

Governance and Administration in Programme Continuity and Organizational Resilience at Beacon of Hope in Kibera Kenya

Dorcus Anupi*, Aloys Ojore, Jeketule Soko

Tangaza University, Kenya.

ABSTRACT

This study examined governance and administration in relation to programme continuity and organizational resilience at Beacon of Hope, an organization supporting orphans and vulnerable children in Kibera, Nairobi County. Three specific objectives guided the article: to describe perceived governance and administrative practices; to examine stakeholders' accounts of how these practices support continuity and resilience; and to assess the reported association between governance and the available composite organizational outcome. A mixed methods single-organization study combined 29 completed staff and volunteer questionnaires with 16 purposively selected key informant interviews. Descriptive statistics, Spearman's correlation and a supplementary Kruskal–Wallis comparison were interpreted alongside interview themes. First, respondents rated board functionality, role clarity and donor-related governance arrangements positively, with reported item means of approximately 4.31 on a five-point scale; documented policies received a mean of 4.17. Second, informants described board oversight, audits, implemented procedures and safeguarding arrangements as foundations for accountability and institutional credibility, although independent evidence of service continuity was unavailable. Third, governance correlated positively with a composite combining perceived funding readiness, continuity and resilience ($p = .617$, $p < .01$); this does not establish separate relationships with each outcome or causation. The study concludes that governance was perceived as an important institutional capability, while demonstrated resilience remains insufficiently measured. It recommends verifying the implementation of governance policies, linking oversight to explicit continuity procedures, and measuring funding readiness, service continuity and resilience separately in future longitudinal research.

Keywords: governance and administration, programme continuity, organizational resilience, orphans and vulnerable children, local NGOs, Kibera, accountability

INTRODUCTION

For an organization supporting vulnerable children, good governance must mean more than holding board meetings or preparing reports. It should help staff make sound decisions, protect essential services and respond when funding changes. International research shows why this is difficult: NGOs answer to donors, regulators, staff and communities whose expectations do not always coincide (Banks et al., 2015; Ebrahim, 2003; O'Dwyer & Unerman, 2008). The question is therefore not simply whether governance structures exist, but how they operate when an organization must decide what it can continue to provide.

Governance establishes oversight, authority and accountability, while administration turns decisions into everyday procedures. The distinction matters because

formal arrangements do not necessarily translate into effective action. Herman and Renz's (2004) panel study found that changes in practices regarded as good management did not consistently correspond with changes in perceived effectiveness. Their findings caution against treating a checklist of structures as proof that an organization performs well. In a child-support programme, evidence of sound governance should consequently be considered alongside evidence about the services children and caregivers receive.

Accountability introduces a further question: accountability to whom? Ebrahim (2003) distinguishes reporting and disclosure from participatory and learning processes. Kilby (2006), drawing on 15 NGOs in India, examines accountability to constituents in relation to empowerment. O'Dwyer and

Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Unerman's (2008) Amnesty Ireland case shows how attention can become concentrated on powerful stakeholders even where managers favour broader accountability. Together, these studies suggest that donor compliance and community responsiveness should be examined separately, rather than assumed to develop together.

Programme continuity and organizational resilience also require careful distinction. Continuity concerns the maintenance of essential activities; resilience concerns how an organization anticipates, copes with and adapts to adversity (Duchek, 2020). Searing et al. (2021), studying 31 nonprofits during the Illinois budget impasse, examine the practical work of surviving a revenue crisis while continuing services. Their approach makes clear why remaining open is an incomplete measure of success. An institution may survive while reducing the reach or regularity of its programmes.

These concerns are relevant to African development organizations, although institutional and funding conditions vary. Gugerty's (2008) analysis across 20 African countries distinguishes different forms of NGO self-regulation, showing that accountability arrangements take different institutional forms. In Southern Africa, Wellens and Jegers (2017) find that local partners' involvement in decision-making matters to perceptions of governance, while their influence at donor level remains limited. Governance must therefore be understood within wider relationships of authority and dependence, not solely through an organization's internal rules.

Recent Kenyan evidence adds a useful qualification. Mbatha et al. (2026) report high ratings of governance accounting practices among NGOs in Kajiado County, but a positive association with risk management that did not reach conventional statistical significance. Their study illustrates that favourable descriptions of governance can coexist with uncertain evidence about related outcomes. This is especially relevant when interpreting staff assessments of organizational resilience. Resource dependence theory also suggests that internal capabilities operate within external constraints on resources and discretion (Hillman et al., 2009).

Within Nairobi's informal settlements, Njoroge et al. (2025) examine governance and sustainability among women's self-help groups in Viwandani. Their work

directs attention to collective decision-making and internal organizational arrangements. These groups differ from Beacon of Hope, but provide a nearby comparison for examining how local institutions organize responsibility and participation. Syengo et al. (2026), reviewing post-donor sustainability in mission-oriented development work, further position governance alongside financial management, leadership and learning. Both studies discourage treating governance as a stand-alone explanation of sustainability.

The social transformation perspective gives this discussion a practical purpose. Management for Social Transformation connects management and ethical responsibilities with mission-oriented practice (Soko et al., 2012). Applied here, the relevant question is whether institutional arrangements help sustain support to vulnerable children and their households. This is an analytical application of the book's stated orientation, rather than a claim that the book provides empirical evidence about Beacon of Hope.

Beacon of Hope offers a case in which to examine these issues. The organization's staff and stakeholders can describe its governance arrangements and their perceived value, but those assessments need to be distinguished from independently documented continuity. The problem is not an assumed absence of policies. It is uncertainty about how far favourable assessments of governance correspond with the ability to maintain and adapt services under pressure. The global literature establishes reasons to expect a relationship, while the Kenyan evidence shows why that relationship should be tested rather than presumed (Herman & Renz, 2004; Mbatha et al., 2026).

The gap addressed in this article is therefore both contextual and analytical. The studies reviewed do not establish how governance operates within Beacon of Hope's Kibera programmes. They also examine different outcomes, including accountability, governance perceptions and risk management, which cannot be treated as interchangeable with continuity or resilience. This study contributes a mixed methods account of reported practices, stakeholder explanations and the available statistical relationship. It also identifies a boundary in the evidence: the study combines perceived funding readiness, continuity and resilience in one outcome measure, preventing separate conclusions about the latter two outcomes.

Study objective and specific objectives

The study's overall objective was to: "Assess the relationship between governance and administration and programme continuity and resilience at Beacon of Hope in Kibera, Nairobi County."

Three specific objectives guided the analysis:

1. To describe staff and volunteers' perceptions of governance and administrative practices at Beacon of Hope.
2. To examine stakeholders' accounts of how governance and administrative practices support programme continuity and organizational resilience.
3. To assess the reported association between governance and administration and the available composite outcome, while identifying its limitations for conclusions about continuity and resilience separately.

The third objective reflects the available outcome measurement: its statistical outcome combines perceived direct funding readiness, programme continuity and resilience. It is consequently broader than the original objective and cannot provide an isolated test of either continuity or resilience.

Literature

Global evidence on governance and effectiveness

Research on nonprofit effectiveness challenges the assumption that good procedures necessarily produce good outcomes. Herman and Renz (2004) followed organizations over time and found that different stakeholder groups judged effectiveness differently. This matters for the present study because staff ratings describe one set of perspectives on Beacon of Hope, rather than a definitive assessment of its performance. Boards, employees, donors and service users may reasonably notice different strengths and weaknesses.

The study also helps frame the distinction between structures and their use. A board's existence says little about the quality of its deliberation, whether it receives timely information or whether management implements its decisions. The present article therefore examines board functionality, role clarity and procedures as reported practices, while asking what additional evidence would connect them to maintained services. This avoids assigning effects to governance arrangements solely because participants rate them highly (Herman & Renz, 2004).

Accountability and organizational purpose

Ebrahim (2003) identifies accountability mechanisms that extend beyond financial reporting. Kilby (2006) gives particular attention to relationships with constituents, while O'Dwyer and Unerman (2008) illustrate the risk of external accountability narrowing around powerful stakeholders. The shared concern is that reporting requirements can become more visible than responsiveness to communities. For organizations serving vulnerable children, this suggests examining whether information on service interruptions, complaints and unmet needs reaches those with decision-making authority.

These studies do not imply that audits or donor reports lack value. Rather, they raise a question about balance. Controls can protect resources and demonstrate responsible stewardship, but service users also need opportunities to influence decisions affecting them. The literature therefore supports examining governance through both oversight and responsiveness, while leaving their relationship to continuity open to empirical investigation (Ebrahim, 2003; Kilby, 2006).

Resilience under financial pressure

Duchek (2020) describes resilience as a capability involving anticipation, coping and adaptation. Searing et al. (2021) bring this concern into nonprofit practice by studying organizations facing a prolonged public revenue crisis. Their analysis identifies responses across finance, staffing, outreach, services and leadership. The implication for governance research is that adaptation is visible in decisions and actions across the organization, rather than in a single positive judgement about leadership.

Resource dependence theory explains why these actions may nevertheless have limits. Organizations must manage relationships with actors controlling resources they need (Hillman et al., 2009). A board can improve oversight without being able to replace a lost funding stream. Governance may shape the response to disruption, but it should not be credited with outcomes that depend on wider financial or institutional conditions. The present study consequently interprets governance as a possible enabling capability rather than a sufficient explanation of resilience.

African evidence on participation and institutional arrangements



Gugerty (2008) shows that African NGO self-regulation includes national associations, organizational clubs and voluntary codes. This diversity argues against assuming that a common label such as accountability describes the same institutional practice everywhere. Wellens and Jegers (2017), using information from NGO staff and local partner representatives in Southern Africa, also find uneven opportunities for influence across organizational levels. These studies locate governance within wider relationships, including whose priorities are heard and where decision-making authority sits.

Syengo et al. (2026) extend the sustainability discussion to mission-oriented development initiatives. Their synthesis connects governance with leadership, resource stewardship, human capacity and learning. Its relevance is the emphasis on interacting capabilities. Its limitation for this article is equally clear: review evidence cannot establish how those capabilities operated at Beacon of Hope. The present study supplies local accounts, while distinguishing reported mechanisms from verified service outcomes.

Kenyan and Nairobi evidence

Mbatha et al. (2026) examined governance accounting and risk management using a cross-sectional mixed methods study of 93 respondents in Kajiado County. High governance ratings accompanied a positive but statistically non-significant relationship with risk management. The result provides a useful Kenyan comparison because it separates respondents' recognition of governance practices from evidence about their association with a related organizational outcome. Risk management is not the same as programme continuity, however, and the study cannot settle the relationship examined here.

Njoroge et al. (2025) focus on women's self-help groups in Viwandani, Nairobi. Their study links the discussion of sustainability to participation, committees and internal controls, while recognizing wider constraints. The organizational setting differs from Beacon of Hope's professional service responsibilities. The strongest comparison is therefore about everyday governance practices and member participation, not equivalent service outcomes. Soko et al. (2012) provide a complementary management perspective centred on organizational purpose and ethical practice; the book is used as a conceptual reference, not as an empirical test.

Research gap

Taken together, the literature supports three questions. Which governance practices are recognized within the organization? How do stakeholders explain their role during disruption? And what evidence connects those practices with the maintenance and adaptation of services? Existing research offers relevant comparisons but does not answer these questions for Beacon of Hope's Kibera programmes. The present article addresses them within one case, while acknowledging that its composite outcome limits the statistical answer. This is a bounded contribution, rather than a claim that governance and NGO sustainability have received no previous attention.

METHODOLOGY

Research design and case boundaries

The study used mixed methods, combining a cross-sectional questionnaire with semi-structured key informant interviews to examine governance and administration. Beacon of Hope is the organizational case, and its work supporting orphans and vulnerable children in Kibera provides the programme context. Individual questionnaire responses are assessments of that organization, not observations of 29 different organizations.

The design is appropriate for combining standardized descriptions of perceptions with explanations of organizational practice. Integration is achieved by comparing ratings with interview accounts and identifying agreement, additional context and unresolved questions. Fetters et al. (2013) explain that integration is central to mixed methods research; merely presenting two datasets does not establish triangulation. Here, convergence increases confidence that particular practices were recognized by participants, but cannot independently validate organizational outcomes.

Population sampling and achieved participation

Beacon of Hope had an overall workforce of 154 and an accessible population of 52 people whose responsibilities were relevant to the study. Eligibility included involvement in the relevant programmes or organizational functions, at least six months' service, adulthood and willingness to consent. Purposive selection targeted participants with pertinent institutional knowledge. Thirty questionnaires were targeted

and 29 completed, giving a response rate of 96.7% among those approached. This is not a population response rate or evidence of representativeness.

Sixteen key informants participated: three senior management representatives, two Department of Children Services representatives, three programme management representatives, three community volunteers, three Social Services representatives and two donor agency representatives. Their varied roles provided complementary perspectives on governance and programme operations. The qualitative sample is analytically separate from the survey; adding interviews to questionnaires does not enlarge the statistical sample to 45.

A finite-population calculation yielded approximately 46 participants; the questionnaire component targeted 30 and achieved 29 responses. Because selection was purposive, this article makes no claim of a 5% sampling margin of error. The rationale for selection is access to relevant knowledge within a bounded case, accompanied by limitations concerning selection bias and transferability.

Instruments and measurement

The questionnaire used response anchors from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. Governance items addressed board functionality, role clarity, policies, accountability, donor confidence, compliance and administrative continuity. The seven-item governance scale had Cronbach's alpha of .973 in the 29 completed questionnaires. High internal consistency does not establish construct validity, and items incorporating donor confidence or continuity may overlap conceptually with the outcome.

The outcome scale contained eight items combining perceived direct funding readiness, programme continuity and resilience, with reported alpha of .928. Consequently, the correlation reported below concerns this broad composite. Separate validated scales and separate associations for continuity and resilience are unavailable. Item wording, scoring and overlap require examination before stronger claims can be made.

A pilot involved five participants excluded from the main study. Revisions simplified terminology and instructions and refined interview prompts. Questionnaire administration used KoBo Toolbox, with links shared through WhatsApp and oral clarification

in Kiswahili where necessary. Interviews explored governance arrangements, accountability, continuity and adaptation. Detailed interview dates, duration and transcription procedures require author confirmation.

Analysis and integration

Quantitative analysis used governance item means, Spearman's correlation and a supplementary comparison across occupational groups. Spearman's correlation summarizes monotonic association between respondents' ratings without requiring a causal interpretation. The Kruskal–Wallis comparison concerns differences across occupational groups, not the association between governance and resilience. Statistical results were interpreted as associations between individual assessments of one organization.

Interview findings were organized using an objective-based thematic framework, with recurring ideas grouped into explanatory themes. Thematic interpretation provides a way to connect recurring accounts while retaining differences in participants' views (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The completeness of the qualitative audit trail remains a limitation. Integration below relates each numerical finding to relevant interview material and literature, retaining gaps where independent corroboration is missing.

Ethics and researcher position

The study obtained ethical approval through Tangaza University and research authorization through NACOSTI, together with informed consent, voluntary participation and anonymized respondent codes. Approval identifiers and dates need confirmation for journal submission. The researcher held a leadership role in Beacon of Hope's Social and Economic Empowerment department. This insider position supported contextual knowledge but could influence recruitment, willingness to criticize and interpretation. Recruitment and interviews used assurances of voluntariness and neutral questioning; these precautions reduce rather than eliminate the concern. Organizational identification and quotation use should be checked against the original consent arrangements.

Findings and Discussions

Perceived governance and administrative practices

Respondents generally assessed governance positively. The highest reported item means concerned

board functionality, role clarity and donor-related governance arrangements. Policies received a slightly

lower mean, but the available figures do not establish whether differences between items are meaningful.

Table 1: Reported Governance and Administration Item Means

Governance or administrative practice	Mean
Active and functional Board of Directors	4.31
Clearly defined board and management roles	4.31
Governance systems enhancing donor confidence	4.31
Governance structures supporting donor compliance	4.31
Leadership promoting transparency and accountability	4.28
Administrative systems supporting continuity during funding disruption	4.21
Documented governance and operational policies	4.17

Note. N = 29; five-point response anchors. Source: Study questionnaire findings, 2026. Item standard deviations and response distributions are unavailable for this presentation. No overall governance mean is inferred from these rounded values.

The ratings raise a question about how visible institutional arrangements relate to the documentation underpinning them. Board functionality and role clarity were rated at approximately 4.31, compared with 4.17 for documented policies. However, the difference is only descriptive: without item distributions or paired tests, it cannot establish a meaningful implementation gap. A reasonable interpretation is that participants recognized the governance structure, while the consistency of policy use remains a separate question.

This finding is easier to understand when compared with other studies. Njoroge et al. (2025) describe internal governance arrangements among Nairobi self-help groups, supporting attention to how responsibility is organized in local institutions. The present case extends that discussion to a service organization, but does not establish that the two settings share the same mechanisms or outcomes. Herman and Renz (2004) provide a caution: adoption of accepted practices did not reliably track changes in effectiveness in their panel study. Beacon of Hope's positive ratings should therefore be treated as evidence of perceived institutional strengths, not a substitute for performance evidence.

The rating for administration during funding disruption (4.21) deserves particular attention. It concerns an expected connection with continuity, whereas board functionality concerns an organizational arrangement. Including both in the governance scale may blur the distinction between a capability and the

outcome it is intended to support. Respondents who believe the organization is well governed may also believe it will maintain services, strengthening the correlation through overlapping judgements. This does not invalidate their views, but it limits what the scale can tell us about actual continuity.

A further issue is the emphasis on donor-related governance. High ratings of confidence and compliance suggest that external credibility is prominent in how participants understand governance. That is valuable for stewardship, yet the ratings do not show whether children and caregivers can influence service decisions. The practical implication is to preserve the reported governance strengths while examining their operation through decision records, policy follow-up and evidence of responsiveness to service users.

Reported pathways to continuity and resilience

Informants described governance as supporting accountability and institutional credibility through board oversight, documented procedures, internal controls, safeguarding and reporting. One account described quarterly board subcommittee meetings involving programme, finance and monitoring personnel, with reports forwarded to the full board. This suggests a reported route through which operational information could reach oversight structures, although meeting records were not independently examined.

One informant stated: "Beacon of Hope has over the years conducted an annual audit, and the reports are made public via the website and the shared newsletters. This ensures transparency and accountability of the funds committed" (KII 12).

Another explained: "Many funders do not want to take undesired risks. An organisation managed through

clearly written and executed procedures and policies gives the funder confidence that the right actions will be followed” (KII 13).

The interviews help explain why the structures received favourable ratings. Informants did not refer only to the existence of policies; they emphasized procedures being executed, reports being shared and oversight receiving information from different functions. The distinction is important. A policy that staff can use when making a difficult decision has a different practical value from a document retained for an inspection. The accounts point to a plausible pathway from oversight to consistent action, although the study did not follow individual decisions through implementation.

The audit account primarily concerns transparency to external stakeholders. O’Dwyer and Unerman (2008) show why broader accountability should not be assumed from externally oriented mechanisms. Applied to this case, the question is whether the same reporting arrangements also make service reductions, delays and unmet needs visible to the board and affected households. The interviews establish that some informants associated audits with credibility; they do not demonstrate that public reporting gave beneficiaries greater influence.

Wellens and Jegers (2017) offer a related African comparison. Their Southern African case finds that local participation and influence at donor level can differ markedly. Beacon of Hope’s reported committee arrangements may support internal coordination, but the present evidence does not show how community concerns enter those deliberations. This is an unanswered question about the reach of governance, rather than evidence that participation is absent.

The reported pathway to resilience is also incomplete. Staff and stakeholders describe arrangements capable of supporting decisions, but do not provide a documented sequence linking a funding disruption, an oversight decision and the subsequent continuity of services. Searing et al. (2021) examine the practical responses of nonprofits during an actual revenue crisis, making the continuation of services central to their analysis. Their work suggests what additional evidence would strengthen this case: what the organization changed, which services it protected and what happened afterwards.

The findings therefore support a measured interpretation. Governance appears to provide a recognized framework for responsible action and institutional credibility. Whether that framework protected programme continuity requires service records and documented response decisions. For Beacon of Hope, a useful next step would be to review a small number of disruption episodes and trace how oversight, delegation and communication shaped the response. This would connect the strengths described by informants with observable programme experience.

Association with the available organizational outcome

The analysis found a positive Spearman correlation between governance and the combined outcome ($\rho = .617, p < .01; N = 29$). Higher governance ratings thus tended to accompany higher ratings of the broad outcome composite. Because the same questionnaire respondents assessed both constructs, common response tendencies and overlapping item content offer alternative explanations alongside the proposed substantive relationship.

Table 2: Statistical Evidence Relevant to Governance

Analysis	Reported result	Interpretation
Spearman correlation with combined outcome	$\rho = .617, p < .01; N = 29$	Positive respondent-level association with a broad composite
Kruskal–Wallis comparison by organizational position	$H(2) = 1.315, p = .518; n = 28$	No detected difference among the three included position groups

Note. The composite combines perceived funding readiness, continuity and resilience. The group comparison excludes the single monitoring and evaluation officer; included groups comprise 13 field officers, 10 community volunteers and five respondents in other positions. Source: Study questionnaire findings, 2026.

The correlation is consistent with the expectation that governance and organizational functioning are connected, but it does not identify the mechanism. Respondents who rated governance highly also tended to rate the combined outcome highly. This could reflect effective routines, a generally favourable view of the

organization, overlapping questionnaire content, or some combination of these. Because both measures were collected at one point, the study cannot establish whether governance preceded the outcome or whether confidence in programme performance shaped governance ratings.

Mbatha et al. (2026) provide a useful contrast. Their Kajiado study reports favourable governance assessments but a smaller, non-significant association with risk management ($r = .186$, $p = .074$). Beacon of Hope's reported correlation is stronger, yet the estimates concern different samples, measures and outcomes; it would be misleading to interpret them as evidence that its governance is more effective. Together, the studies show why high descriptive ratings and statistical relationships need separate interpretation.

The position-group comparison answers a different question. No difference was detected among the three included groups, but the small group sizes limit the conclusion. The result does not establish equivalent experiences or organization-wide consensus. The monitoring and evaluation officer was excluded because that category contained one person, so the comparison also omits a potentially distinctive technical perspective. It is best retained as supplementary information about the sample.

More importantly, the correlation does not test continuity and resilience separately. The outcome combines those concepts with perceived funding readiness, meaning that the relationship could be driven partly by respondents' confidence in donor preparedness. This matters substantively: being considered ready for funding is different from maintaining services during disruption. Future measurement should preserve those distinctions and include records of service delivery over time.

Adjusted estimates are not presented because unresolved inconsistencies in the available model output prevent reliable interpretation. The bivariate relationship should therefore not be described as an independent governance effect. Verification of the original coding and statistical output is necessary before adjusted estimates can be reported.

For objective three, the contribution is a credible question for further research rather than a definitive answer: which governance routines help sustain services, under what resource conditions, and over what

period? Answering it would require separate outcome measures and repeated observations, supported by records of decisions and programme activity. This approach would move the evidence beyond general confidence in organizational capacity.

Conclusion and Suggestions

The study examined governance through three related questions. First, selected staff and volunteers rated governance and administrative practices favourably, especially board functionality, role clarity and donor-related arrangements. Second, stakeholders described oversight, audits and implemented procedures as supporting accountability and credibility, but the evidence did not independently demonstrate uninterrupted services or adaptation. Third, governance was positively associated with the available composite outcome; separate relationships with programme continuity and resilience remain unestablished.

For the first objective, Beacon of Hope should periodically verify how governance policies operate in practice. Reviews should follow a small set of decisions from board approval through delegation, implementation and documented follow-up. This would connect perceived governance strengths with observable administrative routines.

For the second objective, board and management reviews should include essential service priorities, authority during disruption and arrangements for communicating changes to affected households. Reviews of actual disruption episodes should document decisions, response timing, continuity of support and lessons for future action. These proposals follow the reported importance of governance; their effectiveness requires evaluation.

For the third objective, subsequent research should measure perceived funding readiness, programme continuity and resilience separately. Longitudinal service records, documented governance decisions and stakeholder accounts would strengthen interpretation. Before further inferential claims are made, the study's scoring, statistical outputs and model diagnostics require reconciliation. Larger multi-organization studies could then examine how governance operates alongside resource conditions without assuming that favourable perceptions establish causal effects.

REFERENCES

1. Banks, N., Hulme, D., & Edwards, M. (2015). NGOs, states, and donors revisited: Still too close for comfort? *World Development*, 66, 707–718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.09.028>
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
3. Ducheck, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13, 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
4. Ebrahim, A. (2003). Accountability in practice: Mechanisms for NGOs. *World Development*, 31(5), 813–829. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(03\)00014-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00014-7)
5. Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6 Pt 2), 2134–2156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117>
6. Gugerty, M. K. (2008). The effectiveness of NGO self-regulation: Theory and evidence from Africa. *Public Administration and Development*, 28(2), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.490>
7. Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2004). Doing things right: Effectiveness in local nonprofit organizations, a panel study. *Public Administration Review*, 64(6), 694–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00416.x>
8. Hillman, A. J., Withers, M. C., & Collins, B. J. (2009). Resource dependence theory: A review. *Journal of Management*, 35(6), 1404–1427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309343469>
9. Kilby, P. (2006). Accountability for empowerment: Dilemmas facing non-governmental organizations. *World Development*, 34(6), 951–963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2005.11.009>
10. Mbatha, L., Kinyariro, D., & Gitari, J. (2026). The relationship between governance accounting practices and risk management among non-governmental organizations in Kajiado County, Kenya. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering Management & Applied Science*, 15(6), 468–476. <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150600036>
11. Njoroge, I. N., Soko, J. J., & Kimuru, P. (2025). Organizational practices, governance structures, and sustainability of women’s self-help groups in informal settlements in Nairobi, Kenya. *Journal of the Kenya National Commission for UNESCO*, 6(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.62049/jkncu.v5i1.425>
12. O’Dwyer, B., & Unerman, J. (2008). The paradox of greater NGO accountability: A case study of Amnesty Ireland. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 33(7–8), 801–824. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2008.02.002>
13. Searing, E. A. M., Wiley, K. K., & Young, S. L. (2021). Resiliency tactics during financial crisis: The nonprofit resiliency framework. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 32(2), 179–196. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21478>
14. Soko, J. J., Mphande, M. O., Pierli, F., & Katuse, P. (Eds.). (2012). *Management for social transformation*. Paulines Publications Africa. <https://shop.paulinesafrica.org/product/Management-for-Social-Transformation>
15. Syengo, J., Soko, J., & Wanyama, M. N. (2026). Post-donor sustainability of development initiatives among Catholic women religious congregations: A systematic literature review. *Eastern African Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 31–49. <https://doi.org/10.58721/eajhss.v5i2.1780>
16. Wellens, L., & Jegers, M. (2017). Beneficiaries’ participation in development organizations through local partners: A case study in Southern Africa. *Development Policy Review*, 35(S2), O196–O213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12279>
17. The study collected questionnaire and interview data on organizational capacity and outcomes. Access to underlying questionnaires, interview material and analysis files must be determined by the author in accordance with participant consent and institutional requirements. Ethics and Consent
18. The study reports Tangaza University ethical approval, NACOSTI authorization and informed consent. Approval details and permission for

publication of organizational identity and participant quotations require confirmation before submission. Funding Information

19. Article-specific funding information requires an author declaration before submission. Acknowledgements
20. Acknowledgements and any author or contributor roles should be agreed by the author and contributors before submission. Competing Interests
21. The researcher's organizational leadership role is disclosed in the methodology. A complete competing interests declaration requires author confirmation.

HOW TO CITE: Dorcus Anupi, Aloys Ojore, Jeketule Soko, Governance and Administration in Programme Continuity and Organizational Resilience at Beacon of Hope in Kibera Kenya, *Int. J. Sci. R. Tech.*, 2026, 3 (10), 1426-1435.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23762059>