European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 4, No. 01, **April 2015.** **P.P. 75 – 89**
URL: *http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx-/*
ISSN: 2235 -767X

NETWORKING: A PREREQUISITE FOR SOCIO VALUE CREATION OF NGOS IN SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA

Adele, Hasimiyu Ademola

Department of Management and Accounting,
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology
Ogbomoso, Nigeria
adeleademola@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study examined impact of networking on healthcare service delivery of selected NGOs in southwestern Nigeria, most especially their ability to collaborate effectively in order to co-create significant social and economic values. Also is the improvement on their value propositions resulting from their partnership with other organisations. A census-based survey 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, and inferential statistical tools of Chi-square Test of Independence, the Cramer's phi coefficients, Contingency coefficients and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Findings revealed that networking enabled NGOs circumvent resource constraints, expand operational scope and improve value proposition of their innovations.

KEY WORDS: *Networking, collaborative value creation, social entrepreneurship, social innovations, social ventures, non-governmental organization,*

Introduction

The growing and persistent nature of social and environmental problems afflicting most societies today has necessitated the call for alternative approaches to proffering solutions to them. These are as a result of the perceived ineffective, inefficient and unresponsive approaches of both the public and philanthropic institutions to which the responsibilities have been traditionally assigned. This is not unconnected with a combination of several reinforcing socio-economic and political changes being witnessed around the globe recently:- 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 resulting effect manifests itself via mass impoverishment of the general people, widening income inequalities, and consequently a reduction in the purchasing power of the people with its attendant negative impact on private sector investments.

While the advent of social entrepreneurship is primarily to proffer effective and sustainable solutions to these problems, through the process of identifying root causes of social problems and transforming them into business opportunities to be exploited for the mutual benefits of all (Adele, 2014), the share magnitude and complexity of these socioeconomic problems have equally brought about the realization that its enormity transcends the capacity of any individual or organization to deal effectively with. As posited by Visser (2011), responsibility for socioeconomic problem should be a form of sharing, a recognition that it is a collective thing that encompasses all and sundry. And that sole responsibility, in this respect, is an oxymoron. He further stated that being socially responsible does not mean doing it alone. In other words, it is not expedient for individuals, groups or organisations to singularly assume responsibility for tackling societal problems.

The collaborative value creation as a conceptual framework avails individuals, groups and or organisations opportunity to leverage on critical resources they did not possess. Through which, as (Adele and Oyedokun, 2014) posited, they identify the root causes of endemic environmental problems, transform them into business opportunities, the exploitation of which brings about innovative and sustainable solutions that are made available and affordable to all and sundry. As noted by Yunus (2007), social entrepreneurship is a change process intended to create solutions that are more effective, more efficient, transparent, sustainable and measurable. While agreeing with Yuns' (2007) assertion, Alvord, et al (2004) posit that the challenges of finding effective and sustainable solutions to socioeconomic problems are substantial and that the solution may require many of the features associated with successful business innovations.

One important feature of successful business enterprise is networking – a vehicle through which organisations access critical resources, which they often do not possess, to achieve objectives they could not independently. Cross-sector collaborations, as viewed by academic, businessmen as well as non-profit executives, have increased tremendously in recent times. This is as a realization that it avails organisations opportunity to accomplish more with less. And that it has become a powerful and inescapable means for achieving socio-economic missions – creating values for social and economic purposes.

Organizations with social mission are those organizations 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 programme 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 we describe social entrepreneurship 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 programme by the community. Most organizations 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 cultural, socio-economic and 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 its financial resources and networking capability, strength and the idea behind its 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).

The main objective of this study is to examine the effectiveness of corporate collaboration on social and economic value creation of social enterprises. Specifically, to evaluate how cross-sector collaboration effectively co-create significant social and economic values. It should however be noted that the advent of social entrepreneurship is a response to the declining government involvement in the economy and the society, This view is 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. Hence 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.

Value Creation of Social Enterprises:

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 solutions 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, we describe social value 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 and Social Value creation:

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 is 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 statement 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.

Networking and Social Value Creation:

An organization that will create social value must be willing and able to collaborate and partner 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 every organization success. Networking is hereby described as a social and managerial mechanism that connects employees working on teams and projects to jointly execute plans – even when they are separated by continents and time zones. It is a process that makes value creation rely more on remote work, collaborations and distributed decision making which allows firms outsource more work, partner with suppliers and customers to create new products or make existing ones more efficient.

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 innovations 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, NGOs 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. As stated in Adele (2014) report and for the purpose of this study. 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.

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 Schoonhaven, 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 achieved through networks.

The study also employed Chi- Square Test of Independence to examine the networking 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 network relationship 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.

Results and Discussion

The study examined networking as a relationship between NGOs and business firms with social mission. This strategic relationship becomes imperative where Government considers engagement with NGOs as an instrument for addressing global challenges and development and businesses see it as a way of building thrusts with stakeholders with a view to gaining competitive advantage. More importantly when NGOs accept partnership as a means through which to accomplish their social missions, academics need to focus attention on such strategic engagement as a social phenomenon in need of deeper research and understanding. Specifically, this study examined the effects of networking of NGOs on making social innovations possible. An innovation is considered social only when it addresses socio-environmental problems of society by creating product/service that offers effective and sustainable solutions and is made affordable and available to all.

The study also examined the effects of networking on the potentials of existing innovations value propositions. With its capacity to improve and introduce new features and benefits on existing product/service, networking can improve the effectiveness and efficiency of existing innovations, thereby expanding the effect of social service ventures to accomplish social objectives. This is done through generating access to new resources via networking and crowdsourcing of funds. Improved access to critical resources enables NGOs to combine resources, share expertise and experience that can produce improved/added value which could not be accomplished independently.

Results of our analysis showed a positive relationship between networking/strategic partnerships to enable NGOs create innovations that are effective and sustainable in addressing social and environmental problems. Table 1 (Appendix 1) 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 589.9 was significant at 0.05 levels; 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 0.852 and a Contingency coefficient of 0.863 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 595.5 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, 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.

The results also indicated a positive relationship between networking and the ability of NGOs to improve on their existing value propositions. Table 2 (Appendix 1) indicated a contingency measure of association between strategic partnerships and the potentials of a social innovation to improve its value propositions. With a Chi-square value of 261 which was significant at 0.05 level, this confirms the existence of a strong relationship between the networking and NGOs capacity to improve its innovation's quality and potentials to proffer much better solutions to social problems. This outcome suggests that NGOs have benefited immensely from network platforms that are capable of inculcating new features and benefits on existing product/service help them improve the effectiveness and efficiency of existing innovations, thereby afford them opportunity to accomplish their objectives.

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 ANOVA F-value of 451.321 which was also significant at 0.05 level further affirmed the effects of suitable network platforms on improved social values of selected NGOs.

The result is in tandem with Bishop and Green (2008), assertion that new investment philanthropy measures the maximum impact of donor's capital investment by the total volume of social value created. It is the proportion of the people that is benefiting from the breakthrough with respect to the total number of people in need. Similar view by Martin and Osberg (2007), consider innovation as social value, only when it succeeds in creating a new equilibrium that assures an equitable distribution of the benefits accruable from it. In the same vein, Porter and Lee (2013), while revealing strategy that fix health care in their celebrated "Big Idea" posit that if health care value is to be increased substantively on a large scale, providers need to serve far more patients and extend their reach through strategic expansion. In their opinion, outright purchase of full-service hospitals or practices in new geographical areas is rarely the answer, they rather volunteer, geographical expansion should focus on improving value and not just volume (Porter and Lee, 2013). Well-staffed satellite facilities could be established to deliver less complicated care while more complex cases are referred to the organization's hub. Also clinical affiliations could be established with community health providers or other local organisations, using their facilities. This could also be achieved by leasing outpatient facilities of community hospitals, making use of their operating rooms and other inpatient and ancillary services in order to enhance and expand service delivery.

This aptly described partnership between MD Anderson and Bannex Phoenix across 4 satellites in the greater Houston region in the USA, where management oversight and clinical care are being provided on chemotherapy, radiation therapy and low complex surgery, while complex cases are referred accordingly. In the same vein, all the 19 hospital affiliates of Cleveland Clinic (a Heart and Vascular Institute) across the Eastern Seaboard in the US are benefiting from the expertise, experience and reputation of their parent organization. While Cleveland, an NGO, is able to broaden its regional reach and brand, it also benefits from shared revenue, management fees and joint-venture incomes. Similarly also, beyond the sporadic growth of Aravind Eye Hospital from an 11-bed clinic in 1992 to over 3500 beds in five big hospitals across India, its services are being extended even beyond India through networking and partnerships with several eye hospitals, while manufactured intraocular lenses were sold in more than 120 countries world over as at 2006.

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 improve their potentials to solve social and environmental problems.

Conclusion

The realization that strategic partnership and collaboration is necessary to enable NGOs accomplish their social mission, bearing in mind they often do not possess and could not possess adequate enough resources, has necessitated the massive adoption of networking as a leverage. Collaborative value creation has been receiving greater attention since it avails NGOs opportunity to combine strengths and resources across sectors and by promoting common goals, which enables partners to exploit each other's differences for mutual benefits.

Networking of an NGO was perceived as the ability of the NGO to partner with other important agencies with a view to leverage on critical resources it needs but which are not within its reach independently. This perception was not unconnected with the fact that organizations do not operate in autarky, hardly can it be sufficient in every resources it needs to operate, more so an NGO. As for health care delivery by NGOs, there is need for sponsorship, donations and volunteers through which it access critical resources. More often, conducive environment necessary for success of its operation is usually guaranteed by governments, hence there are needs for collaboration with governments at all tiers. At the same time, well-established government or private hospital resources are usually leveraged to scale-up services without the need to set up such facilities that may be at high costs to NGOs.

Networking was therefore measured by the extent of relationships an organization builds with foundations, donors, partners, volunteers and government or its agencies in order to achieve together what individually might not be easily achievable.

References

1. 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
2. Adele, H. A., and Oyedokun, J. A. (2014): Scaling Healthcare Services through ICT Devices: A Study of Selected Non- Governmental Organisations in Southwestern Nigeria. Seventh Sense Research Group 1(3) ISSN 2393-9125
3. 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
4. Auerswald, P. (2009): Creating Social Value. Stanford Social Innovation No. l (Review Spring): 50 - 55
5. 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
6. Awogbenle, A. C. (2010); Youth Unemployment: Entrepreneurship Development Programme as an Intervention Mechanism. African Journal of Business Management 4 (6): 21 - 35
7. 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
8. Bishop, M. and Greem, M. (20100; Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Save the World Bloomsbury Publishing Social Science, Philanthropy and Charity ISBN: 1608192431
9. Brown, G. J. (1990); Role of NGO in Development Cooperatives, Research Paper, UNDP/Yale Collaborative Programs, New Heaven, Olera Publications, Maslyukivska
10. Certo S.T and Miller T (2008): Social Entrepreneurship: Key Issues and Concepts. Business Horizons 51(4) : 267-271 http://www.econpapers.repec.org
11. 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
12. 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
13. Ehigiamusoe G (1998): "Understanding Non-Governmental Organisations" OB-ZED Publishers Benin , M.City Nigeria
14. 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
15. Freeman, R (1984): Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston, MA:: Pitman
16. Kizner, I. (1989): Perception, Opportunity and Profit. Chicago, IL. University of Chicago Press 273 - 276
17. Kotler, J. and Murray, P., (1975): Third Sector Management – The Role of Marketing. Public Administration Review: 35 407 - 472
18. 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
19. Mair, J.and Marti, I (2006); Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight. Journal of World Business, 41 (1), 36-44.
20. 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

21. 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
22. Naidoo, J. (2012): An Infinite Vission: The Story of Aravind Eye Hospital. www.dailymaverick.co.za/jayaseelan-naidoo/1511540/htmp
23. Nicholls, A. (2006); Social Entrepreneurship, New Model of Sustainable Change, London, Oxford University Press
24. 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
25. Pieffer, J. and Salancick, C (1978): The External Control of Organisations: A Resource Dependency Perspective .New York Harper and Row
26. 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
27. Stevenson, H. H and Jarillo, J. C (1990): A Paradigm of Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Management Strategic Management Journal 11 (summer, 1990) 17 - 24
28. 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
29. Visser, W. (2011): The Age of Responsibility: CSR 2.0 and the New DNA of Business. West Sussex, U.K,: John Willey & Sons Ltd.
30. World Bank (2007): Building Knowledge Economies. Advanced Strategies for Development World Bank Institute http://www.worldbank.org
31. Yaziji, M. and Doh, J (2009): NGOs and Corporations: Conflict and Collaboration. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press
32. Yunus, M (2011): Distresses in Microfinance Banks; Wrong Banking Model. Microfinance Africa, Global Microsoft Summit Sadans Media Limited. N.Y.

Appendix 1

Table 1 Social innovation * networking 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			Significant
Contingency Coefficient	0.863			Significant
N of Valid Cases	203			

Smmary[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. F Change	
1	.865[a]	.748	.746	.65266	.748	595.531	1	201	.000	.177

a. Predictors: (Constant), networking
b. Dependent Variable: social innovation

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 innovation
b. Predictors: (Constant), networking

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
	Networking	.830	.034	.865	24.404	.000	.763	.897

a. Dependent Variable: social innovation

Table 2 Social innovation * value proposition 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			Significant
Contingency Co-efficient	0.750			Significant
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 innovation

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 innovation
b. Predictors: (Constant),value proposition

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.500[a]	.250	.246	1.12546

a. Predictors: (Constant), value proposition