes that to foster entrepreneurial culture, there is a need to understand the meaning of the concept for proper government policy intervention in the entrepreneurship market. Further, Brownson (2013, p. 147) conceptualizes entrepreneurial culture as a society that depicts the exhibition of the attributes, values, beliefs (attitude or mindset) and behaviour associated with entrepreneurs by individuals in such a society which distinguishes them from others. These components of entrepreneurial culture need to be nurtured and present in a society for the application of such a mindset.

Problem Statement

In the 21st century, social entrepreneurs have become vital players as a result of their efforts in solving the most pressing societal problems. As a result, several social enterprises have emerged across the globe with a social mission of solving societal problems. Unfortunately, the practice of social entrepreneurship in developing nations like Kenya and more so in the devolved units of governments is still at the infancy phase. This is notwithstanding the exponential upsurge of social problems in these nations and devolved units. Social challenges/problems are opportunities for social entrepreneurs to start a social business. For an entrepreneur to thrive, an entrepreneurial culture and mindsets are crucial. Reviewed literature has shown that entrepreneurial culture leads to socio-economic transformation. Primary data gathered by the researchers during the pilot study revealed that in Kiambu County, there were 1944 active social enterprises as of 2019. Unfortunately, the extent to which these social enterprises contributed towards social transformation was a concern for the researchers. Thus, the study sought to fill the knowledge gap on the influence of entrepreneurial culture (an aspect of social entrepreneurship) towards social transformation in Kiambu County.

Study Hypothesis

The null hypothesis, which this study sought to test, was:

H₀: There is no statistically significant influence between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation in Kiambu County, Kenya.

H_a: Entrepreneurial culture has significant influence on social transformation in Kiambu County, Kenya.

Literature Review

Syed and Malik (2014) confirmed that indulgent societies encourage innovation as a way to continually satisfy drives related to having fun and enjoying life. Further, Khan and Cox concluded that indulgent cultures create technology as a way to improve life (2017, p. 99). As can be seen from these discussions, culture situates activities of social entrepreneurs and their enterprises categorically in the radar of social transformation. The emergence of social entrepreneurship in Africa is linked to Ubuntu philosophy, which emphasizes interdependence and reciprocity over individualism and self-interest, and to a cultural belief in putting tribal interests above individual gain (Chilufya & Kerlin, 2017). This means that the practice of social entrepreneurship is inherent in many African cultures.

Culture is perceived to be a social capital when it is used to address societal problems of interest from the African context. In support of this argument, Littlewood and Holt (2015) mapped

out value-creating activities of 20 hybrid enterprises from Mozambique, Zambia, Kenya and South Africa. These enterprises were found to exhibit features of nonprofits, for profits, and community associations hence the reference to their hybridity. Most of these studies indicate the necessity of social enterprises in solving societal problems.

There has been an enormous amount of research conducted to determine the relationship between entrepreneurial culture and business ventures. For example, Danish et al. (2019) did an investigation on “the Factors affecting Entrepreneurial Culture: the mediating role of creativity”. Accordingly, Danish et al. discovered that enterprising society has been a space of examination in research for a long time since the development in innovation-based researches (p. 1). Danish et al. analyzed the impact of receptiveness to change and self-viability on enterprising society with the interceding job of inventiveness (p. 4). The study was in Punjab on a sample size of 300 whereby 225 representatives of different private firms was used. The study showed the importance of entrepreneurial culture in social enterprises (p. 4).

Similarly, Foreman-Peck and Zhou (2010, p. 1) did a study on, “Strength and Persistence of Entrepreneurial Cultures”. Foreman-Peck and Zhou concluded that entrepreneurial cultures made a difference, thus migrants from some origins were significantly more entrepreneurial and most of these differences were attributed to culture (p. 19). Further these scholars also noted that some entrepreneurial cultures have persisted over the twentieth century in businesses (p. 19). In the study, it was also noted that the most grounded entrepreneurial societies showed by those originating from the Middle East, Greece and Turkey however some extra chronicled material is important to build up who these individuals were (p. 19). This examination upholds the innovative culture variable use in the current investigation.

Likewise, Toghraee and Monjezi (2016, p. 1) did a study on, “Introduction to Cultural Entrepreneurship: Cultural Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries” and found that these aspects of entrepreneurship were “great significant engines of economic growth in the postindustrial world”. Toghraee and Monjezi concluded that cultural entrepreneurship can run a cultural and creative organization, carry out a strategically cultural mission, face risks to the creation of balance between managerial values and innovation and contribute to critical infrastructure (p. 5). From the study, it is evident that the dimensions of entrepreneurial culture in social enterprises were worth investigating.

More so, Ijaz et al. (2012, p. 908)) conducted a study on “Cultural Factors Effecting Entrepreneurial Behaviour among Entrepreneurs: Case Study of Multan, Pakistan”. In the study, Ijaz et al. noted that culture has stronger impact on developing entrepreneurial behavior and that family and friends play a huge role as source for developing entrepreneurial behavior (p. 908). They further noted that moral and financial support helps entrepreneurs to take risks and inculcate new ideas in their businesses (p. 915). The aspect of entrepreneurial culture as identified is important and hence investigated in the current study. As indicated by the exploration by Ijaz et al., the significant discoveries deducted from accumulated information presumed that, “there is a relationship among culture and business venture” (p. 908).

Further, Beugelsdijk (2010, p. 1) in a study on “Enterprising Culture, Regional Innovativeness and Economic Growth” reasoned that regions that have encountered higher financial development rates and which are more imaginative, have a culture that can be described as enterprising (p. 8). Beugelsdijk also certified that, by focusing on the role of innovative culture, one endeavors to add to the conversation in regional science, financial topography, and the capability of enterprising society in making territorial economic progress (p. 8).

A study by Kimutai (2015, p. 79) sought to, “assess the nature of entrepreneurship culture among successful business owners in Eldoret Town, Kenya”. Kimutai established that,

“organizational culture appeared to be a significant issue for successful entrepreneurship (p. 79)”. Kimutai discovered that the vision of the entrepreneur contributed to the success and as such visionary entrepreneurs had higher chances of business success (p. 790). In this line of thought, scholars have argued that entrepreneurial culture is born out of the vision of the enterprise. In fact, Kimutai (p. 79) states that entrepreneurial culture embodies risk-taking, innovation, and creativity. These factors of entrepreneurial culture as identified herein were investigated in the current study.

Iraki (2010) pointed out that “Culture encompasses, without being reducible to, values and norms that underpin a people’s way of thinking and doing things” (p. 262). Further, Iraki argued that,

“Development could be analyzed as any progression toward a goal...thus a community will have a certain perception of the world (culture) and how it would like to transform that world to its own good (development) through various initiatives and processes whereby development should be anchored in a people’s culture (p. 262).

What is evident here is that entrepreneurs’ culture is important for achieving an intended goal and mission of a venture. Similarly, Welter (2010) suggested that community entrepreneurship embodied social commitment, non-profit goals, and benefits for the wider community. This argument justifies the interest of the present study in understanding, “the role of social enterprises in contributing to social transformation”. This is important in explaining the number of social enterprises in Kiambu County where the study was carried out.

Mungai and Ogot (2012, p. 175) observed that in the majority of sub-Saharan countries, ethnic cultures played a dominant role in molding the values and perceptions of citizens than national cultures. Mungai and Ogot compared the differential rate of gender involvement among four Kenyan ethnic groups namely Luo, Kikuyu, Kalenjin, and Kamba and concluded that there were neither significant gender differences on community perception of entrepreneurship nor the extent on the presence (or absence) of personality traits associated with entrepreneurship (p. 175). Therefore, entrepreneurial culture was investigated to establish its relationship with the study phenomena.

Methodology

This study used a descriptive survey design. A descriptive study design was appropriate because it enabled the researchers to engage the social enterprises in their natural contexts in Kiambu County (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). The choice of this design was informed by the fact that social entrepreneurial practices reside within the people or individuals in their entrepreneurial actions and outcomes. Descriptive research design was fitting in the current study as it is concerned with the individual characteristics of the social entrepreneurs within their social enterprises.

The study was conducted in Kiambu County, which is located in the former Central Province of Kenya. The county has twelve sub-counties. The County of Kiambu is the “bedroom” for workers from Nairobi City County. This scenario has led to overstretching some vital human services as the country struggles with explosive population issues such as health, sanitation, poverty, and education among others. Kiambu County is unique with over 1944 social enterprises addressing diverse social problems in a growing population with shrinking resource base. The study was conducted within the opportune background of numerous social enterprises attending to diverse social problems.

The target population was composed of 1944 social enterprises in Kiambu County. The target population were social enterprises with an objective of social business. The inclusion criterion was those enterprises founded with a mission of solving one or more social problems in the society. Purposive sampling was used to select Kiambu County after which stratified sampling

technique was used to stratify the social enterprises according to the 12 sub-counties belonging to Kiambu County. In this study, stratification enabled the researchers to cluster the social enterprises according to sub-county stratum. Stratified sampling benefits this study because it enabled the researchers to a representative sample of all the social enterprises from each sub-county. This approach enabled the researchers to reduce standard error by providing control over the variance. After stratification, the researchers used simple random sampling to pick respondents from each stratum for the study.

The researchers gathered both qualitative and quantitative data. The study relied more on primary data. The primary data allowed the researchers to understand the views of respondents in regards to the influence of social entrepreneurship in social transformation in Kiambu County. A mixed method approach was used for data collection. The data was collected concurrently. The researchers used questionnaires and an interview guide to collect the data for analysis. The analysis of data followed the research objectives. The instruments were thoroughly checked by research experts (supervisors) to ensure they conformed in aspects of reliability for the study. The collected data for this article was subjected to quantitative analysis as shown in the following sections.

Results

Response Rate Results

The response rate is the level of individuals who responded to a study. According to Orodho (2004) a response rate is the degree to which the final data sets incorporate all sampled individuals and is determined as the number of respondents with whom interviews are completed and divided by the absolute number of respondents of the whole sample including none respondents. This study sampled 322 social enterprises. The researchers distributed 322 questionnaires. The response and non-response rates are in Table 1.

Table 1: Response Rate

Questionnaire	Frequency	Percentage
Returned	285	88.5%
Not Returned	27	11.5%
Total	322	100%

From Table 1, 322 questionnaires were distributed and 285 returned. Table 1 results indicate that the overall response rate is 88.5% against a non-response rate of 11.5%. According to Kothari (2014), a response rate of 50% is normal and a response rate between 60-70% is satisfactory while a response rate above 70% is excellent response rate. Examining the response rate in Table 1 it obvious that this was an excellent response rate (88.5%) and it is acceptable as representative of the sample to provide sufficient findings for analysis and to infer the conclusions about the study variables.

Respondents' Gender Distribution

The study sought to identify the gender distribution of the participants of the study. The results on this question are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Gender Distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	128	44.9
Female	157	55.1
Total	285	100.0

From the results on gender in Table 2, participant distribution in regards to gender shows that 55.1% (157) were females while 44.9% (128) were males. Hence, the results in the study represent the views of both genders.

Social Enterprise Age

The study sought to find the age of the social enterprises that were represented in this study. The results on this question are presented in Table 3. Firm age was considered as the number of years of operation of the social enterprise.

Table 3: Age distribution of social enterprises

Years	Frequency	Percent
0-5 years	171	60.0
6-10 years	63	22.1
11-20 years	31	10.9
Above 21 years	20	7.0
Total	285	100.0

Table 3 indicates that 60% of social enterprises existed for 5 years and below, 22.1% between 6-10 years, 10.9% between 11-20 years and 7% over 21 years. The distribution of these firms for the years they have been in operation is as shown in Table 3.

Regressions Results for Entrepreneurial Culture and Social Transformation

The hypothesis of this study was that there is no significant effect of entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises. This hypothesis was tested through regression analysis. The results of the regressions are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.190 ^a	.036	.033	12.22047

a. Predictors: (Constant), ECUL

The results indicate there is a relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises as indicated by R^2 of 0.036 implying that 3.6% of social transformation by social enterprises is explained by entrepreneurial culture. The implication is that an improvement in entrepreneurial culture by social enterprises by one unit causes an increase in social transformation by social enterprises by 0.036. The *adjusted R square* of 0.033 means that entrepreneurial culture without the constant explains only 3.3% variation in social transformation by the social enterprises. The remaining 96.7% variation in social transformation by the social enterprises is, explained by other variables not in the model.

Table 5: ANOVA Test

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1821.081	1	1821.081	12.194	.001 ^b
	Residual	48684.831	326	149.340		
	Total	50505.912	327			

a. Dependent Variable: ST

b. Predictors: (Constant), ECUL

The results for Analysis of Variance for entrepreneurial culture with social transformation by social enterprises is shown in Table 5 in which the computed *F-Statistics* value was 12.194 which is greater than the critical value of 3.85 and *p-value* was 0.001 which is less than 0.05 meaning that the relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises was significant.

Table 6: Beta Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	33.160	4.499		7.370	.000
	ECUL	.239	.068	.190	3.492	.001

a. Dependent Variable: ST

Table 6 shows beta coefficient in which, the *t-values* are 7.370 and 3.492 with *p-values* being 0.000 and 0.001 respectively which is less than 0.05 hence the model was statistically significant. The model is defined as $Y = 33.160 + .239X_1 + e$, indicating that every unit increase in entrepreneurial culture leads to 33.160 increase to social transformation by social enterprises. This implies that entrepreneurial culture has a positive relationship with social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County. The null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County is therefore rejected.

Table 7. Correlations

		ECUL	ST
ECUL	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	285	
ST	Pearson Correlation	.252**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	285	285

The results in Table 7 reveals that there is a significant correlation between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises, with *p-value* of 0.001, which is below 0.05 and Pearson Correlation coefficient was 0.252 while other independent variables were held constant.

The correlations are significant at the 0.01 degrees. This implies that there was a positive relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County. The positive coefficient of correlation value implies that, an improvement in entrepreneurial culture by the social enterprises improves social transformation. This leads to the conclusion that there is a significant moderate positive relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by SEs in Kiambu County, Kenya.

Discussions

The sample for the study was in two categories according to their gender. The results from Table 2 shows that 55.1% were females while 44.9% were males. This indicates that there were more females than males involved in social businesses in Kiambu County. This could be because the focal point of social enterprises is on solving social problems where women experience a large portion of these problems. There are still few men involved in social entrepreneurship, as culturally it was not the domain for men. Nonetheless, the representation is not that much skewed to either gender indicating that both genders share concern for social problems, which are solved through social business enterprises.

The heart of social entrepreneurship is working to alleviate social problems and, in this case, women were more concerned in social problems than men are. This is consistent with the current study where women were more involved in social enterprises than men were. In support of this viewpoint, a survey by The British Council (2016) in Ghana revealed that the social enterprise ecosystem had a strong female presence; that is, social enterprises had more female leaders than mainstream business, and female-led social enterprises were more likely to hire women onto their staff.

The results on social enterprises age in Table 3 indicate that 31.3% of the businesses had existed for more than 20 years. It was also established that some businesses, that is, 28.1%, had been in operation for a period ranging between 6 to 10 years, followed by 24.2% which have been in operation for a period ranging between 11 to 20 years and 16.4% had operated for a period of 0 to 5 years. The findings in the current study resonate with a study by Jamburia (2013) in Sweden where it was found that the more a social enterprise had been in operation the more people it had served contrary to the newly formed enterprises. Thus, the findings of Jamburia support the argument that the more social enterprises engage the more they are transformative. For social enterprises to continue in operation for several years is an indication of competitiveness and innovativeness. It is additionally a sign that they have gained adequate expertise and knowledge in their line of operation and service delivery.

The correlation results indicate there is a significant correlation between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County, with *p-value* of 0.000, below 0.01 and Pearson correlation value of 0.252. This implies that there was a significant relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County. The positive coefficient correlation implies there is a positive relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County. That is, as the entrepreneurial culture between social enterprises improves social transformation by the social enterprises increases. The study concluded that there is a moderate significant positive relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County, Kenya.

The results of Analysis of Variance for entrepreneurial culture with social transformation by social enterprises showed *p-value* was 0.001 below 0.05 meaning that the relationship between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises was significant. The beta coefficient summary showed *t-values* of 7.370 and 3.492 with *p-values* of 0.000 and 0.001, below 0.05 hence the model was statistically significant. This implies that entrepreneurial culture has a positive relationship with social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County. The quantitative data supports the qualitative data.

The findings are in concurrence with the contentions by Ijaz et al. (2012, p. 914) that social qualities impact the practices of individuals in society. Ijaz et al. (2012) saw that entrepreneurial

goal depends on family, gender, business experience and schooling. These discoveries concur with the assertions presented on entrepreneurial society in the current examination. The significance of culture in this examination is upheld by the discoveries of Ijaz et al. (2012) that stated that, “social standards and qualities assisted business visionary with facing challenges and bring groundbreaking thoughts (p. 915)”.

More specifically, the findings are supported by Danish et al. (2019, p. 2), who established that, “entrepreneurial culture has been characterized as the demeanor, qualities, aptitudes, and intensity of a group or individuals working in an institute/ organization to generate income”. Likewise, the findings of the current study corroborate the arguments of Bayraktar (2016) who found a positive connection between creativity and entrepreneurial culture.

These findings affirm the call by Danish et al. (2019), which saw that innovative culture has been a space of examination in research for a long time since the development in innovation-based undertakings. These outcomes add to arguments of Danish et al. (2019). Accordingly, Ijaz et al. (2012) further argued that, culture strongly affects enterprising conduct which upholds the discoveries of the current examination. These arguments concur with Kimutai (2016, p. 79) who expressed that, “entrepreneurial society encapsulates hazard taking, advancement, and imagination”. Further, Satar (2018), who saw that a solid authoritative culture upgraded representatives' abilities, upholds these discoveries.

The regression model from Table 6 shows that entrepreneurial culture was genuinely critical at $\beta=0.239$; $t=3.492$; $p=0.001$. Henceforth, at 95% degree of certainty, enterprising society has a positive impact on social transformation. These outcomes show that a unit expansion in entrepreneurial culture is liable for expanding social transformation by 0.239. This examination infers that there is a positive, however, measurable impact between entrepreneurial culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County. This is in accordance with findings of some scholars who argue that social components shaping entrepreneurial perspectives and expectations, affect the individual profession decision of whether to be a social business visionary (Thornton et al., 2011). Enterprising society, as per Kuhlke et al. (2017) is a call to foster enterprising abilities in innovative social areas to offer more in monetary terms. Enterprising society through inventiveness culture assumes a significant part as the principle driver of financial development both now and later on (Toghraee & Monjezi, 2017; Werthes, et al., 2017; Ratten & Ferreira, 2017). The findings also corroborate with Prasetyo (2019) who found entrepreneurial culture to be having the greatest impact (0.1332), circuitous impact (0.0899) and absolute impact (0.2231) on local financial development (p. 242).

Conclusion

The study looked to discover the impact of entrepreneurial culture on social transformation by social enterprises. In view of the findings, the accompanying conclusions are outlined. Correlation investigation results showed that there was a significant relationship between enterprising society and social transformation by social enterprises, considering the *p-value* of 0.000, which is under 0.01. This shows there was a significant relationship between enterprising culture and social transformation. The positive coefficient infers that the increment of entrepreneurial culture by social enterprises increases social transformation in the society. The result indicates presence of a significant but moderate positive relationship between enterprising society and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County, Kenya.

The outcomes of Analysis of Variance for enterprising society with social transformation by SEs showed *p-value* was 0.001, under 0.05. The beta coefficient showed, *t-values* of 7.370 and

3.492 with p-values being 0.000 and 0.001, under 0.05 consequently genuinely significant. The information was broken down utilizing regression models and the study uncovered that the respondents were of the assessment that, “enterprising society overall affects social transformation at 0.05 degree of critical”. Accordingly, it is reasoned that the null hypothesis, which expressed that there is no critical connection between enterprising culture and social transformation by social enterprises in Kiambu County is dismissed and the substitute hypothesis acknowledged at 95% degree of certainty.

References

- Ariza-Montes, A., Morales-Fernández, E. J., & Sianes, A. (2015). Social Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurs: The Influence of Cultural Context. In *Entrepreneurship, Regional Development and Culture*, pp. 157-177. Springer, Cham.
- Bayraktar, S. (2016). Do entrepreneurs really create entrepreneurial cultures? When intentions do not match actions. *Bogazici Journal*.
- Brownson, C. D. (2013). Fostering entrepreneurial culture: A conceptualization. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(31), 146-155.
- Chilufya, R., & Kerlin, J. A. (2017). Shaping social enterprise: Understanding institutional context and influence. In: Kerlin (Ed) *Shaping social enterprise: Understanding*
- Chilufya, R., & Kerlin, J. A. (2017). Shaping social enterprise: Understanding institutional context and influence. In Kerlin (Ed) *Shaping social enterprise: Understanding institutional context and influence*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Danish, R. Q., Asghar, J., Ahmad, Z., & Ali, H. F. (2019). Factors affecting “entrepreneurial culture”: the mediating role of creativity. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 1-12.
- Darko, E., & Koranteng, K. (2015). *Social Enterprise Landscape in Ghana, the British Council, Diversified Financial Services. Company Overview of Women’s World Banking Ghana (WWBG) Savings and Loans Company Limited*. https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/social_enterprise_landscape_in_ghana_report_final.pdf
- Ijaz, M., Yasin, G., & Zafar, M. J. (2012). Cultural factors effecting entrepreneurial behaviour among entrepreneurs: Case study of Multan, Pakistan. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 2(6), 908-917.
- Iraki, F. (2010). Culture and Development: Lessons learnt from the Post-Election Violence in Kenya. *The Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa*, 2(1), 261-276.
- Jamburia, G. (2013). Sustainability of social enterprises: A case study of Sweden.
- Khan, R. H. & Cox, P. L. (2017). Country Culture and National Innovation. *Archives of Business Research*, 5(2), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.52.2768>. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.52.2768>.
- Kimutai, C. (2014). Inside the Chandaria Family Businesses. Management, (pp. 18-23). Nairobi, Kenya: *The Kenya Institute of Management*.
- Kothari, C. R. (2014). *Research Methodology. Methods and Techniques*, (Second Revised), New Delhi: New Age International.

- Kuhlke, O., Kooyman, R., & Schramme, A. (2017), Cultural entrepreneurship as an academic discipline and professional practice embracing new theories. *Cultural Entrepreneurship in Theory, Pedagogy and Practice*. Available from: <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Littlewood, D. & Holt, D. (2015). “*Social enterprise in South Africa social enterprise in South Africa social enterprise in South Africa social enterprise in South Africa*”, ICSEM Working Papers, No. 2, Liege: The International Comparative Social Enterprise Models (ICSEM) Project.
- Orodho, A. J. (2003). *Essentials of educational and social sciences research method*. Nairobi: Masola Publishers.
- Orodho, J. A. (2004). *Elements of Education and Social Science Research Application in Education and Social Sciences*, Masola Publishers, Nairobi Kenya.
- Prasetyo, P. E. (2019). Role of entrepreneurial culture as the driver of economic growth. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 9(3), 237.
- Ratten, V., Ferreira, J. J. (2017). Future research directions for cultural entrepreneurship and regional development. *International Journal Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 21(3), 163-169.
- Satar, M. S. (2018). Organisational culture in social entrepreneurship ventures: A consideration from practitioners’ perspective. *International Journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 6(1), 35-41.
- Toghraee, M. T., & Monjezi, M. (2017). Introduction to Cultural Entrepreneurship: cultural Entrepreneurship in developing countries. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(4), 67-73.
- Werthes, D., Mauer, R., & Brettel, M. (2017). Cultural and creative entrepreneurs: Understanding the role of entrepreneurial identity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 24, 290-314.