

INCENTIVES FOR SOCIAL ORGANISATIONS AND SOCIAL VALUE CREATION IN SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA

Adele, Hasimiyu Ademola & Oyedokun, Jonathan Akintunde

Department of Management and Accounting, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology
Ogbomoso, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: The growing and persistent socio-economic problems afflicting most societies today is giving impetus to the call for entrepreneurial approaches to solving social and environmental problems *This study examined the contributions of social entrepreneurial attributes of selected NGOs to social value creation, most especially on healthcare service-delivery that benefits society at large. Specifically, the influence of attributes such as the adoption of social mission, number of years of service within the study area and their ability to replicate innovations were examined on NGOs ability to create and sustain social values. Census-based surveys of NGOs that provide healthcare services were made, to sample a total of seven registered NGOs utilized for the study. A total number of 548 copies of questionnaire were administered on both the selected NGO officials and their beneficiaries. Data obtained were analysed using descriptive statistical tools, to identify major characteristics of social entrepreneurship attributes of sampled NGOs. The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to determine the relationship between social entrepreneurial attributes of NGOs and their healthcare service-delivery, while the Cramer's phi coefficients, Contingency coefficients and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics were used to confirm the significance of the results. Findings revealed the existence of strong relationships between identified variables and that they are necessary requirements for any organization to create and sustain social values.*

KEYWORDS: *Entrepreneurship; Social Entrepreneurship, Social Value; Social Mission, Spatial Coverage, Networking; Self-sustainability*

INTRODUCTION

The general observation of the persistently increasing social and economic problems afflicting most societies today have become serious cause of concern to administrators, managers and academics alike. Various approaches currently fashioned to proffer solutions have to greater extent been observed to be inefficient, ineffective and unresponsive. This is not unconnected with a combination of several reinforcing socio-economic and political changes being witnessed around the globe recently:- the advent of globalization, as observed by Stigliz (2012), has expectedly benefited some countries via enhanced economic growth, but it has led to increased inequality in many others including the US, given prosperity to only very few people at the top and consequently making it very hard for democratic processes to work well, - the ever-growing inequality in wealth distribution and concern for the environment as observed by the World Bank (2007); and - the continuous reduction in government social-welfare spending via the adoption of free market ideology - a more neoliberal approach by governments worldwide, with an emphasis on market

forces as a primary mechanism for the distribution and redistribution of resources World Bank (2007). These have led to shrinking funds, resulting in fewer interventions by the public sector on socio-welfare programmes (Nicholls, 2006). The consequences are the persistent reduction in the quality of lives of the general poor, escalating insecurity, and continuous deteriorating healthcare service-delivery.

However, the search for practical and sustainable solutions is giving impetus to the call for socio-entrepreneurial approaches to solving these mounting problems. Social entrepreneurship is designed to proffer innovative and sustainable solutions through innovative combination of available resources via which are identified socio-entrepreneurial opportunities, and with available resources, design, produce and distribute effective, efficient and sustainable solutions for the mutual benefit of all and sundry. Social entrepreneurship can be described as a mechanism by which social and environmental problems are solved through innovative approaches and in a transparent manner with a view to ensure sustainable development (Brigitte, Enrico and Roy, 2010). Objectives of social entrepreneurship include; the identification of practical solutions to social problems, using available resources in order to capitalize on opportunities by: identifying social problems and transforming them into business opportunities; finding appropriate financing strategies and alternative managerial models for creating social value. Brigitte et al. (2010) further emphasized that developing a model for reaching self-sustainability and even financial autonomy of social groups in the process of social entrepreneurship may be a promising solution for the shortcomings of capitalism.

Organisations with social mission are those organisations that are able to connect social mission to innovation, and this can include both commercial organizations and those with an exclusively social mission, or a hybrid form of these (Austin St Wenson and Wei-Skillem, 2006). They provide local economies with public goods that generate positive externalities for the local communities; a housing assistance program helps families in transition find affordable accommodation, a conservation society provides open green space in the form of a downtown park, and a non-profit hospital can provide emergency care to those without economic means to afford it - all these externalities are generally seen as important components of local quality of life. Thus social entrepreneurship, as posited by Adele (2014), could be described as the process by which appropriate combination of innovative strategies are deployed, outside government enclave, to proffer practical solutions to endemic social and environmental problems afflicting the disadvantaged majority. The solution must be practical by making use of locally available resources, and at the lowest cost possible in order to ensure sustainability of such programmes by the community. Most organisations that render these services are the non-profit, non-governmental organizations.

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are non-governmental, non-profit oriented, self-governing bodies led by willful volunteers (Brown, 1990). They are groupings that are outside the domain of government in the areas of formation, funding, management and the processes and procedures in which they carry out their set objectives geared towards socio-cultural, socio-economic and socio-political transformation of all facets of the society. They function alongside the government as well as profit-based enterprises in delivery of social services for the upliftment and well-being of the society. They are therefore referred to as the third sector (Ehigiamusoe 1998).

NGOs evolve from ideas, experiences, interests, and innate zeal to respond to or remedy the observed phenomena or desire in the society. NGOs could be international, national, regional, or community-based depending on their financial resources and networking capability, strength and the idea behind their formation (sets goals). They focus on a number of areas – skill acquisition, economic empowerment, disease control and management, adult literacy scheme, capacity building, information driven, charity, conflict- resolution and peace promotion.

The idea behind the formation of NGOs in essence, is to effect desired changes in those areas that are felt undesirable in the society. These they do on their own, through collaboration and partnership with donor organizations and or networking with other NGOs. However, many NGOs especially those here in Nigeria are being constrained by a number of factors ranging from that of funding to shortage of volunteers (Awogbenle, 2010). It is on these premises that this study examined the phenomena of social entrepreneurship attributes of NGOs in southwestern Nigeria. Specifically the study assessed the qualifications the selected NGOs possess that enable them create solutions to endemic socio-economic problems in Nigeria. Efforts were made to examine how the contributions of an NGO translate into the upliftment of citizens' welfare. This in turn could be used to determine the extent of support, partnership, sponsorship and collaboration from the government or its agencies to any NGO operating in Nigeria.

Entrepreneurial attributes, as severally identified in extant literature (Dees, 2001; Dorado, 2006; Filion and Ananou., 2010; Mitra, 2011; Nicholls, 2006), includes: social mission; length of experience; spatial coverage; networking as well as self-sustainability in their attempts to identify how social entrepreneurship is sustained by both NGOs and enterprises, thus this study examined the extent to which these attributes are present in selected NGOs in Southwest Nigeria.

The Concept of Social Entrepreneurship

The interests in social entrepreneurship, that is, entrepreneurial activity that primarily serves social objective, has been on the rise in recent decades (Alvord Brown and Letts, 2004; Perrini and Vurro, 2006; Sharir and Lerner, 2006). Alvord et al., (2004) posit that the concept was developed out of the realization that the challenges of finding effective and sustainable solutions to many social problems are substantial, and that the solutions may require many of the features associated with successful business innovations. Similar view by Sharir and Lerner (2006) saw social entrepreneurship as a response to declining government involvement in the economy and society. This view is also in consonance with Dorado (2006), who affirmed that social entrepreneurial companies are those whose primary goal emphasizes social and economic value creation as a necessary condition to ensure financial viability. Thus social entrepreneurship could be described as the simultaneous pursuit of economic, social and environmental goals by enterprising ventures, and as human response to social and environmental problems. It represents an alternative governance system that could be employed to tackle pervasive poverty that is ravaging most economies today.

Research works in the area of social entrepreneurship has been varied in perspectives. While some scholars refer to it as an initiative of not-for-profit firms in search of alternative funding strategies or management schemes to create social values (Boschee, 1998; Boschee and McClurg, 2003), others saw it as a socially responsible practice of commercial business employed in inter-sectoral

partnerships (Sagawa and Segal, 2000; Mair and Marti, 2006). Yet, others observed it is a means to address and alleviate social problems and catalyze social transformation (Alvord et al. 2004; Alvord and Barney, 2007). Thus social entrepreneurship could be described as the process of creatively combining available resources (men and materials) in an innovative manner to explore and exploit opportunities in new ways to create social values by stimulating social changes while at the same time meeting social needs.

However social entrepreneurship could occur in both for-profit as well as non-profit entrepreneurial firms. As affirmed by Mair and Marti (2006), the choice of set-up is typically dictated by the nature of social needs addressed; the quantity of resources needed; the scope for raising capital and the ability to capture economic value. By implication, while social entrepreneurship is usually anchored on ethical motives and moral responsibility, an individual might equally be driven by self-esteem or personal fulfillment. A business entrepreneur could also manifest social wealth creation through corporate social responsibility. This is in tandem with Venkataraman (1997), report that “an entrepreneur is particularly productive from a social welfare perspective when in the process of pursuing selfish ends, also enhances social wealth by creating new industries, new technology new institutional forms, new jobs, net increase in real productivity”. Hence, while the profit motive is the central engine of entrepreneur, it does not preclude other motives that are beneficial to the society at large.

The distinctive motive of social entrepreneurship is the ability to creatively combine resources – which they often do not possess – in order to address social and environmental problems resulting in fundamental changes in established systems. This is in line with Schumpeter (1934), report that “there is a source of energy within every economic system which would, of itself, disrupt any equilibrium that might be attained therein; this source of energy is innovation”. It is the interaction between an innovative individual and his/her inert social environment that brings the much needed transformation. Examples of such interaction abound, and through which some highly successful social entrepreneurs attracted considerable media attention, amongst them: Professor Muhammad Yunus, founder of the Grameen Bank for microfinance in Bangladesh since 1976. He has been able to assist millions, especially women and the less-privileged, to fight poverty by providing soft loans for their businesses and for which the professor was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006. Jeffrey Skoll of eBay, who founded the Skoll Foundation in 1999, is another one. He has been supporting social entrepreneurs and other innovators dedicated to solving the world’s most pressing problems and upon which he was included among Time Magazine’s 100 People of the Year in 2006.

The Institute for One World Health (IOWH), founded by Dr. Victoria Hale in 2000 is a socio-pharmaceutical firm. Created to develop drugs for neglected diseases whose victims could not afford ordinarily. It thereby changes the perception that production could not be effected without adequate market. The Aravind Eye Hospital, founded by Dr. Venkataswamy in India in 1976, to provide eye-care services and cataract surgery to cure blindness at a highly subsidized rate; This enable the general poor who could not otherwise afford the cost as it obtains in advanced countries, overcome blindness. Also is the Sekem, founded by Dr. Ibrahim Abouleish in Egypt in 1977, as a multi-business social venture. It comprises of schools, university, adult education and medical centers, through which he is creating socio-economic and cultural values with significant impact

on the society. All of these point to one distinctive driver of social entrepreneurship which is the innovative combination of resources to alleviate social and environmental problems thereby changing established structures in fundamental ways. However, these examples indicate the entrepreneurial traits/attributes of individuals involved. Hence, a person is first and foremost an entrepreneur before being considered a social entrepreneur; this brings us to the importance of entrepreneurial attributes.

Development of Social Entrepreneurial Attributes

Reactions to the economic recessions of 1970s and 1980s, as related by Brigitte et al. (2010), reflected two major dimensions from the two dominating regions of the world – the United States and Western Europe. Within the particular context of these regions, two specific geographical traditions greatly influenced reactions that shaped approaches to the recession in question. While in the US, the recession elicited large cutbacks in federal funding and confronted nonprofits operating in poverty programmes, education, healthcare, the environment, and community services with a severe financial problem. Kerlin (2006), on the other hand, observes the European enterprises approach to the recession was by official government deliberate attempt to provide enabling environment for civil societies and cooperatives that address services such as housing for the marginalized, childcare, urban regeneration and employment generation programmes for the long term unemployed. The approach is more or less government response by creating the third sector (or the social economy). Similar observation by Nyssens (2006) confirms that within the European approach, social enterprises are generally of the nonprofit or cooperative types, dedicated to the creation of social impact for the community while combining revenue generation with the work or participatory activities of programme beneficiaries.

In the light of the aforementioned reactions, Brigitte et al., (2010), while analyzing social entrepreneurship in their study on empirical research analysis, identified four distinct approaches through which the subject could be studied. These are; the American schools comprising the innovation school of thought and the social enterprise school of thought; and the European schools, which include the emergence of social enterprise school of thought and the UK approach to social entrepreneurship. In order to reveal their different perspectives and their main commonalities with respect to social value creation in entrepreneurship these approaches are hereby briefly discussed.

The Innovation School of Thought: The Innovation School of thought perceives social entrepreneurs as individuals who take-on social problems and meet social needs in an innovative manner. The school, as observed by Dees and Anderson (2006), focused on establishing new and better ways to address social problems or meet social needs. Social entrepreneurs do so by either establishing a nonprofit enterprise or a for-profit enterprise. For both the Innovation and Social Enterprise schools of thought within the American tradition, the private foundations that promote the strategic development of the sector and their founders have contributed significantly to the fundamentals of the schools. For the Social Innovation School of thought, Bill Drayton, founder of Ashoka, is considered the leading figure. This school of thought on social entrepreneurship is rooted in the body of knowledge of commercial entrepreneurship on the discovery, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities. In the case of social entrepreneurship, these opportunities are found in social needs exploited through innovative means to satisfy those needs.

The Social Enterprise School of thought: The main subject of study was the enterprise, described as an entrepreneurial, nonprofit venture that generates “earned-income” while serving a social mission. In order to guarantee continuity of service provision, this school focuses on generating income streams independent from subsidies and grants. In addition to the theme of funding, this school also promotes the idea that adopting business methods is a successful way to improve the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations and make them more entrepreneurial. Edward Skloot is one of the pioneers of this school of thought. He founded New Business Ventures for Nonprofit Organizations in 1980, the first consultancy firm working exclusively for non-market companies, thus acknowledging a new niche and a relevant topic of interest for the third sector. The National Gathering of Social Entrepreneurs, led by Jerr Boschee and Jed Emerson, amongst others, became an influential private initiative promoting the development of a more effective and independent nonprofit sector. Like the Social Innovation School, the Social Enterprise School of thought also has a commercial knowledgebase equivalent. The Social Enterprise School is embedded in the commercial entrepreneurship tradition that defines entrepreneurship as the process of creating and managing (new) organizations.

The Emergence of Social Enterprise in Europe (EMES): As related by Brigitte et al., (2010) the (EMES) research network began in 1996 and consists of scholars cooperating in order to investigate the social enterprise phenomenon and establish a broad definition that allows for the national differences within the European Union. The main objective of the research of the EMES network was the emergence and growth of social enterprises within the European Union. The ‘ideal typical’ definition used by the EMES network defines the characteristics of the social enterprise within this approach. As in the Social Enterprise School, the unit of observation is the enterprise. In the case of the EMES approach, the social enterprise has an explicit aim to benefit the community, launched by a group of citizens, enjoys a high degree of autonomy, participatory in nature, and does not base decision-making power on capital ownership. In general, the organizations within this approach consist of the following types: associations, co-operatives, mutual organizations, and foundations. In contrast to the Social Enterprise School, which applies a non-distribution constraint to profits, the EMES approach allows for some profit distribution due to the inclusion of co-operatives. Although such co-operatives exist within the United States, they are not subject to the social enterprise discourse.

The UK approach: Despite the broadness of the definition applied by the EMES research network, the UK approach to social entrepreneurship is distinct from the EMES approach and the American tradition and therefore allows for a separate approach. When the Labour Party came to power in the UK in the late 1990s, it proactively tried to stimulate partnerships between civil societies, the public sector, and the private sector. In order to promote the establishment of social enterprises throughout the country, the Blair government launched the Social Enterprises Coalition and created the Social Enterprise Unit within the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). The DTI defined social enterprise as being comprised of businesses with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximize profits for shareholders and owners. In 2004, a new legal form was introduced, the Community Interest Company. Since 2006, all social enterprise affairs have been the responsibility of a newly established ministry of the Third Sector dedicated to improving the professionalism of the sector, ameliorating access to financial sources, and

refining the legal framework in favour of sector growth. UK social enterprises are subject to a limited distribution of profits and can be initiated by individuals, groups of citizens, or by legal entities. In contrast to the EMES approach, the goods and services provided can be related, unrelated, or central to the venture's mission. In addition, the social enterprises in the UK are trading within the market.

This study was designed to align with the United States approach, and efforts have been made to identify salient features of social entrepreneurship in the Nigerian context. As observed by Kellog, (1998), the USA has a long-established social enterprise sector, dating back to its 1960s response to industrial decline, social unrests, and public service reduction. The distinguishing feature of US social enterprises as noted by Kellog (1998) is the adoption of a 'business-led' approach, involving the application of business principles to management and enterprise activities. Thus, the Social Enterprise Alliance of the USA saw social enterprises as: "Any earned-income business or strategy undertaken by a nonprofit to generate revenue in support of its charitable mission. 'Earned income' consists of payments received in direct exchange for a product, service or privilege" (www.sealliance.org). It is worth noting that US social enterprises are eligible for a number of major tax exemptions for operating on a non-profit basis. Because of the business-like model of social enterprise, in the US they are encouraged to draw on support structures in place for general businesses. Funding for social enterprises in the US is often sourced from conventional business as well as the normal diverse range of central or state government and other charitable foundations.

Social enterprises in the US fulfill a range of functions and deliver a wide range of services. Many of these reflect the differences compared with the UK where provision of welfare and universal services is done by the state. This context leads to a large number of targeted, single-issue social enterprise organizations, which vary dramatically in scale. Majority of the support organizations for social enterprise in the USA are subscriber membership organizations, offering training, consultancy and networking facilities to members, individuals or organizations. The largest of these organizations include the Roberts Enterprise Development Fund (REDF). This organization provides guidance, leadership and investment to a portfolio of social enterprises engaged in a range of activities; others are The Skoll Foundation, Ashoka; Schwab Foundation etc.

Arising from the foregoing, Fillion and Ananou, (2010), were of the opinion that adopting a mission to create and sustain social value is the core of what distinguish social from business entrepreneurship. While incorporating Dees (2001) approach to the understanding of social entrepreneurship, they encapsulate in (Figure 1, Appendix) that an organization which professes social value creation must have social mission as its objective. In its bid, it must always strive to recognize and relentlessly pursue new opportunities to serve that mission. Where others fear problems, it sees opportunity to change obstacles into items of benefits through continuous innovation, adaptation and learning. It operates in an open and transparent manner which enables the organization to collaborate with relevant organizations, agencies and or the public in order to collectively achieve what individually seems difficult. It is always interested in achieving more with less and sustains its social value creation by establishing economic activities through which it earns income.

The peculiarities of developing economies, as Nigeria, might necessitate examining how the above described model would fit into the Nigerian situation. Attributes such as social mission, length of experience, spatial coverage, partnership with private and public sectors are expected to influence the ability of an organization to create social value. Also, the American model is predicated on the ability of a nonprofit to create economic values through which incomes earned sustain its social value creation. This becomes imperative as observed by Mair and Marti (2006), that social entrepreneurs are usually faced with limited potential to capture the value created. And that those who address basic social needs, such as food, shelter or education, very often find it difficult to capture economic value because, although, the customers are willing, they often are unable to pay even a small part of the price of the product and services provided. In the same vein Kellog (1998), posited that the distinguishing feature of social entrepreneur is the adoption of business-led approaches to management and enterprises activities. It offers them opportunity to obtain additional resources which may lead to self-sustenance and financial autonomy. The study hereby examined the ability of Nigerian NGOs to create and sustain social value within the local context. This is predicated on their possession of certain attributes found in those American enterprises that answers the social enterprise nomenclature. However, these identified attributes are hereby described for the purpose of this study and are in no way exhaustive.

Social Value:

Social value as described by Mair and Marti (2006), is a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, more efficient, more sustainable, and that is just more than existing solutions for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals. A similar view by Aureswald (2009), affirms social value as the creation of benefits or reduction of costs for the society through efforts to address societal needs and problems in ways that go beyond private gains and general benefits of market activity. Thus it is any combination of innovative strategies that are deployed to bring much better solution to social and environmental problems afflicting a set of disadvantaged people to the extent of bringing long-sought relief at affordable/no cost to all and sundry. This is a bit different from wealth creation as economic value is subjugated for the social value. This agrees with Peredo and McLean, (2006); Certo and Miller's, (2008); Light, (2009) position that social value deals with the fulfillment of basic and long standing needs such as the provision of food, shelter, water, education, medical services to those in need (who might not be able to afford it ordinarily).

Social value is created when efforts are made to turn a situation of unsatisfactory (unjustified) equilibrium - that made majority of citizens to accept the inconvenience as something they must tolerate - into an opportunity to create new solutions whose benefits accrue to the larger society (Martins and Osberg, 2007). And to Peredo and McLean, 2006, seeking solutions to social problems and creation of social values are the main peculiarities of social entrepreneurs This aptly described the scourge of cataract-induced blindness in India before 1976 that prompted Dr. Venkataswamy and his team to confront the menace headlong through deployment of appropriate combination of innovative strategies. Dr. V founded the Aravind Eye Care Hospital in his resolve to make cataract surgery available and affordable. Average cost of cataract operation was \$1800 in the US as at 2006, however, from his 11- bed clinic in Mandurai, India, he built what today is the largest non-profit eye care hospital in the world, attracting about 32 million patients with over 4 million cataract-related surgical operations successfully performed in 36 years at no cost to the

general poor citizens who could not otherwise afford it (Naidoo, 2012). Similarly, the innovative strategies that propelled Victoria Hale to defy economic logic - that production could only be affected with respect to available effective market - is another example of social value creation. She founded the Institute for One World Health in Sanfransisco in 2000 as the first non-profit pharmaceutical company with a mission to discover, develop and deliver safe, effective and affordable medicines for disadvantaged people afflicted with neglected infectious diseases in the developing world. With sponsorship from the Skoll Foundation and the India government approval, its first drug, paromomycin – an oral formulation to treat intestinal protozoal infections –is providing a cost-effective cure for a disease that kills over 200,000 people per annum in India.

Arising from the above, social value is described as any innovation or a combination of innovative strategies deployed to identify human and environmental problems (such as cataract-induced blindness or scourge of infections popular with the less-privileged), and with locally available resources, plan, produce and equitably distribute among the citizens, irrespective of whether or not they can afford it, appropriate and effective solutions on a continuous basis

Social Mission:

To be able to create social value, an organization must have social mission. As affirmed by Dees (2001), social entrepreneur play the role of change agents by adopting a mission to create and sustain social value and not just private value. Similarly, Kotler and Murray (1975) posit that while the private sector is motivated by profit, public sector tries to address some needs of its citizens; the non-profits try to perform functions that satisfy certain needs that are not adequately met by either the private or the public sector. Hence non-profits usually exist to fulfill social mission. Social mission can be described as a philosophy that aims to provide public goods that generate positive externalities. It is the commitment that makes an organization responsible to donors, partners or governments and at the same time accountable to the community being served by providing services that are effective, implementable and affordable. An organisation mission serves as a long term objective the achievement of which is the reason for the existence of the organization. It must be clearly stated and efficiently distilled so that every member of the organization understands it. As affirmed by Baker and Sinkula (1999), a mission's clarity helps sustain employee commitment and the resulting shared vision provides direction for the organization. Similar view by McDonald (2007) stated that a clear motivating organization mission helps an organization to focus attention on those innovations that will most likely support the accomplishment of its objective. Little wonder mission statements like: MD Anderson's - "Making cancer history"; Institute for one world health's - "To discover, develop and deliver safe, effective and affordable medicines for disadvantaged people afflicted with neglected infectious diseases in the developing world"; the Association for Reproductive and Family Health's – "Working together, building a healthier future"; People Against HIV/AIDS in the Barracks" – "Together we can win the fight against HIV" to mention but few, are all simple and captivating. A mission assists an organization to remain focused on its set objectives and at the same time ensures efficient allocation of resources, such that only projects/programmes that falls within the core value are pursued.

To have social mission therefore, a firm must have a clearly stated objective that benefit the community it intends to serve distinct from profit motives. It is a philosophy that is more concerned with mobilisation of critical resources, with a view to caring for the people. It is also about helping

to build institutions that advance solutions to such problems as poverty, illness, illiteracy, environmental degradation, human right abuses and corruption, in order to make life better for many people. Even where business management models and economic activities are embarked upon, it must be to sustain the core value activities of providing positive externalities.

Length of Experience:

An organization's learning experience could be described as the development of management processes that constantly align an organization with its mission. As posited by Mitra (2011), it is a combination of different elements that are tightly woven into a virtuous cycle of performance, reinforcement and amplification of individual element's contribution that proffer solutions to everyday problems as they occur. In the same vein Aiken and Britton (1997) describe it as ability to acquire, share and use information to timely adapt to new market environment that could be drawn from past experience(s) within or outside the organization. Also Britton (1998), in his study on "the learning NGO", opined that an organization benefits from its own experience that emanate from a complex set of practices, systems and relationships which link the organization's vision, mission, values and behaviour to desired outcomes and results. Thus learning by experience is a necessary and an integral part of an organization plans for sustainable development, such that for it to create social value it must learn the most effective ways of achieving its objectives with the community. This it does by cultivating the people to develop an understanding of their needs in order to devise appropriate programme of assistance through experimentation, risk-taking, creativity while building on its past experience (Britton, 1998).

This explains why it took Dr. Venkataswamy and his team 3 decades to increase people's access to eye care services. They gradually and painstakingly address the financial, organizational and technical barrier to affordable eye care treatment on a much desired (mass) scale in India. This learning-by-doing strategy requires time, energy and enormous will-power of the founder and his team to experiment and perfect business model that suit the organization's purpose. It is through this processes an organization learns to use its resources efficiently to achieve its objective at minimum cost possible. While acknowledging the need for tolerance about inefficient use of resources via unavoidable mistakes in the beginning, Dees (2001) posited that organization must have high tolerance for ambiguity and learn how to manage risks for themselves and others through exploring, learning and improving. They need to view failure of projects as a learning experience and not as personal tragedy.

Hence length of experience is the number of years an organization has evolved in the art of delivering critical products or services to its target market with improved quality and efficiency. It is continuous processes that must be evolving as it involves creating a new stable and better equilibrium for the general society that translate to social value creation.

Spatial Coverage:

Social value is created when and only when the innovative benefits of products and/or services produced are made available and affordable to all and sundry. Scaling up a social innovation offers the potential to greatly expand the social value of the innovation to a greater number of beneficiaries. Scaling, as defined by Dees (2001), is the process of increasing a social-purpose

organisation's product/service to better match the magnitude of the societal need/problem it seeks to address. It is a process by which a program that has helped to proffer a solution to a social problem in a smaller scope is expanded to broaden its impact on society. Similar view by Bloom and Chatterji (2009), expresses scaling of social value as the ability of a social solution to be easily transferred. This is a reflection of the effectiveness with which an organization can reproduce the programmes and initiatives that it has originated. Such services, products and other efforts must easily be copied or extended without a decline in quality using training, franchising, contracting and other appropriate mechanisms to ensure quality control (Bloom and Chatterji, 2009).

Venture growth in entrepreneurship literature has always been attributed to resources available to a firm. And in line with early works from the field of strategic management, Wernerfelt (1984), in his Resource Based Theory of the firm, posits that organizational growth is a function of the resources available to a firm, and this relationship has since remained consistent even for new ventures. Similar view by Gilbert, et al (2006) affirms the growth in both commercial and social enterprises is predicated on ability to harness resources, strategy and industry context, and that access to necessary financial, human and social resources are important for growth. However, Bloom and Smith (2010), in their bid to identify drivers of social entrepreneurial impacts, acknowledged that both social and commercial ventures face similar challenges for growth and must therefore strive to manage relationships with multiple stakeholders and find ways to mobilise resources and achieve sustainability. Arising from the above, it is opined that the strategic innovation that would effectively create social value must not only inspire others to replicate it, but must also achieve a scale necessary to bring about permanent equilibrium shift in the larger society. The strategy must be able to motivate necessary stakeholders to mobilise important resources and thereby assure equitable distribution of its benefits to a greater proportion of the afflicted people.

Networking:

An organization that will create social value must be willing and able to collaborate and network with other organizations (local and international), private sector, donors, philanthropists, governments and its agencies in order to leverage on critical resources. An important attribute of entrepreneurship is that it is not limited by resource constraints. As opined by Stevenson and Jarillo (1990), entrepreneurship is a process by which individuals pursue opportunities without regards to resources currently controlled. And since no organization can leave in autarky, collaboration is necessary for organization success. Networking/collaboration has the potential to address challenges and opportunities that an organization may not be able to solve independently. Hence ability of an organization to join forces with others could avail it valuable solutions that can contribute in achieving its own mission and objectives. Because NGOs are perceived as proxies for societal and environmental needs as their organizational legitimacy is often grounded in socio representation (Valor and Diego, 2009). It is mutually beneficial of any sector to collaborate with them. While the private sector benefits by combining its profit-driven technological innovation and product development with the NGOs societal and environmental missions, they both create possibilities for the advancement of the general people. Government and its agencies also utilize NGOs as instruments for addressing global challenges and development. Thus by combining strengths and resources in order to pursue common goals networking/collaboration enable partners to exploit each other's differences for mutual benefits.

The need for networking was adequately addressed in the Stakeholder and Resource Dependent Theories – both are organizational management theories. While contributing to the development of the stakeholder theory, Freeman (1984) defines stakeholder as any individual/group who can affect or is affected by the activities/achievements of an organization's objectives. Freeman (1984) further argues that the success of an organization is a function of the continued management of its relationships with its stakeholders, and that its continued legitimacy and survival depends on simultaneously managing the different and often conflicting interests. The beauty of this theory could be drawn from its position which portrays collaboration as potential mutually beneficial stakeholder management approach, since it involves a high degree of information and knowledge exchanges. Networking /collaboration becomes imperative for organisations when one considers the paucity of economic resources of firms. Because organisations are not self-sufficient and do not have control over all the resources they require (Kizner, 1989), there is need for interaction with others in order to achieve set objectives.

In their contributions to the Resource Dependency Theory, Yaziji and Doh (2009) posit that perceived mutual dependencies between organisations can motivate potential partners to come together and join forces when they perceive critical strategic interdependencies with other organisations in their environment. Pieffer and Salancick (1978) also argue that all organisation's outcomes are based on interdependencies because, as they put it, in social systems and social interactions, interdependencies exists whenever one actor does not entirely control all of the conditions necessary for obtaining the outcome desired from its actions. This implies networking with other organizations could be an excellent means of managing firm-specific links by gaining access to critical resources necessary for their own success and survival.

While Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation provided funding for the Institute for One World Health of Victoria Hale to develop drugs for “neglected diseases”, the foundation was delighted it is meeting its altruistic motives while the NGO becomes fulfilled. Similarly, the Combat Blindness Foundation and David Green's “Project Impact, 2004” among others were bankrolling Aravind projects to ensure they both succeed in their mutually exclusive objectives. To create social value that brings about a new and permanent equilibrium shift. At the same time, an organization needs conducive, legal and economic environment that can only be guaranteed by government policies. As stated in Auerswald (2009) report, social entrepreneurs can create social value by influencing governments through initiating enactment of laws to foster conducive environment for their operations. Similarly, Brown (1990) posits, social ventures are effective where there are potentials for strong collaborative relationship with respective governments. However, where the government commitment to improved social welfare is weak, they find dialogue and collaboration frustrating and even counterproductive. Networking is therefore an important mechanism through which business ventures can overcome their resource-constraint challenges, more so an NGO whose market environment is not usually financially motivated. Network effect is measured by the extent of relationships an organization builds with sponsors, foundations, donors, partners and volunteers in order to achieve together what individually might not be easily achievable.

Self-sustainability:

Promotion of social value creation can be sustained when non-profit organizations involve economic activities through which they earn incomes to finance their operation on a continuous basis. For an organization to create and sustain social value it must strive beyond adopting a social mission, it must be business-like by deploying private sector management techniques for their production efficiency. While charting sustainable pathways for social ventures, Dees (2001) proposes that non-profits can benefit from the focus of commercial enterprises of – customer focus, sound strategy, effective planning, efficient operations and financial discipline. This is in line with Boschee and McClurg (2003), Bornstein, (2007) as well as Bygrave and Zacharakis (2011) who affirm that only non-profits that bring business expertise and market-based skills to bear on their operation would sustain social value creation. They must be able to invoke business principles and innovative approaches to their mission in order to render societal welfare services. Similar view by Brigitte et al., (2010) affirms it is self-sustainability and even financial autonomy that would enable non-profit organizations permanently transform social problems into business opportunities. This is achievable through finding appropriate financing strategies and alternative managerial models for creating social values (Brigitte et al., 2010).

It is interesting to note that funding strategies have often been the determinant factor in the level of success and as the backbone for social value creation and its sustenance. Many scholars are of the opinion funds generated within the ambits of an organization jurisdiction would enable it be more focused and ensure smooth running on its social value creation (Fowler, 2000; Perini, 2006). Others believe that funds from external sources enable the organization to pull adequately enough resources to ensure its capacity to match social value with the magnitude of societal needs (Anderson, et al, 2006; Leadbeater, 2007). Yet, others are of the opinion a combination of both is bound to bring better results to an organization, most especially the non-profits (Dees and Anderson, 2003; Mair and Marti, 2006; Martin and Osberg, 2007).

It could be observed that profits from Grameen Telecoms, Grameen Energy and others are deployed to further Grameen Bank's mission of providing loans to the poor masses. Similarly, Aravind's business model comprises 40% paying clients whose profit is ploughed back into the core operation of the hospital. In addition, customized intraocular lenses sales also serve as part of revenue stream for Aravind's sustainability. This became necessary as paucity of funds from donors and sponsors could negatively affect operations and could jeopardise ability to sustain social value creation activities. Nicholls (2006) observed, grant scarcity that followed Stock market crash of early 2000 (when many philanthropists had to cut back on capital spending) necessitate non-profits to combine social enterprise model with a clear business proposition. Hence NGOs that will create and sustain social value must strive to continuously improve on their activities by deploying business strategies that is capable of sustaining their activities. This can be achieved by efficiently utilizing available local resources, produce high quality goods and services at lowest cost possible, engage in supportive (income-generating) economic activities with a view to reduce dependence on aids, donations, grants etc that may sometimes fail and thereby disrupting free flow of their core activities.

METHODOLOGY

A survey of 41 registered NGOs operating in southwestern Nigeria was made out of which purposive sampling technique was used to select seven (7) that render healthcare services for the study. NGO operatives were categorized into three with respect to their area of core competence; they are; Professionals (Doctors, Nurses and Pharmacists), Administrative staffs and the General staffs (Ad-hoc/volunteers). Simple random sampling method was used to select a total of 30 officials from each NGO (comprising paid employees and volunteers) so as to give equal representation to all segments of the operatives of each NGO.

Incidental sampling technique was adopted for the study. This was because the researcher could not determine the number of beneficiaries to meet on each visitation to the NGOs service outlets. However, a total number of 338 beneficiaries responded to the questionnaire from the seven outlets of the selected NGOs. A total of 548 questionnaires were administered across all the sampled NGOs (210 officials – paid and volunteers, as well as 338 beneficiaries). And of the 502 (91.6%) response, a total of 486; 203 NGO officials and 283 beneficiaries respectively (88.6%) cases were used for data analysis following screening and data evaluation.

Primary data used in this study was obtained through structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was randomly administered to elicit information on the two identified constructs for the studies from both the selected NGO officials and their beneficiaries. Statements relating to each constructs that were presented before each individual official of selected NGOs were equally reframed for individual NGO beneficiaries, to ascertain the veracity of NGO official's claims. This was done to ensure total quality of data gathered for the study (Eisenhardt and Schoonhoven, 2007).

Data obtained were analysed with the aid of descriptive statistical tools to identify association between social entrepreneurship attributes and social values of sampled NGOs.

The study also employed Chi- Square Test of Independence to examine the social entrepreneurial attributes of NGOs and their social value. This test was conducted on independent samples (NGO officials and their beneficiaries). Contingency Co-efficients, and Cramer's phi co-efficient were used to measure the association between ICTs deployment and extent of NGO's social values. These become appropriate since nominal variables constituted the measures for the study. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also employed to justify comparative analysis of these variables between the two independent samples.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The study identified five attributes of social entrepreneurship that a socially-oriented organization must possess to enable it create and sustain social values. Each attribute the study adopted as a construct was hereby captured by three variables. The resulting eighteen variables formed the kernel of the study questionnaire administered to the NGO officials and their beneficiaries. Responses obtained were analysed with the aids of descriptive as well as inferential statistical tools, and the resulting findings are hereby discussed.

Table 1(Appendix) revealed a contingency measure of association between the social value rendered by an NGO and its mission statement. Though the result indicated a lower Chi-square value of 25.615, the value was however significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result reflected the lackadaisical attitudes of most beneficiaries of NGO services to their identities. Most beneficiaries are only interested in services they derive and are not particular about the mission/vision of the service providers. It could be observed that a large proportion of beneficiary respondents were unable to ascertain the mission statement of NGO they patronize.

The relationship was also affirmed significant by a Cramer's V value of 0.393 and a Contingency coefficient of 0.324. Furthermore, the relationship between social mission and social value services rendered by NGOs was also affirmed through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) F-value of 17.284, which was also significant at 5%. Thus having a social mission is a pre-requisite to rendering social value services, hence the adoption of social mission attribute of social entrepreneur by an NGO have significant impact on its social value creation ability.

The result empirically corroborates the position of Baker and Sinkula (1999); Dees (2001); Kotler and Murray (1975) and McDonald (2007), who in separate conceptual papers, variously posited that for an organization to create social value, it must play the role of change agents by adopting a mission to create and sustain social value and not just private value. And those non-profits usually exist to fulfill social mission by attempting to satisfy certain needs that are not adequately met by either the private or the public sector.

Table 2 (Appendix) shows a measure of the relationship between the length of experience of an NGO and the social value it renders to its immediate community. With a Chi-square value of 589.934 at a 0.05 level of significance, the result confirms the existence of a strong relationship that was availed an NGO, over the years, to have cultivated the community people and develop an understanding of their needs in order to devise appropriate programmes of assistance for them. The relationship was further affirmed to be significant by a Cramer's V value of 0.852 and a Contingency Coefficient of 0.863 respectively. Both values were observed to be higher than 0.5 and tending towards 1, suggesting a strong relationship between length of experience and social value creation ability of sampled NGOs. The existence of a strong relationship was further confirmed through an ANOVA F-value of 585.531 which was also significant at 0.05 level. Thus the longer number of years an organization spent rendering critical services to a people has strong influence on its ability to sustain social values.

This result is in line with the position of Britton (1998), in his study on "the learning NGO", where he observed that an organization benefits from its own experience that emanate from a complex set of practices, systems and relationships which link the organization's vision, mission, values and behavior to desired outcomes and results. It also an empirical confirmation of the assertions by Aiken and Britton, (1997); Dees (2001; Mitra (2011), who in their variously conceptual studies described organization learning experience as the development of management processes that constantly align an organization with its mission. they further assert it is a combination of different elements that are tightly woven into a virtuous cycle of performance, reinforcement and amplification of individual element's contribution that proffer solutions to everyday problems as they occur.

Table 3 (Appendix) revealed the relationship between the potential of an NGO to greatly expand the social value of its innovation to a greater number of beneficiaries. This is a contingency measure of association between the social value rendered by an NGO and the extent of its spatial coverage. The table indicates a Chi-square value of 21.465, though this value was low, it was however significant at 0.05 level. This level of significance confirms the existence of relationship between social value rendered and the volume of beneficiaries attended to by each NGO. This outcome also suggests that the NGOs have demonstrated capacity to replicate innovations at their different service outlets. The relationship was also affirmed through a Cramer's V value of 0.291 and a Contingency coefficient of 0.450 respectively, though both values were observed to fall below 0.5, they were however significant at 0.05 level. The ANOVA F-value of 255 further affirmed the effects of spatial coverage on social value creation of NGOs, as it was also significant at 0.05 level.

This result is in agreement with postulations by Bishop and Green (2008); Bloom and Charteji (2009); Marti and Osberg (2007); Porter and Lee (2013) that innovations that engender social values must be easily copied or extended without a decline in quality, and that healthcare providers need to serve far more patients and extend their reach through strategic expansion in order to fulfill social mission/objective.

Table 4 (Appendix) indicates a contingency measure of association between the social values rendered by NGOs and their network of partners, sponsors, collaborators etc. The Chi-square value of 261 was significant at 0.05 level of significance, this confirms the existence of a strong relationship between the social value rendered by NGOs and the support they enjoy from their collaborators (networks). This outcome suggests that NGOs have developed a sound and healthy cooperation with their partners leading to a build of trust. This is as reflected in the commitment of their collaborators culminating in the sustenance of NGO mission. The relationship was further affirmed significance through a Cramer's V value of 0.567 and a Contingency coefficient of 0.750 respectively. Both were observed to be above 0.5 and tending towards 1, signifying a strong relationship. The effects of Networking on social value of NGOs was also observed to have 0.05 influence, by implication, Networking significantly influence the social value services rendered by NGOs. The ANOVA F-value of 451.321 which was also significant at 0.05 level further affirmed the effects of Networking on social values of NGOs.

The result corroborates the positions of Denice et al, (2010); Valor and Diego (2009) who argued that an important factor in the performance of a firm is the network of relations in which it is embedded. They further posited that by working more closely with other organizations, it can access, combine, and share expertise, resources, and knowledge and co-produce additional knowledge in ways that would be impossible by acting independently. The result is also in agreement with the study by Pieffer and Salancick, (1978), in their Resource Dependency Perspective, posited that all organization's outcomes are based on interdependencies because in social systems and social integration, interdependencies exists whenever one actor does not entirely control all of the conditions necessary for the achievement of desired action.

Table 5 (Appendix) shows a contingency measure of association between social value sustenance and financial autonomy of NGOs. It reflects a measure of the influence the deployment of private

business practices exert on the ability of an NGO to create and sustain social value. With a Chi-square value of 392.740 which was significant at 0.05 level, a confirmation was made of the existence of a strong relationship between the deployment of economic activities through which incomes are generated to finance and sustain social services rendered by NGOs. The result suggest that NGOs have developed a stream of incomes through related economic activities (sale of products and/or services), that enable them overcome dependence on sponsorship and donations upon which they have no control. The relationship was also confirmed significant through a Cramer's V value of 0.695 and a Contingency coefficient value of 0.812 both of which were significant at 0.05 level of significance. A further confirmation of the existence of a strong relationship was affirmed through the ANOVA F-value of 222.440, which was also significant at 0.05 level. Thus the relationship between deployment of business strategies and sustenance of social value creation of NGOs is not at all superfluous. Hence the null - hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis upheld.

This result was in conformity with previous assertions by Bornstein (2007); Brigitte, et al, (2010); Bygrave and Zacharakis (2011); Nicholls (2009); Sharir and Lerner (2006); Weerawardena and Mont (2006) who variously affirm that only non-profits that bring business expertise and market-based skills to bear on their operation would sustain social value creation This becomes achievable through deploying appropriate financing strategies and alternative managerial models for creating social values.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that social mission of NGOs, though well understood by their officials, are not so comprehensible to their immediate communities as many respondents beneficiaries appeared ignorant of them. Also is the NGOs capacity to replicate their innovations, this appeared limited in scope as the resources necessary to do so are enormous and tend to be beyond them.

The study however revealed most NGOs have over the years experienced the learning curve through which they are creating appropriate social values to the benefit of their communities. More NGOs are also observed to be recording outstanding successes in their collaboration efforts with both private and public institutions (local as well as international). These enable them to promote their innovations to the benefit of a large number of people.

The study also confirmed the deployment of business practices by a number of the NGOs. This enables them to remain focused and enhance their capacity to render services on a continuous basis.

While contributions of social entrepreneurs are usually regarded as ancillary to economic development of local communities, the realization that the social problem-solving capacity of social-purpose organisations is greatly serving unique purposes (as alternative approaches to global challenges) in several climes is giving impetus to the call for their distinct approaches on social/humanitarian issues. However, considering the fact that economic development are usually hampered by bureaucracy and poor legislation, the study propose policy makers to ensure enabling

environment for social entrepreneurship to thrive through good legislation that protect individual property rights, efficient allocation of economic resources and promote private ownership of capital for development. It is believed conducive economic climate will encourage commercial and industrial progress. This becomes necessary as social entrepreneur operates between civil society, the state and the market, and they are greatly influenced by all the three.

To corporate bodies the study observed that the role of business in society has in the 21st century evolved from just profit making and social corporate responsibility, investors are now more interested in non-financial performance indicators such as their reputational status, contributions to society, and how they positively impact stakeholders. Business owners are encouraged to give a more robust definition to the meaning of capitalism; entrepreneurs should be motivated to give back to the society from where fortunes are made. This is sequel to ensuring sustainability of both their enterprise and their market.

REFERENCES

- Adele, H. A. (2014): Social Entrepreneurship in Southwestern Nigeria: A Study of Selected NGOs. Unpublished Ph. D Thesis, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria
- Aiken, M. and Britton, B. (1997): The Learning Organisation and the Voluntary Sector. International NGO Training a Research Centre Occasional Papers. Series 13
- Alvarez S.A and Barney J.B (2007): Discovery and Creations Alternative Theories of Entrepreneurial Action. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal 1(1-2) pages 11-26
- Alvord S. H, Brown L. D, and Letts C. I. W (2004): "Social Entrepreneurship and Social Transformation: An Exploratory Study. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences 40 (3): 280-282
- Auerswald, P. (2009): Creating Social Value. Stanford Social Innovation No. 1 (Review Spring): 50 - 55
- Austin, J. St.wenson H. and Wei-Skillern J. (2006): Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship, Same, Different or Both? Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice pg 1-22
- Awogbenle, A. C. (2010); Youth Unemployment: Entrepreneurship Development Programme as an Intervention Mechanism. African Journal of Business Management 4 (6): 21 - 35
- Baker, W. E and.; Sinkula, J. M (1999): The Synergistic Effects of Market Orientation and Learning Orientation on Organisational Performance.. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 25, 305-318
- Bishop, M. and Greem, M. (2010); Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Save the World Bloomsbury Publishing Social Science, Philanthropy and Charity ISBN: 1608192431
- Bloom, P. N. and Chatterji, A. K (2009): Scaling Social Entrepreneurial Impact. California Management Review 51; 114 – 133
- Bloom, P. N. and Smith, B. R (2010): Identifying the Drivers of Social Entrepreneurial Impact:

- Theoretical Development and an Exploratory Empirical Test of SCALERS, Journal of Social Entrepreneurship 1 (1), 126 - 145. www.caseatduke.org/.../SCALERS
- Bornstein, D. (2007): How to Change the World Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas. Oxford University Press, New York
- Boschee, J. (1998); Social Entrepreneurship, Across the Board 32 (3) 20 – 25 <http://www.iese.edu/research/ / DI-0546-E>
- Boschee, J. and McClurg, J (2003): Towards A Better Understanding of Social Entrepreneurship: Some Important Distinctions <http://www.caledonia.org.uk/papers>
- Britton, B. (1998): The Learning NGO. International NGO Training and Research Centre Occasional Papers Series No. 17 ISBN 10: 1 – 897748-36-1 <http://www.intrac.org>
- Brigitte, H. Enrico, P. & Roy, T (2010); What Do We Know about Social Entrepreneurship? An Analysis of Empirical Research, International Review of Entrepreneurship 8 (2), Senate Hall Academy Publications
- Brown, G. J. (1990); Role of NGO in Development Cooperatives, Research Paper, UNDP/Yale Collaborative Programs, New Heaven, Olera Publications, Maslyukivska
- Bygrave, W. D. and Zacharakis, A. (2011): Entrepreneurship – Business and Economics. John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey
- Certo S.T and Miller T (2008): Social Entrepreneurship: Key Issues and Concepts. Business Horizons 51(4) : 267-271 <http://www.econpapers.repec.org>
- Dees, J. G. and Anderson B. (2006) Framing a Theory of Entrepreneurship: Building on Two Schools of Practice and Thought. ARNOVA, Occasional Paper Series. Research on Social Entrepreneurship: Understanding & Contributing to an Emerging Field 1 (3)
- Dees, J. G. (2001): Rhetoric, Reality and Research: Building a solid Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change. London: Oxford University Press 144 - 168
- Dorado S (2006): Social Entrepreneur Ventures, Different Values so Different Process of Creation. Journal of Development Entrepreneur 11(4) : 319-343 www.cba.uri.edu/.../soc
- Ehigiamusoe G (1998): “Understanding Non-Governmental Organisations” OB-ZED Publishers Benin , M.City Nigeria
- Eisenhardt, K. M (2009): Building Theories from Case Study Research. Academy of Management 14(4) 532 – 550
- Eisenhardt, K. M. and Schoonhoven, C. B (2007): Resource Based View of Strategic Alliance Formation: Strategic and Social Effects in Entrepreneurial Firms. Organization Science 7 (2) 136-150
- Freeman, R (1984): Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston, MA:: Pitman
- Filion, L. J. and Ananou, C. (2010): *De l'intuition au projetd'entreprise*. Montreal: Les Editions Transcontinental Inc.
- Fowler, A.(2000); NGO, As a Moment in History; Beyond Aid and Social Entrepreneurship. Third World
- Gilbert, B., McDougal, P. and Audretsch, D (2006): New Venture Growth: A Review and Extension. Journal of Management 32, 926-950 www.istr.org/.../Ryan,/2006
- Kellog, W. K (1998): Evaluation Handbook; The Non-governmental Organisation. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-governmentalorganisation>

- Kent, C. A. and Anderson, L. P. (2003); Social Capital, Social Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurship Education, Walstad (Eds) Birmingham, Dublin Senate Hall
- Kerlin, J.A. (2006); Social Enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and Learning from the Differences, International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations. 17, 246-262.
- Kotler, J. and Murray, P., (1975): Third Sector Management – The Role of Marketing. Public Administration Review: 35 407 - 472
- Leadbeater, J. (1997): The Rise of the Social Entrepreneurs. London: Demos www.demos.co.uk/.../1997
- Light, P. C. (2006): Searching for Social Entrepreneurs: Who They Might Be; Where they Might be Found, What they Do? Stanford Social Innovation Review <http://www.ssireview.org//searchforsocialentrepreneurs>
- Mair, J. and Marti, I (2006); Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight. Journal of World Business, 41 (1), 36-44.
- Martin, R. L and Osberg, S (2007): Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. Stanford Social Innovation Review, Stanford Graduate School of Business Spring, 2007 27 – 39 www.ssireview.org
- McDonald, R. E (2007): An Investigation of Innovation in NPOs: The Role of Mission. Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quality 36 (256) <http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/36/2/256>
- Mitra, C.S. (2011); Contribution of Social Entrepreneurship and Corporate Social Responsibility in Solving Social Problems of Communities, University of Babeş – Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, Romania. Journal of Management and Marketing Vol. 6 (9): 243 – 255 <http://www.managementandmarketing.ro/.../223>
- Naidoo, J. (2012): An Infinite Vission: The Story of Aravind Eye Hospital. www.dailymaverick.co.za/jayaseelan-naidoo/1511540/http
- Nicholls, A. (2006); Social Entrepreneurship, New Model of Sustainable Change, London, Oxford University Press
- Nyessens, (2006): Social Enterprise: At the Crossroads of Markets, Public Policies and Civil Society. London: Routledge, Taylor Francis Group.
- Pereolo A. M. and Mclean M (2006): Social Entrepreneur a Critical Review of the Concept. Journal of World Business 41: 55-85 <http://www.socialgiving.wikispaces.com/.../view>
- Perini F and Vurro C (2006): Social Entrepreneur; Innovation and Social Entrepreneur across Theory and Practice in main J, Robinson J, Hockerts K (2006) Entrepreneur Palgrave Macmillan, New York pages 57-85
- Pieffer, J. and Salancick, C (1978): The External Control of Organisations: A Resource Dependency Perspective .New York Harper and Row
- Porter, M. E and Lee, T. H (2013): The Strategy That Will Fix Healthcare: The Big Idea. Harvard Business Review 3, October, 2013 <http://www.hbr.org/2013/...the-strategy-that-will-fix-healthcare>
- Sagawa S., and Segal, E., (2000): Common Interest, Common Good: Creating Value through Business and Social Sector Partnerships California Management Review 42 (2): 105 - 122
- Schumpeter, J. A., (1934): The Theory of Economic Development, Harvard University Press, Cambridge. Editura YTPRESS, Cluj-Napoca.
- Sharir M and Lerner M (2006): Gauging the Success of Social Ventures Initiated by Individuals Social Entrepreneurship Journal of World Business 41: 6-20

- Stevenson, H. H and Jarillo, J. C (1990): A Paradigm of Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Management Strategic Management Journal 11 (summer, 1990) 17 – 24
- Stiglitz, J. (2013): The Great Divide: Income Inequality and its Costs – US Setting “Terrible Example” with Income Inequality <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/121226/Joseph-Stiglitz-us-income-inequality>
- Valor, C and Diego, A. M (2009): Relationship of Business and NGOs: An Empirical Analysis of Strategies and Mediators of their Private Relationship: Business Ethics: A European Review 18 (2) 110 - 126
- Venktaraman, S. (1997): The Distinctive Domain of Entrepreneurship Research. Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, JAI, Greenwich, C. T
- Weerawardena, J. and Mort, J. S. (2006): Investigating Social Entrepreneurship: A multi-dimensional Model. Journal of World Business 41 (21 – 35) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb>
- Wernefelt, B (1984): A Resource Based View of the Firm. Strategic Management Journal Vol. 5 No. 2:171 – 180 <http://links.jstor.org/sci0143-2095>
- World Bank (2007): Building Knowledge Economies. Advanced Strategies for Development World Bank Institute <http://www.worldbank.org>
- Yaziji, M. and Doh, J (2009): NGOs and Corporations: Conflict and Collaboration. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press

APPENDIX

Table 1: Social value * Socio-Mission Cross tabulation

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Degree of Significance |
|--|-------|----|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|------|-------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 25.615 ^a | 16 | .000 | Significant |
| Likelihood Ratio | 10.432 | 16 | .000 | |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 31.198 | 1 | .000 | Significant |
| Cramer's V | 0.393 | | | |
| Contingency Co-efficient | 0.324 | | | Significant |
| N of Valid Cases | 203 | | | |

a. 8 cells (32.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

Model Summary^b

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|-------------|---------------|
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. Change | |
| 1 | .281 ^a | .079 | .075 | 1.24674 | .079 | 17.284 | 1 | 201 | .000 | .199 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Socio mission

b. Dependent Variable: social value

ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 26.866 | 1 | 26.866 | 17.284 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 312.425 | 201 | 1.554 | | |
| | Total | 339.291 | 202 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

b. Predictors: (Constant), Socio mission

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficient | Sig. | 95.0% Confidence Interval for B | |
|-------|---------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.821 | .158 | | .000 | 1.509 | 2.133 |
| | Socio mission | .152 | .037 | .281 | .000 | .080 | .225 |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

Table 2: Social value * Length of experience Cross tabulation Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Degree of Significance |
|------------------------------|----------------------|----|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 589.934 ^a | 16 | .000 | Significant |
| Likelihood Ratio | 497.423 | 16 | .000 | |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 151.026 | 1 | .000 | |
| Cramer's V | 0.852 | | | |
| Contingency Coefficient | 0.863 | | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 203 | | | |

Summary^b

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|-------------|---------------|
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. Change | |
| 1 | .865 ^a | .748 | .746 | .65266 | .748 | 595.531 | 1 | 201 | .000 | .177 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Length of experience

b. Dependent Variable: social value

ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 253.673 | 1 | 253.673 | 595.531 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 85.618 | 201 | .426 | | |
| | Total | 339.291 | 202 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

b. Predictors: (Constant), Length of experience

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. | 95.0% Confidence Interval for B | |
|-------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | (Constant) | .251 | .098 | | 2.562 | .011 | .058 | .445 |
| | Length of experience | .830 | .034 | .865 | 24.404 | .000 | .763 | .897 |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

**Table 3: Social value “Spatial Coverage Cross tabulation
Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Degree of Significance |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 21.465 ^a | 12 | .073 | Significant |
| Likelihood Ratio | 66.244 | 12 | .000 | |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.085 | 1 | .298 | |
| Cramer's V | 0.291 | | | |
| Contingency Coefficient | 0.450 | | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 203 | | | |

ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig |
|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-----|--------|
| Regression | 189.749 | 1 | 249.749 | 255 | 0.0043 |
| Residual | 149.542 | 201 | 0.445 | | |
| Total | 339.291 | | | | |

Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | T | Sig |
|------------------|-----------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | B | | | |
| Constant | 2.088 | .285 | 7.338 | 0.000 |
| Spatial Coverage | 0.465 | .124 | .316 | 0.003 |

Dependent Variable: Social Value

| Model Summary | | | | |
|---------------|------|----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Model | R | R-Square | Adjusted R ² | Standard Error |
| 1 | .759 | .5734 | .5479 | 1.1248 |

Table 4: Social value * Networking Cross tabulation

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | Df | . Sig. (2-sided) | Degree of Significance |
|------------------------------|----------------------|----|------------------|------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 261.058 ^a | 16 | .000 | Significant |
| Likelihood Ratio | 212.142 | 16 | .000 | |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 50.421 | 1 | .000 | |
| Cramer's V | 0.567 | | | |
| Contingency Co-efficient | 0.750 | | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 203 | | | |

ANOVA^a

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| Regression | 234.690 | 1 | 234.690 | 451.326 | .000 ^b |
| Residual | 104.601 | 201 | 0.520 | | |
| Total | 339.291 | 202 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

| Coefficients^a | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------|-------|------|
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | |
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .925 | .194 | | 4.778 | .000 |
| | Networking | .619 | .076 | .500 | 8.177 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

b. Predictors: (Constant), Networking

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .500 ^a | .250 | .246 | 1.12546 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Networking

Table 5: Social value * Economic sustainability Cross tabulation**Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Degree of Significance |
|------------------------------|----------------------|----|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 392.740 ^a | 16 | .000 | Significant |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1=309.957 | 16 | .000 | |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 106.114 | 1 | .000 | Significant |
| Cramer's V | 0.695 | | | |
| Contingency Coefficient | 0.812 | | | Significant |
| N of Valid Cases | 203 | | | |

Cramer's V= .695 ,Contingency Coefficient.= .812

ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 178.235 | 1 | 178.235 | 222.440 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 161.056 | 201 | .801 | | |
| | Total | 339.291 | 202 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

a. Predictors: (Constant), Economic sustainability

Coefficients^a

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | .122 | .163 | | .748 | .455 |
| Economic sustainability | .805 | .054 | .725 | 14.914 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: social value

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .725 ^a | .525 | .523 | .89514 |

b. Predictors: (Constant), Economic sustainability