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ABSTRACT

People affected by disability represent a critical segment in national development agenda but they account for the highest proportion of the poor. Yet the role of leadership in poverty reduction among people affected by disability, and particularly, the inclusion of disability in leadership development discourse in Kenya is limited. Using a case of Action Network for the Disabled (ANDY), this study sought to establish the influence of self-leadership behaviors on poverty reduction and evaluate the contribution of leadership empowerment programs to lifting this neglected constituent from the vicious circle of poverty. Cross-sectional research design was used. A modest population of 54 program beneficiaries was targeted. The data was collected through a combination of tools such as structured questionnaire ($\alpha>0.7$), interview guide and document analysis. Spearman’s rho was used to draw inferences and hierarchical regression modelling technique helped test the hypotheses. Data was analyzed using SPSS version 20 and Nvivo software. Results revealed that two dimensions of self-leadership influenced multidimensional poverty scores to a statistically significant degree. These were: self-goal setting ($r_s=-.396$, $p<0.01$) and positive affect ($r_s=-.348$, $p<0.05$). The composite measure of self-leadership explained 7.9% of the variability in multi-dimensional poverty scores ($p<.01$). Specifically, one unit increase in self-leadership behaviours caused a 2.735 unit reduction in multi-dimensional poverty score. Empowering leadership interventions had the highest influence on multi-dimensional poverty scores ($r_s=-.491$, $p<.01$) and improved the predictive power of the overall model by 29.7% from 7.9% to 37.6%. Thus the null hypotheses were rejected and alternate hypotheses supported: self-leadership predicted poverty eradication and empowering leadership interventions strengthened it. The managerial implication is that encouraging program beneficiaries and coaching dimensions of empowering leadership stand out in terms of impact and make a case for future reallocation of program resources. In terms of theory development, positive affect and self-goal setting elements of self-leadership emerge as the two dimensions that survived empirical testing and thus warrant retention in the conceptual framework. A Full-range Empowerment Model has been proposed. A future study can expand on this study by collecting data from a larger and diverse population of people affected by disability. Further investigation using weighted poverty indices might also expose the factors hiding in the error term.
LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Components of functioning and disability...........................................21
Table 2.2: A synthesis of the research gaps ..............................................................37
Table 3.1: Population distribution ...........................................................................41
Table 3.2: Sampling matrix .......................................................................................42
Table 3.3: Reliability statistics ..................................................................................46
Table 4.1: Response rate ..........................................................................................50
Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents by number of dependants .........................53
Table 4.3: Distribution of respondents by level of education ....................................54
Table 4.4: Distribution of respondents by basic needs met .......................................56
Table 4.5: Distribution of respondents by number of basic items met .......................57
Table 4.6: Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Andy Program impact .............60
Table 4.7: Descriptive analysis of positive affect dimensions ....................................62
Table 4.8: Correlation between positive affect and multi-dimensional poverty ........63
Table 4.9: Descriptive statistics of respondents’ self-goal setting .............................65
Table 4.10: Correlation between Self-Goal Setting and Multi-Dimensional Poverty 67
Table 4.11: Descriptive statistics of respondents’ self-determination .........................68
Table 4.12: Correlation between Self-Determination and Poverty Reduction ............71
Table 4.13: Descriptive statistics of respondents’ self-resilience dimensions .............72
Table 4.14: Correlation between self-resilience and multi-dimensional poverty .......75
Table 4.15: Views on role-modelling by Andy Officers ............................................76
Table 4.16: Views on Andy Officer encouraging participation on beneficiaries .........78
Table 4.17: Views on the practice of coaching by Andy Officers ............................81
Table 4.18: Views on the practice of informing by Andy Officers ............................88
Table 4.19: Views on the practice of showing concern by Andy Officers ...............91
Table 4.20: Correlation between empowering leadership and MPS .......................96
Table 4.21: Hierarchical regression model summary .............................................97
Table 4.22: ANOVAa ...............................................................................................97
Table 4.23: Coefficientsa .........................................................................................98
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Bio-psychosocial model of disability .......................................................... 19
Figure 2.2: Disability and poverty vicious circle ................................................................. 22
Figure 2.3: From disability to poverty .................................................................................. 23
Figure 2.4: Conceptual framework ....................................................................................... 35
Figure 4.1: Distribution of respondents by gender ............................................................... 50
Figure 4.2: Respondents’ marital status ............................................................................... 52
Figure 4.3: Distribution of respondents by number of basic needs met ......................... 54
Figure 4.4: Year respondents started benefiting from Andy Programs ....................... 57
Figure 4.5: Andy support program received ....................................................................... 58
Figure 4.6: Suggestions for improvement of leadership empowerment ....................... 100
Figure 4.7: Self-help model of inspiration for leadership and empowerment ............ 109
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDY</td>
<td>Action Network for the Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>African Union Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLQ</td>
<td>Abbreviated Self-leadership Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELQ</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership composite score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSRC</td>
<td>Human Sciences Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNCHR</td>
<td>Kenya National Commission on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPIs</td>
<td>Multidimensional Poverty Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>Multidimensional Poverty Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOSTI</td>
<td>National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAPD</td>
<td>National Coordinating Agency for Population and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>New International Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Pan Africa Christian University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>Republic of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB</td>
<td>Self-leadership Behaviour composite score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMILE</td>
<td>Self-help Model of Inspiration for Leadership and Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Disability: Disability is an umbrella term that denotes the negative collusion between one’s health condition and the numerous environmental and personal factors associated with various forms of impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions (Mitra, Posarac, & Vick, 2011). In this study, the term “disability” has been used to refer to all forms of impairments encompassed in the legal definition found in the Persons with Disabilities Act Cap.133 of the Laws of Kenya and that adversely affect the individual’s socioeconomic and environmental participation (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

Empowering leadership: This refers to an approach to leadership characterized by the provision of support to subordinates through information, training, coaching, emotional care and encouragement (Fong & Snape, 2015). This term has been operationalized in the current study as a leadership attitude and behavior oriented towards coaching, role-modelling, informing, encouraging participation and showing concern.

People affected by disability: These are individuals living with disability or their families, be they parents, siblings or legal custodians as implied in the spirit and purpose of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2008). In this study, the term has been used to refer to people living with disability and those who have parental responsibility over them as defined in the Children’s Act Cap. 141 Laws of Kenya (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

Positive affect: This refers to individual’s feelings and emotions that enhance his or her adaptation to life’s challenges and stresses (Coob et al., 2010). This has
been operationalized in the current study as behaviours characterized by cheerfulness, calmness, activity, confidence and enthusiasm.

**Poverty:** This refers to the deprivation of humans of their basic necessities of life when their earnings are compared to a threshold that represents a judgment about the income needed to maintain a standard of living perceived to be acceptable (Kasali, 2016). An expanded definition of poverty in Kenya as documented in a publication of the World Bank (2008) puts this term into context. According to this definition, people in poverty “are never sure of their next meal, depend on others for survival, live in dilapidated housing, are poorly dressed, do not own property, are always in poor health and unable to afford education for their children” (p. 19). Both definitions have been used to operationalize the term poverty in this study as the multidimensional deprivation in terms measured by education, health, decent living conditions, gainful employment and income.

**Poverty reduction:** This is the development and implementation of targeted interventions towards the allocation of scarce resources to activities likely to reduce the deprivations and vulnerabilities of the poor (Aryeetey & Kanbur, 2007). In this study, the term “poverty reduction” means the decrease in multidimensional poverty of people affected by disability as measured by education, health, living conditions, employment and income.

**Self-determination:** This is the predisposition of an individual to act as the causal agent in one’s life (Zucker & Holloway-Libell, 2015). The term is conceptualized in this study as one’s feeling that he/she freely initiate and regulate his/her own action or control his/her own destiny. It is depicted through problem solving, self-awareness, self-advocacy, choice making and independent action.
Self-goal setting: This is the tendency to act as the number one agent of change in one’s life and to choose one’s action devoid of undue external force or influences (Gragoudas, 2012). The term is simply defined in this study as the identification and commitment to one’s own specific desirable end result and is measured through individual’s goal clarity, level of challenge, goal commitment, milestones of success and goal attainment.

Self-leadership: This is the ability to steer oneself in a manner that fits one’s uniqueness and makes it possible for the individual to realize goals that are relevant to him or her (Bryant & Kazan, 2012). In this study, the term self-leadership refers to is the act of self-influence demonstrated through an individual’s self-goal setting, self-determination, positive affect and self-resilience.

Self-resilience: This is the quality of an individual to quickly recover to the original state or condition after being pressed and crushed whether physically or psychologically (Bryant & Kazan, 2012). In this study, the term refers to the ability of people affected by disability to demonstrate adaptability, flexibility, persistence, hardiness and courage.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter provides a background overview of the concept of self-leadership and links self-leadership behaviours to the global challenge of poverty reduction. It recounts the worldwide trend on poverty reduction efforts and looks at the issue of poverty among people affected by disability. The chapter then discusses the problem and states the objectives of the study as well as research questions. The objectives, hypotheses, significance of the study, its scope and its limitations are also provided.

Background to the Study

An ancient Chinese philosopher is cited to have once said; “the best of all leaders is the one who helps people so that, eventually, they don’t need him” (Hoover, 2004, p. 123). This means that the leader’s role in the life of followers is that of empowerment. This saying underscores a leader’s role in fostering self-leadership in the led, a concept which is growing in importance in disability studies (Furtner, Sachse & Exenberger, 2012). Self-leadership refers to an individual’s ability to steer himself or herself in a manner that fits his or her uniqueness and makes it possible for the individual to realize goals that are relevant to him or her (Bryant & Kazan, 2012). According to Persily (2013), empowering leaders, motivated by the belief that every individual has something to offer, set up situations in which the led can self-lead using their own talents to realize positive change upon their situation.

Self-leadership programs are meant to enable the led to focus on what they can do to be the best they can be (Bryant & Kazan, 2012). Self-leadership is therefore a
paradigm shift in leadership practice that emphasize follower’s self-influence. In this case, the leader leads others towards self-influence in order to realize better life outcomes based on the conviction that those being led are a repository of wisdom and can direct themselves to bring about a positive transformation in their lives and the lives of others if an enabling environment exist for them to nurture and develop their own potential (Neck, 2006).

The currency of self-leadership programs resides in the fact that they are motivational in nature because they focus on motivating people to develop behaviours that enable them to willingly contribute extra effort to their work and their organizations by fulfilling their higher-order needs for self-enhancement, by generating a strong identification with the group in which they belong, and by inducing high-quality social exchanges between them and their leaders (Huang & Bond, 2012).

*Poverty reduction*

Efforts to influence all the self-leadership behaviours hitherto discussed, through self-leadership empowerment programs are gradually gaining recognition as an alternative solution to realizing Sustainable Development Goal Number One, namely - poverty reduction in all its forms and dimensions (United Nations Development Programme, 2017). Poverty refers to the deprivation of humans of their basic necessities of life (Kasali, Ahmad, & Ean, 2016). According to Saunders, Wong and Wong (2014), poverty can be analyzed by making a comparison of one’s earnings with a threshold that represents a judgment about the income needed to maintain a standard of living perceived to be acceptable.
The first method focuses on income poverty whereas the other approach dwells on deprivation, and the two approaches differ significantly in the way underlying constructs are brought out and operationalized (Brucker, Mitra, Chaitoo, & Mauro, 2015). Poverty looks at the ability to support basic living standards from income, whereas deprivation is anchored on the views of the community regarding the items considered essential to sustain a minimum living standard that is acceptable and then characterize those without these items as deprived. When the number of items the individuals deprived of are equal to or over a set criteria, the individual is said to be multi-dimensionally poor (Brucker et al., 2015).

Agenda 2030 which constitutes the post-2015 United Nations’ (UN) sustainable development framework acknowledges that reducing all forms and dimensions of poverty is the number one global challenge which should be addressed through a multipronged approach for the benefit of the present and future generation (Godia, 2015). This is recognized by the African Union’s Agenda 2063 framework which communicates the AU’s determination to eradicate poverty as one of the most pressing problem in the continent (African Union Commission, 2015). Conservative estimates suggest that 1.7 billion people live under the international extreme poverty cut-off of less than $2 a day (Kasali et al., 2016). When adjusted for cost-of-living differences across nations, it is estimated that nearly two billion people live on less than $3.10 per day in emerging and developing countries (ILO, 2016) with Sub-Saharan Africa being home to the highest majority of people living below the poverty line (UN, 2015). It is instructive to recognize that disabled persons account for the highest share of the poor, with estimates indicating that 1 billion people are affected by one or multiple forms of disability (UN, 2011).
According to the Institute of Security Studies (2015), Kenya ranks 6th out of the top 10 Sub-Saharan nations having the largest populations living in extreme poverty. Thus puts the country in the global map for targeted intervention programs. The country is in fact one of four African nations where poverty increased over the last decade (Pew Research Centre, 2015). Data published by the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2014) indicates that the country’s national poverty rate is 45.2%, with some scholars suggesting a higher figure of 53% (Bryant, 2013). This means that Kenya has one of the highest poverty rates in the world. The 2005-2015 Multidimensional Poverty Index statistics published in the United Nations Human Development report that 36% of Kenyans fall in the multidimensional poverty bracket, of which 46% are intensely deprived (Ocampo, 2016).

The foregoing statistics imply that about half of Kenya’s over 40 million people live below the poverty line. According to a definition of poverty in Kenya published by the World Bank (2008, p.19), these people “are never sure of their next meal, depend on others for survival, live in dilapidated housing, are poorly dressed, do not own property, are always in poor health and unable to afford education for their children”. At policy level, poverty in Kenya is measured based on the total household consumption against a set threshold (United Nations, 2010).

Poverty reduction among people affected by disabilities

People affected by disability – defined as individuals living with disability or their families – come in different types and forms such as physical, mental or sensory impairment (World Health Organization, 2017). In Kenya, more than four forms of disabilities have been acknowledged in policy. These include but not limited to: physical impairment, mental impairment, visual impairment, hearing impairment and
albinism (ROK, 2012). There are wide ranging types of disability within each form. These forms are typically characterized by outward manifestations such as speech, cognitive, memory, learning, movement, social and behavioral difficulties.

People with disability are often marginalized socially and have significantly reduced opportunities for accessing healthcare, school or getting a job, which exacerbate their poverty – a situation that affects both the disabled person and their family (Banks, Kuper, & Polack, 2017). This viewpoint is well elucidated by Palmer (2011) who asserts that disability is not a one-person phenomenon. Palmer argues that poor earnings and extra expenses associated with taking care of a disabled member can interfere with lifestyle and standard of living of other members of the family. Palmer’s claims are supported by empirical evidence. For instance, in an estimate of how disability impacts households in Cambodia, Palmer, Williams and McPake (2016) found that having a member of the household who has a disability raises the income needed for the household to achieve the same standard of living as a household without a member with a disability by 17%. The same study revealed that the additional cost of disability raises poverty levels of affected families as the poverty rates rise from 18% to 34%; and households from low income backgrounds affected by disability fall 7% below the poverty line on average, in comparison to 3% disability costs are excluded. This exposes the people affected by disability to the risks of sinking deep into poverty.

According to Phinilla-Roncancio (2015), people affected by disability find themselves among the poorest of the poor and face social exclusion from basic services associated with healthcare, schooling and occupation; their savings are fewer and assets limited. Phinilla-Roncancio further contends that in developing nations,
disability opportunity costs are borne by the family. This is due to a scarcity of services such as social protection that can cover these costs and the lack of recognition of the role of the family as a welfare institution. This is because the needs of people with disabilities are unique and should be covered. Most often, the unique needs stretches family income, creating a poverty trap. Disability has therefore been earmarked as a key developmental issue in fulfilling the UN Sustainable Development Goals and reducing poverty in society (Palmer, 2011).

It has been documented that 25 percent of the global population have a member with disability (UN, 2011). In Kenya, one of the most recent national survey was undertaken in the year 2008. The report by the National Coordinating Agency for Population and Development (2008) indicated that 1 in 10 Kenyans experience some form of disability and 65% of persons with disability regarded both the physical and socioeconomic environment as a major problem in their daily lives. Of critical importance is the observation that people with disability are least hired and, if lucky to be employed, are the first casualty of any redundancy program (UN, 2011).

An index of economic status of people with disability in Kenya shows that disability prevalence is almost double among the poor. A report compiled by Mitra, Posarac and Vick (2011) indicated that Kenya is ranked among the top 5 countries with the most poverty stricken groups within people with disabilities. The report noted that disability occurrence among those who are multi-dimensionally poor is nearly twice as high as prevalence of disability among the non-poor. Further, 36% of households with people living with disability in Kenya are at the tail end of asset index scores. With the most recent national census data indicating that over 1.3 million people in Kenya live with one disability or another (KNCHR, 2016), people
affected by disability represent a critical segment in national development agenda. Yet research attention on the disability-poverty nexus in general and the role of leadership in poverty reduction among people affected by disability in particular is sparse (Pinilla-Roncancio, 2015).

Some scholars have proposed that the prevailing poverty rates in Africa has a lot to do with the state of African leadership (Poncian & Mgaya, 2015). This view underscores the need to put the practice of leadership in Africa into perspective. This perspective is supported by Katola and Nyabwari (2013) who asserted that poverty in Africa is as a result of wrong leadership. These authors put emphasis on the need to equip the poor with skills to bring them out of their poverty situations, which calls for a search for the right kind of leadership. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and donor agencies are now recognizing the importance of tackling disability matters from a leadership perspective to achieve meaningful reduction of poverty levels and are prioritizing self-empowerment intervention strategies (Kett, Lang, & Trani, 2011).

Self-leadership empowerment programs at Action Network for the Disabled

One of the organizations in Kenya whose approach to poverty reduction among people affected by disability and can be equated with the self-leadership paradigm is Action Network for the Disabled (ANDY). With a history dating back to its inception in the year 2009, ANDY is an NGO whose mission is to advance and advocate for equal opportunities for people affected by disability by promoting proactive social and economic participation (ANDY, 2017).

The scope of ANDY programs included three key areas. The first one was economic empowerment with a focus on realizing self-potential. It also sought to develop leadership capacity of persons affected by disability. The goal of this
program was to enhance the capacity of disabled youth in order to enable them realize their visions through self-leadership mentorship aimed at nurturing their talents into a source of livelihood in the long run. The third one was sports and recreation. The goal of this program was to promote social participation through sports and recreational activities as a tool for personal development. This was based on the belief that sports and health are related as sports contribute to increasing mobility skills, social skills and self-esteem (ANDY, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

A review of community based intervention models by Mousavi (2015) suggest that self-leadership approaches to poverty reduction can expand the capabilities of those affected by disability and cultivate a mindset characterized by positive affect, self-goal setting and resilience. However, empirical support for this claim in the Kenyan context is sparse. Minja’s (2013) study of effective leadership concluded that self-leadership is the foundation of all leadership but did not relate self-leadership to poverty reduction outcomes or to people with disabilities.

This study responded to calls for research on poverty among people affected by disability given that such people are found to be significantly worse off in Kenya (Mitra et al., 2011). A number of programs have been designed to reduce poverty among people living and those affected by disability. There is a growing need to empirically measure the influence of these interventions and programs in developing countries, more so, the influence of self-leadership interventions in behavior modification as suggested by Mitra et al. (2011). The present research sought to fill this knowledge gap with reference to self-leadership behaviours of people affected by disability.
Purpose of the Study

The study purpose was to establish the influence of self-leadership behaviors on poverty reduction among people affected by disability. It also sought to evaluate the contribution of leadership empowerment programs to lifting this neglected constituent from the vicious circle of poverty.

Objectives

This study sought to achieve five specific objectives:

i. To determine the influence of positive affect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

ii. To establish the influence of self-goal setting on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

iii. To determine the influence of self-determination on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

iv. To evaluate the influence of self-resilience on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

v. To test the strengthening effect of empowering leadership on the relationship between self-leadership and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

Research Questions

i. What is the influence of positive affect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya?

ii. Is there a relationship between self-goal setting and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya?
iii. What is the influence of self-determination on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya?

iv. How does self-resilience influence poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya?

v. Does empowering leadership strengthen the relationship between self-leadership and poverty reduction among people affected by disability?

Hypothesis

Two hypotheses were constructed as follows;

H_{01}: Self-leadership behaviours have no effect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

H_{02}: Empowering leadership does not strengthen the relationship between self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

Assumptions of the Study

The study made the following assumptions;

i) Leadership empowerment programs by the case organization to the target population would continue throughout the life of the study and beyond.

ii) The views expressed by the respondents were a true reflection of their innermost feelings about the subject of study.

iii) The target population was a fair representation of all people affected by disability who are recipients of ANDY programs.

iv) The study results are generalizable.
Rationale

Knowledge of the role of self-leadership behaviours in poverty alleviation among people affected by disabilities in Kenya is sparse. This study is thus significant in the sense that it fills the information gap on effectiveness of self-leadership programs in helping eradicate poverty among people with disabilities and their families who continue to be a marginalized and excluded constituent from current leadership development discourse.

Significance of the Study

The study will be useful to a number of stakeholders. It will inform ANDY in the development of leadership training curricula targeting people affected by disability towards mainstreaming disability issues within national development as a contribution to the achievement of sustainable development goals. It also illuminates the contribution of empowerment leadership programs as a tool for poverty reduction among people with disability which can be scaled nationally if the contribution is significant. The study will also inform government policy decisions and implementation of programs on people with disabilities. The study will also inspire people with disability to adopt self-leadership as an approach to poverty reduction. Other scholars who wish to extend studies on the area of self-leadership might use the report as a reference point.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study was ANDY’s operations in Nairobi County. Data was collected from both male and female respondents affected by disability who benefited from ANDY’s empowerment programs. Only program beneficiaries who had attained
the age of 18 years and above at the time of the research were targeted. Program beneficiaries below the age of 18 years were outside the scope of this study. Also, the study area was predominantly urban, which was not representative of populations in rural areas. Although ANDY engages in a variety of programs towards the emancipation of people with disabilities, the study variables were limited to two key activities in which self-leadership intervention is potentially most manifest. These are: economic empowerment and capacity development. The study focused on positive affect, self-resilience, self-determination and goal setting dimensions of self-leadership.

Limitations

A number of factors presented challenges in undertaking this study. Firstly, because the nature of ANDY programs involved a lot of fieldwork, the staff were not available for interview within the timeframe for undertaking the research. This problem was compensated for by extending the study time-frame and undertaking document analysis. The second challenge faced was language barrier since some participants were unable to understand English language which was used for the research instrument. This problem was resolved by administering the instrument face to face, hence allowing for translation of the questions in Kiswahili. Another shortcoming of the study was the lack of baseline data to make comparison. The research relied on recall ability of respondents on their economic status at before the start of the program as the basis of their answers. The study was based on NGO mode of operation which is different from approaches by governmental programs and this might limit generalizability. Future research directions have been suggested in the final chapter to fill this gap.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the general conceptual and contextual background to the study and discussed elements of self-leadership, poverty reduction as a sustainable development issue, trends in poverty among people affected by disability and various interventions including the self-leadership empowerment programs by ANDY. The problem under investigation has been stated and the purpose, objectives and research questions outlined. The chapter has provided two hypotheses and proceeded to make assumptions and provide the study’s rationale. The significance of the study have been explained as well as the scope, limitations and delimitations. The next chapter reviews the pertinent literature.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter reviews the empirical and theoretical literature related to the study and presents the conceptual framework. The chapter begins with a review of poverty reduction within disability studies to provide both a conceptual and contextual understanding of how poverty is understood as it relates to people affected by disability. This is important to demonstrate the relationship that exist between disability and poverty reduction based on past studies in order to provide a mural upon which self-leadership behaviours and programs can be understood. The chapter then reviews literature on the relationship between self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction and considers how the findings can be extended to poverty reduction among people affected with disability. The theoretical framework upon which the study was grounded is then discussed. The study variables are then extracted from the literature review to develop a conceptual framework that guided the current study.

The Concept of Self-Leadership

Self-leadership is conceptualized as the ability to steer oneself in a manner that fits one’s uniqueness and makes it possible for the individual to realize goals that are relevant to him or her (Bryant & Kazan, 2012). Strategies associated with self-leadership programs put emphasis on self-leadership behaviours such as positive affect, self-goal setting, self-determination and self-resilience; with the leader focusing on creating a favorable environment for these self-leadership habits to develop (Furtner, Sachse, & Exenberger, 2012).
Positive affect dimension

Positive affect is the individual’s feelings and emotions that enhance his or her adaptation to life’s challenges and stresses (Gloria, Faulk, & Steinhardt, 2012). Such feelings include mood states of joy, interest and alertness (Miller, 2011). A daily dose of positive affect, from the viewpoint of Leger, Charles, Turiano and Almedia (2016), is characterized by the individual’s cheerfulness, calmness, enthusiasm, attentiveness, activity and confidence as opposed to feelings of nervousness, worthlessness, hopelessness, loneliness, fear, irritability, shame, frustration and anger.

Koob, Le Moal and Thompson (2010) decomposed positive affect into two sub-classes: state positive affect which refers to short-lived feelings associated with pleasurable engagement with the environment, and trait positive affect which is a stable disposition towards positivity. The latter is considered independent of the environmental conditions and is found to have a positive contribution to the individual’s wellbeing. In addition, literature suggests that people who manifest positive affective behaviors raise their performance standards and increase their chances of better life outcomes (Gross, Semmer, Meier, Kalin, Jacobshagen, & Tschan, 2011). This concept springs from the realization that most people are driven by a longing for participation, ownership, belonging, competence, accomplishment, appreciation or meaning (Bryant & Kazan, 2012). The authors surmise that positive affect is thus a self-leadership behavior characterized by staying focused, enthused and excited about one’s own goals, despite environmental conditions. They expound further that it is about accepting that both good and bad things do happen but we can learn from those things and grow by making the best of either circumstance.
Goal-setting dimensions

Goal setting as an element of self-leadership is characterized by the identification and commitment to a specific desirable end result, fueled by a discontent with one’s present condition (Locke & Latham, 2006). The literature on goal setting frequently draws attention to five important elements. These are: goals must be specific (that is, the exact definition of what is being pursued is given), measurable (meaning it can be quantified), challenging but attainable (within the goal-implementer’s capability), realistic (i.e. whether existing and potential resources are available to help achieve the goal) and time-bound, meaning that a specific deadline is assigned to the goal (Lawlor & Hornyak, 2012; Lunenburg, 2011).

Self-goal setting is an aspect of behaviour encouraged on the belief that the mere existence of a goal serves to focus the individual’s attention and energy (Manz & Sims, 1991). An important point raised by self-leadership proponents is that this behaviour is a learned behaviour, thus, it can be developed over time, meaning that the skill can be acquired through leadership empowerment (Manz & Sims, 1991).

Self-determination dimension

According to Neck (2006), feelings of self-determination are at the core of the definitive meaning of self-leadership. De Zilva (2014) opines that self-determination conjures up images of autonomy over work behaviour such as deciding about work to engage in. People who have a sense of self-determination are self-driven, flexible, creative, resilient and self-regulated. Gragoudas (2012) asserts that training on how to be self-determined empowers people to lead themselves and take actions that create their own future. He further emphasized that people affected by disability must take stock of their capabilities and negotiate for inclusion and reasonable accommodations.
in the world of work. These elements have been delineated under distinct concepts such as problem solving, self-awareness, self-advocacy, choice making and independent action (Cote, Pierce, Higgins, Miller, Tandy, & Sparks, 2010).

Gragoudas (2012) associates leadership with self-determination by explaining self-determination as the tendency to act as the number one agent of change in one’s life and to choose one’s action devoid of undue external force or influences. According to Gragoudas, self-determination demands that the individual acquire knowledge, competence and a mindset that facilitates autonomous behaviour. This includes appreciating own talents, capabilities and limitations, along with self-confidence.

**Resilience dimension**

Resilience is another self-leadership behaviour that is critical for survival and growth in life (Howard & Irving, 2013). Bryant and Kazan (2012) define this term as the quality of an individual to quickly recover to the original state or condition after being pressed and crushed whether physically or psychologically. It is the mark of a self-leader to be flexible enough to adapt to changing situational demand and cope with adverse life events or circumstances (Howard & Irving, 2013). This self-leadership behaviour is regarded as an asset and individuals with resiliency skills realize greater positive life outcomes (Ray, 2014).

Elements associated with resilient behaviour include adaptability, flexibility, persistence, hardiness and courage (Dong, Nelson, & Shah-Haque, 2013). By definition, these behaviours can be learned and therefore a function of leadership development through an individual’s interaction with the environment (Southwick,
Bonanno, Masten, Panter-Brick, & Yehuda, 2014). The implication of this is that resilience can be enhanced through leadership empowerment programs.

Poverty Reduction among People Affected by Disability

Within the field of disability discourse, poverty reduction efforts approach the problem of poverty from three different lenses: individual perspective, social construction and bio-psychosocial model (Grue, 2011). One of the most extensive research in this area was done by Kikabhai (2014) who undertook a critical investigation of the issue of exclusion of individuals with learning disability from participating in higher education thereby limiting their chances of coming out of poverty. The individual lens frames poverty as the result of a disability that hinders one’s active participation in gainful work and community participation (Power, Dillane, & Devereux, 2014). On this respect, Kikabhai (2014) noted a dominant notion among scholars who perpetuated the idea that the individual, rather than the disability, was the problem and called for poverty reduction programs that aim to equip the person with disability with the appropriate skills to rehabilitate or “deal with it” (p.35). However, this lens also tackles the problem of poverty from a needs-based perspective, and calls for social actors such as the state and charitable organizations to provide social services to the disabled to help them rise out of poverty (Simplican, Leader, Kosciulek, & Leahy, 2015).

The second lens addresses the challenge of poverty reduction among people affected by disability as a social issue and draws attention to social forces at play (Boateng, 2014; Hudson, 2014). Proponents of this view construct poverty as a process of social exclusion of people affected by disability and is a product of uneven
development (Rouf, 2015). This has led to a demand for social changes to guarantee the active involvement of disabled persons in the economy. It is therefore rights-based, with a focus on changing policies to protect the human rights of disabled persons and mainstream them in the national development agenda as a solution to poverty reduction (Pinilla-Roncancio, 2015).

The third model is the bio-psychosocial model which understands the problem of poverty reduction among people affected by disability as the interaction between a health condition and social barriers (Mitra, 2011). World Health Organization (2002) represents this model as shown in figure 2.1.
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**Figure 2.1: Bio-psychosocial model of disability**


This model arose from the former models’ disregard of the role of the environment and is today favored within modern disability discourse as firmly
embedded in the International Classification of Disability and Health (World Health Organization, 2002). The model approaches the interaction between disability and poverty from a multidimensional lens and considers both the individual and measures such as education, employment, assets, living conditions, household expenditure and health service expenditure as mitigating factors against their efforts to rise out of poverty (Mitra, 2011). Thus, disability and poverty is construed as a function of “the interaction between a person with a health condition and the context in which they live” (Human Science Research Council, 2006, p.8).

The World Health Organization (2002) provides a summarized definition of the components of human functioning that characterize the bio-psychosocial model as shown in Table 2.1. In conceptualizing the nexus between disability and poverty reduction within these components, it is instructive to note that disability is heterogeneous. Pinilla-Roncancio (2015) expounds on this idea by explaining that the needs of people with disabilities vary depending on the type and severity of impairment, besides personal and social characteristics that underplay their vulnerability. He further argues that subject to the type of disability, different bio-psychosocial conditions may limit their access to basic opportunities and services such as education, health and employment and therefore interventions aiming to prevent, mitigate or overcome poverty for people affected by disability cannot be similar.
Table 2.1 Components of functioning and disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body function</th>
<th>Both physiological and psychological functions of body systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body structure</td>
<td>Anatomical parts of the body such as organs, limbs and their components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impairments</td>
<td>Problems in body functions or structures such as significant deviation or loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>The execution of a task or action by an individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Involvement in a life situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity limitations</td>
<td>Difficulties an individual may have in executing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation restrictions</td>
<td>Are problems an individual may experience in involvement in life situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>Factors that make up the physical, social and attitudinal environment in which people live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Both Figure 2.1 and Table 2.1 above illustrate how the disability, the individual and the environment interact to explain the multiplicity of issues that confront persons affected by disability in the course of life which come into the poverty reduction equation. Pinilla-Roncancio (2015) explains that the relationship between disability and poverty is equally complex and bidirectional, with social inclusion playing a key role. This interrelationship is depicted in Figure 2.2. From the figure, it can be deduced that social inclusion, equity as opposed to discrimination, access to basic opportunities and human capital development would lead to poverty reduction among people affected by disability. Typically, people affected by disability incur extra costs and barriers to healthcare, schooling and job opportunities and have to incur opportunity costs, which hinder their own efforts to alleviate poverty.
A United Nations report documented a growing consensus in disability studies that “the most pressing issue faced globally by persons with disabilities is not their specific disability, but rather their lack of equitable access to resources such as education, employment, healthcare and the social and legal support systems, resulting in persons with disabilities having disproportionately high rates of poverty” (UN, 2011, vii). Pinilla-Roncancio (2015) illustrated this relationship by showing the role of social exclusion as depicted in Figure 2.3. The figure demonstrates how exclusion from access to education, healthcare and gainful income activities plays a role at the intersection of disability and poverty. This interrelationship between disability, exclusion and poverty is found to be stronger in developing nations which have
inadequate systems for social protection cover to this population. This construction finds overwhelming support from a review of literature by Eide, Khupe, and Mannan (2014). From the illustration, it can be inferred that social inclusion as opposed to exclusion, is the key to poverty reduction among people affected by disability.

Figure 2.3: From disability to poverty

Source: Adaptation from Pinilla-Roncancio (2015, p.116)
A statistical analysis of the nexus between disability and poverty reduction undertaken by Eide and Ingstad (2013) confirmed extensive limitations in accessing services, a systematic configuration of lower living standards amongst people affected by disability in comparison to those not affected. Studies undertaken in South Africa revealed that disabled persons who were employed had a higher likelihood of getting employed either in the informal economy or in the formal economy but without written contracts (Graham, Moodley, Ismail, Munsaka, Ross, & Schneider, 2014). Empirical evidence suggest that this situation is exacerbated for disabled females, with narrative analysis from disabled women in countries such as Ghana citing discrimination as the greatest problem facing persons with disabilities in their efforts to rise out of poverty (Naami, 2015).

Eide, Khupe and Mannan (2014) highlighted important perspectives on existing knowledge of the association between disability and poverty reduction, the policy foundation for handling the rights of disabled persons, and cultural transformation as a central component in reducing discrimination. After exploring various constructions of poverty, they concluded that a critical view of current knowledge of disability and progress is basic to producing the knowledge needed to reduce poverty amongst people affected by disability. An important point to note from the review by Eide et al. (2014) is that while poverty is increasingly considered a multi-dimensional concept where various approaches to poverty reduction such as the basic needs approach, the economic resource approach and the capability approach have been promoted, discourse on the role of leadership in the disability-poverty reduction nexus has been conspicuously silent. As Martin et al. (2013) rightly argue, it is important to expand knowledge concerning what strategies leaders should pursue to
encourage self-leadership behaviours among persons affected by disability as a solution to the challenge of poverty. The next section makes a detailed review of the relationship between self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction.

Self-leadership Behaviours and Poverty Reduction

*Self-goal setting and poverty reduction*

Nuri (2015) studied the influence of goal setting on poverty reduction by undertaking field experiments in Indonesia, Colombia and Ethiopia. Nuri’s research was based on a case study of a successful empowerment program that created a structure for program beneficiaries to maximize their own abilities, resources and social networks. The study not only reported other studies that claimed that self-set goals influenced higher performance but also found a positive and significant influence of self-goal setting on poverty reduction as measured by growth in income. Through an incentive scheme that rewards initiatives, the participants in Nuri’s study developed the ingenuity and capacity to guide themselves out of poverty. For example, their earnings increased by 27 percent within a span of two years and 40 percent of the program beneficiaries were able to own their own homes within the same time span.

Another study was done by Rothwell, Bhaiji and Blumental (2013) who assessed the impact of self-goal setting behaviours enhanced by the program among Hawaiian poor populations. They found that the said program not only helped the beneficiaries to set their goals for the future but were able to accomplish their self-set goals through the program. The beneficiaries reported a wide array of tangible benefits (decent living conditions, better education, home-ownership and establishment of income generating) projects and intangible benefits (such as
increased self-awareness, increased self-confidence and self-efficacy). The program implementers believed in the participants, gave them self-esteem, developed their strengths and capabilities, guided them, encouraged them to develop self-improvement and coached them to maintain a positive perspective.

Both studies are suggestive of the potential positive effect of self-goal setting on poverty reduction in Kenya. However, there is no evidence to support the hypothesis that similar results can be obtained among people affected by disability. This was a gap in literature that the current study sought to fill.

*Self-determination and poverty reduction*

Chiu and Haines (2011) explored the construct of self-determination within the field of disability studies and found that self-determination is described as a psychological construct which view people as active contributors to their poverty status. In their study, self-determination was characterized as voluntary action that enable the person to act as the primary causal agent in one’s life and enact improvement in one’s own quality of life. A review of literature by Martin and Hill (2012) suggest that self-determination moderates the disability-poverty nexus because of its focus on the social-contextual conditions that lead to active involvement in one’s environment as opposed to isolation from and apathy towards the world. Yamamoto, Unruh and Bullis (2011) studied self-determination within a broader construct of self-empowerment through self-employment among people with disabilities in the US. Their study established the existence of a relationship between self-determination in employment for individuals with disabilities and poverty alleviation as well as self-sufficiency, skill development, self-worth and a sense of community.
In Africa, evidence of influence of self-determination on poverty reduction is implied in an empirical study by Lombard and Strydom (2011) who examined how community development through social entrepreneurship enabled program beneficiaries in South Africa to shift their attitude and mindset with regards to their role in poverty reduction. They observed that the relationship between self-determination and positive outcomes such as poverty reduction was enhanced where supportive social-contextual conditions existed to inspire feelings of competence. The study suggested that if people are supported through self-empowerment programs, they can take actions that significantly reduce the extent of their poverty and social deprivation. However, effectiveness in social-contextual measures resides in the recognition that social, economic and environmental barriers, rather than functional impairments, are the barriers to individual autonomy and self-determination (Morris, 2011). As such, people affected by disability should have a choice and control over how empowerment programs they might need is provided for them to realize autonomy and self-determination (Morris, 2011). It was not however clear whether the same conclusions can be made with respect to the social context in Kenya.

Positive affect and poverty reduction

Numerous empirical studies associate the basic tenets of positive affect to an individual’s predisposition to take appositive stance towards life experiences – a choice which exerts an important physiological functioning that enables people to grow, to flourish and to cope with the inevitable adversities of life (Alessandri, Vecchione, Tisak, Deiana, Caria, & Caprara, 2012; Bouckenoooghe & Raja, 2013; Steptoe & Wardle, 2011). The relationship between positive affect (PA) and poverty alleviation has been implied within the broader PA-work outcome nexus.
Citing evidence from studies in the US, Rothbard and Wilk (2011) reported studies that found that PA facilitates active engagement with others in their environments and greater cognitive availability, broadening their thought-action repertoires which is beneficial for productivity and improves economic outcomes. This proxy relationship manifest because positive affect energizes the individual and facilitate work-related behaviour such as problem solving (Letangule & Letting, 2012).

In a review of past empirical works, Naseem and Khalid (2010) established that positive affect engenders success across multiple life domains including high performance, work productivity and wealth creation. Steptoe and Wardle (2011) studied the power of positive affect among UK elderly people and found a significant association between higher levels of positive affect and resilience. In their view, positive affect motivates people to work and to endure environmental conditions to attain their goals. From this finding, it can be inferred that the relationship between positive affect and economic outcomes such as poverty reduction is implied (De Neve, Diener, Tay, & Xuereb, 2013). What is not known is whether the same results held true for people affected by disability.

**Resilience and poverty reduction**

Joscon (2016) investigated the concept of resilience in the context of poverty based on the experiences of low-income urban Filipino parents. Specifically, Joscon examined the protective factors that buffer the negative effects of poverty and adverse living conditions on low-income Filipino mothers and fathers. It was found that highly resilient parents were at lower risk of sinking deeper into poverty than parents
manifesting low resilience and that the level of resilience was contingent on protective factors in the parent’s environment.

Breitkruz, Wunderli, Savage and McConnell (2014) explored resilience in families of children with disabilities in the Province of Alberta, Canada. Their analysis which was based on 78 responsive interviews showed that resilient families were able to conduct their lives with a “business-as-usual” approach to their daily lives as compared to families who were less resilient and had reported that disability had overtaken their day-to-day routines and activities.

Other studies on resilience has been undertaken within the purview of self-leadership as it relates to entrepreneurial behaviour and economic outcomes (Bernard & Barbosa, 2016; Bullough, Renko, & Myatt, 2013). One such study was undertaken by Owens, Kirwan, Lounsbury, Levy and Gibson (2013) based on 143 small business owners in the US. It was found that after controlling for demographic factors, resilience explained the variability of economic outcomes to a statistically significant degree. However, similar studies among people affected by disability is sparse.

Theoretical Framework

The study was anchored on two leadership theories and one poverty reduction theory. The two theories are: Self-leadership Theory and Empowering Leadership Theory and the third theory is the Theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion.

Self-leadership theory

According to Neck (2006), the concept of self-leadership as a theory first appeared in the 1980s from a seminal work that featured in the Academy of Management Review. The article is credited to Manz (1986) who defined self-
leadership as the practice of influencing yourself to perform both naturally motivating tasks and managing yourself to perform work that, although not naturally motivating, must nonetheless be done. Manz subscribes to the view that “an existing reality is more in the mind of the beholder than in any physical sense” (Manz, 1986, p.594) thereby underscoring the importance of nurturing and developing self-leadership competences.

Neck (2006) observes that Manz (1986) laid the basic theoretical foundations of self-leadership which later became applied in two primary areas: self-managing teams and empowering leadership. Self-leadership proponents argue that the one person that an individual should change first in life is the self, and by so doing, the person is more able to influence his or her environment (Manz, 1986). Self-leadership is therefore significant because it enables one to live more authentic, fulfilled lives. Bryant and Kazan (2012) affirm that self-leadership forms the foundation for effective leadership and go ahead to claim that with self-leadership, we can manage stress and achieve peak performance. Self-leadership programs thus adopt a capability approach to the developmental issues affecting people with disabilities based on the argument that it is the capability to create well-being from needs rather than the needs themselves that determines poverty (Palmer, 2011).

The relevance of self-leadership theory to the study of poverty reduction among people affected by disabilities is implied in the works of Neck (2006) who asserted that the deployment of self-leadership approaches are associated with a number of foreseeable outcomes such as independence, productivity, psychological empowerment and self-efficacy. Neck proposed that future researchers should undertake to examine the hypothesized relationship between self-leadership and these
outcome variables in greater detail. The current study investigated these variables with respect to poverty reduction outcomes among people affected by disability.

**Empowering leadership theory**

According to Neck (2006), developers of the self-leadership concept prescribed self-leadership among group members as part and parcel of the self-managing process and it is about this time that the concept of empowering leadership began to be explored. Fulmer and Gelfand (2012) credit the development of empowering leadership to Caldwell and Dixon (2010), suggesting that empowering leadership is a recent theoretical development.

Empowering leadership is described as an archetype of leader behaviour characterized by offering support to subordinates through information, training, coaching, emotional support and encouragement (Fong & Snape, 2015). This view is supported by Bester, Stander and Van Zyl (2015) who assert that empowering leaders will share knowledge and assign responsibility, promote accountability, facilitate participation, be an example and show concern by paying attention and listening to followers.

According to Allen (2016), empowering means taking from the power available to us and sharing it in such a way that followers can grow and work with a greater degree of efficiency. This means that the role of an empowering leader is to train, team-build, trust and let go the people they lead (Diamond & Diamond, 2007). Empowering leadership thus heightens the significance of work by promoting involvement in decision making, encouraging autonomy, and showing confidence in follower performance (Auh, Menguc, & Jung, 2014).
Harris, Li, Boswell, Zhang and Xie (2014) examined how empowering leaders, in conjunction with contextual and relational factors facilitate follower creativity. Results showed that empowering leadership positively predicts creativity, with the relationship being contingent on the organizational context. These relationship was however moderated by follower trust in the leader and organizational support for creativity. An interrogation of empowering leadership theory was also undertaken by Lorinkova, Pearsall and Sims (2013) who found that teams who have empowering leaders at the helm record higher success over time because they enable increased levels of team learning, coordination and development of a mental model.

Since empowering leaders believe that followers themselves are an influential sources of wisdom and direction, and strive to develop followers who are effective at self-leadership (Neck, 2006), empowering leadership theory was applicable in examining the contributory role of empowering leadership programs in the nexus between self-leadership and poverty reduction among people affected by disabilities.

Theory of poverty and social exclusion

The theory of poverty and social exclusion was propounded by Jordan (1996) who put emphasis on the need to redirect poverty discourse away from the relationship between market and state towards individuals and groups that are taking actions to alleviate their own poverty and social exclusion. Social exclusion in this sense, is understood as a multi-dimensional phenomenon that involves deprivation on several fronts that define full-citizenship including “paid work and income, education, housing, health care, legal assistance and accessibility of public provisions” as well as “solidarity, social bonds and participation, integration, engagement, discrimination and norms of social citizenship” (Jehoel-Gijsbers & Vrooman, 2007, p.7). The theory
explains poverty and social exclusion from the lenses of the socially marginalized and the environment appropriate for causing social change (Jordan, 1996).

The theory’s focus on the multi-dimensionality of lives of those deprived from social participation because of their disability draws the attention of policy makers and implementers to view social inclusion of the excluded individuals and groups as a human right (Quin & Redmond, 2005). The theory seems to have influenced recent developments associated with government interventions on poverty reduction and economic empowerment in Kenya’s disability sector. For instance, both the Children’s Act and the Disability Act make provisions for the promotion of social inclusion of people affected by disability by protecting rights of access to social services such as education, healthcare, housing, labour, transport and other empowerment programs/affirmative actions that foster social and economic participation (ROK, 2012).

The theory of poverty and social exclusion was of particular importance to the current study when the issue of agency or responsibility for exclusion is raised. According to Ramachandran (2016), the actions of the affected persons themselves and various institutional actors can both function as “excluders”. Social exclusion is seen in this sense as the inescapable outcome of institutions which take away incentives for people to shape their own lives (that is, to self-lead) through both the safety net they provide and the incentives they offer in sustaining passivity of the excluded (Ramachandran, 2016). The theory provides the lens through which interventions by various institutions in the disability sector such as Andy’s empowerment programs and poverty of program beneficiaries intersect.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework shown in Figure 2.4 draws from the concept of self-leadership and empowering leadership theory. The arrow suggests the direction of the relationship. The four self-leadership behaviours, namely: self-goal setting, self-determination, self-resilience and positive affect constituted the independent variables.

Self-goal setting was measured through program beneficiaries’ self-report on setting specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound goals. Self-determination was represented by problem-solving, self-awareness, self-advocacy, choice making and independent action. Self-resilience was reflected in program beneficiaries’ flexibility, adaptability, persistence, hardiness and courage. Positive affect was shown by respondents’ cheerfulness, calmness, activity, confidence and enthusiasm.

Poverty reduction was measured by change in the individual’s Multidimensional Poverty Scores (MPS) on 17 items that measures five dimensions: education, health, living conditions, empowerment and income. Absolute scores were used.

Empowering leadership programs by ANDY through coaching, role-modelling, motivating, informing and encouraging participation were hypothesized to intervene in the relationship between self-leadership behavior and poverty reduction among people affected by disability.
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

- Self-goal setting
  - Goal clarity
  - Level of challenge
  - Goal commitment
  - Milestones of success
  - Goal attainment

- Self-determination
  - Problem solving
  - Self-awareness
  - Self-advocacy
  - Choice making
  - Independent action

- Positive affect
  - Cheerfulness
  - Calmness
  - Activity
  - Confidence
  - Enthusiasm

- Self-resilience
  - Adaptability
  - Flexibility
  - Persistence
  - Hardiness
  - Courage

MODERATING VARIABLE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Poverty reduction
Change in multidimensional poverty scores on five measures:
- Education
- Health
- Living conditions
- Employment
- Income

Empowering leadership programs
- Coaching
- Role-modelling
- Informing
- Encouraging participation
- Showing concern

Figure 2.4 Conceptual framework
A Synthesis of the Research Gaps

From the literature review, it can be inferred that a paucity of research exists with respect to self-leadership behaviours, interventions programs and poverty reduction among people affected by disability. Empirical studies on self-goal setting are suggestive of the potential positive effect of self-goal setting on poverty reduction in Kenya. However, there was no evidence to support the assumption that similar results could be obtained among people affected by disability.

Past research on the nexus between self-determination and poverty reduction suggest that people affected by disability should have a choice and control over how empowerment programs they might need is provided for them to realize autonomy and self-determination. It was not however clear whether the same conclusions could be arrived at with respect to the social context in Kenya.

It can also be inferred from research done on positive affect that a relationship exists between positive affect and economic outcomes such as poverty reduction. What was not known is whether the same results hold true for people affected by disability.

Studies on the concept of resilience indicate that resilience explains the variability of economic outcomes to a statistically significant degree. This means that self-resilience potentially affect poverty reduction. However, similar studies among people affected by disability was sparse. A synthesis of the research gaps is presented in Table 2.2. The current study attempted to close the identified literature gaps.
Table 2.2: *A synthesis of the research gaps*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key studies</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Research gaps</th>
<th>How this study addressed the gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership empowering behaviour, psychological empowerment, organisational citizenship behaviours and turnover intention in a manufacturing division.</td>
<td>Bester, J., Stander, M.W., &amp; Van Zyl, L.E. (2015)</td>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviors</td>
<td>Employees’ perception of their leaders’ empowering behavior predicts organizational citizenship</td>
<td>Study did not demonstrate the nexus between empowering leadership and follower self-leadership and its relationship to empowerment outcomes</td>
<td>The study tested the strengthening effect of empowering leadership with respect to people with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparing students with disabilities to transition from school to work through self-determination training.</td>
<td>Gragoudas, S. (2012)</td>
<td>Youth with disabilities and employment</td>
<td>By incorporating self-determination skills training into the curriculum for transition-aged youth with disabilities they will be prepared to enter and succeed in the labor force.</td>
<td>Study was not backed up by primary data</td>
<td>Primary research was undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Getting what’s new from new-comers: Empowering leadership, creativity and adjustment in the socialization context</td>
<td>Harris, T. B., Li, N., Boswell, W. R., Zhang, X., &amp; Xie, Z. (2014).</td>
<td>Creativity of new recruits in an organization</td>
<td>Empowering leadership positively predicts newcomer creativity contingent on the organizational context</td>
<td>Sample did not include persons with disability</td>
<td>Current study was based on people affected by disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key studies</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Knowledge gaps</td>
<td>How this study addressed the gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Examining the differential longitudinal performance of directive versus empowering leadership in teams</td>
<td>Lorinkova, N. M., Pearsall, M. J., &amp; Sims, H. P. (2013)</td>
<td>Compared outcomes of directive versus empowering leadership</td>
<td>Teams led by an empowering leader experience higher performance over time because of higher levels of team learning, coordination, empowerment, and mental model development.</td>
<td>Focused on organizational outcomes</td>
<td>The study focused on individual development outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The role of community based rehabilitation in poverty reduction</td>
<td>Mousavi, T. (2015)</td>
<td>Community based rehabilitation programs and disability</td>
<td>Community Based Rehabilitation can play a crucial role in poverty reduction programmes by expanding the capabilities of people with disabilities.</td>
<td>Impact of program on poverty reduction was not tested inferentially</td>
<td>Inferential statistics was applied to establish statistical significance in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social return on investment of an innovative employment option for persons with developmental disabilities</td>
<td>Owen, F., Li, J., Whittingham, L., Hope, J., Bishop, C., Readhead, A., &amp; Mook, L. (2015)</td>
<td>Social return on investment as a means of determining the value of program impacts</td>
<td>Program improved quality of life</td>
<td>Study was done in US, where social support programs is developed.</td>
<td>Study was based in Kenya and approached program impact from a leadership perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the theoretical and empirical review of existing literature. This entailed a review of the existing scholarly works on poverty reduction among people affected by disability. A critical review of past studies on the relationship between self-leadership behaviour and poverty reduction has been made. The chapter has also discussed the theories upon which the research was anchored. A summary and synthesis of the literature gaps has been made. Lastly, the conceptual framework has been explained. The next chapter discusses the methodology adopted.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the influence of self-leadership on poverty reduction among persons affected by disability. This chapter explains the methodology that was used to undertake the study. This includes the research design, target population, sampling procedure, research instruments, instrument validity and reliability, data collection procedure, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

Research Design

A cross-sectional research design using mixed methods approach was adopted. Mixed-methods research has been defined as an empirical study that integrates both quantitative and qualitative approaches to the collection and analysis of data (Almalki, 2006). The currency of mixed methods spring out of the limitations of a purely quantitative or purely quantitative methodology (Caruth, 2013). The benefit of this method, according to Almaki (2016) is that data from different sources, using different techniques are triangulated into a robust design. In this study, the mixed methods was used to establish levels of poverty among beneficiaries of Andy programs, describe self-leadership behaviour and empowering leadership programs and evaluate the association between self-leadership behaviour and poverty reduction as well as the moderating influence of empowering leadership programs based on information from multiple sources.
Target Population

The target population comprised 54 persons affected by disability who had benefited from ANDY programs. This population was drawn from three self-help groups in Nairobi County being supported by ANDY: parents of children in Kasarani Autism Unit (23), parents of children in Dagorretti Special School (20) and parents of children in Treeside Special School (11). The unit of analysis was the individual program beneficiary. This population comprised of parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder, cerebral palsy, dyslexia and other mental illnesses. Majority of these parents take their children to these public schools to benefit from Free Primary Education because of their low income status. The researcher was interested in this population group because members are at high risk of languishing in poverty when the responsibility of caring for a child with a disability is added to their low income status. Table 3.1 summarizes the population distribution.

Table 3.1: Population distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kasarani Autism Unit Parents</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treeside Special School Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagoretti Special School Parents</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ANDY (2017)

Sample

Since the population was small, all the members of the target population were included in the study. Thus, the sample was 54 respondents, representing 100% of the population size. Table 3.2 shows the sampling matrix. Kasarani Autism Unit parents
were 23, Treeside Special School parents were 11, and Dagoretti Special School parents were 20.

Table 3.2: *Sampling matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kasarani Autism Unit parents</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treeside Special School parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagoretti Special School parents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sampling Method**

Census was applied instead of sampling. In this technique, data is collected from all members of the target population (Cottrell & McKenzie, 2010). The inclusion of all members of the population into the study made the need for sampling irrelevant.

**Type of Data**

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Quantitative data was collected with respect to poverty reduction measures. On the other hand, qualitative data was in the form of respondents’ views regarding their own self-leadership behaviours and empowering leadership by ANDY officers as well as a review of documents and records obtained from ANDY website.

**Data Collection Methods**

Data was collected using a structured questionnaire for quantitative data, and in-depth interview and document analysis for qualitative data.
The questionnaire was divided into five sections as shown in Appendix II. The first section profiled respondents’ demographics such as age, gender, occupation and income. The second section comprised 17 multidimensional poverty indicators (MPIs) across five dimensions: education, health, living conditions, empowerment and income. The third section comprised a set of Likert scale statements measuring self-leadership behaviours. This was subdivided into four sub-sections with a battery of statements each measuring different self-leadership dimensions on a 5–point scale from 1= ‘never’ to 5= ‘always’. The four dimensions of self-leadership were: positive affect, self-goal setting, self-determination and self-resilience.

The fourth section comprised another set of Likert scale statements with respect to empowering leadership programs. This was based on Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) developed by Arnold, Rhoades, Arad and Drasgow (2000) which was adapted to suit the current study. Arnold et al. (2000) identify five elements that constitute empowering leadership behaviour, each with a battery of items on a 5-point scale where 1= ‘never’ and 5= ‘always’. The elements were: role-modelling, encouraging participation, coaching, informing and showing concern.

An interview guide was used to collect data from the Project Coordinator, an officer from ANDY who dealt directly with the three self-help groups in Nairobi County as shown in Appendix III. The guiding questions explored issues such as self-leadership behaviors promoted by the NGO, ways program beneficiaries have benefited most, challenges faced by the NGO in efforts to develop the self-leadership capacity of program beneficiaries, what could be done differently and advise to program beneficiaries.
Document analysis was also used to complement the data collected through questionnaires and interviews. This was achieved through a systematic examination of reports and publications downloaded from ANDY’s website. Specifically, the following documents available in the organization’s website at the time of the study were considered for analysis: annual reports for the periods 2014 to 2016, stories of change from four members of different self-help groups, impact assessment reports published on the website and photo gallery. A guide was developed for this purpose as shown in Appendix IV. An extract of the NGO’s annual report is provided in Appendix IX, a sample change story presented in Appendix X and a screenshot of photo gallery is annexed in Appendix XI.

Validity of the research instruments

From a quantitative standpoint, the term “validity” in research refers to the degree to which the battery of statements in instrument encompasses all the important aspects of the construct under investigation (Al Kindy, Shah, & Jusoh, 2016). Cohen, Mannion and Morrison (2013) assert that “in quantitative data validity might be improved through careful sampling, appropriate instrumentation and appropriate treatments of statistical data” (p. 179). In the current study, validity was technically ensured by virtue of the fact that data was collected from the entire target population rather than sampling. This ensured the highest semblance of the data to the population of study. Appropriate instrumentation was ascertained by using a structured questionnaire which is the tool for the collection of quantitative data. Content validity was ensured by developing multiple items for each construct. Further, expert opinion of the researcher’s supervisor was sought. The feedback obtained was used to review the instrument accordingly.
Using qualitative approaches, attention is drawn to the credibility or believability of the results from the participants’ standpoint, transferability or the extent to which the results can be generalized to other contexts, dependability or the extent to which an independent investigator can obtain the same results and conformability, which refers to the extent to which the results can be corroborated (Klenke, 2015). For qualitative data, validity was preserved by maintaining an audit trail of the data collected, extractions of which have been annexed as appendices. Further, rich verbatim account of participants have been included to support the findings, as recommended by Noble and Smith (2015). Multiple sources of qualitative information was triangulated to corroborate the research results in line with Golafshani (2003). Care was taken to represent the voices of the research participants as expressed by them.

Reliability of the research instrument

Instrument reliability is concerned with establishing whether the instrument measures what it purports to measure (Cooper & Schindler, 2012). In quantitative research, this is ascertained by assessing the internal consistency of items in the questionnaire through a statistic known as Cronbach’s alpha (Melynk, 2012). This statistic tests the extent to which each item relate to the others as a measure of a single construct, with scores ranging from 0 to 1, with scores of at least 0.7 and above considered to suggest high reliability (Laksmi & Mohideen, 2013; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). In this study, the data obtained from instrument pre-testing was used to determine Cronbach’s alpha using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The results are shown in Table 3.3. The results show that Cronbach’s Alpha
coefficient exceeded the 0.7 threshold for all the variables, which means that the instrument was highly reliable.

Table 3.3: Reliability statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-leadership behaviours</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering leadership</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question of reliability is also a concern for qualitative data in mixed-methods research. In this study, constant data comparison and verification of accuracy was undertaken to assure reliability as suggested by Leung (2015). The information obtained from qualitative sources were cross-validated with theoretical and empirical literature as a measure of generalizability.

Instrument Pretesting

Instrument pretesting refers to the initial stage of data collection undertaken to establish whether the statements or questions are accurate, consistent and understandable (Leon, 2003). The questionnaire instrument was pretested on a small sample of 5 respondents from ANDY program beneficiaries in neighboring Kiambu County. The process helped in identifying questions that were ambiguous and facilitated their modification. The responses were analyzed for internal consistency and items with weak inter-rater reliability coefficients were revised or deleted.

Data Analysis Plan

The process of analyzing data entailed coding and entering the data into SPSS. The data was then cleaned, validated, normalized and transformed. Data was analyzed
through quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data was first analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques. This included determination of the population mean ($\mu$) and population standard deviation ($\sigma$) as well as percentage frequencies. Multidimensional Poverty Score was used to compare the intensity of poverty experienced. Inferences were drawn using correlation analysis whereby Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient technique was applied. This was run to establish the association between the composite scores of self-leadership behaviours (SLB) as well as the composite score of empowering leadership (EPL) and MPS. Hierarchical regression technique was used to control for the influence of EPL variables in testing the explanatory power of SLB on MPS among people affected by disability. The following standard regression equation was used as illustrated by Ghauri and Gronhaug (2005):

$$ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + ... + \varepsilon_i $$

Where:

- $Y_i$ = dependent variable
- $\beta_0$ = Value of $Y_i$ when $x$ is zero.
- $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$ = predictors
- $\varepsilon_i$ = standard error

Applying the general model above to the current study, the following equation was used:

$$ MPS = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SLB + \beta_2 EPL + \varepsilon_i $$

Qualitative data was analyzed through content analysis technique. According to (Flick, 2013), the approach to analyzing qualitative data begins with first coding
the data using a label that groups several statements under one concept. These are then organized into themes by grouping the concepts that recur into logical categories. Subsequently, these are described, analyzed and explained to make sense of the concepts. This process was applied to data collected through in-depth interviews and document analysis. The data collected was analyzed using NVivo version 10 computer software. The themes: self-leadership, empowering leadership and poverty reduction were the main units of analysis. The dominant themes underlying the data were aggregated and presented using figures and verbatim excerpts.

Ethical Considerations

Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Jackson (2012) identify a common set of ethical principles that researchers are expected to adhere to. Many of the principles focus on the protection of the interest of research subjects. These include: no harm to the participants, respecting their dignity, obtaining their informed consent, protecting their privacy, ensuring their confidentiality, keeping them anonymous and being truthful about the aims of the study. In addition to these, researchers are also expected to honestly and transparently communicate their research findings and avoid any false reporting.

In this study, the researcher explained the purpose of the study and obtained informed consent after guaranteeing confidentiality and anonymity of research participants using an Informed Consent Form (Appendix I). Participants were informed that their participation was entirely voluntary and that they reserved the right to withdraw their participation at any time. Respondents were also informed not to reveal their identity anywhere in the process.
The researcher obtained an introductory letter from the University which was used as evidence that the researcher was undertaking the study for academic purposes only (Appendix IV). The researcher also obtained a research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) (Appendix V), a duly stamped Authorization Letter from the County Commissioner, Nairobi County (Appendix VI) and research authorization letter from the County Director of Research (Appendix VII). The data collection tools were then physically administered by the researcher to the respondents.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has described the methodology used in undertaking the study. This has comprised an explanation and justification of the research design, the target population, sample and sampling method, type of data and data collection methods. The chapter has also discussed the validity and reliability of the research instruments, instrument pretesting and data analysis procedure and ethical considerations. In the next chapter, the results and findings are analyzed and discussed.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results and findings of the study. The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section presents descriptive analysis of respondents’ socio-demographic data. The remaining sections present both quantitative and qualitative analysis of data based on the four study objectives. These sections are: the influence of positive affect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya, the influence of self-goal setting on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya, the influence of self-determination on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya, influence of self-resilience on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya, and the strengthening effect of empowering leadership on the relationship between self-leadership and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

Response Rate

Out of the 54 respondents targeted, a total of 44 participants responded to the study as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-responses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.1, the response rate was high, at 81.5%. This is in line with the suggestion by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) that a response rate exceeding
70% is very high and sufficient for analysis. Therefore, the data was considered adequate for analysis.

Descriptive Analysis of Respondents’ Socio-demographic Information

**Gender of respondents**

The distribution of respondents by gender is shown in figure 4.1.

![Distribution of respondents by gender](image)

Figure 4.1 *Distribution of respondents by gender*

Figure 4.1 shows that 82% of the respondents were female whereas 18% were male. The results suggest that most of Andy Kenya program beneficiaries were women. This may be explained by the fact that the data was collected from self-help groups which, in line with Nyataya (2016), is traditionally dominated by the female gender. Since the self-help groups were formed as a vehicle to support parents of children with disability, it is also natural that women account for the majority
members due to their traditional gender role of caregiving and nurturing children as suggested in extant literature (Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr, 2014).

Marital status of respondents

The finding is presented in Figure 4.2.
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Figure 4.2: Respondents’ marital status

Figure 4.2 reveals that 73% of the respondents were married and 27% were unmarried. Therefore, majority of the respondents were married. This implies that most of the members of the self-help groups under study had less personal autonomy needed to accelerate empowerment. This has potential implications on empowering leadership program outcomes in line with past empirical research by Nikkhah, Redzuan, and Abu-Samah, (2010) who reported that marital status had an effect on empowerment, with married and widowed women having less empowerment status than single and divorced women. The results also imply that the program also reaches
out to mothers of children with disability who represent one of the most marginalized constituents of our society.

Respondents’ dependants

Table 4.2 presents the distribution of respondents by number of dependants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dependants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 reveals that 50% of the respondents had four dependants, 18.2% had three dependents, another 18.2% had one dependent, 4.5% of the respondents supported 2 dependents whereas 4.5% supported 5 dependents and a further 4.5% of the respondents supported 8 dependents. The finding suggests that most of the respondents economically supported at least four dependants. This is consistent with the average household size in Kenya, which, as of the year 2015, was reported to stand at 4 people (UN, 2017). Although the number of dependants supported by the respondents was lower than Kenya’s average which stands at about 8 for every 10 working-age adult going by the 2017 UNDP statistics (UNDP, 2017), having a disabled member in the household significantly increased the economic burden on the respondents in view of research reports revealing that their economic burden increases by 17% (Palmer et al., 2016).
Respondents’ level of education

Table 4.3 shows the findings.

Table 4.3: Distribution of respondents by level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.3 reveal that 36.4% of the respondents attained primary level of education, 22.7% obtained secondary education, 31.8% went to college while 9.1% were university graduates. Therefore, majority (59.1%) of the respondents attained up to secondary level of education. The results indicate that most of the respondents did not attain postsecondary level of education, suggesting that they lacked formal training in any area of skill necessary to participate effectively in the economy. This implies that respondents were disadvantaged since development literature links higher education with the realization of potential to contribute to wealth creation and poverty alleviation (Chege, Stephen, Wairimu, & Njoroge, 2015).

Poverty Index of Program Beneficiaries after Intervention

Multi-dimensional poverty measures were used to determine the incidence of poverty among respondents in the sample based on 17 basic needs items met. The results are presented in Figure 4.3.
Figure 4.3 reveals that respondents on average, met about 9 out of 17 basic needs items ($\mu=8.64$, $\sigma=3.87$). The basic needs items met ranged from 2 to 14. The finding implies that the respondents met just about half of the basic needs items. It can thus be inferred that the program beneficiaries were living right on the multidimensional poverty line and as such, were at high risk of slipping back into poverty. The results echo a study by Mitra et al. (2011) which found that people affected by disability were significantly worse off on several dimensions of poverty.

*Types of basic needs met after intervention*

Table 4.4 further ranks the basic needs met by percentage frequency of respondents saying “Yes”.
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Figure 4.3: Distribution of respondents by number of basic needs met
Table 4.4: Distribution of respondents by basic needs met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic needs items</th>
<th>Percent saying “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My house is connected to electricity</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my school-age children are enrolled in school</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My house has a cemented floor</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to adequate sanitation</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to information</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me and my household live on more than Ksh.200 a day</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well-nourished everyday</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use gas or electricity for cooking</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own tools that enable my mobility/movement</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly save part of my income</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have increased my education from ANDY support</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own an income generating project</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always sure of my next meal</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have insurance cover</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own assets such as land</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in full time employment</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that 90.9% of the respondents had access to clean drinking water, 86.4% were living in a house connected to electricity, 81.8% had all their school-age children enrolled in school, 72.7% lived in houses with cemented floors, 68.2% had adequate sanitation, another 68.2% had access to information, 63.6% lived on more than Ksh.200 a day, 59.1% were well-nourished everyday and 54.5% used gas or electricity for cooking. The table however shows that only 36.4% of the respondents owned tools that enabled their mobility, 36.4% regularly saved part of their income, 31.8% had increased their education from Andy support, 31.8% owned an income generating project, 27.3% were always sure of their next meal, 22.7% had insurance cover, 18.2% owned assets such as land and 13.6% were in fulltime employment. These statistics suggest that, while majority of the respondents met most of the basic needs measures used to determine poverty, including income which
implies that they lived above the poverty line, most of the respondents were below the poverty line where it mattered most as majority were not sure of their next meal and most of them were at risk of slipping into poverty because of lack of insurance.

*Distribution of respondents by number of basic needs met after intervention*

Table 4.5 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by number of basic needs met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of basic needs items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 items</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 items</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 items</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 items</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per table 4.5, 13.6% of the respondents only met between 0-4 basic needs items, 31.8% met between 5-8 basic needs items, another 31.8% met 9-12 basic needs items, and 22.7% of the respondents met over 12 of the 17 basic needs items. On aggregate, the results indicate that 54.5% of the respondents met at least half of the basic needs items whereas 45.5% met less than half of the basic needs items. This is consistent with data published by the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2014) which indicates that the country’s national poverty rate is 45.2%. However, it is way above the 2005-2015 national Multidimensional Poverty Index statistics published in the United Nations Human Development reports which indicated that 36% of Kenyans fall in the multidimensional poverty bracket, of which 46% are intensely deprived (Ocampo, 2016). The findings suggest that majority of the respondents were intensely deprived if multidimensional poverty measures are used.
Figure 4.4 presents data on the year respondents began benefiting from Andy programs.

The figure reveals that 77% of the respondents began benefiting from Andy empowerment programs in the year 2017 while 23% began receiving support in the year 2016. The finding suggest that for most of the respondents, less than a year had elapsed by the time of the study since they began receiving support from Andy programs. Therefore, the findings of the study can be relied on as an early impact report.

**Andy programs respondents benefited from**

Respondents were asked to indicate the program they benefited from in Andy. The distribution of respondents by program benefited from is shown in Figure 4.5.
The findings in figure 4.5 show that 95% (42) of the respondents indicated that they received economic empowerment support. However, 5% (2) of the respondents were employed under the program. Thus, most of the respondents received support in terms of economic empowerment. This is in line with the viewpoint of poverty reduction as a social issue whose advocates construct poverty as a product of uneven development, thus directing interventions on strategies that promote the full participation of people affected by disability in the economy through social inclusion by way of economic empowerment (Pinilla-Roncancio, 2015).

Andy programs’ impact

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which Andy programs improved various dimensions of their quality of life on a 5-point scale where 1=No change and 5=Very great extent. Table 4.6 presents the population mean (\(\mu\)) and population standard deviation (\(\sigma\)).
Table 4.6: Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Andy Program impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of program impact</th>
<th>( \mu )</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living conditions</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per table 4.6, the results reveal that the greatest outcome of Andy programs to the life of beneficiaries were realized in terms of investment (\( \mu=3.82, \sigma=1.21 \)), followed by social network (\( \mu=2.95, \sigma=1.41 \)) and income (\( \mu=2.83, \sigma=1.32 \)). As the table suggests, other dimensions of life such as education (\( \mu=1.82, \sigma=0.84 \)), living conditions (\( \mu=1.82, \sigma=1.00 \)), employment (\( \mu=1.23, \sigma=0.52 \)) and health (\( \mu=1.18, \sigma=0.84 \)) registered low mean scores in terms of program impact. The findings imply that Andy empowerment programs effectively translated into measurable outcomes in socioeconomic results but the social dividends in terms of improvement in quality of life as indicated by living conditions, employment and health was yet to be felt. This was corroborated by interview data from the Project Officer which revealed that a good number of Andy’s beneficiaries benefited in terms of socioeconomic empowerment, capacity building in different areas, referrals and networking, and scholarships.

Analysis of impact assessment reports on the organization’s website provided support for the social network/social participation, investment and income generation themes. The same notions of social participation, investment and income generation were revealed in all the four stories of change and photo gallery on ANDY’s website. The following are some of the excerpts:
“I make detergents for sale to schools and the neighborhood. I do train women living with disabilities on the skills too and also do sell the detergent making materials to them” (Program beneficiary).

“The...program has given us the momentum to reach more children and women with disabilities on referrals to access healthcare services and soon we are going to have a Disability Awareness Sunday with a local church” (Program beneficiary).

“The fast food business has employed its members… In addition to selling food within the locality, Woodley Deaf Community shares and ensures customers understand the deaf culture and sign language so as to have complete integration and empowerment” (Program beneficiary).

The Influence of Positive Affect on Poverty Reduction among People affected by Disability in Kenya

*Descriptive analysis of positive affect dimensions*

Descriptive results of findings on various dimensions of positive affect of respondents is presented in Table 4.7. The table shows the frequency distribution as well as the population mean (μ) and population standard deviation (σ) scores on a 5-point scale. The table reveals that 36.4% of the respondents always felt alive and cheerful and another 45.5% almost always felt alive and cheerful despite their circumstances. However, 9.1% of the respondents sometimes felt cheerful while another 9.1% of the respondents rarely felt cheerful despite their circumstances. A high mean score was obtained on a 5-point scale (μ= 4.09, σ=0.91). This suggests that majority of the respondents felt cheerful most of the time despite their circumstances.

Table 4.7 indicates that 54.5% of the respondents sometimes felt overwhelmed and worried by their situation; 18.2% of the respondents almost always felt overwhelmed and 11.4% always felt overwhelmed and worried by their situation. However, some 9.1% of the respondents rarely felt overwhelmed and worried while another 6.8% never felt overwhelmed or worried by their situation. A moderate mean
score was on obtained on a scale of 1 to 5 ($\mu=2.82$, $\sigma=0.99$), meaning that most of the respondents were occasionally overwhelmed by their situation.

Table 4.7: Descriptive analysis of positive affect dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive affect dimensions</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Despite my circumstances, I feel alive and cheerful</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel overwhelmed and worried by my situation</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively participate in nation building even in my own small way</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I can do most things just as good as other people</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more to celebrate in life despite my setbacks</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table also reveals that 61.4% of the respondents said they almost always actively participated in nation building even in their own small way and another 18.2% always participated in nation building. The table indicates that 20.5% of the respondents said they sometimes actively participated in nation building in their own small way notwithstanding their situation. A high mean score was obtained on a 5-point scale ($\mu=3.98$, $\sigma=0.63$), implying that most of the respondents were actively participating in nation building despite their challenges.

The table shows that 47.4% of the respondents almost always believed and a further 43.2% always believed they can do most things just as good as other people while 4% of the respondents sometimes believed so. A high mean score was obtained
(μ=4.34, σ=0.65). This suggests that most of the respondents had confidence in their ability to do most things just as other people.

Further, 84.1% of the respondents said there was always more to celebrate in life despite their setback and 11.4% of the respondents said there was almost always more to celebrate. However, some 4.5% of the respondents said there was sometimes more to celebrate despite their setbacks. The mean score obtained was very high (μ=4.80, σ=0.51). This implies that majority of the respondents believed there was more to celebrate in life despite their setbacks.

Collectively, it can be inferred from the findings that most of the respondents maintained a positive affect despite their circumstances as people affected by disability. This is in line with empirical studies which associate the basic tenets of positive affect to an individual’s predisposition to take appositive stance towards life experiences which, according to Alessandri et al. (2012), is a choice which exerts an important physiological functioning that enables people to grow, to flourish and to cope with the inevitable adversities of life.

**Correlation between positive affect on multi-dimensional poverty**

Spearman’s Rank correlation analysis was run to establish the correlation between positive affect composite score and multi-dimensional poverty score. Table 4.8 presents the results at \( p < .05 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-dimensional Poverty</th>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spearman’s rho</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spearman’s rho</strong></td>
<td>-0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Correlation between positive affect and multi-dimensional poverty
Table 4.9 reveals that there was a statistically significant inverse correlation between positive affect and multidimensional poverty ($r_s = -0.348, p<0.05$). This means that multi-dimensional poverty reduced with rise in positive affect among people affected by disability. This finding lends credence to reports of a study by Rothbard and Wilk (2011) which suggest that positive affect facilitates active engagement with others in their environments and greater cognitive availability, broadening their thought-action repertoires which is beneficial for productivity and improves life outcomes.

The Influence of Self-Goal Setting on Poverty Reduction among People affected by Disability in Kenya

*Descriptive analysis of self-goal setting dimensions*

The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of various dimensions of self-goal setting as well as the population mean ($\mu$) and population standard deviation ($\sigma$) scores on a 5-point scale is presented in Table 4.9. The study sought to establish whether respondents stated their goals in time and/or money form. Table 4.9 shows that 52.3% of the respondents sometimes did so, 4.5% almost always did so and a further 18.2% always did so. However, 9.1% of the respondents rarely stated their goals in time and/or money form and 15.9% of the respondents never stated their goals in time or money form. On a 5-point scale, a moderate score was obtained ($\mu=3.00, \sigma=1.24$) which means that most of the respondents sometimes stated their goals in time and/or money form.
### Table 4.9: Descriptive statistics of respondents’ self-goal setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-goal setting dimensions</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>μ</th>
<th>σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I state my goals in time and/or money form</td>
<td>f = 7</td>
<td>f = 4</td>
<td>f = 23</td>
<td>f = 2</td>
<td>f = 8</td>
<td>f = 44</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals I set for myself are usually difficult but attainable</td>
<td>f = 2</td>
<td>f = 4</td>
<td>f = 23</td>
<td>f = 9</td>
<td>f = 6</td>
<td>f = 44</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I set my goals, I make an effort to implement them and make adjustments to accommodate emerging realities</td>
<td>f = 2</td>
<td>f = 2</td>
<td>f = 28</td>
<td>f = 2</td>
<td>f = 10</td>
<td>f = 44</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I break down my goals into performance indicators at different time intervals.</td>
<td>f = 2</td>
<td>f = 0</td>
<td>f = 27</td>
<td>f = 12</td>
<td>f = 3</td>
<td>f = 44</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attain most of the goals I set to achieve to a large extent</td>
<td>f = 2</td>
<td>f = 0</td>
<td>f = 25</td>
<td>f = 8</td>
<td>f = 9</td>
<td>f = 44</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked whether the goals they set for themselves were usually difficult but attainable. It was found that 52.3% of the respondents sometimes did so, 20.5% of the respondents said they almost always did so, and 13.6% of the respondents said they always did so. However, 9.1% of the respondents said that it was rarely the case that the goals they set for themselves were usually difficult but attainable. The table also shows that 4.5% of the respondents said the goals they set for themselves were never difficult. A moderate mean score was established (μ=3.30, σ=0.98). This means that respondents sometimes set goals that were usually difficult but attainable.

The table shows that 63.6% of the respondents said that it was sometimes true that after they set their goals, they made an effort to implement them and make...
adjustments to accommodate emerging realities, 4.5% of the respondents said it was almost always the case, and 22.7% of the respondents said it was always true. The table shows that 4.5% of the respondents said it was rarely true that after they set their goals, they made effort to implement them and adjust to accommodate emerging realities, and another 4.5% said it was never true. The mean score was moderate ($\mu=3.36, \sigma=1.04$), implying that respondents sometimes made an effort to implement goals after making them and adjust to accommodate emerging realities.

The table indicates that 61.4% of the respondents sometimes broke down their goals into performance indicators at different time intervals. The table also shows that 27.3% of the respondents almost always broke down goals into performance indicators while 6.3% of the respondents always did so. However, some 4.5% of the respondents never broke down their goals into performance indicators at different time intervals. A moderate mean score was obtained on a 5-point scale ($\mu=3.32, \sigma=0.80$). This means that most of the respondents sometimes broke down goals into performance indicators.

Respondents were asked whether they attained most of the goals they set to achieve to a large extent. The table reveals that 56.8% of the respondents said they sometimes attained goals they set, 18.2% of the respondents almost always attained set goals and 20.5% of the respondents always attained their set goals to a large extent. However, some 4.5% of the respondents never attained most of the goals they set to achieve. A relatively high mean score was obtained ($\mu=3.50, \sigma=0.98$). This implies that most of the respondents sometimes attained their goal to a large extent.

On aggregate, the results suggest that majority of the respondents sometimes practiced self-goal setting as revealed by the finding that most of the respondents
stated their goals in time and/or money form, set difficult but attainable goals, broke
down their goals into performance indicators, made an effort to implement the set
goals and attained most of their goals. This is consistent with the perspectives of
Manz and Sims (1991) who held that the currency of self-goal setting resides in the
realization that the mere existence of a goal serves to focus the individual’s attention
and energy which increases changes of success.

*Correlation between self-goal setting and multi-dimensional poverty*

Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship
between a composite measure of self-goal setting and multi-dimensional poverty
score. Table 4.10 presents the results at $p<.01$.

**Table 4.10: Correlation between Self-Goal Setting and Multi-Dimensional Poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-dimensional poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-goal setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>-.396**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.10 shows that the relationship between multi-dimensional poverty and
self-goal setting score was negative and statistically significant ($r_s =-.396$, $p<.01$).

This means that the more respondents practiced self-goal setting, the lower their
multidimensional poverty score. This finding is in line with the study by Nuri (2015)
whose experiment in Indonesia, Colombia and Ethiopia established that self-set goals
influenced higher performance but also found a significant influence of self-goal
setting on poverty reduction as measured by growth in income. It is also consistent
with the study by Rothwell et al. (2013) which established that self-goal setting
behaviors not only helped the beneficiaries to set their goals for the future but were able to accomplish their self-set goals.

The Influence of Self-Determination on Poverty Reduction among People affected by Disability in Kenya

Descriptive analysis of self-determination dimensions

The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of various dimensions of self-determination as well as the population mean (μ) and population standard deviation (σ) scores on a 5-point scale is presented in Table 4.11.

| Table 4.11: Descriptive statistics of respondents’ self-determination |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Self-determination dimensions     | Never | Rarely| Sometimes | Almost always | Always | Total | μ     | σ     |
| I try to figure out solutions to problems no matter how difficult they are | f 3   | o 0   | 6 13.6% | 20 45.5% | 15 34.1% | 44 100.0% | 4.00  | 1.06  |
| I know my strengths and weaknesses | f 0   | 3 6.8% | 2 4.5% | 24 54.5% | 15 34.1% | 44 100.0% | 4.16  | 0.81  |
| I do speak up for my rights when they are being infringed | f 0   | 0 0.0% | 11 25.0% | 17 38.6% | 16 36.4% | 44 100.0% | 4.11  | 0.78  |
| I make a point to keep track of how well I’m doing | f 0   | 3 6.8% | 8 18.2% | 20 45.5% | 13 29.5% | 44 100.0% | 3.98  | 0.88  |
| I have total control over the decisions and actions that affect my life | f 4   | 0 0.0% | 2 4.5% | 20 45.5% | 18 40.9% | 44 100.0% | 4.09  | 1.14  |
| I live my life without needing help from anyone | f 11 25.0% | 8 18.2% | 3 6.8% | 16 36.4% | 6 13.6% | 44 100.0% | 2.95  | 1.46  |

Respondents were asked whether they try to figure out solutions to problems no matter how difficult the problems are. The table shows that 45.5% of the respondents
almost always tried to figure out solutions to problems and 34.1% always did so. The table also shows that 13.6% of the respondents sometimes tried to figure solutions to their own problems while 6.8% of the respondents never tried to find solutions to difficult problems. A high mean score was obtained ($\mu=4.00, \sigma=1.06$) which implies that most of the respondents almost always tried to figure out solutions to problems no matter how difficult they were.

With regards to whether respondents knew their own strengths and weaknesses, 54.5% of the respondents said they almost always knew their strengths and weaknesses and a further 34.1% always knew their strengths and weaknesses. However, 4.5% of the respondents said they sometimes knew their strengths and weaknesses but 6.8% of the respondents rarely had this knowledge. On a scale of 1 to 5, a high mean score ($\mu=4.16, \sigma=0.81$) was obtained, implying that majority of the respondents were aware of their strengths and weaknesses.

Respondents were asked whether they did speak up for their rights when being infringed on. The table indicates that 38.6% of the respondents said they almost always spoke up for their rights and a further 36.4% of the respondents said that they always did speak up for their rights when being infringed on. Twenty five percent of the respondents sometimes did speak up for their rights. A high mean score ($\mu=4.11, \sigma=0.78$) was obtained on a 5-point scale, suggesting that most of the respondents did speak up for their rights whenever being infringed on.

The study sought to establish whether respondents kept track of how well they were doing. The table reveals that 45.5% of the respondents almost always kept track of how well they were doing and 29.5% of the respondents always made a point to keep track of how well they were doing. The table also shows that 18.2% of the
respondents sometimes made a point to keep track of how well they were doing whereas 6.8% of the respondents rarely kept track of their performance. A relatively high mean score ($\mu=3.98$, $\sigma=0.88$) was realized on a 5-point scale, implying that most of the respondents almost always made a point to keep track of how well they were doing.

On whether respondents lived their life without needing help from anyone, 36.4% of the respondents almost always did so, 13.6% of the respondents did so and 6.8% of the respondents sometimes did so. However, 18.2% of the respondents rarely lived their life without needing help from anyone while 25.0% of the respondents never lived their life without needing outside health. A moderately low mean score ($\mu=2.95$, $\sigma=1.46$) was realized on a 5-point scale, which means that most of the respondents sometimes lived their life without needing help from anyone.

Collectively, the findings suggest most of the respondents almost always practiced various dimensions of self-determination such as finding solutions to problems however difficult they were, being self-aware about own strengths and weaknesses, standing up for own rights if infringed on, tracking performance, having total control of decisions affecting own life and living life without needing outside help. This is consistent with the assertion by Gragoudas (2012) that self-determination enable individuals to be leaders in their own lives and make decisions that will shape their future. The results also suggest, in concert with the definition offered by Gradoudas (2012) that self-determination is the attitudes and abilities required to act as the primary causal agent in one’s life and to make choices regarding one’s action free from undue external forces or influences.
Correlation between self-determination and multi-dimensional poverty

Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship between self-determination composite score and multi-dimensional poverty score. Table 4.12 presents the results at $p<.05$.

Table 4.12: Correlation between Self-Determination and Poverty Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-dimensional poverty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research question tested was whether there was an influence of self-determination on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Table 4.12 reveals that the relationship between multi-dimensional poverty score and self-determination was not statistically significant ($r_s = -0.096, p > 0.05$). This means that self-determination had no significant influence on poverty reduction. This finding contradicts the results of Yamamoto et al. (2011) who’s study of self-determination within a broader construct of self-empowerment through self-employment among people with disabilities in the US revealed the existence of a relationship between self-determination in employment for individuals with disabilities and poverty alleviation. This may be explained by the fact that although employment status is one of the many dimensions of poverty, one can be employed but still languish in poverty due to other risk factors. The results suggest that one can exercise their freedom to make choices and decisions that affect their life without necessarily climbing out of their poverty.
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Descriptive analysis of self-resilience dimensions

The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of various dimensions of self-resilience as well as the population mean (μ) and population standard deviation (σ) scores on a 5-point scale is presented in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-resilience dimensions</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>μ</th>
<th>σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I adapt to changes easily</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is always about being flexible</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t give up easily on what I have set to achieve</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this life, one must be tough to achieve what they want</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can deal with whatever comes my way</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4.13 above, 43.2% of the respondents almost always adapted to changes easily and 29.5% of the respondents always adapted to change easily. However, 20.5% of the respondents sometimes adapted to change easily while 6.8% never adapted to change easily. A relatively high mean score (μ=3.89, σ=1.06) was obtained on a scale of 1 to 5, implying that most of the respondents adapted easily to change.
Fifty percent (50.0%) of the respondents held the view that life is almost always about being flexible, and 36.4% said life is always about being flexible. Some 13.6% of the respondents said sometimes life is almost always about being flexible. A high mean score ($\mu=4.23$, $\sigma=0.68$) was realized on a 5-point scale, implying that most of the respondents believed that life was almost always about being flexible.

Respondents were asked whether they didn’t give up easily on what they set out to achieve. The table indicates that 47.7% of the respondents always didn’t give up easily, 36.4% almost always didn’t give up easily, and 15.9% sometimes didn’t give up easily. A high mean score was obtained on a scale of 1 to 5, ($\mu=4.32$, $\sigma=0.74$) which implies that most of the respondents always didn’t give up easily on that which they set out to achieve.

Fifty percent of the respondents almost always believed that in this life, one must be tough to achieve what they want, and 40.9% of the respondents always believed so. Some 4.5% of the respondents held the view that sometimes one must be tough to achieve what they want, whereas 4.2% of the respondents never believe that one must be tough to achieve what they want. A high mean score was obtained on a 5-point scale ($\mu=4.23$, $\sigma=0.91$), meaning that most of the respondents believed that one must be tough to achieve what they want in their life.

The study sought to establish whether respondents could deal with whatever came their way. The table reveals that 43.2% of the respondents always could deal with whatever came their way, another 43.3% said they almost always could deal with whatever came their way, 9.2% of the respondents said they sometimes could deal with whatever arise in their life and 4.5% of the respondents rarely believed that they could handle whatever came their way. On a 5-point scale, a high mean score was
obtained (μ=4.25, σ=0.81). This implies that most of the respondents believed they could always deal with whatever came their way.

From the results, it is collectively revealed that most of the respondents almost always practiced self-resilience by easy adaptation to change, having flexibility, never giving up, being tough to achieve one’s goals and dealing with water comes in the way. This is in line with the characteristics of self-resilience which, according to Dong et al. (2013), include adaptability, flexibility, persistence, hardiness and courage.

**Correlation between self-resilience and multi-dimensional poverty**

Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship between self-resilience composite score and multi-dimensional poverty score. Table 4.14 presents the results at \(p<.05\). The table indicates that there was zero correlation between self-resilience and poverty reduction \(r_s = .000, p > .05\). This means that self-resilience had no influence on poverty reduction. This finding seems to contradict the findings of a study by Owens et al. (2013) in the US which found that resilience explained the variability of economic outcomes to a statistically significant degree. Two reasons may explain this inconsistency between the two studies. Firstly, positive economic outcomes may result from resilience behavior without necessarily causing a rise out of poverty. Secondly, self-resilience, by definition, imply that one is merely able to quickly recover back to their original state (Bryant & Kazan, 2012). This means that if the original state was a state of poverty, then self-resilience on its own, is not a sufficient condition to alleviate poverty. Self-resilience practices, in this sense, only serves as a protective factor against sinking deeper into poverty. This argument is in line with the findings of a study by Jocson (2016) which found that
highly resilient parents were at lower risk of sinking deeper into poverty than parents manifesting low resilience and that the level of resilience was contingent on protective factors in the parent’s environment. It is also consistent with Breitkruz et al. (2014) who’s exploration of resilience in families of children with disabilities in the Province of Alberta, Canada, revealed that resilient families were able to conduct their lives with a “business-as-usual” approach to their daily lives as compared to families who were less resilient.

Table 4.14: Correlation between self-resilience and multi-dimensional poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-dimensional Poverty</td>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-Resilience</td>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Descriptive analysis of role modelling dimensions of empowering leadership

Respondents’ views were sought on three aspects of role-modelling dimension of empowering leadership as practiced by Andy Officers. The findings are presented in Table 4.15. As per table 4.15 above, 54.5% of the respondents said Andy Officer always set high standards for performance by her own behavior and 25% said the officer almost always set high standards for performance by her own behavior. The table indicates that 15.9% of the respondents said the officer sometimes set high standards for performance through her own behavior but 4.5% of the respondents said the officer rarely set high standards for performance through behavior. A high mean
score ($\mu=4.30$, $\sigma=0.90$) was obtained, implying that majority of the respondents observed that Andy Officer modelled high performance. This means that the Officer led by example, which potentially inspired like behavior among program beneficiaries. This is in line with findings reported by Evins (2015) regarding the importance of role-modelling on desirable behaviors among students with disability in the western world.

Table 4.15: Respondents’ views on role-modelling by Andy Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role-modelling by Andy Officer</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The officer set high standards for performance by his/her own behavior</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$%$</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>4.5%</th>
<th>15.9%</th>
<th>25.0%</th>
<th>54.5%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The officer works as hard as he/she can to ensure I succeed</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$%$</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>20.5%</th>
<th>18.2%</th>
<th>61.4%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The officer sets a good example by the way he/she conducts him/herself</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$%$</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>6.8%</th>
<th>22.7%</th>
<th>70.5%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer worked as hard as she could to ensure success of the beneficiaries. The table reveals that 61.4% of the respondents observed that Andy Officer always works as hard as she could to ensure beneficiary’s success and 18.2% of the respondents said Andy Officer almost always works hard to ensure their success. However, 20.9% of the respondents said Andy Officer sometimes worked hard to ensure beneficiaries’ success. On a scale of 1 to 5, the mean score obtained was high ($\mu=4.41$, $\sigma=0.82$) implying that most of the respondents observed that the officer always worked hard to ensure beneficiaries’ success.
success. This is consistent with the characterization of an empowering leader by Baker and Mathis (2011) who suggest that empowering leadership is about striving for the success of those that they lead.

With respect to setting example, the table reveals that 70.5% of the respondents said Andy Officer set a good example by the way she conducted herself. Another 22.7% of the respondents said the officer almost always set a good example by her conduct and some 6.8% of the respondents said the officer sometimes set a good example. A very high mean score ($\mu=4.64$, $\sigma=0.61$) was obtained, which suggests that the officer always set a good example by her conduct. This further lends support to the theme of role-modelling in keeping with empowering leadership theory which holds that empowering leadership is about setting high performance standards by one’s own behavior as a leader (Fong & Snape, 2015).

Collectively, the results suggest that majority of the respondents noted that Andy Officer always modelled a good example. This is consistent with the tenet of empowering leadership which identifies leading by example as an important element (Bakar, 2013). It means that program beneficiaries were empowered through role-modelling.

Descriptive analysis of encouraging participation dimensions of empowering leadership

Table 19 shows the findings. In terms of encouraging participation, Table 4.16 shows that 68.2% of the respondents said that Andy Officer always encouraged them to express their ideas and suggestions and another 31.8% of the respondents said the officer almost always encouraged them to express their ideas and suggestions. A very
high mean score ($\mu=4.68$, $\sigma=0.47$) was obtained, implying that the officer always encouraged beneficiaries to express their ideas and suggestions.

Table 4.16: Respondents’ views on Andy Officer encouraging participation on beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The practice of encouraging participation by Andy Officer</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer encourages me to express my ideas/suggestions</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer listens to my ideas/suggestions</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer uses my suggestions to make decisions that affect me</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer gives me a chance to voice my opinion</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer considers my ideas when he/she disagrees with them</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 84.1% of the respondents said Andy Officer always listened to their ideas and suggestions and another 15.9% said the office almost always listened to their ideas and suggestions. Again, a very high mean score ($\mu=4.84$, $\sigma=0.37$) was computed, which means that the officer did always listened to beneficiaries’ ideas/suggestions. This means that the officer displayed characteristic of an empowering leader in line with Bester et al. (2015) who observed that empowering leaders show concern by listening and attending to followers.
Seventy five percent (75%) of the respondents also said that Andy Officer always the suggestions to make decisions that affect beneficiaries and 25% of the respondents said the officer almost always used suggestions by beneficiaries to make decisions affecting them. On a scale of 1 to 5, a very high mean score (μ=4.75, σ=0.44) was recorded, which implies that the officer always used suggestions by beneficiaries to make decisions affecting them. This means that the offer encouraged autonomy and discretion of program beneficiaries in terms of decision making. This agrees with Morris (2011) who held that people affected by disability should have a choice and control over how empowerment programs they might need is provided for them to realize autonomy.

Respondents were asked whether they were given a chance to voice their opinion. The table reveals that 65.9% of the respondents said Andy Officer always gave them a chance to voice their views, 29.5% of the respondents said the office almost always gave them a chance to voice their opinion, and 4.5% of the respondents said the office sometimes accorded them a chance to air their views. This yielded a very high mean score (μ=4.61, σ=0.58) on a 5-point scale, meaning that the officer always gave a chance to voice their opinion. This is in line with empowering leadership theory which, according to Lorinkova et al. (2013), encourage members to contribute their ideas.

Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer considered their ideas even when she disagreed with them. The table indicates that 52.3% of the respondents said that the officer always considered their ideas and another 13.6% of the respondents said the officer almost always considered their ideas. Some 22.7% of the respondents held the view that the officer sometimes considered their ideas, 6.8% of the respondents held that the officer rarely considered their ideas even when she
disagreed with them whereas 4.5% of the respondents said the officer never considered their ideas even when she disagreed with them. A high mean score ($\mu=4.02$, $\sigma=1.21$) was obtained, meaning that most of the respondents observed that the officer almost always considered their ideas even when disagreeing with them. This finding is consistent with empowering leadership theory which emphasizes follower decision making without getting the leader’s approval (Green, 2014).

**Descriptive Analysis of Coaching Dimensions of Empowering Leadership**

Table 4.17 shows the findings. Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer helped them see areas in which they needed more training. Table 4.7 indicates that 45.5% of the respondents said the officer always helped them see areas they needed more training and 20.5% of the respondents said the officer almost always helped them identify areas they needed more training. The table also shows that 13.6% of the respondents said the officer sometimes helped them identify their training needs whereas 13.6% of the respondents observed that the officer rarely helped them establish areas they needed more training in. Some 6.8% of the respondents noted that the officer never helped them identify areas they needed more training in. A moderately high mean score ($\mu=3.84$, $\sigma=1.33$) was realized on a 5-point scale, implying that most of the respondents noted that the officer almost always helped them identify their training needs. This underscores the importance of follower development. This compares well with the observation by Zhu, Sosik, Riggio and Yang (2012) that it is characteristic of empowering leaders to recognize and develop followers’ knowledge, skills and capabilities to help them realize their full potential.
Table 4.17: Respondents views on the practice of coaching by Andy Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The practice of coaching by Andy Officer</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>μ</th>
<th>σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer helps me to see areas in which I need more training</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer suggests ways to improve my performance</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer encourages me to solve my problems</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer encourages me to exchange information with my group</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer provides help where I need</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer teaches me how to solve problems on my own</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer pays attention to my efforts</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer tells me when I perform well</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer supports my efforts</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer helps me to focus on my goals</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer helps me to develop good working relationship with others</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.17 reveals that 45.5% of the respondents said Andy Officer always suggested ways to improve performance; 34.1% of the respondents said the officer almost always suggested ways of improving performance; 6.8% of the respondents said the officer sometimes offered suggestions for improvement whereas 13.6% of the respondents said the office rarely suggested areas the respondents could improve on.

The mean score obtained on a scale of 1 to 5 was high ($\mu=4.11$, $\sigma=1.04$) meaning that the officer almost always suggested to beneficiaries areas of improvement. This means that the officer challenged program beneficiaries not to be complacent but to always strive for excellence, which is similar to the viewpoint of Zhu et al. (2012).

The table further indicates that 40.9% of the respondents noted that Andy Officer always encouraged them to solve their problems; 34.1% of the respondents said that the office almost always encouraged them to solve their problems; 18.2% of the respondents said the officer sometimes provided them with encouragements and 6.8% of the respondents said the officer rarely encouraged them to solve their problems. A high mean score ($\mu=4.09$, $\sigma=0.94$) was recorded, which implies that the officer almost always encouraged them to find solutions to their problems. It can thus be inferred that the Officer recognized the importance autonomy and promoted the same among program beneficiaries. This is consistent with empowering leadership literature as put forward by Wu and Parker (2017) who maintain that empowering leaders play an important role of follower emancipation by encouraging their autonomy by challenging them to invent solutions to their own problems.

Fifty percent (50%) of the respondents said Andy Officer always encouraged them to exchange information in the group. Another 38.6% of the respondents said the officer almost always encouraged them to exchange information in the group, and
11.4% of the respondents said the officer sometimes encouraged them to exchange information. A high mean score was registered on a 5-point scale ($\mu=4.39$, $\sigma=0.69$), meaning that the officer did encourage respondents to exchange information in the group. This agrees with empowering leadership theory which holds that empowering leaders create a climate in which high levels of information and knowledge exchange are encouraged (Lorinkova et al., 2013).

The table indicates that 36.4% of the respondents said Andy Officer always provided help where they needed, 38.6% of the respondents said the officer almost always provided help where needed and 6.8% of the respondents said the officer sometimes provided help where needed. However, 11.4% of the respondents were of the view that the officer rarely provided help where needed and some 6.8% of the respondents said the officer never provided help where needed. On a scale of 1 to 5, a relatively high mean score ($\mu=3.83$, $\sigma=1.23$) was obtained, which implies that respondents noted that the officer almost always provided help where needed. This suggests that the Officer was always available to provide a helping hand, which is in line with Fong and Snape’s (2015) characterization of an empowering leader.

Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer teaches them to solve problems on their own. The table reveals that 43.2% of the respondents said the officer always teaches them how to solve problems on their own, 29.5% of the respondents said the officer almost always taught them how to solve problems on their own and 20.5% of the respondents said the officer sometimes taught them how to find solutions to problems on their own. However, 6.8% of the respondents were of the view that the officer never teaches them how to resolve problem on their own. A high mean score ($\mu=4.02$, $\sigma=1.13$) was computed on a scale of 1 to 5, meaning that
the officer did teach beneficiaries how to solve problems on their own. This is in line with coaching behavior of empowering leaders whom, according to Manz and Sims (1991), help members of the group to solve problems together and therefore providing opportunities to share knowledge.

The study sought to establish whether Andy Officer pay attention to their efforts. The table indicates that 47.7% of the respondents said that the officer always pay attention to their efforts, 13.6% of the respondents said the officer almost always pay attention to their efforts, and 31.8% of the respondents said the officer sometimes pay attention to their efforts. However, 6.8% of the respondents said the officer rarely paid attention to their effort. The mean score obtained on a scale of 1 to 5 was high ($\mu=4.02$, $\sigma=1.04$), meaning that the officer did pay attention to beneficiaries’ efforts. This also agrees with empowering leadership tenet identified by Manz and Sims (1991) who posit that followers are likely to obtain fair recognition by an empowering leader for their contribution of ideas and information, which could inspire them to share their knowledge.

Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer tells them when they perform well. According to the findings, 65.9% of the respondents said the officer always tells them when they perform well, 13.6% of the respondents said the officer almost always tells them when they perform well and 18.2% of the respondents said the officer sometimes tell them when they perform well. However, 2.3% of the respondents said the officer never tell them when performing well. A high mean score was computed on a 5-point scale ($\mu=4.41$, $\sigma=0.95$). This suggests that the officer did almost always tell program beneficiaries when they performed well. This is in line with the tenet of empowering leadership which holds that empowering leaders
provide praise and recognition for effective performance, special contributions and performance improvements (Kozlowski, 2012).

The views of respondents were sought as to whether Andy Officer supported their efforts. The result shows that 54.5% of the respondents said the officer always supported their efforts and 34.1% of the respondents said the officer almost always support their efforts. However, 11.4% of the respondents said the officer rarely supported their effort. The mean score obtained on a scale of 1 to 5 was high (μ=4.32, σ=0.96), which means that the officer did support beneficiaries’ efforts. Martin et al., (2013) suggest that empowering leaderships focuses on granting followers a fair amount of autonomy so they are able to make independent decisions regarding how to achieve desired outcomes.

The table also reveals that 43.2% of the respondents said that Andy Officer always helps them focus on their goals, 27.3% of the respondents said the officer almost always help them focus on their goals and 22.7% of the respondents said the officer sometimes help them focus on their goals. However, 6.8% of the respondents said the officer rarely help them focus on their goals. A high mean score (μ=4.07, σ=0.97) was obtained on a scale of 1 to 5, which implies that the officer did indeed help beneficiaries focus on their goals. This indicates that the officer was cognizant of the potential that resides in being focused, thus providing empirical support for goal-setting as a valid element of self-leadership behaviors as theorized by Bryant and Kazan (2012).

Regarding whether Andy Officer helped respondents develop good working relationship with others, 54.5% of the respondents said the officer always did so, another 40.9% of the respondents said the officer almost always helped them develop
good working relationship with others and 4.5% of the respondents said the officer sometimes helped them develop a good working relationship with others. A very high mean score (\( \mu = 4.5, \sigma = 0.59 \)) was computed, which indicates that the officer always helped program beneficiaries develop a good working relationship with others. It can be inferred from this finding that the officer recognized the power of collaboration that accrues from having a good working relationship with people. This supports the view of Baker (2011) who asserts that empowering leaders encourage collaboration as a powerful tool for self-help. The high mean score on all the coaching dimensions of empowering leadership was corroborated by findings from interviews held with the Project Officer at Andy which showed that the officer encouraged self-leadership behaviours as suggested in the following verbatim comments:

In response to positive affect;

“I always encourage the project beneficiaries to focus on their positive energy more and always believe in themselves” (Project Officer).

In response to self-goal setting;

“I encourage the project beneficiaries to focus on the result of what they want to achieve in life by concentrating more on their strength and not their weaknesses” (Project Officer).

In response to self-determination;

“I always encourage the project beneficiaries to seize every opportunity that comes their way to better their lives and also to be the drivers of their own lives since they understand better their capability” (Project Officer).

In response to self-resilience;

“The road to success is never easy, I always remind the beneficiaries to brace themselves for challenges along the way and to ensure an alternative plan for quick recovery should they come face to face with unexpected challenge” (Project Officer).
As evident from the verbatim comments, the theme of coaching stands out throughout the responses, suggesting that a key aspect of empowering leadership by the officer was to coach and mentor program beneficiaries by inspiring and motivating them to manifest self-leadership behaviors. This means that mentoring and coaching were important elements of empowering leadership acknowledged by ANDY Officer as strategies of empowering people affected by disability. This affirms Fong and Snape’s (2015) conceptualization of empowering leadership. Analysis of the stories of change revealed that the sub-theme of coaching by helping beneficiaries stay focused was the most predominant as exemplified in the following excerpts;

“ANDY field visits have made us where we are” (Program beneficiary).

“Thank you for your field visits too; they have made me stay on focus” (Program beneficiary).

Thanks a lot Light and Hope and ANDY; your field visits have put us on track” (Program beneficiary).

Descriptive Analysis of Informing Dimensions of Empowering Leadership

Table 4.18 shows the findings. The study sought to establish whether Andy Officer explains program decisions. Table 4.18 shows that 56.8% of the respondents observed that the officer always explain program decisions, 18.2% of the respondents said the officer almost always explain program decisions and 11.4% of the respondents said the officer sometimes explain program decisions. However, 6.8% of the respondents were of the view that the officer rarely explain program decisions while another 6.8% of the respondents said the officer never explain program decisions. A high mean score (μ=4.11, σ=1.26) was computed on a 5-point scale, which implies that the officer did almost always explain program decisions. This
agrees with clarifying roles tenet of empowering leadership which highlight that empowering leaders explaining responsibilities and expectations (Kozlowski, 2012).

Table 4.18: Respondents views on the practice of informing by Andy Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The practice of informing by Andy Officer</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>μ</th>
<th>σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer explains program decisions</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f = 3</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f = 3</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f = 6</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f = 3</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.18 indicates that 65.9% of the respondents said Andy Officer always explains program goals while another 27.3% of the respondents said the officer almost always explain program goals. Some 6.8% of the respondents said the officer rarely explain program goals. A very high mean score (μ=4.52, σ=0.82) was obtained, which means that the officer always explained program goals. This signals that leadership communication is a key aspect of empowering leadership behaviors that are important to poverty reduction among people affected by disability. The finding agrees with past empirical works by Wong, Nerstad and Dysvik (2014) which linked empowering leadership to goal communication and clarification.
Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer explains how beneficiaries fit into program goals. The table reveals that 43.2% of the respondents said the officer always explained how they fit into program goals and 34.1% of the respondents said the officer almost always explain how they fit into program goals. The table further shows that 9.1% of the respondents said the officer explained how they fit into program goals but 6.8% of the respondents said the officer rarely explained so while another 6.8% of the respondents said the officer never explained how they fit into program goals. A high mean score ($\mu=4.00, \sigma=1.20$) was recorded on a 5-point scale, which means that the officer did almost always explain how beneficiaries fit into program goals. This finding further lends credence to role of communication for effective follower empowerment as suggested by Wong et al. (2014).

With respect to whether Andy Officer explains the purpose of the program’s policies to beneficiaries, it was found that 52.3% of the respondents said the officer always did so, 25% of the respondents said the office almost always did so and 2.3% of the respondents said the officer sometimes did so. However, 6.8% of the respondents said the officer rarely explained the purpose of the program’s policies and 13.6% of the respondents said the officer never explained the purpose of the program’s policies to beneficiaries. A moderately high mean score ($\mu=3.95, \sigma=1.45$) was computed on a scale of 1 to 5, meaning that most of the respondents noted that the officer almost always explain the purpose of the program’s policies to beneficiaries. This finding is also in line with the perspectives of Wong et al. (2014) about leadership communication as hitherto discussed.

Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer explains rules and expectations to program beneficiaries. According to the table, 61.4% of the
respondents said the officer always explain rules and expectations to them and 25% said the officer almost always explain rules and expectations to them. However, some 6.8% of the respondents said the officer rarely explains rules and expectations to them whereas a further 6.8% of the respondents said the officer never explain rules and expectations to them. On a scale of 1 to 5, the mean score obtained was high (μ=4.27, σ=1.21). This suggest that the officer almost always explain program rules and expectations to beneficiaries. This finding equally suggest that Andy Officer acknowledged the significance of clarifying rules of engagement. This is in line with the observation that leaders influence positive behaviors by determining and explaining ground rules that guide followers towards behaviors that are likely to lead to realization of goals (Adams et al., 2012).

Descriptive analysis of showing concern dimensions of empowering leadership

Table 4.19 shows the findings. Respondents were asked whether Andy Officers cares about their personal problems. Table 4.19 indicates that 40.9% of the respondents said that the officer always cares about their personal problems, 9.1% of the respondents said the officer almost always cares about their personal problems, and 25% of the respondents said the officer sometimes cares about their personal problems. However, 9.1% of the respondents held the opinion that the officer rarely cares about their personal problems. A moderately high mean score (μ=3.57, σ=1.40) was computed on a scale of 1 to 5, implying that for most of the respondents, the officer almost always cares about their personal problem. This is in line with empowering leadership practice as defined by Fong and Snape (2015).
Table 4.19: Respondents views on the practice of showing concern by Andy Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The practice of showing concern by Andy Officer</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>μ</th>
<th>σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer cares about my personal problems</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer shows concern for my wellbeing</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer treats me as equal to other people</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer takes time to discuss my concerns patiently</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer shows concern for my success</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer stays in touch with me</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer gets along with me</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer gives me honest and fair answers</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer knows what work I am doing</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Officer finds time to chat with me</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked whether Andy Officer shows concerns for their wellbeing. Table 4.19 reveals that 29.5% of the respondents said the officer always shows concern, 20.5% of the respondents said the officer almost always shows
concern, and another 20.5% of the respondents were of the view that the officer sometimes shows concern for their wellbeing. However, 13.6% of the respondents observed that the officer rarely showed concern while 15.9% of the respondents held the opinion that the officer never shows concerns for their wellbeing. A moderate mean score ($\mu=3.34$, $\sigma=1.45$) was obtained on a 5-point scale. This implies that on average, most of the respondents observed that the officer sometimes showed concern for their wellbeing. The moderate score may be explained by the fact that the Officer largely engaged with program beneficiaries at the group level more than one-on-one. The results depict a moderate practice for showing concern dimension of empowering leadership, suggesting that the Officer potentially needed to improve on this front.

Drawing from empowering leadership theory as propounded by Caldwell and Dixon (2010), empowering leadership effectiveness begins by showing genuine concern, which is a particularly desirable practice in the disability sector.

The study sought to determine whether Andy Officer treats beneficiaries equally. The table shows that 63.6% of the respondents said the officer always treats them as equal to other people and 22.7% of the respondents said the officer almost always treats them as equal to other people. Some 9.1% of the respondents said the officer sometimes treat them as equal to others whereas 4.5% of the respondents were of the view that the officer never treated them as equal to others. A high mean score ($\mu=4.45$, $\sigma=0.85$) was obtained on a scale of 1 to 5, which implies that most of the respondents were of the view that the officer almost always treated them as equal to other people. This is reflective of the concept of fairness, which is an ethical principle observed by effective empowering leaders (Manz & Sims, 1991).

In terms of whether Andy Officer takes time to discuss respondents’ concerns patiently, the table indicates that 47.7% of the respondents observed that the officer
always discuss their concerns patiently, 27.3% of the respondents said the officer almost always discuss their concerns patiently, and 18.2% of the respondents said the officer sometimes discuss their concerns patiently. However, 4.5% of the respondents held the opinion that the officer rarely discuss their concern patiently while another 2.3% of the respondents said the officer never discuss their concerns patiently. On a scale of 1 to 5, a high mean score was obtained (μ=4.14, σ=1.02); implying that the officer almost always discuss their concerns patiently. This finding elevates the trait of patience as a component of empowering leadership. This is in line with the argument by Feng (2015) that such leaders show patience, kindness and respect for those they lead. As the results of this study has shown, this may in fact be a basic requirement of leadership effectiveness in the disability sector because of the many challenges the affected already face.

Respondents were also asked whether Andy Officer shows concern for their success. The table reveals that 65.9% of the respondents said the officer always shows concern for their success and 27.3% of the respondents said the officer sometimes shows concern for their success whereas 6.8% of the respondents held the view that the officer rarely show concern for their success. A high mean score was obtained (μ=4.25, σ=1.08), which suggest that the officer almost always shows concern for beneficiaries’ success. This is in line with Baker and Mathis’ (2011) who argue that empowering leaders get concerned about the success of followers.

The study sought to establish whether Andy Officer stays in touch with beneficiaries. The table indicates that 45.5% of the respondents said the officer always stays in touch with them, 15.9% of the respondents said the officer almost always stays in touch, 27.5% of the respondents said the officer sometimes stays in touch and 4.5% of the respondents said the officer rarely stays in touch while 6.8% said the
officer never stays in touch with them. A moderately high mean score was obtained on a 5-point scale ($\mu=3.89$, $\sigma=1.24$), implying that for most of the respondents, the officer almost always stays in touch with them. This means that the officer was always in communication with the program beneficiaries, which is a critical ingredient for positive influence as posited by Auh et al. (2014).

With respect to whether Andy Officer gets along with program beneficiaries, the table reveals that 31.8% of the respondents said the officer always gets along with them, another 31.8% of the respondents said the officer almost always gets along with them while yet another 31.8% of the respondents noted that the officer sometimes gets along with them. However, some 4.5% of the respondents said the officer never gets along with them. A moderately high mean score ($\mu=3.86$, $\sigma=1.03$) was computed, meaning that for most of the respondents, the officer almost always gets along with them.

Respondents were asked whether Andy Officer gives them honest and fair answers. The table indicates that 86.4% of the respondents said the officer always gives them honest and fair answers and 11.4% of the respondents the officer almost always gives them honest and fair answers whereas some 2.3% of the respondents said the officer sometimes gives honest and fair answers. A very high mean score ($\mu=4.84$, $\sigma=0.43$) was obtained on a 5-point scale, meaning that the officer always gives honest and fair answers to program beneficiaries. This finding is resonant to the perspective of Manz and Sims (1991) about the tenets of empowering leadership.

The study sought to establish whether Andy Officer knows what work program beneficiaries are doing. The table shows that 34.1% of the respondents said the officer always knows what work they were doing, 4.5% of the respondents said
the officer almost always knows what work they were doing, and 18.2% of the respondents said the officer sometimes knows what work they were doing. However, 15.9% of the respondents said the officer rarely knows what work they were doing and a further 27.3% of the respondents said the officer never knows what work they were doing. A moderate mean score (μ=3.02, σ=1.65) was obtained on a scale of 1 to 5, which suggests that on average, the officer sometimes knows what work program beneficiaries were doing. This finding suggests that the office did not maintain a very close working relationship with individual program beneficiaries, which is potentially explained by the scope of engagement of the officer at group level. It also points towards the need for closer interpersonal relationship with individual program beneficiaries for better influence.

Concerning whether Andy Officer finds time to chat with program beneficiaries, the table reveals that 43.2% of the respondents said the officer sometimes finds time to chat with them, 11.4% of the respondents said the officer almost always finds time to chat with them, and 22.7% of the respondents said the officer always finds time to chat with them. However, 9.1% of the respondents said the officer rarely finds time to chat with them, while 13.6% of the respondents said the officer never finds time to chat with them. Collectively, the results suggest that the officer practiced all showing concern dimensions which are tenets associated with empowering leadership theory outlined by Bakar (2013). This means that the theory of empowering leadership was supported by the study findings.
Correlation between empowering leadership and multi-dimensional poverty

Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship between empowering leadership composite score and multi-dimensional poverty score. Table 4.20 presents the results at \( p < .01 \).

Table 4.20: Correlation between empowering leadership and multi-dimensional poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-dimensional Poverty</td>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Empowering leadership</td>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>-.491**</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.20 shows that there was a statistically significant inverse relationship between empowering leadership and respondents’ multi-dimensional poverty scores \( r_s = -.491, p < .01 \). This implies that multi-dimensional poverty reduced with increase in empowering leadership. This finding is in keeping with past studies conducted in organization’s settings that showed linkages between empowering leadership and performance outcomes as reflected in the study by Lorinkova et al. (2013).

*Strengthening effect of empowering leadership on the relationship between self-leadership behaviors and poverty reduction*

Hierarchical regression analysis was run to test this effect. The results are presented in Tables 4.21 to 4.23. Table 4.21 presents findings on the prediction power of self-leadership on poverty reduction after controlling for empowering leadership interventions. Findings in Table 4.21 shows that after accounting for empowering leadership (Model 2), self-leadership behaviors explained 7.9% of the variability in
multidimensional poverty score ($R^2=.376-.297$). Table 4.22 shows the ANOVA results.

Table 4.21: Hierarchical regression model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.545$^a$</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>3.44964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.613$^b$</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>3.28998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Empowering Leadership  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Empowering Leadership, Self-Leadership Behaviours

Table 4.22: ANOVA$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>211.199</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211.199</td>
<td>17.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>499.801</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.900</td>
<td>12.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>711.000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>267.218</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133.609</td>
<td>12.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>443.782</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>711.000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Multi-dimensional Poverty Score  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Empowering Leadership  
c. Predictors: (Constant), Empowering Leadership, Self-Leadership Behaviours

Table 22 shows that $F>1$, $p<.01$ throughout, which is highly significant, suggesting that the final model improves prediction ability to poverty reduction. However, that 37.6% of the variability in multi-dimensional poverty score was explained by the model implies that 62.4% of the poverty reduction outcomes cannot be explained by the two variables (self-leadership and empowering leadership) alone. Rather, there must be other factors that contribute to poverty reduction.

Table 4.23 shows the contribution of each predictor variable (powering leadership and self-leadership) to the outcome variable (multi-dimensional poverty scores).
The study sought to test two hypotheses:

The first hypothesis was as follows;

\[ H_{01}: \text{Self-leadership behaviours have no effect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.} \]

Multi-dimensional poverty was regressed on self-leadership behaviour and the findings presented in Table 4.23. The table reveals that self-leadership behaviours had a statistically significant explanatory power on multi-dimensional poverty scores (\(B=-2.735, p<.05\)). The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis supported. Self-leadership behaviour does contribute to poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. The regression equation for the model is as follows:

\[ \text{MPS} = 16.350 -2.735 \text{SLB} \]

The equation suggests that one unit increase in respondent’s self-leadership behaviours is associated with 2.735 unit reduction their multi-dimensional poverty score. This is in line with a review of community based intervention models by Mousavi (2015) which revealed that self-leadership approaches to empowerment can play a crucial role in poverty reduction. The finding agrees with self-leadership theory.

---

Table 4.23: Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>27.872</td>
<td>3.921</td>
<td>7.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>-3.939</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>-.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>16.350</td>
<td>6.296</td>
<td>2.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>-3.695</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>-.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Leadership Behaviours</td>
<td>-2.735</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>-.283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Multi-dimensional Poverty Score
whose proponents like Neck (2006) argue that application of self-leadership strategies are associated with a number of predictable empowerment outcomes. However, analysis of stories of change revealed that self-leadership behaviors only manifested under the theme of self-determination and this was evident in two out of the four stories of change as implied in the following excerpts;

“As a group we sat down and carefully examined our IGA skills. Most of us had poultry keeping skills thus that is what we decided on with the VIS grant” (Program beneficiary).

“The group realized that they had a lot in common and if they could come together they would be able to do activities which would benefit them” (Program beneficiary).

The second hypothesis was as follows;

$H_{02}$: Empowering leadership does not strengthen the relationship between self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

In order to test this hypothesis, multi-dimensional poverty was regressed on empowering leadership as indicated in Table 4.23. The table reveals that empowering leadership had a statistically significant explanatory power on multi-dimensional poverty ($B=-3.939$, $p<.01$) and, as revealed in Table 4.21, improved the predictive power of the overall model by 29.7%. The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis supported. Empowering leadership does strengthen the predictive power of self-leadership behaviours on poverty reduction.

The equation for this is presented as follows:

$$\text{MPS} = 27.872 - 3.939\text{EPL}$$

The equation means that one unit increase in empowering leadership intervention causes a 3.939 unit reduction the respondents’ multi-dimensional poverty.
score after accounting for self-leadership behaviors. This finding agrees with the claim by Auh et al. (2014) that empowering leadership enhances poverty reduction outcomes through self-leadership behaviours. The theory of empowering leaderships was therefore proven by these results. This corresponds with the viewpoint of Tress (2017) who hold that empowering leadership plays an intrinsic and extrinsic encouragement role, thereby stimulating engagement and action. Findings from document analysis also buttress these results. For instance, a review of ANDY’s financial reports revealed that its principal activities is to “empower youth with disabilities in realizing self-potential and reliance, raise awareness of capabilities and employability of persons with disabilities and facilitate access to decent work” (ANDY, 2015).

Suggestions for improving poverty reduction programs by Andy Staff

Respondents were asked to suggest ways in which Andy staff could improve its programs to enable people affected by disabilities to come out of poverty through leadership development. Thematic analysis of respondents revealed four main recurring themes as presented in Figure 4.6. The figure indicates that top in the list of beneficiaries’ needs was training on stress management skills (33.3%), followed by training on business and entrepreneurship (29.4%) and training on financial management skills (25.5%). Some 11.8% of the respondents also needed financial aid/sponsorship. The results suggest that empowering leadership initiatives by ANDY should focus on training and equipping beneficiaries with three specific skills: stress management, entrepreneurship and financial skills. The findings underscores the currency of positive affect dimension of self-leadership behaviours, which as defined by Gloria et al. (2012), enhances adaptation to life’s challenges and stresses. The
identification of the need to be equipped with business and entrepreneurship skills as well as financial skills point to the need for expansion of Andy’s empowerment program scope.

**Figure 4.6: Suggestions for improvement of leadership empowerment**

![Bar chart showing percentages for different suggestions.]

Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the analysis and discussion of the study findings. Both descriptive and inferential analyses of data has been made and the study hypotheses tested. The inferences drawn have been validated by cross-verification using document analysis and the null hypotheses have been rejected. The results have been compared and contrasted with literature. A summary of the majority findings is presented in the next chapter where conclusions and recommendations are made.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to test whether self-leadership behaviour does contribute to poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya and whether empowering leadership interventions strengthen this relationship. The study set to achieve five specific objectives. In this chapter, a summary of the findings is made for each objective. The implications of the findings are then discussed and conclusions drawn. Subsequently, recommendations are made and areas for further research are proposed.

Summary of Findings

The major findings are summarized for each objective as follows;

*The influence of positive affect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya*

The first objective was to establish the influence of positive affect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Spearman’s Rank correlation analysis was run to establish the correlation between positive affect and multi-dimensional poverty score at $p<.05$. Results revealed there was a statistically significant inverse correlation between positive affect and multidimensional poverty ($r_s =-.348, p<.05$). This means that multi-dimensional poverty reduced as positive affect rose among people affected by disability.
The influence of self-goal setting on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

The second objective was to determine the influence of self-goal setting on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship between a composite measure of self-goal setting and multi-dimensional poverty scores at $p<0.01$. The findings indicated that the relationship between multi-dimensional poverty and self-goal setting score was negative and statistically significant ($r_s = -0.396$, $p<0.01$). This means that the more respondents practiced self-goal setting, the lower their multidimensional poverty score.

The influence of self-determination on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya

The third objective was to investigate whether self-determination had an influence on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship between self-determination and poverty reduction at $p<0.05$. The results revealed that the relationship between multi-dimensional poverty score and self-determination was not statistically significant ($r_s = -0.096$, $p>0.05$). This means that multi-dimensional poverty scores did not change with change, meaning that self-determination had no influence on poverty reduction.


The fourth objective of the study was to assess the influence of self-resilience on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship between self-resilience and
multidimensional poverty scores at \( p < .05 \). Results showed that there was zero correlation between self-resilience and multidimensional poverty scores \( (r_s = .000, \ p > .05) \). This means that self-resilience had no influence on poverty reduction.

A hypothesis was presented that self-leadership behaviour contributes to poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Multi-dimensional poverty was regressed on a composite score of self-leadership behaviour. The findings revealed that self-leadership behaviours had a statistically significant explanatory power on multi-dimensional poverty scores \( (B = -2.735, \ p < .05) \). The null hypothesis was rejected. Self-leadership behaviour did contribute to poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

*The strengthening effect of empowering leadership on the relationship between self-leadership and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.*

The fifth objective was to evaluate whether there was a strengthening effect of empowering leadership on the relationship between self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Spearman’s rank correlation analysis was run to establish the relationship between empowering leadership and poverty reduction at \( p < .01 \). The results revealed that there was a statistically significant inverse relationship between empowering leadership composite score and respondents’ multi-dimensional poverty scores \( (r_s = -.491, \ p < .01) \). This implies that multi-dimensional poverty reduced with increase in empowering leadership.

It was hypothesized that empowering leadership strengthens the relationship between self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Multi-dimensional poverty was scores were regressed on
empowering leadership score. The results indicated that empowering leadership had a statistically significant explanatory power on multi-dimensional poverty \((B= -3.939, p < .01)\) and improved the predictive power of the overall model by 29.7% from 7.9% to 37.6%. The null hypothesis was rejected. Empowering leadership does strengthen the predictive power of self-leadership behaviours on poverty reduction.

Implications

This study has both managerial and theoretical implications. The managerial implications of the study is that empowering leadership interventions strengthen self-leadership outcomes on poverty reduction and demonstrate value for money. Specifically, encouraging program beneficiaries and coaching dimensions of empowering leadership stand out in terms of impact and make a case for future reallocation of program resources in their direction. These two dimensions of empowering leadership are important for achieving meaningful impact of intervention programs towards the achievement of poverty eradication in all its forms among people with disabilities as a sustainable development goal. Empowering leadership focuses on the human capital of program beneficiaries but its ultimate impact on poverty reduction yields spill-over effects on the organization and society because it causes a reduction in dependency on grants and transfer payments. The findings will help program managers to understand which empowering leadership dimensions are worth considering when designing future interventions.

From a theoretical viewpoint, positive affect and self-goal setting elements of self-leadership emerge as the two dimensions that have significant influence on poverty reduction among people affected by disability and should be retained as valid dimensions of self-leadership construct. Although the self-leadership composite score
had an explanatory power on multi-dimensional poverty scores, self-determination and self-resilience on their own did not survive empirical testing and therefore add no value to theorizing the role of leadership on poverty reduction at the intersection of disability. These two dimensions are necessary but not sufficient conditions for enabling people affected by disability to climb out of poverty because of two hypothetical reasons. The first reason is that, by definition, self-resilience keeps people affected by disability from sinking deeper into poverty without necessarily improving their economic status. Similarly, self-determination merely promotes autonomy which people affected by disability can negotiate but autonomy alone cannot lift one out of poverty. By extension, the findings point towards the need for a reconstruction of self-leadership theory as it applies to the disability sector.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn:

*The influence of positive affect on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya*

Positive affect has a significant positive influence on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Being cheerful, feeling alive, actively participating in nation building even in a small way, believing in oneself and maintaining a positive perspective that there is always more to celebrate in life despite life’s setbacks are important ingredients for rising out of poverty. Indeed, poverty can be nothing but a state of mind.
The influence of self-goal setting on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

Self-goal setting has the highest significant positive influence on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Setting specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound goals, and making every effort to implement them while adjusting goals to accommodate emerging realities keep people focused enough to realize positive transformation.

The influence of self-determination on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya

Self-determination has no influence on poverty reduction among people affected by disability. It is therefore a necessary but not a sufficient condition for enabling people affected by disability to climb out of poverty. This is potentially because while self-determination promotes autonomy of the self, the realities of some levels of disability make certain aspects of self-determination such as living life without needing help from anyone either impractical or counterproductive to the individual’s poverty reduction efforts.


Self-resilience also has no influence on poverty reduction among people affected by disability. This is self-explanatory in the sense that the expected functional utility of self-resilience is quick recovery and restoration from adversities of life. Flexibility and easy adaptation to change, never giving up easily on one’s goals and an ability to deal with whatever comes one’s way are elements of self-resilience that serve as bare minimums for surviving and thriving with a disability.
The strengthening effect of empowering leadership on the relationship between self-leadership and poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya.

Empowering leadership strengthens the effect of self-leadership behaviors on poverty reduction among people affected by disability in Kenya. Specifically, the dimensions of empowering leadership with compelling evidence are two: coaching and encouraging social participation. By encouraging program beneficiaries to express their ideas and suggestions, voice their opinions on issues and putting their ideas into consideration, a sense of self-worth is ignited on people that propels them into actions that lift them out of poverty. Similarly, by coaching and mentoring them to maintain focus, individuals direct all their resources into their own self-set goals which significantly increases chances of success.

Recommendations

In view of the conclusions, the following recommendations are worth considering:

i) Equipping program recipients with goal-setting skills should be intentionally embedded into poverty eradication interventions and other empowerment programs targeting people affected by disability. Training them on how to set specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound goals would go a long way in catalysing poverty reduction outcomes.

ii) Program implementers such as project coordinators, life coaches and volunteers should be sensitized on the value of infusing a positive perspective on people affected by disability. This, they can achieve by enmeshing themselves in the lives of program recipients through showing concern and encouraging social participation. Practical ways of implementing this include organizing targeted social events and meetings.
iii) Self-leadership is not a panacea for all poverty issues facing people affected by disability and as such, interventions targeting self-leadership behaviours should integrate self-leadership programs into their projects rather than make it the sole focus of their activities.

iv) In connection with the preceding recommendations, a leadership approach to poverty reduction intervention in the disability sector is developed as shown in Figure 4.7. This approach, which has been called the Full-range Empowerment Model for poverty reduction integrates the significant dimensions of self-leadership behaviours that need to be stimulated and the empowering leadership elements that collectively form effective stimulants for poverty reduction. The model proposes that since disability is a multidimensional construct, other intervention measures such as the removal of social barriers should act as reinforcement.

![Full-range Empowerment Model](image-url)

Figure 4.7: Full-range Empowerment Model
The contribution of this study to the body of knowledge is multi-fold. Firstly, the study explored the theory of self-leadership and its application to poverty reduction in a largely marginalized sector. Existing studies so far such as the study by Bester et al. (2015) and Lorinkova et al. (2013) have been done on self-leadership theory and its allied concept of empowering leadership in the corporate sector. In this study, the elements of self-leadership and empowerment leadership have been tested among families affected by disability and this has led to the drawing of a distinction between elements that merely maintains one’s poverty status quo (self-resilience, self-determination, role-modelling, informing, showing concern) and those that are associated with significant change (self-goal setting, positive affect, coaching, encouraging participation). This has given birth to the development of what is referred herein as the Full-range Empowerment Model, a leadership and empowerment approach to poverty reduction in the disability sector. Although it is of immediate application to interventions targeting families affected by disability, it is the considered view of this study that it can be applied across all marginalized and vulnerable groups. Therefore, its application has currency for achieving the first MDG goal, namely, eradication of extreme poverty in all its forms.

Secondly, previous studies in the disability sector undertaken by Gragoudas (2012) and Mousavi (2015) either were not based on original research or were lacking in empirical analysis; while the study by Owen et al. (2015) was undertaken in the US where disability empowerment programs are well developed. Thus, this study has contributed to knowledge by drawing inferences from primary research, triangulating data from multiple sources and testing for statistical significance using inferential
statistics not only in a developing country context, but in a region with the highest share of the poor population in the world.

Finally, documented studies in the disability sector in Kenya have not applied self-leadership theory to the investigation of poverty eradication interventions. Yet the concept of self-help has become firmly embedded in Kenya, with a government department dedicated to the registration and regulation of self-help groups. For example, although Minja’s (2013) study recognize the power of self-leadership as an antidote to the many social issues faced in Kenya today, its application to the disability sector was not brought out, which is a knowledge gap filled by the current study. It is argued that this is one of the few pioneering studies that adds to the body of knowledge of poverty eradication from a leadership perspective with particular focus on the disability sector which is one of the most marginalized sectors in history.

Areas for Further Research

Like any other study, this study was not without its shortcomings. Therefore, further improvement can help increase the reliability and generalizability of statistical estimates. The following areas are identified for further research:

i) This study targeted a small, relatively homogenous population of people affected by disability yet disability is a diverse and multi-dimensional concept. A future study can expand on this study by collecting data from a larger and diverse sample of people affected by disability.

ii) In retrospect, the data collected revealed that it was probably too early to conduct an impact study on the interventions implemented by ANDY. While the results of the current study can offer guidance for policy directions, a
follow up study, perhaps adopting longitudinal design is recommended for a comprehensive impact assessment.

iii) The current study was also limited in scope to Nairobi County which is characteristically an urban setting yet the dynamics of poverty potentially vary between urban and rural environments. A comparative study may be conducted to establish whether there are any significant difference between poverty outcomes of programs in rural and urban settings using the same multi-dimensional poverty measure. A study comparing NGO led interventions with government led programs could also be undertaken.

iv) Although the regression model had explanatory power on the variability in multi-dimensional poverty scores, a significant proportion of the variability was not explained by the model. It is thus proposed that further investigation should reveal which factors are accounted for in the error term.

v) The current study used absolute values rather than weighted indices to compute respondents’ multi-dimensional poverty scores. It would be interesting to establish whether the empirical evidence revealed in the current study survives such an adjustment.

vi) Finally, because the study evaluated a program that was based on NGO mode of operation, generalizability of the results may not be extendable to programs designed and run by other stakeholders such as government agencies and corporate organizations with poverty eradication interventions targeting the disability sector. Therefore, a similar study could be based on a government agency or a private foundation.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has summarized the study findings and explained the managerial and theoretical implications. The chapter has also drawn conclusions and made recommendations of the study for policy and practice. The chapter has further acknowledged the limitations of the study and suggested future research directions. In a nutshell, self-leadership reduces poverty and empowering leadership strengthens poverty reduction outcomes. However, self-leadership is not a panacea for all poverty issues facing people affected by disability and should be integrated into interventions rather than making it the sole focus. A model for achieving this has been proposed.
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APPENDIX I: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Introduction:

My name is Sylvance Mboha. I am a post-graduate student conducting research for the award of a Master's Degree in Leadership at Pan Africa Christian University.

Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of the study is to determine the influence of self-leadership behaviors on poverty reduction and test the strengthening effect of empowering leadership programs by ANDY.

Confidentiality:

To ensure your confidentiality, all the information you write in the questionnaire is strictly confidential and will be used for the purpose of this research study only. Please do not reveal your name or identity anywhere on the instrument.

Statement of Informed Consent:

I understand that participation in this study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent to participate in this study at any time. Refusal to participate or withdrawal will involve no penalty or benefits. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the research, and I have received answers concerning the areas that I do not understand. I willingly consent to participate in this research.

_______________________________  ______________________
Signature of Respondent           Date
Dear respondent,

My name is Sylvance Mboha. I am undertaking an academic research titled; “Self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among persons affected by disability in Kenya: A case study of Action Network for the Disabled”. This is in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in Leadership at the Pan Africa Christian University. The study is intended to lead to the empowerment of people affected by disabilities through leadership development. This questionnaire contain six short sections that should only take a few moments of your time. Please respond to the questions as accurately and as completely as possible. Your responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0721862116 or Pan Africa Christian University.

==================================================================

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

1. Gender:
   - Male □
   - Female □

2. Marital Status:
   - Married □
   - Unmarried □

3. Number of dependents: ________________________________

4. Level of education:
   - Primary level □
   - Secondary level □
   - College level □
   - University level □
   - Other (please specify) ________________________________

5. Which year did you start benefiting from ANDY programs? __________

6. Which programs have you benefited from (tick all that apply)
   - Economic empowerment □
   - Employment empowerment □
   - Other (please specify) ________________________________
SECTION B: POVERTY REDUCTION

7. In this section, indicate whether the following is true concerning your living status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have increased my education from ANDY support</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my school-age children are enrolled in school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well-nourished everyday</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always sure of my next meal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have insurance cover</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My house is connected to electricity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to adequate sanitation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My house has a cemented floor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use gas or electricity for cooking</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to information</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own assets such as land</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own tools that enable my mobility/movement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me and my household live on more than Ksh.200 a day</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in full time employment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own an income generating project</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly save part of my income</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate the extent to which the following aspects of your life has improved as a result of ANDY Programs? (1=No change and 5=Very great extent).

Income  __________   Living conditions  __________
Employment  __________   Network  __________
Education  __________   Investment  __________
Health  __________
SECTION E: SELF-LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR

9. In this section, please tick against the number which most closely represents your opinion on the following statements (1=Never; 2= Rarely; 3= Sometimes; 4=Almost always; 5=Always).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive affect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Despite my circumstances, I feel alive and cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel overwhelmed and worried by my situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively participate in nation building even in my own small way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I can do most things just as good as other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more to celebrate in life despite my setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-goal setting</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I state my goals in time and/or money form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals I set for myself are usually difficult but attainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I set my goals, I make an effort to implement them and make adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I break down my goals into performance indicators at different time intervals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attain most of the goals I set to achieve to a large extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-determination</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I try to figure out solutions to problems no matter how difficult they are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know my strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do speak up for my rights when they are being infringed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make a point to keep track of how well I’m doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have total control over the decisions and actions that affect my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live my life without needing help from anyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-resilience</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I adapt to changes easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is always about being flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t give up easily on what I have set to achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this life, one must be tough to achieve what they want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can deal with whatever comes my way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10. Please indicate whether ANDY Officers practice the following (1=Never; 2=Rarely; 3=Sometimes; 4=Almost always; 5=Always).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership dimensions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role modelling (leading by example)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets high standards for performance by his/her own behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works as hard as he/she can to ensure I succeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets a good example by the way he/she conducts him/herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouraging participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages me to express my ideas/suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens to my ideas/suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses my suggestions to make decisions that affect me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives me a chance to voice my opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers my ideas when he/she disagrees with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me to see areas in which I need more training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests ways to improve my performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages me to solve my problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages me to exchange information with my group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides help where I need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches me how to solve problems on my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pays attention to my efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells me when I perform well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports my efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me to focus on my goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me to develop good working relationship with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains program decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains program goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains how I fit into program goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains the purpose of the program’s policies to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains rules and expectations to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Showing concern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about my personal problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows concern for my wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats me as equal to other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes time to discuss my concerns patiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows concern for my success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays in touch with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets along with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives me honest and fair answers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows what work I am doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds time to chat with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11. Please suggest ways in which ANDY staff can improve its programs to enable people affected by disabilities to come out of poverty through leadership development.

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and cooperation.
Dear interviewee,

My name is Sylvance Mboha. I am undertaking an academic research titled; “Self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among persons affected by disability in Kenya: A case study of Action Network for the Disabled”. This is in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in Leadership at the Pan Africa Christian University. The study is intended to lead to the empowerment of people affected by disabilities through leadership development. This interview involve a few questions that should only take a few moments of your time. Please respond to the questions as accurately and as completely as possible. Your responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0721862116 or Pan Africa Christian University.

=============================================================

1. What is your designation?

2. What self-leadership behaviours do you promote to ensure that program beneficiaries are empowered to take control of their lives and situations – that is to self-lead with respect to the following dimensions?
   a. Positive affect
   b. Self-goal setting
   c. Self-determination
   d. Self-resilience

3. In what ways would you say beneficiaries have benefited most from ANDY programs?

4. What are the unique challenges you face in your efforts to develop the self-leadership capacity of program beneficiaries?

5. If you could do one thing differently about how ANDY implements its empowerment programs, what could it be?

6. What advice would you give to program beneficiaries to transform their lives through self-leadership initiatives?

Thank you for your time and cooperation
APPENDIX IV: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE

1. What document is this? (An annual report, an impact assessment report, a change story, a photo gallery?).

2. When was it documented? (Check for date or other information as evidence).

3. Who created the document? (ANDY staff, program beneficiary or other stakeholder?)

4. Is the mood of the writer revealed in the document? (Does it convey a sense of empowerment, disempowerment, disappointment, emancipation?).

5. List three things the document says about poverty reduction among people affected by disability?
   i) ___________________________________________
   ii) ___________________________________________
   iii) ___________________________________________

6. Identify one thing that the document tells you about self-leadership behaviours of program beneficiaries?
   i) Goal setting: ___________________________________________
   ii) Positive affect: ___________________________________________
   iii) Self-determination: _______________________________________ 
   iv) Self-resilience: ___________________________________________

7. List five things that the document says about empowering leadership practice by the NGO?
   i) Coaching: ___________________________________________
   ii) Role-modelling: _______________________________________
   iii) Informing: ___________________________________________
   iv) Encouraging participation: _____________________________
   v) Showing concern: _______________________________________
APPENDIX V: PAC UNIVERSITY INTRODUCTION LETTER

14th June, 2017

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: SYLVANCE A. MBOHA MAL/0659/15

Greetings! This is an introduction letter for the above named person a final year student in Pan Africa Christian University (PAC University), pursuing Master of Arts in Leadership.

He is at the final stage of the programme and he is preparing to collect data to enable him finalise on his thesis. The thesis title is “Self – Leadership Behaviours and Poverty Reduction among Persons Affected by Disability in Kenya: A Case of Action Network for the Disabled”.

We therefore kindly request that you allow him conduct research at your organization.

Warm Regards,

[Signature]

[Address]

14th June 2017
APPENDIX VI: NACOSTI RESEARCH PERMIT

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:

MR. SYLVANCE ANYUMBA MBOHA
of PAN AFRICA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY,
56875-200 NAIROBI, has been permitted
to conduct research in Nairobi County
on the topic: SELF-LEADERSHIP
BEHAVIOURS AND POVERTY REDUCTION
AMONG PERSONS AFFECTED BY
DISABILITY IN KENYA: A CASE STUDY
OF ACTION NETWORK FOR THE
DISABLED
for the period ending:
18th July, 2018

P. K. B. KABEKWA
National Commission for Science,
Technology & Innovation

**CONDITIONS**

1. The Licence is valid for the proposed research,
   research site specified period.
2. Both the Licence and any rights thereunder are
   non-transferable.
3. Upon request of the Commission, the Licencee
   shall submit a progress report.
4. The Licensee shall report to the County Director of
   Education and County Governor in the area of
   research before commencement of the research.
5. Excavation, filming and collection of specimens
   are subject to further permissions from relevant
   Government agencies.
6. This Licence does not give authority to transfer
   research materials.
7. The Licencee shall submit two (2) hard copies and
   upload a soft copy of their final report.
8. The Commission reserves the right to modify the
   conditions of this Licence including its cancellation
   without prior notice.

Republic of Kenya

National Commission for Science,
Technology and Innovation

RESEARCH CLEARANCE
PERMIT

Serial No.A 15042
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APPENDIX VII: NACOSTI AUTHORIZATION LETTER

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE,
TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Ref No: NACOSTI/P/17/63622/17813

Date: 18th July, 2017

Sylvance Anyumba Mboha
Pan Africa Christian University
P.O. Box 200-56875
NAIROBI,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among persons affected by disability in Kenya: A case study of action network for the disabled,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nairobi County for the period ending 18th July, 2018.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Nairobi County before embarking on the research project.

Kindly note that, as an applicant who has been licensed under the Science, Technology and Innovation Act, 2013 to conduct research in Kenya, you shall deposit a copy of the final research report to the Commission within one year of completion. The soft copy of the same should be submitted through the Online Research Information System.

GODFREY P. KALERWA MSc., MBA, MKIM
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:
The County Commissioner
Nairobi County.

The County Director of Education
Nairobi County.
SYLVANCE ARYUMBA MBURA
P.O Box 200-56875
NAIROBI

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

We are in receipt of a letter from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation regarding research authorization in Nairobi County on "Self-leadership behaviours and poverty reduction among persons affected by disability in Kenya: A case study of action network for the disabled."

This office has no objection and authority is hereby granted for a period ending 18th July, 2017 as indicated in the request letter.

Kindly inform the Sub County Director of Education of the Sub County you intend to visit.

[Stamp: NAIROBI]

MAIN NGURU
FOR: REGIONAL COORDINATOR OF EDUCATION
NAIROBI

CC: Director General/CEO
National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation
NAIROBI
APPENDIX IX: EXTRACT OF ANDY’S YEAR 2015 ANNUAL REPORT

Action Network for the Disabled
Financial Statements
For The Year Ended 31st December 2015

Report of the Executive Committee

The Executive Committee has the pleasure of presenting the report together with the audited financial statement for the period ended 31st December 2015.

Action Network for the Disabled is a Non-Governmental organization, registered under Section 23 of the NGOs Coordination Act 1990. Its rules and regulations govern its day to day operations.

Principal Activities:

Empower youth with disabilities in realizing self-potential and reliance, raise awareness of capabilities and employability of persons with disabilities and facilitate access to decent work.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>16,263,146</td>
<td>6,736,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Expenses</td>
<td>14,248,745</td>
<td>9,108,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance for the year</td>
<td>2,014,401</td>
<td>(2,371,814)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elizabeth Sakwa – CHV and Member MNCH Buddy Group

I, Elizabeth Sakwa am thankful for this VIS program. I am a member of MNCH Buddy Group and a mother of an epileptic child. I could not afford medicines for my child. My child always suffered seizures and could not attend school. Not only that; an epileptic child needs a special diet. The VIS program has enabled me to achieve all the above. As you can see, here is the box of medicines and even my son is not here; he is in school!

NFSS gave me the VIS grant through my group and I invested in my detergent making skills. I make detergents for sale to schools and the neighbourhood. I do train women living with disabilities on the skills too and also do sell the detergent making materials to them.

Identifying children and women living with disabilities within the community is my priority and I do refer them to NFSS for therapy services and medical attention. I give talks on good nutrition in the households I do visit. Thank you for your field visits too; they have made me stay on focus.
APPENDIX XI: SCREENSHOT OF PHOTO GALLERY