

How does national culture enable or constrain entrepreneurship? Exploring the role of Harambee in Kenya

Vershinina, Natalia; Woldesenbet Beta, Kassa; Murithi, William

DOI:

[10.1108/JSBED-03-2017-0143](https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-03-2017-0143)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Vershinina, N, Woldesenbet Beta, K & Murithi, W 2018, 'How does national culture enable or constrain entrepreneurship? Exploring the role of Harambee in Kenya', *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 687-704. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-03-2017-0143>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Natalia Vershinina, Kassa Woldesenbet Beta, William Murithi, (2018) 'How does national culture enable or constrain entrepreneurship? Exploring the role of Harambee in Kenya', *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 25 Issue: 4, pp.687-704, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-03-2017-0143>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



How does national culture enable or constrain entrepreneurship? Exploring the role of Harambee in Kenya

Journal:	<i>Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development</i>
Manuscript ID	JSBED-03-2017-0143.R3
Manuscript Type:	Conceptual Paper
Keywords:	Entrepreneurship, Harambee, Kenya, National Culture, Toolkit

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

How does national culture enable or constrain entrepreneurship? Exploring the role of Harambee in Kenya

Abstract

Purpose: The paper seeks to conceptualise how various value dimensions of Harambee, the Kenyan culture, affect the fostering of entrepreneurial behaviours. Theoretically, we draw upon perspectives that view culture as a toolkit and use cultural variables provided by Hofstede to examine the links between national culture and entrepreneurial endeavours in an African context.

Design/methodology/approach: The paper is based on review and synthesis of accessible secondary sources (published research, country specific reports, policy documents, firm level empirical evidences, etc.) on the topic and related areas to understand and advance research propositions on the link between enterprising efforts and national culture specific to Kenyan context.

Findings: Several theoretical propositions are offered on themes of collective reliance, social responsibility, enterprising, resource mobilisation, and political philanthropy to establish relationships, both positive and negative, between values of Harambee and entrepreneurial behaviours. Further, the study provides initial insights into how actors blend both collectivistic and emergent individualistic orientations and display collective identity in the process of mobilising resources and engaging in entrepreneurship.

Research limitations / implications: The conceptual framework presented bears a considerable relevance to advancing theory, policy and practice associated with national culture and entrepreneurial behaviour in the African context and has potential to generate valuable insights.

Originality / Value: This original study provides a springboard for studying the relationship between African cultural context and entrepreneurial behaviours.

Key Words: Entrepreneurship, Harambee, Kenya, National Culture, Toolkit

Introduction

How does national culture influence entrepreneurial behaviour in African context? Drawing on the perspective that views culture as a toolkit (Swidler, 1986) and the national culture categories developed by Hofstede (1980), we examine the ways in which the Kenyan national culture, Harambee, influences the fostering of entrepreneurship in an African context of Kenya. We define

entrepreneurship broadly to include new-venture creation that is growth oriented, small businesses and micro-enterprises that may provide self-employment (life-style and informal entrepreneurship), and social enterprises (Bhide, 2000). Harambee is a nationally adopted political rhetoric that simply means “lets pull together” denoting a national spirit of social inclusivity and cohesion (Chieni, 2001).

It has been long established that culture is something that can be used and drawn upon (Swidler, 1986) and it affects social existence (i.e. people’s behaviours, choices, proclivities, etc.). Based on their empirical research on cultural difference, Bednar et al. (2006, 1) show that inter-cultural differences exist, different cultures exhibit signature characteristics that are far from idiosyncratic collections of attributes and individuals within a culture, and there is consistency among behaviours that can be used by others to anticipate and predict responses based on cultural affiliations. Although contested, this has been demonstrated in the extensive work by Hofstede (1980) who categorised countries along cultural dimensions of individualism, power-distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity.

Although culture such as Harambee can be conceptualised in different ways such as ‘frame’, ‘values’, ‘beliefs’, ‘stories’, and ‘categories’, in this article we conceptualise it as a ‘toolkit’ (Swidler, 1986). In this way, we shift understanding of culture from a perspective that sees culture as structurally deterministic to one, which sees it as a toolkit that enables actions and choices. Such a conceptualisation of culture could provide an insight into how actors use cultural repertoires to conceive strategies of actions and engage in entrepreneurial behaviour. Being historically contingent, culture provides actors/ entrepreneurs with a toolkit from which they can select resources to participate in entrepreneurial activities. Furthermore, we draw on Hofstede’s (1991) three of the four underlying dimensions of culture – power distance, individualism and uncertainty avoidance – to understand how they enable or constrain the entrepreneurial behaviour.

Previous studies using Hofstede’s work to examine the relationship between cultural categories and entrepreneurial activities found that: a) uncertainty avoidance is associated with low appreciation of entrepreneurial behaviour (Bowen and De Clercq, 2008; Thomas and Mueller, 2000); b) the existence of national differences relates to entrepreneurial cognition and opportunity-seeking (Bosma and Levie, 2010; Mitchell et al., 2002); c) entrepreneurial intentions are more likely to occur in a culture where entrepreneurial activity is perceived as desirable and viable (Stenholm, et al, 2013); d) ‘differences in entrepreneurial orientations are more likely in countries that are individualistically oriented as compared to collectivist or uncertainty-avoidant cultures’ (Dickson and Weaver, 2008; Mueller and Thomas, 2001; Stenholm et al, 2013, 182); e) there is a negative relationship between uncertainty avoidance and innovation (Shane et al, 1991) and a negative relationship between uncertainty avoidance and risk-taking (Kreiser, Marino, Dickson, and Weaver, 2010). However, there is a paucity of such studies within an African context and this paper, in part, seeks to fill this gap.

In most parts of Africa due to its colonial history, cultural dexterity, the skilful use of aspects of collectivist and individualist orientation can be observed; there is presence of both tribal and national culture (Zoogah, et al., 2015), and ethnic beliefs about work are derived from traditional or tribal practices (Mbiti, 1999; Ugwuegbu, 2001). Such cultural features influence cognitions, behaviour, and practices of Africans in different ways when compared to individuals in Western context. Recent scholarly works have seen cultures such as ‘Ubuntu’ being introduced into management research in the African context. Zoogah et al, (2015, 15) identify this shared meaning as “I am who I am through others.” Essentially a strong form of collectivism, Ubuntu is a pattern of behaviours that helps integrate members of a society into a strong, cohesive in-groups (Mbigi and Maree, 1995). Zoogah et al (2015, 15) aptly summarised Ubuntu’s distinctive features:

“Members share resources and support each other in exchange for unquestioning loyalty; demonstrate caring, respect, and compassion that ensure a high-quality community life; create networks of social obligations that link managers to extended families, villages, and ethnic groups; and set a foundation to relationships, personalized and horizontal, within organizations that can contribute to competitive advantage (Mangaliso, 2001)”.

In this article, we explore the Kenyan national culture, Harambee, which is similar to Ubuntu. We were motivated to study the influence of culture on entrepreneurial behaviour in Africa taking the case of Kenya for three reasons. First, the study of culture influence on the entrepreneurship is rare in an African context. Second, Kenya’s national culture- Harambee - is akin to “Ubuntu” in South Africa, “Ujamaa” in Tanzania, and “Humanism” in Zambia (Chieni, 2001) and thus any findings from this study have wider implications to entrepreneurial behaviour to other African countries. Third, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor reports (2014:12; 2017) showed that individuals in African countries exhibit ‘the highest perception of opportunities, perceived skills to act entrepreneurially and entrepreneurial intentions’ and hence it would interesting to examine the role of culture on such entrepreneurial behaviours.

By conceptualising culture as a ‘toolkit’, and drawing on Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, and contextual information we advance literature - and theory-driven propositions to guide further studies in this research area. In doing so, we want to achieve two goals: first, we seek to unpack the cultural values of Harambee as a set of overarching organising principles in shaping the behaviour and actions of individuals, communities, and other actors. Second, we aim to develop a set of theoretically rich propositions to help further understanding of, and encourage, various actors (researchers, policy makers and practitioners) to engage in productive exploration of culture for entrepreneurship and socio-economic development by skilfully managing its limitations and constraints.

Our propositions indicate that social actors (entrepreneurs, organisations, or government agencies) either use or draw from the values attributed to Harambee, directly or indirectly to inform their strategic actions. Generally, idiosyncratic characteristics such as collective reliance, social responsibility, enterprising, resource mobilisation, and political philanthropy have been drawn upon to enable socio-economic growth and realising the strategic development agenda within the African continent. Contrary to previous literature that hypothesises ‘collectivism’ as negatively related to entrepreneurial behaviour, our focus on the Kenyan context, a developing economy, reveals it has a potential to spur entrepreneurship.

The paper is organised as follows. The next section defines culture, in particular, focusing on views that see culture as a toolkit to provide the conceptual base for the article. This is followed by introduction of Harambee, its past, present and its distinctive values, and how specific values of Harambee act as an enabler or constraint and in combination as a toolkit, enables actions. We provide conclusions and implications in the paper’s final section.

Understanding Culture

Hofstede (2001, 9) defined culture as ‘the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others’. Generally, culture is defined as a set of values, norms, attitudes and meanings that are shared by the members of a certain group that influence how they process and interpret the world (Morrison, 2006). Most commonly, culture is seen as the taken-for-granted values, norms, beliefs, and symbols acquired through socialization (Wrong 1961), which shape action in predictable, culture reproducing directions (Peterson 1979). According to Chrisman et al., (2002, 115), ‘cultural differences in interpretation and perception will lead to differences in behaviours and outcomes’. Usually, culture has been categorised into national, regional, ethnic, occupational and organisational sub-cultures (Hofstede, 2001). Particularly, national culture consists of “the underlying value systems that are specific to a group or society and motivate individual to behave in a certain way” (Shinnaret al., 2012, 466), such as venturing into business activities. Generally, the configuration of cultural values across countries is based on Hofstede’s (1980) seminal work on cultural dimensions. Hofstede’s national culture dimensions are critical in driving cross-cultural comparisons and comprise, for instance, individualism / collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity and long-term orientation dimensions. Some scholars have argued that countries that exude a combination of individualistic, masculine cultures, that rank high on power distance and low on uncertainty avoidance could lead to a favourable entrepreneurship and possibly orientation towards entrepreneurial activities among citizens (Busenitz and Lau, 1996). In this paper, we build our arguments by conceptualising culture as a toolkit (as something that can be used and drawn upon) and explain how values of Harambee relate to entrepreneurship.

Conceptualising culture as a toolkit

How we view culture is probably the most important factor when dealing with change, entrepreneurship and innovation at different levels. How does culture interact with action and choices individuals, communities and government agents make? Viewing culture as a determinant structural variable could constrain such choices and actions. But if we conceptualise culture as “the publicly available symbolic form through which people experience and express meaning” (Swidler, 1986, 273), then culture becomes a toolkit through which people consciously engage to issues they face in their lives. According to Weber (2005, 228) Swidler’s view of culture as a toolkit can be summarised as:

“Culture influences action through more than values that provide the ends of action. Culture also supplies actors with the means—the tools—for solving practical problems and for navigating their environment. This “supply-side” analysis of culture shifts researchers’ focus from values and choices to cultural resources, habits, skills and styles. As each actor has at hand only a bounded set of heterogeneous resources (concepts, actions, stories and symbols) for solving the diverse problems of everyday life, distinctive toolkits can be associated with particular actors and collectives”.

Swidler’s view of culture as a tool kit or repertoire suggests that people deploy available and legitimate cultural resources such as ‘concepts, scripts, models and other cultural artefacts they find in their environment (Douglas, 1986, 383). There is thus a mutual influence between the culture and the belief systems or cognition. Culture is context-bound and potentially malleable; it facilitates deliberate strategic actions of people (Weber, 2005). Therefore, culture as a toolkit provides ground for entrepreneurs, businesses and government agents to pursue their interests, simultaneously enabling and constraining their behaviour, decisions and actions.

Cultural repertoires can be found at individual and broader societal levels, the latter being the main source of cultural tools available for use. We know more about culture than we are able to engage with. “Like a library that holds many more books than any one person could ever read, a “culture sustains an array of resources that people can draw in different ways” (Swidler, 2002, 2). So, individuals can use cultural repertoires (skills, goals, attitudes, concepts, etc.) as they fit to their interest “in varying configurations to solve different kinds of problems” (Swidler 1986, 273). Examples include political actors using cultural resources to change ideas and practices, ‘in social movements to frame the direction of change and its implementation’ (Berezin, 1997, cited in Weber et al. 2008). In the cultural toolkit approach, culture is neither universal nor one-sided but it is ‘activated in action’ (Leonardi, 2011, 348) and facilitates a creation of context-specific knowledge.

Previous studies examine how organisations use cultural repertoires selectively from their industry register. For Weber (2005) and Porac et al. (1989), industry registers contain the whole list of concepts generated by, accessible to, and accepted as relevant for the members of industry to interpret situations and develop strategic action. Weber (2005) reported that pharmaceutical companies used industry register to reconfigure their repertoire when developing competitive strategies.

Moreover, Ocasio and Joseph (2005) show that organisations change the corporate governance concepts in their repertoires for organisational isomorphism. Combined, these studies show the importance of understanding skilful use of cultural resources legitimated and accepted within the relevant industry registers or institutional contexts. The “culture as toolkit” perspective has the potential to show how the mechanisms of Harambee can represent the cultural registers which individuals and organisations use to inform their framing, choices and strategic actions. Moreover, the issue of legitimation is contextual too (Welter et al., 2017; Wang, Thornhill and De Castro, 2017), as culture enables us to understand what is appropriate in a particular context in terms of norms, beliefs and actions.

National Culture and its influence on Entrepreneurship

Although Hofstede (1980) did not specify the relationship between culture and entrepreneurship, numerous studies recognise the influence of national culture on the level of entrepreneurial activity and economic development (Linan and Fernandez-Serrano, 2014; Pinillos and Reyes, 2011; Hayton et al., 2002; Mitchell et al., 2000), innovations and growth (Rauch et al., 2013) and entrepreneurial beliefs and intentions (Gasse and Tremblay, 2011). Some scholars established a positive relation between ‘cultures that value and reward entrepreneurial behaviours (such as risk taking and autonomy) with an increased level of entrepreneurship and innovation, whereas cultures that reinforce conformity, group interests, and control over the future with low level of risk taking and entrepreneurial behaviour (Hayton, George and Zahra, 2000, 33; citing Herbig and Miller, 1992). Such studies contend that there are differences in the types of entrepreneurial activities (necessity or opportunity-driven) (Linan & Fernandez-Serrano, 2014) within different cultural communities. Although entrepreneurs may face similar structural constraints, they may perceive and experience them differently (Mitchel et al., 2002). Existing work on this area suggests that entrepreneurial behaviour is shaped by the country specific culture and this causes the differences in developing a common entrepreneurial behaviour around the world. Based on the review of 21 empirical studies on national culture and entrepreneurship, Hayton et al. (2002, 41) suggested that ‘national culture is likely to influence national or regional rates of entrepreneurship by creating a larger supply of potential entrepreneurs’. In addition, using data from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor on 52 countries, Pinillos and Reyes (2011) show that a country’s entrepreneurship rate is negatively related

to an individualistic culture when development is low or medium, but is positively related to individualism when the level of development is high. Similarly, Linan & Fernandez-Serrano, 2014 (2014), establish a difference in regards to entrepreneurial activity among four regions in the European Union (Central, Northern, Eastern, and Mediterranean) as a result of cultural differences. Although, these studies are informative in conceptualising the influence of culture on entrepreneurship, it can be noted that most if not all, are conducted in a Western context. This begs the question, would similar conclusions be reached in a developing economy context such as Kenya.

Whilst the African continent has been seen as a “parochial dinosaur” (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991), Africa presents a potential opportunity for researchers (Zoogah et al., 2015; Alexander and Honig, 2016; Nkomo, 2017). Recent studies have sought to understand African specific cultures such as ‘Ubuntu’ as a defining variable within the research on Africa (Amaeshi and Idemudia, 2015; Rivera-Santos et al., 2015; Karsten and Illa, 2005; Mangaliso, 2001). By coining the term ‘Africapitalism’ Elumelu (2012) seeks to emphasise the obligations of the private sector towards social economic development of Africa and assumes the feasibility of such undertaking. ‘Africapitalism’, embedded in the Ubuntu philosophy, is viewed as “an economic philosophy that embodies the private sector’s commitment to the economic transformation of Africa through investments that generate both economic prosperity and social wealth” (Amaeshi and Idemudia, 2015: 210). Other scholars highlight the African contextual environment, especially ‘Ubuntu’ as a key concept for management research (Karsten and Illa, 2005), social entrepreneurship (Rivera-Santos et al., 2015) and competitive advantage (Mangaliso, 2001). Although these studies make a compelling argument for research within an African cultural context, we argue that due to the diverse nature of the African continent, it would be erroneous to conclude that Africa consists of one universal culture ‘Ubuntu’. Whilst, these studies might be justified to position Africa as “one block”, Zoogah et al. (2015, 23) called for studies that distinguish “different parts of Africa, based on regional, historical, or income differences”.

Therefore, this paper seeks to examine how a collectivist culture such as Harambee enables or constrains entrepreneurial cognition and behaviour drawing on studies, which examine the influence of culture on entrepreneurship. The key research question which guided our investigation was ‘How does national culture such as Harambee influence entrepreneurial behaviours in African context?’

Harambee: what is it?

The term ‘Harambee’ has its origins from the word ‘Halambee’ which is derived from the Bantu speaking people of the coastal region (Chieni, 2001). In short it means “let us pull together”. Such cultural practices have their roots in the customs and traditions of some communities within the nations and were popular instruments in fight against colonial oppression and then a rallying call for nation building efforts after independence.

In Kenya, as envisaged by the Nation's founding President Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, when he declared that the building and prosperity of the nation was in the hands of indigenous people, Harambee became an organising principle to mobilise people and resources for nation building. He summarised the essence of the concept of Harambee in his inaugural public speech in 1963 as follows:

"But you must know that Kenyatta alone cannot give you everything. All things we must do together to develop our country, to get education for our children, to have doctors, to build roads, to improve or provide all day-to-day essentials. I give you the call: Harambee!" (C.f. Waithima, 2012, 5).

Since then Harambee became a political slogan for resource mobilisation and was then referred to as the "Harambee Movement" (Government of Kenya, 1988). The Harambee movement then evolved into a new model for development through which "Harambee projects" were conceived and proposed by locals to be supported by government, public donations and contributions from affluent people (politicians and business owners). Its essence is rooted in resource mobilisation – physical, financial and human - for the common good. It "embodies values of mutual assistance, social responsibility, joint efforts, and community self-reliance (Chieni, 2001) for nation-building through participative and cooperative endeavours and to mobilise resources to better the lives of people.

In the next section, we discuss the defining values of Harambee and then examine how such values (through available cultural repertoires) shape entrepreneurship.

Conceptualising 'Harambee'

In the Kenyan context, Harambee as a national culture manifest across political, social, and economic spheres (Ngau, 1987; Kanothi, 2009; Wamaitha, 2012). Harambee inspired projects aim at delivering public good (for example, schools, health centres and conservation projects) or helping disadvantaged individuals (through contributions to pay fees, medical bills, pre-weddings and funeral arrangements) among others (Chieni, 2001; Chepkyonyi, 2008). Based on the review of literature, five core values of Harambee were identified (Table 1).

-----Insert Table 1-----

These five Harambee core values infuse multiple societal levels and may be activated by multiple agents for the benefit of community members, organisations, regions and the nation. Therefore, Harambee acts as a lens through which stakeholders' actions can be assessed and

evaluated, albeit being seen as having an enabling effect. In this article, we seek to advance propositions which show the positive and/or negative effects of Harambee values on aspects of entrepreneurship (entrepreneurial intention, opportunity seeking, social entrepreneurship, business creation and business growth) using a conceptual model (Figure 1).

-----Insert Figure 1-----

Harambee as toolkit for entrepreneurship action

In this section, we develop propositions that elucidate Harambee’s enabling and constraining effects on entrepreneurial behaviours and how these values are translated into strategic action by different social actors.

Collective reliance

Countries with individualistic oriented culture are more likely to display entrepreneurial orientation than countries with collectivist or uncertainty avoidance culture (Dickson and Weaver, 2008; Mueller and Thomas, 2001; Morris et al, 1994). Collective reliance is one of the values Harambee manifests in people’s high-level embeddedness, reciprocal gestures, mutual support and help at times of crisis. We conceptualise that collective reliance is a collective endeavour for common good, where mutual support is available when and as needed. Such collective behaviours are observable in "Chama" model or micro-finance institutions and are associated with less risky ventures to minimise uncertainty. Our use of the value of collective reliance mirrors the collectivist cultural dimension of Hofstede (1980). At national level, collective reliance represents the governments’ and societies’ preference to collective social-economic interest over the interests of individuals. Such behaviour is likely to manifest during times of crisis and, social and economic problems to provide protection to potentially vulnerable people and resilience at a societal level. Collective effort is celebrated as a group achievement in addressing socio-economic goals. Such collective efforts are, for instance, enabled through strong community relationship and social entrepreneurship. In an environment typified by collective reliance, both uncertainty and opportunity seeking behaviours (perceived opportunity) will be kept to minimum (Kropp et al. 2008, Webb et al., 2013) while addressing social issues. We argue that collective reliance requires long-run commitments to manage uncertainty with clearly established rules and structures, and predictable stable relationships. Such requirements become constraints to engage in risky entrepreneurial activities and give a way to collective endeavours to address socio-economic problems. Predictability allows for actors to participate in effective future-oriented behaviours such as intention to create social enterprises. Harambee’s value of collective reliance, therefore, is more likely to drive the creation of social enterprises than purely profit oriented enterprises.

Proposition 1. Harambee value of collective reliance is negatively associated with perceived entrepreneurial opportunity.

Proposition 2. Harambee value of collective reliance is positively associated with creation of social enterprises.

Social responsibility

Entrepreneurship in Africa does not evolve in a vacuum, but rather within a complex framework of political, economic and social change (Johnson, 2000; Harding, 2006; Urban, 2008). The importance of entrepreneurship as a phenomenon in social life is critical; as entrepreneurs contribute to an economy by providing new business models for firms to trade commercially, and some of them engage in commercial activity in a socially responsible way (Urban, 2008). These individuals and ventures, provide an alternative delivery system for public services such as health, education, housing and community support (Harding, 2006, 10). Moreover, entrepreneurs in Africa are also seen to be a growing source of solutions to issues that currently plague society, such as poverty, crime and abuse (Schuyler, 1998; Williams and Kedir, 2016). Socially-oriented entrepreneurs provide solutions to social, employment and economic problems where traditional market or public approaches fail (Jeffs, 2006).

For Santos (2012) social enterprises emerge in the context of either or both market or/and government failures. Compassion and pro-social motivation drive social entrepreneurship (Miller et al 2012). Recent scholarly works established the existence of significant interaction between social enterprises and the wider cultural and institutional environment (Miller et al 2012; Santos, 2012). Zahra et al (2009, 522) suggest social entrepreneurship involves “the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner”. In Kenya, individual entrepreneurs and communities engage in social practices to support disadvantaged fellow citizens (Chieni, 2001). Harambee projects are present across various sectors such as education, health, social amenities, infrastructure, water and electricity projects. Here, resource availability drives the opportunity of establishing socially-oriented projects.

Businesses in the Kenyan context are likely to frame their business goals to include aspects of “helping each other”, “building together” and adding value to business and beyond. There are cases where people’s willingness, collective mind-set and resource provisions enable the achievement of social goals. Such socially responsible behaviours are long-term oriented, grounded in national-level social capital and cooperative norms (Estrin, et al, 2013). Based on the foregoing discussions, we propose:

Proposition 3: Harambee value of social responsibility is positively associated with creation of new businesses, large proportion of which will be socially-oriented enterprises.

Value of Enterprising

Entrepreneurial intention is one of the defining characteristics of entrepreneurial behaviour, and is defined as “the conscious state of mind that directs personal attention, experience and behaviour toward planned entrepreneurial behaviour” (Bird and Jelinek, 1988). At national and regional levels, government enterprise policies promote the message that entrepreneurship is valued and respected endeavour. The 2017 GEM report showed that individuals in Africa reported the ‘most positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship; with three quarters of working-age adults considering entrepreneurship a good career choice, while 77% believe that entrepreneurs are admired in their societies’ (GEM, 2017, 8) indicating that entrepreneurs enjoy high-level status and respect. In essence the value of enterprising enhances social legitimation, making self-employment a career valued and socially recognised (Linan & Fernandez-Serrano, 2014, 689) and hence, more people are likely to start new businesses regardless of ‘their personal beliefs and attitudes’ (Etzioni, 1987). According to Linan and Fernandez-Serrano (2014, 689) positive link exists between ‘a high perceived valuation of entrepreneurship in a society and more positive attitudes and intentions by individuals’.

Entrepreneurial behaviours in Kenya are activated within the contours of the African traditional culture which does not prohibit personal wealth creation, but requires the rich to improve their communities (Lutz, 2009; Littrell et al., 2013) through voluntary distribution of their wealth to aid fellow-citizens’ empowerment (Amaeshi and Idemudia, 2015). Such actions however, are not simply meant to promote the sense of collectivism but also to some degree question the relevance of previous literature that hypothesises collectivism is negatively related with entrepreneurial behaviours. Here, we propose that these socially-minded entrepreneurs can ‘tell stories which sound familiar to would-be entrepreneurs’, but which at the same time ‘smuggle’ a new message into people’s mind which signals the importance of entrepreneurship for self- and- community development.

In the Kenyan context, cases exist where firms and business owners commit substantial resources for mentoring, educating and upscaling the skills and knowledge of youth and disadvantaged in view of building their confidence and business-oriented mind-set. Such businesses engage in enterprising young people from less privileged backgrounds to help acquire basic education and skills and in doing so instil creativity and confidence that they can become entrepreneurs. Socially-minded businesses are likely to provide incentives and motivate youths, to develop self-confidence and business acumen and such practices are positively related with entrepreneurial intention and starting of new businesses. These actions are instrumental in increasing both individual’s perception of the social pressure (subjective norm) to engage in, and the perceived ability (self-efficacy) to start, new business (Ajzen, 1991). Therefore, we propose:

Proposition 4: Harambee value of enterprising is positively associated with entrepreneurial intention.

Proposition 5: Harambee value of enterprising is positively associated with new business creation.

Resource Mobilisation

In Kenya, where the market for mobilising resources is inefficient (Jackson et al., 2008; Zoogah et al, 2015), entrepreneurs have limited access to resources necessary to start business ventures. This necessitates local entrepreneurs to rely on family and community networks for mobilising resources for start-up and firm growth. Developing network relations enables an opportunity structure through which entrepreneurs access financial capital to start new ventures.

The influence of resource mobilisation as a cultural toolkit facilitates the creation of new ventures by the most vulnerable - Kenyan youth and women. Three funding programmes, the Youth Enterprise Development Fund (YEDF), The Women Enterprise Development Fund (WEF) and Uwezo Fund (targeting the youth, women and the disabled), were initiated by the government to address the spiralling unemployment and to nurture entrepreneurial behaviour in Kenya. By providing consolidated funds through, YEDF for the youth, and WEF for the women, the government has been making available finance for self-help groups and individuals who seek to venture into business (Shibia and Barako, 2017).

The YEDF's main objective is to provide finance to the youth enterprises through micro-finance institutions (MFIs), registered non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and credit cooperative society (SACCOs). In addition, it undertakes four strategic actions, which help spur entrepreneurship of the youth. First, it provides supporting infrastructure such as business or industrial parks, markets and business incubators. Second, it offers enterprise development services such as entrepreneurship and capacity building training. Third, it facilitates youth-owned businesses to have access to domestic, regional and international markets. And finally, it provides youth with an awareness of overseas employment opportunities with necessary support to complete successful applications. Similar to the YEDF, the WEF is a government agency set up to address the challenges of marginalisation or exclusion of women from access to economic resources and opportunities. It has provided over 3.2 billion affordable credit to women-owned start-up and growth-oriented enterprises since its establishment in 2007. In addition, the Fund offers business support services, capacity building training, marketing, promotion of linkages and infrastructure support (WEDF, 2013). Entrepreneurial behavior is likely to be limited due to high uncertainty avoidance tendencies (Hofstede, 1980). But when actors see culture as a toolkit, they can draw on cultural repertoires such as metaphors, styles, simplified cognition to scan their environment and to identify entrepreneurial opportunities. Further, the literature suggests entrepreneurship thrives on culturally supportive environment (Busenitz and

Lau, 1996; Estrin, Mickiewicz and Stephan, 2013; Stenholm et al, 2013). The resource mobilisation value of Harambee thus is likely to boost the perceived opportunity for starting a new businesses. We argue that the social desirability of entrepreneurship (Arenius and Minniti, 2005; Busenitz, Gomez, and Spencer, 2000; Koellinger, 2008), the existence of institutional support for entrepreneurial activities (Stephan and Uhlaner, 2010) and the perceived resources availability, all combined, drive the intention for creation of new businesses and continued operation of existing enterprises. Based on the discussions above, we propose:

Proposition 6: Harambee value of resource mobilisation is positively associated with new business creation.

Proposition 7. Harambee value of resource mobilisation is positively associated with opportunity seeking behaviours.

Political philanthropy

Entrepreneurial activities take place in a context that shapes them, but the political dimension of entrepreneurship at the national level is rarely being discussed, albeit having an important influence. Any national level commercial activities are intertwined with political structures in these countries (Shaw, et al, 2013). Understanding how politics shape entrepreneurial activities is very important in the African context for three reasons. First, Africa is typified by institutional asymmetry (Bruton, et al. 2015). Second, we know less about how institutional (and/or political) actors' strategic actions may enable or constrain the fostering of entrepreneurial activities where informal sector dominates the economy (Bruton et al., 2012; Webb et al., 2013; Webb et al., 2009). Third, there is an increasing emphasis placed by politicians and policy makers to developing entrepreneurial framework conditions by creating institutions meant to support the flourishing of entrepreneurial activities, allocating resources and business incentives (Holcombe, 2002).

Strategic actions informed by political philanthropy are used by political actors to gain legitimacy and loyalty (Scott, 2001; Swidler, 1986). In Kenya, political actors have previously pulled together national resources to create entrepreneurial framework conditions (Bosma et al 2010; Bowen and de Clercq, 2008; Stephan and Uhlaner (2010). These entrepreneurial framework conditions refer to institutions supporting entrepreneurial activities (Stephan and Uhlaner, 2010) such as Enterprise Funds (YEDF, WEF and Uwezo) in Kenya. These Funds were/are an election promise by the incumbent governments (and/or political aspirants) to gain political mileage, and *a form of political philanthropy*. The main objectives of the funds were to (1) provide affordable capital finance to help the unemployed youth, women and disabled persons to engage in economic activities, (2) to offer an alternative model of distributing funds to communities and individuals at the grassroots level to encourage opportunity seeking behaviour. Overtime, the Funds gained legitimacy in the public domain and became policy action to drive entrepreneurial actions among the youth, women and

disabled, a group that was culturally disadvantaged due to exclusion from formal financial institutions.

Although the involvement of institutional/political actors in providing funds for business development might be a norm, what makes such support provision qualitatively different in Kenya (and largely in the African context) is the fact that they are informed by the Harambee cultural repertoires which see the state that empowers the people, long-term orientation toward the common good. Political philanthropy in countries like Kenya is aimed at increasing the rate of entrepreneurship by providing business support and financial capital that promote opportunity seeking behaviour (Holcombe, 2002; Ndemo, 2015). However, political philanthropy is likely to be driven by the people at higher political echelons to skilfully mobilise support for their political agenda in the name of nation building (Nega and Schneider, 2013). We argue that resources availed through this mechanism are likely to increase the national rate of entrepreneurial activities through creation of new businesses but the majority of such businesses would either be less sustainable or lack growth ambition. Based on the foregoing discussion, we propose:

Proposition 8: Harambee value of political philanthropy is positively associated with entrepreneurial intention.

Proposition 9: Harambee value of political philanthropy is negatively associated with aspirations for business growth

Discussion

Above we have presented our theoretically driven propositions. We have attempted to unpack the main dimensions of Harambee and their effects on entrepreneurial behaviour by theorising them through dimensions of opportunity seeking, entrepreneurial intention, social enterprise, business creation and business growth (Dickson and Weaver, 2008; Mueller and Thomas, 2001; Morris et al, 1994; Urban 2008; Webb, et al, 2010; Zoogah et al, 2015). We have presented a conceptual model which showed the relationship between variables to inform future research on the influence of culture on entrepreneurial behaviour. Our propositions showed that Harambee values of collective reliance, social responsibility, enterprising, resource mobilisation and political philanthropy have both enabling and constraining effects on entrepreneurial behaviours. Specifically, the propositions provided initial explanations on which kinds of entrepreneurial behaviour could be associated with different cultural values of Harambee (for example, collective reliance and social responsibility is likely to drive social entrepreneurship; and political philanthropy may influence the increase in life-style entrepreneurship with little or no growth ambition). Social practices associated with enterprising value of Harambee can be associated with an increased rate of entrepreneurship because of subjective norms and an enhanced self-efficacy. Nevertheless, the constraining effects of cultural values of Harambee are also

evident: donation based financing may discourage opportunity seeking behaviours; over-reliance on community and collective support limits opportunity seeking behaviour and reduces growth aspirations. In such circumstances, opportunity identification follows availability of resources and this is likely to foster lifestyle and informal entrepreneurship (Webb et al., 2009; Godfrey, 2011; Webb et al., 2013).

With the risk of oversimplification, we could hypothesise that socially-oriented businesses and social entrepreneurship are more likely to thrive in such environment than purely profit-seeking entrepreneurship (Thai and Turkina, 2013). There are also conditions in which social enterprises also help spur individual level entrepreneurship (examples include development-oriented micro finance institutions which provide small loans for start-ups and micro-enterprises). Although Harambee values may increase the national rate of entrepreneurship; it is the informal, lifestyle entrepreneurship with less ambition and scope for growth, which prevails in such a context. Those individuals that buy into the idea of collectivism are less likely to engage with formal entrepreneurship because the context is typified by supportive culture and not by the performance based culture as argued by Thai and Turkina (2013).

Harambee values of social responsibility, resource mobilisation and the value of enterprising may enable entrepreneurs to set up their ventures. These individuals will be supported by their community through resource mobilisation activities (social capital and networking), which will ultimately enable entrepreneurial action. Moreover, narratives about the benefits of enterprising is likely to boost opportunity seeking behaviour and proactiveness of enterprising individuals' because of perceived self-efficacy and social pressure to engage in self-employment. However, resources allocated by the government, primarily to achieve their political motives, though is likely to increase the entrepreneurial behaviour of individuals, is less likely to lead to creation of a large number of sustainable ventures and may stifle the use of funding for growth oriented commercial opportunities.

Conclusion and implications

This paper sought to examine how the values of Harambee foster entrepreneurship in an African context, such as Kenya. The paper presented several propositions based on the 'culture as toolkit' perspective together with cultural dimensions developed by Hofstede (1990). By doing this, we extend the perspective of culture as a toolkit by identifying social practices which enable and/or constrain entrepreneurship. Specifically, we conceptualise Harambee into a toolkit consisting of a number of values that influence entrepreneurial actions.

Collective reliance, social responsibility, enterprising, resource mobilisation and political philanthropy are salient Harambee values. These cultural values, according to our model, could be associated with different types of entrepreneurial actions, positively and/or negatively. Of these values, resource mobilisation and value of enterprising are more likely to be associated with the

increased perceived opportunity, entrepreneurial intention and new business creation. Such enterprises are likely to display growth-orientation with significant contribution to economy and the community. Collective reliance and social responsibility, on the other hand, could be positively related to the social entrepreneurial behaviour shaped by the value of collectivism - 'me because of you'. This accords with, the phrases of Mbiti (1969, 108-109), "I am, because we are; and since we are, therefore I am." So, the value of collectivism somehow penetrates both the structure and stakeholders at the state, regional and local levels (Weber, 2005).

We consider the policy initiatives and entrepreneurs' actions reported in this paper as social actions by social actors to spur entrepreneurial behaviours in Kenya. These social actors whilst upholding the value of collectivism and humanity are also able, carefully, to instil confidence and perceived feasibility and desirability of entrepreneurship. As social actors, they function as skilled cultural operatives, sufficiently agentic to select those cultural elements, which align with the context. Political and social actors in the Kenyan context thus indicate a need to have enterprising culture that is different from the taken-for-granted Western view of entrepreneurship. That is, entrepreneurs engage in profit-making, growth oriented businesses but not at the cost of exploiting human beings for greater profit or selfish greed (Broodryk, 2005). Our propositions regarding collective reliance, enterprising, resource mobilisation and political philanthropy fit well with the recent work of Zoogah and Nkomo (2013), Nkomo (2017) and Welter et al (2017) in that we provide insights into the differentiated nature of Kenyan entrepreneurship, whilst maintaining some similarities with Western views of entrepreneurship. Thus, this paper extends research on entrepreneurship in Africa by suggesting the need for a careful hybridization of the Western concepts of entrepreneurship with appropriate African ways that explain the influences of national culture on entrepreneurial behaviour. By focusing on Harambee values, we offer a more nuanced understanding of the mechanisms through which Kenya's national culture enables and/or constrains the fostering of entrepreneurship and provide a conceptual model to further research on the linkages between national culture and entrepreneurship within an African context. Our paper challenges a view which suggests only certain kinds of entrepreneurship leads to business creation and community benefits, and extends the perspective which argues cultural repertoires specific to context provide better explanations why and how entrepreneurship actions are enabled or constrained.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991), "The theory of planned behaviour", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 179-211.

- Akong'a, J. (1989), "Culture in Development" in Idha, S. A. (Ed) *Kenya: An Official Handbook*. Nairobi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.
- Alexander, I.K. and Honig, B. (2016), "Entrepreneurial Intentions: A cultural perspective", *Africa Journal of Management*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 235-257.
- Amaeshi K. and Idemudia, U. (2015), "Africapitalism: A Management Idea for Business in Africa?" *Africa Journal of Management*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 210-223.
- Arenius, P. and Minniti, M. (2005), "Perceptual variables and nascent entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 24 No.3, pp. 233-247.
- Bednar, J., Page, S., Bramson, A., and Jones-Rooy, A. (2006), "Conformity, consistency, and cultural heterogeneity". November, *Proceedings of Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*.
- Berezin, M. (1997), "Politics and culture: a less fissured terrain", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 23 No 1, pp. 361-383.
- Bhide, A. (2000) *The Origins and Evolution of New Businesses*, Oxford University Press, New York,
- Bird, B. and Jelinek, M. (1988), "The Operation of Entrepreneurial Intentions", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 21-29
- Bosma, N.S. and Levie, J. (2010), *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2009*, Executive Report.
- Bowen, H.P., and De Clercq, D. (2008), "Institutional context and the allocation of entrepreneurial effort", *Journal of International Business Studies*, pp. 747-768.
- Boyacigiller, N.A. and Adler, N.J. (1991), "The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 262-290.
- Broodryk, J. (2005), *Ubuntu management philosophy: exporting ancient African wisdom into the global world*, Knowledge Resource Publishing: Johannesburg
- Bruton, G., Khavul, S., Siegel, D. and Wright, M. (2015), "New financial alternatives in seeding entrepreneurship: Microfinance, crowd funding, and peer-to-peer innovations", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 39 No.1, pp. 9-26.
- Bruton, G.D., Ireland, R.D. and Ketchen, D.J. (2012), "Toward a research agenda on the informal economy", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 1-11.
- Busenitz, L.W. and Lau, C.M. (1996), "A cross-cultural cognitive model of new venture creation", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 25-40.
- Busenitz, L.W., Gomez, C. and Spencer, J.W. (2000), "Country institutional profiles: Unlocking entrepreneurial phenomena", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 5, pp. 994-1003.
- Chepkwony, K.C. (2008), *The Role of Harambee in Socio-Economic Development in Kenya: A case of the Education Sector*, Available from <http://africanphilanthropy.issuelab.org/resources/20232/20232.pdf> (accessed, August, 2016)
- Chieni, S.N. (2001), "The Harambee Movement in Kenya: The Role Played by Kenyans and the Government in the Provision of Education and Other Social Services" (presentation, Seventh BOLESWA Symposium, University of Swaziland, Kwaluseni, Swaziland, 38 July-1 August 1997), <http://boleswa97.tripod.com/chieni.htm>
- Chrisman, J.J., Chua, J.H. and Steier, L.P. (2002), "The influence of national culture and family involvement on entrepreneurial perceptions and performance at the state level", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 113-131.
- Dickson, P.H. and Weaver, K.M. (2008), "The role of the institutional environment in determining firm orientations towards entrepreneurial behaviour", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 467-483.
- Douglas, M. (1986), *How Institutions Think*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse.
- Elumelu T.O. (2012), "The path to economic prosperity and social wealth", Available from <http://www.heirsholdings.Com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Africapitalism-Path-to-Economic-Prosperity-and-Social-Wealth.pdf>, (accessed on August, 10, 2015)

- Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T. and Stephan, U. (2013), "Entrepreneurship, Social Capital, and Institutions: Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship Across Nations", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 479-504.
- Etzioni, A. (1987), "Entrepreneurship, adaptation and legitimation: a macro-behavioral perspective", *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 175-189.
- Gasse, Y. and Tremblay, M. (2011), "Entrepreneurial beliefs and intentions: a cross-cultural study of university students in seven countries", *International Journal of Business*, Vol. 16 No. 4, p. 303.
- GEM (2014), *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor* <http://www.gemconsortium.org/report>. (Accessed 23 February 2016).
- GEM (2017), *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2014*. <http://www.gemconsortium.org/report>. (Accessed 5 July 2017).
- Godfrey, P.C. (2011), "Toward a theory of the informal economy", *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 5 No.1, pp. 231-277.
- Harding, R. (2006), *Social Entrepreneurship Monitor*, London Business School, London.
- Hayton, J.C., George, G. and Zahra, S.A. (2002), "National culture and entrepreneurship: A review of behavioral research", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26 No. 4, p. 33.
- Herbig, P.A. and Miller, J.C. (1992), "The United States versus the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia: The case for structural influences on innovation", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 423-434.
- Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hofstede, G. (1980), "Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad?" *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 42-63.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., and Minkov, M. (1991), *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*, Vol. 2, McGraw-Hill, London.
- Holcombe, G.R. (2002), "Political Entrepreneurship and the Democratic Allocation of Economic Resources", *The Review of Austrian Economics*, Vol. 15 No.2/3, pp. 143-159.
- Jackson, T., Amaeshi, K. and Yavuz, S. (2008), "Untangling African indigenous management: Multiple influences on the success of SMEs in Kenya", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 400-416.
- Jeffs, L. (2006), "Social entrepreneurs and social enterprises: do they have a future in New Zealand", *Proceedings of the International Council for Small Business Conference*, Melbourne.
- Johnson, S. (2000), "Literature review on social entrepreneurship", *Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship*, November, Available at: www.bus.ualberta.ca/ccse (accessed 13 November, 2006).
- Kanothi, R.N. (2008), "Multi-Actor Participation in Local Development: The 'Rise and Decline' of Harambee! policy in Kenya", *An Exercise in World-making*, published by the Institute of Social Studies, Graduate School of Development Studies, The Hague.
- Karsten, L. and Illa, H. (2005), "Ubuntu as a key African management concept: contextual background and practical insights for knowledge application", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp. 607-620.
- Koellinger, P. (2008), "Why are some entrepreneurs more innovative than others?", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 31 No.1, pp. 21-37.
- Kreiser, P.M., Marino, L.D., Dickson, P. and Weaver, K.M. (2010), "Cultural influences on entrepreneurial orientation: The impact of national culture on risk taking and proactiveness in SMEs", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 5, pp. 959-983.
- Kropp, F., Lindsay, N.J. and Shoham, A. (2008), "Entrepreneurial orientation and international entrepreneurial business venture start-up", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 102-117.
- Leonardi, P.M. (2011), "Innovation blindness: Culture, frames, and cross-boundary problem construction in the development of new technology concepts", *Organization Science*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 347-369.

- Linan, F. and Fernandez-Serrano, J. (2014), "National culture, entrepreneurship and economic development: different patterns across the European Union", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 685-701.
- Littrell, M., Moukam, L.V., Libite, R., Youmba, J.C. and Baugh, G. (2013), "Narrowing the treatment gap with equitable access: mid-term outcomes of a community case management program in Cameroon", *Health Policy and Planning*, Vol. 28 No. 7, pp. 705-716.
- Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (1996), "Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 135-172.
- Lutz, W. (2009), "Editorial: Towards a world of 2-6 billion well-educated and therefore healthy and wealthy people", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A* (Statistics in Society), Vol. 172 No.4, pp. 701-705.
- Mair, J., Battilana, J. and Cardenas, J. (2012), "Organizing for society: A typology of social entrepreunering models", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.111 No.3, pp. 353-373.
- Mangaliso, M.P. (2001), "Building competitive advantage from Ubuntu: Management lessons from South Africa", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 23-33.
- Mbigi, L. and Maree, J. (1995), *Ubuntu, the spirit of African transformation management*. Knowledge Resources, Johannesburg.
- Mbithi, P.M and Rasmusson, R. (1977), "Self-reliance in Kenya: The Case of Harambee", *Scandinavian Institute of African Studies*, Uppsala.
- Mbiti, J. (1969), *African Philosophy and Religion*, Longman, London.
- Mbiti, J.S. (1999), "Hearts cannot be Lent! In Search of Peace and Reconciliation in African Traditional Society", *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Vol. 20, pp.1-12.
- Miller, T.L., Grimes, M.G., McMullen, J.S. and Vogus, T.J. (2012), "Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 616-640.
- Mitchell, R.K., Smith, B., Seawright, K.W. and Morse, E.A. (2000), "Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation decision", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, pp. 974-993.
- Morris, M.H., Davis, D.L. and Allen, J.W. (1994), "Fostering corporate entrepreneurship: Cross-cultural comparisons of the importance of individualism versus collectivism", *Journal of International Business Studies*, pp. 65-89.
- Morrison, A. (2006), "A contextualisation of entrepreneurship", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 12 No.4, pp. 192-209.
- Mueller, S.L., and Thomas, A.S. (2001), "Culture and entrepreneurial potential: A nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16 No.1, pp. 51-75.
- Nega, B. and Schneider, G. (2013), 'Social Entrepreneurship, Microfinance, and Economic Development in Africa', *Journal of Economic Issues*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 367-376.
- Ndemo, E.B. (2015), "Political Entrepreneurialism: Reflections of a Civil Servant on the Role of Political Institutions in Technology Innovation and Diffusion in Kenya", *Stability: International Journal of Security & Development*, Vol. 4(1) No. 15, pp. 1-14.
- Ngau, P.M. (1987), "Tensions in empowerment: The experience of harambee (self-help) movement in Kenya", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, pp. 523-538.
- Nkomo, S.M. (2017), "Time to Look in the Mirror: Producing Management Theory and Knowledge for Africa", *Africa Journal of Management*, Vol. 3 No.1, pp. 7-16.
- Ocasio, W. and Joseph, J. (2005), "An attention-based theory of strategy formulation: Linking micro- and macroperspectives in strategy processes", in Szulanski, G., Porac, J. and Doz, Y. (Eds.) *Strategy Process: Advances in Strategic Management*, Vol.22, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 39-61.
- Peterson, R.A. (1979), "Revitalizing the culture concept", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 137-166.

- Pinillos, M.J. and Reyes, L. (2011), "Relationship between individualist-collectivist culture and entrepreneurial activity: evidence from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor data", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 23-37.
- Porac, J.F., Thomas, H. and Baden-Fuller, C. (1989), "Competitive groups as cognitive communities: The case of Scottish knitwear manufacturers", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 26 No.4, pp. 397-416.
- Rauch, A., Frese, M., Wang, Z., Unger, J., Lozada, M., Kupcha, V. and Spirina, T. (2013), "National culture and cultural orientations of owners affecting the innovation – growth relationship in five countries", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 25 No. 9-10, pp. 732-755.
- Rivera-Santos, M., Holt, D., Littlewood, D. and Kolk, A. (2015), "Social entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 72-91.
- Santos, F. (2012), "A positive theory of social entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 111 No. 3, pp. 335-351.
- Schuyler, G. (1998), "Social entrepreneurship: profit as a means, not an end", *CELCEE Digest*, Vol. 30, November, pp. 97-98.
- Shane, S., Kolvereid, L. and Westhead, P. (1991), "An exploratory examination of the reasons leading to new firm formation across country and gender", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 6 No.6, pp. 431-446.
- Shaw, E., Gordon, J., Harvey, C. and Maclean, M. (2013), "Exploring contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 580-599.
- Shibia, A.G., and Barako, D.G. (2017), "Determinants of micro and small enterprises growth in Kenya", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 105-118.
- Shinnar, R.S., Giacomini, O. and Janssen, F. (2012), "Entrepreneurial perceptions and intentions: The role of gender and culture", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 36 No.3, pp. 465-493.
- Stenholm, P., Acs, Z.J. and Wuebker, R. (2013), "Exploring country-level institutional arrangements on the rate and type of entrepreneurial activity", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 176-193.
- Stephan, U. and Uhlaner, L.M. (2010), 'Performance based vs. socially supportive culture: A cross national study of descriptive norms and entrepreneurship', *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 41, pp.1347-1364.
- Swidler, A. (1986), "Culture in action: symbols and strategies", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, pp.273-286.
- Swidler, A. (2002) "Cultural repertoires and cultural logics: Can they be reconciled", *Comparative and Historical Sociology*, 14(1), 1-6.
- Thai, M.T.T. and Turkina, E. (2014), "Macro-level determinants of formal entrepreneurship versus informal entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 490-510.
- Thomas, A.S. and Mueller, S.L. (2000), "A case for comparative entrepreneurship: Assessing the relevance of culture", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 287-301.
- Ugwuegbu, D.C.E. (2001), *The psychology of management in African organizations*. Quorum Books, Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport.
- Urban, B. (2008), "Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: Delineating the construct with associated skills", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 346-364.
- Waiguru, A. (2002), "Corruption and patronage politics: The case of 'Harambee' in Kenya", *Measuring Corruption Workshop*, Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice, Governance and Transparency International, Brisbane, Australia, October.
- Wairire, G.G. and Muiruri, J. (2016), "Vyama in Kenya: An Africentric strengths-based approach to community development", in Gray, M. (Ed.) *The Handbook of Social Work and Social Development in Africa*, Routledge International Handbooks, Abingdon, p.292.
- Waithima, A.K. (2012), "The Role of Harambee Contributions in Corruption: Experimental Evidence from Kenya", *Investment Climate and Business Environment Research Conference*, Dakar, April.

- Wang, T., Thornhill, S. and De Castro, J.O. (2017), "Entrepreneurial Orientation, Legitimation, and New Venture Performance", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, doi:10.1002/sej.1246.
- Webb, J.W., Bruton, G.D., Tihanyi, L., and Ireland, R.D. (2013), "Research on entrepreneurship in the informal economy: Framing a research agenda", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 28 No.5, pp. 598-614.
- Webb, J.W., Kistruck, G.M., Ireland, R.D. and Ketchen Jr, D.J. (2010), "The entrepreneurship process in base of the pyramid markets: The case of multinational enterprise/nongovernment organization alliances", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 555-581.
- Webb, J.W., Tihanyi, L., Ireland, R.D. and Sirmon, D.G. (2009), "You say illegal, I say legitimate: Entrepreneurship in the informal economy", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 492-510.
- Weber, K. (2005), "A toolkit for analyzing corporate cultural toolkits", *Poetics*, Vol. 33 No.3-4, pp. 227-252.
- Weber, K., Heinze, K.L. and DeSoucey, M. (2008), "Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 529-567.
- WEDF (2013) *Women Enterprise Fund* (WEF), Available from <http://wef.co.ke/index.php/component/jdownloads/summary/6-women-enterprise-fund-strategic-plan-draft-2013-2017/4-wef-draft-strategic-plan-2013-17draft-17-09-14> (accessed September 2016).
- Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D.B. and Gartner, W.B. (2017), "Everyday entrepreneurship—a call for entrepreneurship research to embrace entrepreneurial diversity", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 311-321.
- Williams, C.C. and Kadir, A.M. (2016), "The impacts of corruption on firm performance: Some lessons from 40 African countries", *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 1650022.
- Wrong, D.H. (1961), "The Oversocialized Conception of man in Modern Sociology", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 26, pp. 183-93.
- Zahra, A.S., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O. and Shulman, J.M. (2009), "A typology of Social entrepreneurs: motives, search processes and ethical challenges", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 24, pp. 519-532.
- Zoogah, D.B. and Nkomo, S. (2013), "Management Research in Africa", *Management in Africa: Macro and Micro Perspectives*, No. 53, p.9.
- Zoogah, D.B., Peng, M.W. and Woldu, H. (2015). "Institutions, resources, and organizational effectiveness in Africa", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 29 No.1, pp. 7-31.

Table 1: Harambee values and meaning

Harambee Value	Value Meaning
Collective reliance	value of social and economic development for common good (Waiguru, 2002, Kanothi, 2009, Jackson et al., 2008; Zoogah, et al. 2016)
Social responsibility	value of engaging in voluntary contribution of various types of resources for projects that target “communal good” (Chieni, 2001; Chepkyonyi, 2008 Mair, et al, 2012; Miller et al 2012; Santos, 2012; Zahra et al, 2009)
Enterprising	value which display entrepreneurship is valued and respected endeavour by community and society at large (Amaeshi and Idemudia, 2015)
Mobilising resources	value that calls for social practices aimed at organising and recombining local (grassroots) and state-level various resources for socio-economic development, including fostering of entrepreneurial activities (Mbithi and Rasmusson, 1977; Ngau, 1987; Waiguru, 2002; Elumelu, 2012; Amaeshi and Idemudia, 2015).
Political philanthropy	Politically driven value for deployment or re-distribution of capital resources to individuals, communities or institutions (Akong’a, 1989; Romeo, 2006, Ndemo, 2015).

Figure 1: Conceptual Model

