

# Entrepreneurial Behaviour, Institutional Context and Performance of Micro and Small Livestock Enterprises in North Eastern Region of Kenya

James Gathungu<sup>1</sup>, Billow Khalid<sup>2</sup>, Dorothy McCormick<sup>3</sup>, Dorothy McCormick<sup>4</sup> and  
James Gathungu<sup>5</sup>

1 UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

Received: 8 December 2015 Accepted: 1 January 2016 Published: 15 January 2016

## Abstract

10 In this paper explores the relationship between entrepreneurial behaviour and firm  
11 performance from institutional environmental perspective. More specifically, the study argues  
12 that an economic process such as entrepreneurial behaviour is best understood from an  
13 institutional framework. The assumption is that the motivation, commitment, experience,  
14 knowledge and behaviours of the entrepreneur are core in the entrepreneurial process.  
15 However, firm performance is also dependent on the institutional and even the geographical  
16 context in which it operates. It is on the basis of this logic that this paper argues that  
17 institutional parameters can moderate the way entrepreneurial behaviour influences  
18 performance of micro and small livestock enterprises in North Eastern Kenya.

**Index terms**— entrepreneurial behaviour, institutions, firm performance, small and medium enterprises.

## 1 Introduction

22 the concept of entrepreneurial behaviour focuses on the concrete, theoretically "actions of individuals -as solo  
23 entrepreneurs or as part of a team of entrepreneurs -in the start up or early stages of organization creation,  
24 usually the first six to seven years" ??Bird, Schjøl and Baum, 2012:2). It manifests itself as a discrete unit  
25 of individual activities that can be observed by audiences. Institutional context are the external actors both in  
26 economic and social kind that influence a firm's choices of direction, action and ultimately its performance. Firm  
27 performance concerns with the growth and survival of the business and finally meeting the goal of firm's owners.

28 This study inquired into the performance of micro and small livestock enterprises in North Eastern Kenya.

29 Specifically the study examined how the performance of the concerned MSEs are influenced by entrepreneurial  
30 behaviour and selected social and economic institutions variables. Earlier studies on entrepreneurship and firm  
31 performance have acknowledged the multidisciplinary nature of entrepreneurship and utilized various theories  
32 to anchor their studies (Delmar, 1996; Maalu, 2010; Covin & Slevin, 1991). Theories of entrepreneurship are  
33 defined as verifiable and logically coherent formulations of relationships that explain entrepreneurship, predict  
34 entrepreneurial activities, or provide normative actions ??Kuratko & Hodgetts, 2007:45). The purpose of theories  
35 is to explain real life events, behaviour, facts or phenomena in consistent, generalized manner.

36 The different theoretical perspectives have been used to understand, explain and predict entrepreneurship and  
37 ground the concepts on logical and coherent thoughts particularly with regard to how the theoretical abstracts  
38 manifest themselves in practice as concrete, measurable variables. Theories applied in the past studies of  
39 entrepreneurship, firm performance and institutional parameters reflect the contextual issues regarding those  
40 studies, where the studies took place and the environmental conditions. The implication of this is that there is  
41 an apparent feeling among scholars that there is no synthesis of "general theory of entrepreneurship and that  
42 most of the theoretical anchorage applied in the field are eclectic, borrowed as it were, from the contributions of

43 other social sciences such as anthropology, economic history, finance and management, psychology and sociology”  
44 ??Kirby, 2013:135).

45 Entrepreneurship appears in the economic science literature primarily through the writing of Richard  
46 ??cantillon (1755). He endowed the concept with economic meaning and the entrepreneur with a role in  
47 economic development. Cantillon recognized that discrepancies between demand and supply in a market create  
48 opportunities for buying cheaply and selling at a higher price and that this sort of arbitrage would bring  
49 equilibrium to the competitive market. The assumption was that the entrepreneur would buy products or  
50 whatever at a fixed price, have them prepared or

## 51 2 Year ( )

52 A packaged and transport them to markets and sell them at an unpredictable, uncertain price. People who  
53 possessed the motivation and alertness to take advantage of these unrealized profit opportunities were called  
54 “entrepreneurs”. The basic characteristic of Cantillon’s analysis was the emphasis on risk. Entrepreneurship he  
55 underlined is a matter of foresight and willingness to assume risk.

56 In their seminal paper titled “In search of the meaning of entrepreneurship” (1989:40), Hebert and Link  
57 emphasize that theories of entrepreneurship could be either static or dynamic, “only dynamic theories of  
58 entrepreneurship have any significant operational meaning.” Arguing that throughout history the entrepreneur  
59 has worn many hats and played many roles. Herbert and Link identified at least nine distinct dynamic themes  
60 in the economic literature regarding the role of the entrepreneur in society. These are: one, the entrepreneur is  
61 the person who assumes the risk associated with uncertainty; two, the entrepreneur is an innovator. Three, the  
62 entrepreneur is a decision-maker. Four, the entrepreneur is an industrial leader. Five, the entrepreneur is an  
63 organizer and coordinator of economic resources. Six, the entrepreneur is a contractor, seven, the entrepreneur  
64 is an arbitrageur. Eight, the entrepreneur is the owner of an enterprise and nine, the entrepreneur is an allocator  
65 of resources among alternatives uses.

66 In order to synthesis the Cantillon’s views on entrepreneurs as bearers of risk and uncertainty, Kirzner’s view  
67 on entrepreneurs as the essence of alertness to profit opportunities and Schumpeter’s views, entrepreneurs as  
68 “innovators” engaged in a process he called “creative destruction”, Hebert and Link suggested a ‘synthetic  
69 definition of the concept of entrepreneurship as “the entrepreneur is someone who specializes in taking  
70 responsibility for and making fragmental decisions that affect the location, form, and the use of goods, resources,  
71 or institutions” ??Hebert & Link, 1989:47). This definition has been cited as synthetic because it incorporates  
72 the main themes of entrepreneurship: risk, uncertainty, innovation, perception and change. The definition  
73 nevertheless does not capture all the important themes of social development of entrepreneurship and micro to  
74 small business research which draw great interests from scholars, as well as from policy makers in the public  
75 sector domain.

76 Any workable analysis of the concept of entrepreneurship must be informed by the lessons of history. “One  
77 lesson to be learned from economic history is that the problem of the place of entrepreneurship in economic and  
78 social theory is not problem theory per se, it is a problem of methods and subjects (Hebert & Link, 1989:48).  
79 According to Parker 2004), the chief contribution of the entrepreneur is to combine and coordinate factors of  
80 production. The entrepreneur stands at the centre of the economic system, directing and rewarding the various  
81 factors of productions, and taking the residual profits. Personal characteristics such as judgment, perseverance  
82 and experience required for successful entrepreneurship would be in scarce supply; providing high profits to those  
83 who become entrepreneurs. As one entrepreneur put it “no one can eat your own lunch for you”.

84 Based on these discussions, it is clear that entrepreneurship is a multidimensional, multidisciplinary field which  
85 is critically important for the welfare and economic prosperity of society. As such the concept of entrepreneurship  
86 is dynamic, situational dependence and can be viewed using different theoretical lenses. Therefore, this study  
87 has focused on its objectives within the framework of entrepreneurial behaviour, social and economic institutions  
88 and resource based view of the firms as the anchored theories.

89 The importance of the livestock sector in Kenya can partly be explained by the fact that 73 percent of the  
90 country is classified as arid, making it unsuitable for crop production (Knips, 2004). Agriculture is the core sector  
91 of the countries and societies in the Horn of Africa, namely the seven member countries of the Intergovernmental  
92 Authority on Development (IGAD): Kenya, Somalia, Ethiopia, Uganda, Sudan, Djibouti and Eritrea (Knips,  
93 2004). Within the agricultural sector a large contribution, on average 57 percent of the GDP of the IGAD  
94 member countries come from livestock. Livestock’s contribution to overall GDP ranges between 10 to 20 percent,  
95 in the case of Kenya, it is 12%. The importance of the livestock economy in the IGAD countries in general and  
96 Kenya in particular is attributed to the fact that major proportion of the land in the region, in the case of Kenya  
97 73 percent, is classified as arid and semi-arid (ASAL) leaving livestock production as the only viable form of  
98 non-capital intensive land use.

99 It is estimated that the livestock sector contributes at least Ksh150 billion annually to the Kenya’s economy  
100 even though Kenya is a livestock deficit nation unlike Ethiopia and Somalia. Kenya’s livestock sector, although  
101 informal, is a multi-billionshilling industry Gathoni (2014). According to Mifugo ni Biashara Project in arid and  
102 semi arid land (ASAL) the national per capita meat consumption in urban areas is 18.5kg/yr with a national  
103 average of 10.8kg/yr, which is high given the estimated average for sub-Saharan countries at 9.4kg/yr.

104 Presently, Kenya’s meat export markets are Egypt, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Tanzania and DRC Congo

---

105 (Sanga, 2014, The Standard, Sept 2: P22). The world health organization report indicates that the world's  
106 livestock sector is growing at an unprecedented rate due to population growth, rising incomes and urbanization,  
107 with annual meat production projected to increase from 218 million tonnes in 1997 -1999 to 376 million tonnes  
108 by 2030 (Gathoni, 2014). This drives the

### 109 **3 Global Journal of Management and Business Research**

110 Volume XVI Issue IX Version I Year ( ) sectors potential growth rate. Therefore the economy and social activities  
111 of the population of North Eastern Kenya depend heavily on income from livestock (Knips, 2004). For the owners,  
112 camels and cattle are not just some assets. There are emotional, social attachments to these treasured livestock.

113 In terms of socio-economic quality of life ratings, the three counties of North Eastern Kenya, a recent study  
114 called Socio Economic Atlas of Kenya, 2014, revealed were doing relatively badly (GoK, 2014). Comparatively  
115 according to the Socio-Economic Atlas of Kenya, only 2,000 households or 1.6 percent of the households in  
116 Mandera have access to TV; only 1.5 percent has piped water in Wajir, and the three counties as a whole  
117 have poverty incidents of 86 percent, making them the counties with the poorest access to modern service and  
118 conveniences in the country. The three counties also lead in both child and maternal mortality rates.

119 The North Eastern Kenya region consists of the three counties of Garissa, Wajir and Mandera. Mandera  
120 borders Ethiopia and Somalia while Garissa and Wajir counties share a long border with Somalia. Besides the  
121 local supplies, the other livestock traded in the markets of the three counties are brought to the local markets by  
122 pastoralists and traders across the border from livestock net exporting countries such as Ethiopia and Somalia  
123 who are attracted by stable markets. The livestock owners, pastoralists and traders live in a remote region  
124 with the attendant environmental, cultural, ecological and resources challenges which all justify this study. The  
125 capital investment of micro scale traders range from Ksh 10,000 to 400,000, small size traders from Ksh 400,000  
126 to 2.5million and medium size traders invest up to Ksh10 million (Garissa County Development Plan, 2010). It  
127 is in that background that the performances of MSEs in the livestock sector in the North Eastern Kenya was  
128 investigated by this paper.

### 129 **4 II.**

### 130 **5 Research Problem**

131 Many studies focusing on the effects of entrepreneurial behaviour on firm performance have argued for direct  
132 relationship between the two (Covin & Slevin, 1991;Delmar, 1996, Kirby, 2003). Knowledge of predictors of new  
133 firm or existing firm performance is unquestionably of interest to entrepreneurs, to those who provide advice  
134 to entrepreneurs as well as to investors in new or existing ventures. Several studies, however, indicate that the  
135 relationship between entrepreneurial behaviour and firm performance is moderated by institutional conditions  
136 (Bird et. al, 2012;Covin & Slevin, 1991). Whereas some of these studies have conceptualized a direct relationship  
137 between entrepreneurial behaviour and firm performance, the results from their findings have been inconclusive  
138 (Fisher, 2012;Kirby, 2003). Furthermore, many of these studies focused only on two variables relationship (Ororo,  
139 2008;Khayesi, 2010). Moreover, there is a dearth of studies examining the relationship between entrepreneurship  
140 behaviour and firm performance in Kenya.

141 Against this background, this paper addresses those highlighted inconsistencies and knowledge gaps by  
142 establishing the effects of institutional context on the relationship between entrepreneurial behaviour and firm  
143 performance by answering the broad question. How do entrepreneurial behaviour and institutional contexts  
144 individually influence the performance of micro and small livestock enterprises in North Eastern Region of Kenya?  
145 The two objectives of this paper are to establish the relationship between entrepreneurial behaviour and micro  
146 and small enterprises performance and also to determine the moderating effect of institutional contexts on the  
147 relationship between entrepreneurial behaviour and the performance of the Micro and Small Enterprises studied.

### 148 **6 III.**

### 149 **7 Methodology**

150 This study used a descriptive survey research design. The population for the study consisted of all the micro  
151 and small livestock enterprises registered with the Counties of Garissa, Wajir and Mandera as at 31 st May 2014.  
152 According to the County Governments there were 305, where Garissa County had the highest number, 145, Wajir  
153 78 and Mandera 82. A survey was conducted with a response rate of response rate 64 percent.

154 Cross sectional data was collected using survey instrument research questionnaire. The questionnaire used  
155 Likert type scale for collecting the data. Follow up interviews and focus group discussion methods were also used  
156 to provide additional depth of responses to make up in part of the deficiencies of the survey method. The data  
157 was subjected to tests of normality, tests of multicollinearity, test of linearity and test of heteroscedasticity. The  
158 data satisfied all the four tests. Descriptive and inferential statistics such as multiple regression and ANOVA  
159 were used to analyze the data in order to address the objectives.

160 IV.

## 9 OBJECTIVE 1: ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR AND PERFORMANCE OF MSEs

---

### 161 8 Findings and Discussion

### 162 9 Objective 1: Entrepreneurial behaviour and performance of 163 MSEs

164 For the purpose of testing objective one, entrepreneurial behaviour was framed as a function of the dimensions  
165 of motivation -achievement need, legitimacy seeking behaviour, risk taking, locus of control and tolerance  
166 for ambiguity or business failures ??Rwigema, 2008). These five dimensions were thus operationalized by  
167 asking questions to the MSEs owners and managers about the concrete actions illustrating these elements.  
168 Similarly, performance of the MSEs was measured in terms of average growth in profits, profit to sales ratio, and  
169 improvement in the satisfactions of the respective MSEs owner and managers. In this section first correlation  
170 analysis was done on entrepreneurial behaviour and MSEs performance followed by regression analysis.

171 The purpose of these analyses was to determine whether there were strong or weak correlations between  
172 the elements of entrepreneurial behaviour and performance of MSEs. Normally low regression coefficients would  
173 indicate weak correlations between the independent and the dependent variables. It was for this reason that it was  
174 felt essential to compute correlation analysis to provide an indication of whether the measures of entrepreneurial  
175 behaviour were indeed related significantly to MSEs performance.

176 The results for the correlation analysis show no negative correlation between any of the variables and MSEs  
177 performance. The results indicate that there is a positive correlation between entrepreneur aspects of tolerance for  
178 ambiguity, legitimacy seeking behavior, risk taking, and locus of control as well motivation (achievement need).  
179 The correlation between compliance with business regulation as a legitimacy seeking entrepreneur behavior and  
180 composite MSEs performance was  $r=0.421$ . Correlation for ability to plan as a tolerance for ambiguity indicator  
181 correlated positively with MSEs performance, with  $r=0.293$ . Motivation/achievement need measured by the  
182 promise of a future prospect of livestock business had a moderately positive correlation with MSEs performance  
183  $r=0.578$ . Taking bold and wide ranging acts for the business and the motivation of never giving up in the livestock  
184 business regardless of failure as risk taking entrepreneur behavior correlated positively with MSEs performance  
185  $r=0.373$ , and  $r= 0.552$  respectively.

186 Establishment of a network of individuals who are trusted and relied on to provide information/ ideas as a  
187 locus of control indicator was also positively correlated  $r= 0.370$ . For the objective of establishing the effect  
188 of entrepreneurial behaviour on the performance of the MSEs in the study, a three step procedure method was  
189 applied. First, a construct of entrepreneurial behaviour was used and then the responses were grouped into five  
190 dimensions. Likert scale responses to all the questions on entrepreneurial behaviour were summed up to create  
191 the index for the construct of entrepreneurial behaviour. Firm performance was also computed as an index of the  
192 sum of the Likert scale responses of all its measures data. 1 shows the regression prediction model summary for  
193 MSEs performance and entrepreneurial behaviour. Although the results of the correlations showed statistically  
194 significant relationship between entrepreneurial behaviour and MSEs performance, it was felt necessary to test  
195 further objective 1, using the direct measures for the dimensions of entrepreneurial behaviour. The literature  
196 reviewed such as those of Kirby (2003); Stokes and Wilson (2006) argue that entrepreneurial behaviour manifests  
197 in business firms in the forms of motivation / need for achievement, locus of control, legitimacy seeking behaviour,  
198 opportunity identification, resource accumulation efforts, and risk taking. The results in Table 1 indicate that,  
199 MSEs performance is positively influenced by indicators of legitimacy seeking behavior(X 4 ) , risk taking (X 3 )  
200 and (X 5 ) entrepreneur behavior dimensions. It is however influenced negatively by tolerance for ambiguity(X 1  
201 ) and locus of control indicators(X 6 ). The resulting model is expressed as follows:MSE Performance=  $1.376-0.31$   
202  $X 1 -0.113 X 2 +0.098X 3 +0.272X 4 +0.228X 5 -0.465X 6$

203 This model has an r coefficient of 0.378 and an F value of 4.96 significant at  $P< 0.01$ . This means the model  
204 could be used in predicting livestock MSE performance based on indicators of entrepreneur behavior. Hence,  
205 entrepreneur behavior has a positive influence on MSEs performance as indicated by the correlations. The  
206 model is moderately strong since entrepreneur behavior account for 11.4 percent of change in livestock MSEs  
207 Performance, with a standard error of 0.796. The Table ???.1 shows that Tolerance values lie below 1.00 and  
208 VHF below 10.00. This shows that there were no problems of multicollinearity in the regression. The same was  
209 true for other regressions. Objective 2: Institutional context moderate performance of MSEs Twoway ANOVA  
210 enabled us to examine the main effects, that is the effects of the independent variables (entrepreneur behavior) on  
211 the dependent variable (MSEs Performance) but also the interaction effects that exists between the independent  
212 variables. The interaction effects of the two predictors on MSEs performance are summarized in Table ?? shows,  
213 as hypothesized in objective 2, the combined effect of entrepreneurial behaviour, institutional context on the  
214 performance of the micro and small enterprises in the livestock sector in North Eastern Kenya is greater than  
215 the effects of the entrepreneurial behaviour on firm performance. In this paper it was found that the combined  
216 effect of the two predictor variables on MSEs performance was greater than that of individual predictors.

217 The interaction effect between entrepreneur behavior and social institutions was statistically significant  
218 ( $F=2.335$ ;  $P<0.01$ ;  $r^2 = 0.670$ ). Similarly, the interaction effects between entrepreneur behavior and economic  
219 institutions was statistically significant ( $F=1.194$ ;  $P<0.01$ ;  $r^2 = 0.542$ ).The interaction effect between  
220 entrepreneur behavior and institutional context was statistically significant ( $F= 1.886$ ;  $P<0.01$ ,  $r^2 = 0.789$ ).

---

## 222 **10 Conclusions**

223 The thrust of this study was the determinants of the performances of the micro and small enterprises in the  
224 livestock sector in Northern Eastern Kenya -in the counties of Garissa, Wajir and Mandera, while anchoring  
225 it on institutional, Bricolage and resource based theories of entrepreneurship studies. In this regard, the main  
226 purpose of this study was to establish the extent to which institutional context affected the relationship between  
227 entrepreneurial behaviour and the performance of micro and small enterprises in the livestock sector in North  
228 Eastern Kenya. Entrepreneurial behaviour together with institutional theories is popular research lenses for  
229 entrepreneurship research (Landstrom, 2006;Boettke & Coyne, 2004). In order to achieve the four research  
230 objectives of this study, basic descriptive statistical nominal and ordinal data analyses were used.

231 The study found that about 18% of the MSEs were "somewhat thriving" and the majority, 82% were  
232 "performing poorly, only surviving." Past studies, Delmar (1996) and Boettke and Coyne (2004) also confirmed  
233 that entrepreneurs interest in the businessdetermination and attitude to the growth of the firm were the most  
234 important individually related variables. Motivation was completely dominant as representative of individual  
235 differences of the owners of the MSEs. It was also noted that entrepreneurs who had chosen to concentrate  
236 on few customers also performed better than those who focused on the general public. The study finds that  
237 institutional context has positive significant moderating influence on the relationship between entrepreneurial  
238 behaviour and the performance of micro and small enterprises.

239 The overall conclusions for this study based from the data analyses, literature and the findings are that  
240 policy makers, practitioners and scholars in the discipline of entrepreneurship need pay greater attention to  
241 entrepreneurial behaviour, institutional context in order to secure better sustained growth of micro, and small  
242 enterprises in the livestock sector and in all others sectors in general.

## 243 **11 VI. Implications for Theory, Policy, Practice and Further 244 Research**

245 The findings and conclusions of this paper have a number of theory, policy and practical managerial implications.  
246 As concerns theories, this study was anchored on institutional and resource based theories. This paper makes  
247 the following recommendations for which have implications for theory, policy and practical managerial. A  
248 number of theories such as heterogeneity demand theory, differential advantage theory, resource heterogeneity and  
249 competence based theories share an emphasis on internal aspect of the firm as determinants of firm performance.  
250 However, institutional theory focuses on the external aspect of the firm as the drivers of firm survival and growth.  
251 Bricolage and effectuation theories address the behaviour of entrepreneurs in resource scarce environment. This  
252 is a major implication of entrepreneurship theory.

253 The findings and conclusions of this paper also suggest three major policy approaches: Facilitating access to  
254 financial capital for livestock trade, empowering livestock producers through provision of information on market  
255 prices, government regulations, veterinary services, buyers preferences, supply and demand of animals in major  
256 terminal markets and lowering market costs.

257 This paper is also useful for managers of micro and small enterprises. This study has observed that one of the  
258 major constraints facing the MSEs is inadequate management skills. The second major constraints facing the  
259 firms in the industry are inadequate access to funding.

260 The managerial implication here is that the firms should form associations and join the existing SACCOs  
261 in the sector such as the USAID funded Community Owned Finance Institute (COFI). The third managerial  
262 implication is that very few of the firm are in the export sector. Whereas, the data of FAO 2014 online indicates  
263 Somalia exported live livestock valued US\$ 360 million and Ethiopia exported livestock worth US\$ 150 million,  
264 there were no figures available for Kenya. It is for this reason that this study has managerial implication for the  
265 firms in the sector to be export oriented if they wish to be bigger and stronger. The fourth managerial implication  
266 is that the study finds that majority of entrepreneurs in the sector have low human capital in terms of education  
267 and business skills training. Therefore the study has shown the relationship of these critical factors surrounding  
the performance of MSEs and suggested alternative approaches to addressing constraints arising <sup>1 2 3</sup>

1

50

Figure 1: Table 1 :

268

<sup>1</sup>Entrepreneurial Behaviour, Institutional Context and Performance of Micro and Small Livestock Enterprises in North Eastern Region of Kenya

<sup>2</sup>© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US) 1

<sup>3</sup>© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US)

## 11 VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY, POLICY, PRACTICE AND FURTHER RESEARCH

---

22

Source	Type	III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model 1EB * SI						
Intercept		574.609	1	574.609	4472.996	.000
Entrepreneurial (EB)		17.760	40	.444	3.456	.000
Social Institutions (SI)		8.936	22	.406	3.162	.000
EB * SI		15.598	52	.300	2.335	.001
Error		8.222	64	.128		
Total		1229.924	188			
a. R Squared = .887 (Adjusted R Squared = .670)						
Model 2EB * EI						
Intercept		651.630	1	651.630	3654.190	.000
Entrepreneurial Behaviour		15.546	35	.444	2.491	.001
Economic Institutions (EI)		15.255	41	.372	2.086	.004
EB * EI		7.454	35	.213	1.194	.267
Error		11.056	62	.178		
Total		1229.924	188			
a. R Squared = .848 (Adjusted R Squared = .542)						
Model 3EB * SI_EI						
Intercept		819.752	1	819.752	9976.947	.000
EB		2.701	18	.150	1.826	.055
SI_EI		28.711	88	.326	3.971	.000
EB * SI_EI		1.395	9	.155	1.886	.082
Error		3.369	41	.082		
Total		1229.924	188			
a. R Squared = .954 (Adjusted R Squared = .789)						
Dependent Variable: Performance						

Figure 2: Table 2 Table 2 :

Year  
52  
Volume XVI Issue IX Version I  
)  
(  
Global Journal of Management and Business Research

Figure 3:

269 .1 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

270 Volume XVI Issue IX Version I Year ( ) A from them, both at the firm level and in the large context of the  
271 MSEs. This paper recommends that future studies should investigate individual social and economic institutional  
272 variables that directly influence performance of MSEs (not investigated in this paper) while taking into account  
273 contextually different settings of causation and effectuation as popularized by Sarasvathy (2001), that is resource  
274 constraints, uncertainty and dynamic business environment. The fact that 78.9% of the variables in the MSEs  
275 performance was explained by the two independent study variables in this study still leaves 21.1% unexplained.  
276 In other words, there are other additional variables within or outside these study themes -variables that are  
277 important in explaining MSEs performance that have not been considered in this study. Therefore further  
278 research is recommended to explain more of the variables in the performance of MSEs in livestock sector in North  
279 Eastern Kenya, given the dynamic, multidimensional and complex nature of entrepreneurship.

280 .2 This page is intentionally left blank

281 [ Stockholm School of Economics] , *Stockholm School of Economics* Economic Research Institute.

282 [Entrepreneurship] , Entrepreneurship . New York: Prentice Hall International.

283 [Kuratko and Hodgetts ()] , D F Kuratko , R M Hodgetts . 2007.

284 [Covin and Slevin ()] *A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour. Entrepreneurship theory and*  
285 *practice*, J G Covin , D P Slevin . 1991. 16 p. .

286 [Sarasvathy ()] *Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to en-*  
287 *trepreneurial contingency. The academic of management review*, S Sarasvathy . 2001. 26 p. .

288 [Fisher ()] *Effectuation, causation and Bricolage. A behavioral comparison of emerging theories of entrepreneur-*  
289 *ship research. Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, G Fisher . 2012. 36 p. .

290 [Delmar ()] *Entrepreneurial behaviour and firm performance*, F Delmar . 1996. (Unpublished Phd Thesis)

291 [Khalid ()] *Entrepreneurial behaviour, social and economic institutions and performance of micro and small*  
292 *livestock enterprises in North Eastern Region*, B Khalid . 2015. Kenya. Nairobi: University of Nairobi, School  
293 of Business (PhD Thesis)

294 [Bird et al. ()] *Entrepreneurs behaviour: elucidation and measurement. Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, G  
295 Bird , L Schjøel , J R Baum . 2012. 36 p. .

296 [Ororo ()] *Entrepreneurship and social capital: A study of informal cross-border trade between Kenya and*  
297 *Tanzania*, R A Ororo . 2008. Nairobi: University of Nairobi, School of Business (PhD Thesis)

298 [Boettke and Coyne ()] 'Entrepreneurship behaviour and institutions' P Boettke , C Coyne . *Minniti (Ed)*  
299 *Entrepreneurship: The engine of growth*, (Westport CT) 2004. Praeger press. 1 p. .

300 [Rwigema ()] *Entrepreneurship: theory and practice*, V U Rwigema . 2011. Johannesburg: Oxford University  
301 Press. (nd ed.)

302 [Cantillon ()] *Essay on the nature of general commerce*, R Cantillon . 1734. London: Macmillan.

303 [Gok ()] *Garissa District development plan*, Gok . 2010. 2009-2013. Nairobi: Government Press.

304 [Herbert and Link ()] 'In search of the meaning of entrepreneurship'. R F Herbert , A N Link . *Small business*  
305 *economics* 1989. Kluwer academic publishers. (1) p. .

306 [Kirby ()] D A Kirby . *Entrepreneurship. London: The McGraw Hill*, 2003.

307 [Wilson ()] *Marketing Research: An Integrated Approach*, A Wilson . 2003. Prentice Hall.

308 [Landstrom ()] *Pioneers in entrepreneurship and small business research*, H Landstrom . 2006. Springerse  
309 Bookstore.

310 [Knips (2004)] *Review of the Livestock Sector in the Horn of Africa (IGAD Countries)*. FAO online database  
311 visited on, V Knips . 2004. 18 th Feb, 2012.

312 [Sanga ()] *Sh 278 million for three livestock export zones* . *The Standard*, B Sanga . 2014. September 2 nd P. 22.

313 [Stokes and Wilson ()] *Small business management & entrepreneurship (5 th ed)*, D Stokes , N Wilson . 2006.  
314 London: Thomson Learning Centre.

315 [Gok ()] *Socio-Economic Atlas of Kenya*, Gok . 2014. Nairobi: Government Printer.

316 [Maalu ()] *Succession strategy and performance of small medium family businesses in*, J Maalu . 2010. Nairobi,  
317 Kenya. Nairobi: University of Nairobi, School of Business (Unpublished PhD Thesis)

318 [Khayesi ()] *The double edged sword of socio capital: Three essays on entrepreneurship in developing nations*, J  
319 Khayesi . 2010. Lausanne. University of Lausanne (PhD Thesis)

320 [Parker ()] *The economics of selfemployment and entrepreneurship*, S C Parker . 2004. Cambridge: Cambridge  
321 University Press.

322 [Gathoni (2014)] *What must be done to livestock sector in Kenya*, R Gathoni . 2014. Tuesday August 15. p. 13.