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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to assess employee involvement in philanthropy in the workplace. It was guided by the following research questions; what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A; what contributes to employee involvement in the philanthropy at the workplace; what are the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace.

A descriptive research design was used for the study. The reason for this choice of research design was because descriptive research design allows for an assessment of the relation between employee involvement and philanthropy. The population of the study consisted of 74 fulltime and permanent employees of USIU-A from which a sample size of 67 was computed. The sampling procedure used in the study was the simple random sampling. Questionnaires were distributed to collect data from the respondents. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used to analyze the collected data and draw relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Concerning philanthropy at USIU-A, the study established that philanthropy at USIU-A that employees are involved in consists of four activities of volunteering, donating, fundraising and sponsorships. The study revealed that the university is optimally engaged in philanthropy and most of the respondents were sometimes involved in philanthropy at USIU-A. The participation of males and females in philanthropy at USIU-A varied among the four activities, notably males sponsoring scholarships more than females, more females fundraising than males, 3% more females donating to various projects compared to males and a slight difference of 1% between females volunteering their skills and talents doing community service as compared males.

Regarding factors that contribute to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace, the study noted that the way an organization communicates its philanthropy objectives is very important to employee involvement, as well as the support of the organization’s leadership teams. The study revealed that it should not be expected that the more motivated the employees are at work, the more involved they will be in philanthropy at the workplace. Nonetheless, it established that when employees are less motivated employees, they will be less involved in philanthropy. Further, respondents agreed that charitable giving at work boosts their self-esteem and gives a positive social identity, belonging and a sense of purpose at work. According to the study, respondents
agreed that the role of the Vice Chancellor is important for employee involvement. Also they expressed that their involvement in philanthropy would mean a lot to them if management recognized their input in philanthropy activities.

Concerning the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace, the study addressed effect on reputation and image of the organization. The study established that respondents alluded to their organization receiving a positive public view based on its support for philanthropy and also that support of management in philanthropy at work creates an even better image and reputation.

The study concludes that it is important for employees to be made aware of what philanthropy is at their workplaces and that communication is a major contributing factor to employee involvement because an organization’s communication strategies have an impact on an individual’s donative behaviour. It further concludes that leadership involvement has a positive effect on employee involvement in philanthropy in terms of giving the organization a good image and reputation.

The study recommends that to improve employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace organizations should make their philanthropy activities clear and communicate them frequently. It recommends that organizational leaders should exhibit a transformational type of leadership to improve the philanthropic behavior of employees so that the behavioral pattern displayed by a reluctant donor type of employee is transformed to the willing donor type. Finally, the study recommends that further studies should be carried out to examine the involvement of the individual’s involvement in philanthropy at the workplace and outside the workplace to compare if similar factors for within the workplace are exhibited for outside the workplace.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Corporate philanthropy or corporate charitable giving is the act of supporting Non-Profit Organizations (NPOs) and charitable causes with the company’s resource. Traditionally, companies supported charitable philanthropy through the company’s direct contribution to a charitable cause in various ways like cash, in-kind donations, and donations of products, services, or equipment. The main objective of corporate philanthropy is to improve the operating budget and special projects of NPOs (Choi and Wang, 2007) cited in (Smith and Sypher, 2010).

Historical evolution of philanthropy differentiated it from charity, where charity is for the short term and philanthropy is for the long term. The philanthropic landscape includes a broad range of grant makers including community foundations, private foundations, trusts, and corporate social investment programs and the sector has begun to organize it through peer networks to learn, advocate and build capacity (Global Institutional Philanthropy [GIP], 2010). The growth of corporate philanthropy has necessitated new positions within organizations with titles like Contributions Program Manager, Vice President of Philanthropy. Subsequently, professional organizations such as the Association of Corporate Contribution Professionals have formed to assist these emerging employee roles.

Today, the involvement of institutions and their employees in philanthropy is more expected in order build a progressive society. Private universities in Kenya have benefited from philanthropy in various ways. The United States International University-Africa (USIU-A) has seen the establishment of the School of Business through philanthropic efforts of a wealthy individual Dr Manu (USIU-A, 2015). Strathmore University as well has benefited from philanthropy as evidenced in their campaign to raise funds for construction of new facilities. Strathmore University further receives scholarships from corporate philanthropy through I& M Bank and East Africa Brewery Limited (Strathmore University, 2015).

Individuals, communities and corporate entities are becoming more involved in educational philanthropy. Odemo and Kisinga (2010) state that corporate philanthropy is
bringing new actors and actors to the philanthropy environment and in Kenya we see the examples of Safaricom, Unilever, and East African Breweries as members of the East African Association of Grant makers who contribute towards educational philanthropy. Institutional advancement has been driven by fundraising through different strategies including philanthropy. According to Colson (2009), the 21st century donor gives to a school which has a clear strategic plan, trustworthy leadership, stable budgets and whose values they share. An institution’s public perception plays a critical role in supporting its philanthropic activities. The way an institution carries out its public relations activities play a major role in garnering support for institutional advancement. Muller (1977) agreed that institutional advancement not only includes public relations, but also alumni relations, fundraising, internal and external communications and government relations. Today we still see these functions of institutional advancement playing a major role in universities around the world including Kenya’s universities. The increased competition for philanthropic support has had education philanthropists being particular on the priority areas they support and thus setting education philanthropy not only as an aspect of corporate social responsibility but also putting emphasis on the return on investment for both the donor and the university.

The involvement of employees in philanthropy at the workplace has seen growing interest in the workplace today. It has become an increasing trend to see employees of an organization involved in philanthropy at the workplace regardless of the nature of work. Commonly, employees of corporate entities are encouraged to be involved in corporate social responsibility activities, donating their time, funds, and skills towards civic empowerment. It is equally important for employees of educational institutions to foster a culture of philanthropy towards communities within which they exists. The advantages claimed for the involvement approach are said to include higher quality products and services, less absenteeism, less turnover, better decision making, better problem solving, and less management overhead—in short, greater organizational effectiveness, Mohrman, Lawler and Morhman (1992). One of the new ways companies demonstrate their social responsibility is by encouraging and supporting employee involvement in community programmes. In particular, employer initiatives intended to assist and support employees to volunteer are attracting increasing interest. Employee volunteering (also called corporate volunteering or employer-supported volunteering) enables employees to
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volunteer in the local community with the active support and encouragement by employers through formal and informal policies and programmes, Pajo and Lee (2011).

Changes in the economic landscape have brought about varying trends in workplace giving. In the Global Impact Report (2011) sight the five main trends to note why and how donors in the workplace give today. They assert that donors care about the impact of their gift, donors increasingly place the same value on monetary gifts as they do their time, donors prefer online systems to make donations, donors are increasingly giving to international causes, making it the fastest growing segment of philanthropy, both corporate and individual, and donors want choices in giving, which increases participation and dollars raised in workplace giving campaigns. Smith and Sypher (2010) mention that in addition to financial resources, corporate support may also take the form of volunteering. Typical volunteer programs include recruiting employees to visit classrooms and hospitals, collect food, participate in walk-a-thons, mentor youth, and build houses.

As businesses deal with pressure from governments, media and society in general to demonstrate social responsibility and to show how they can contribute positively to the social well-being of the communities they operate in, they also attempt to encourage the participation of their employees in volunteering in charitable causes. However, organizations face challenges in getting employees to be involved in philanthropy. A comparative study of civic engagement at five universities was conducted and it aimed at what the different universities were doing in relation to civic engagement, how and why Ostrander (2004). The results of this study at Brown’s University Swearer Centre for Public Service revealed a lack in the involvement of faculty. Community projects are initiated and defined by students through Learning Communities. The Learning Communities are not led by staff directly, but rather staff-trained student coordinators.

1.2 Problem Statement

It is against this backdrop that this study addressed the impact of employee involvement in philanthropy programs at the workplace with particular focus on United States International University-Africa (USIU-A). However literature about the impact of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace exists but limited particularly in
the context of employees at universities. Nonetheless, this is an important issue in today’s workplace and deserves further analysis. Therefore this study borrowed the case of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace from other organizations and philanthropic backgrounds to supplement the limited literature. Further, the discussion of philanthropy at the workplace is discussed broadly bearing the assumption that the concept of workplace philanthropy carries the same definition to employees asked to give donations and participate voluntarily at work.

These other studies serve as points of reference as we discuss philanthropy in the context of giving, employee involvement and their attitudes, and the impact of employee involvement on both the individual and the workplace. Nesbit, Christensen and Gossett (2012) agree that relatively little is known about formal workplace giving based on empirical analysis. In the context of this study, philanthropy shall be discussed from the perspective where we want to understand the involvement of employees in philanthropy at the workplace; both as the extent to which employees give and volunteer within the workplace. It will also discuss the aspects of employees helping to solicit support for their workplace.

According to Truss, Mankin and Kelliher (2012, p.212) “employee involvement represents a situation similar to consensual voice and is often implemented at the level of task decisions, allowing individuals or work groups to contribute”. Swanepoel, Erasmus and Schenk (2008, p.642) agree that “employee involvement gives employees the opportunity to be involved in the decision-making process that affect their daily work and the operations of the organization in general. Employee involvement in the workplace explains the way employees are at liberty to engage and participate voluntarily to causes that meet a social need and are supported by the workplace. Employees who feel connected to the larger system are more likely to make individual decisions that promote the values and goals of the organization, without requiring direct managerial oversight or additional incentives, Nesbitt et al.(2012).

The participation of an organization in philanthropy involves the use of corporate resources in a philanthropic behaviour. These resources could be employees, money, skills capacity within the organization, and time. As the need to improve lives becomes more important due to economic, social, political and technological changes,
organizations are compelled to be more responsive. This means that the employees in the organization have to be involved in effecting these changes. All this influences the organizational strategy and create a compelling case to assess employee involvement in the organization in all activities including those which are philanthropic. Dennis, Buchholtz and Butts (2007) emphasize the importance of employees in philanthropy, stressing the important role of the CEO in corporate philanthropy and the need to understand CEO’s attitudes and values toward philanthropy as the CEO is the primary decision maker of the organization. As the CEOs involvement has been highlighted, equally there is reason to analyse the involvement of all employees of an organization.

The practice of philanthropy at USIU-A is embedded in its efforts to make a difference in many areas including research and teaching, bursaries and scholarships to sports and student societies. The university offers scholarships and it depends on the alumni, friends and donors to create scholarship schemes at different study levels. As a result it was prompting to find out the involvement of USIU-A employees in philanthropy at the workplace.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to assess the impact of involvement of employees on philanthropy programs in the workplace

1.4 Research Questions
1.4.1 What constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A?
1.4.2 What contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace?
1.4.3 What are the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace?

1.5 Significance of the Study
The study would become important to the following stakeholders:

1.5.1 University Staff and Management
This study would help the university management and staff to establish a unique organizational culture towards corporate philanthropy, evaluate their participation individually and collectively at departmental and faculty levels, and engagement and communication strategies geared towards philanthropy. At the end, staff and management should be able to gauge if their institution needs can be met through philanthropy
initiatives and how these initiatives can be integrated into the organizational plan in line with the institution’s mission, objectives and deliverables.

1.5.2 Students and Alumni

Students and alumni are an important part of philanthropy initiatives on campus as they benefit the most from institutional advancement. Therefore it is important that this study could rouse their interest and action by providing the background for them to understand the benefit philanthropy initiatives and their participation in them.

1.5.3 Policy-makers

This study would influence consensus building towards the significance of philanthropy in improving income for institutions and their contribution towards philanthropy. Section 56 (c) of the Universities Bill of 2012 states that “a university shall have powers to receive any grants, donations or endowments on behalf of the university and make legitimate disbursements there from.”

1.5.4 Researchers

This study helped to better understand the behavior and pattern of donors towards philanthropy. The findings of the study provided insight into philanthropy practices of employees which could also prompt researchers to look forward and wide into other philanthropic practices looking at different work environments.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The scope of this study focused on the employees’ involvement in philanthropy at the workplace. The study focused mainly on USIU-A to reduce the generalization of the study to other institutions. The study reviewed relevant literature that had previously been written about employee involvement in general as well as employee involvement in philanthropy. As a result of limited literature on the topic, the study drew as much literature as possible, referring to some that is old.

The study population of USIU-A permanent employees was justifiable as their involvement in the workplace would be assumed to be more than those employed on a part-time basis. The study used questionnaires to obtain data from the permanent
employees of USIU-A over a period of two weeks from 4th June 2015 to 19th June 2015 in order to receive a reasonable number of responses and enable the study to be carried out.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Employee Involvement

To involve employees is to gain their commitment to the organisational goals, and this has often been couched in terms of empowering employees to take responsibility for their roles and function within the organisation (Holden, 2001).

1.7.2 Philanthropy

In its original, altruistic meaning – phil-anthropos- philanthropy describes voluntary, active, non-reciprocal efforts (financial, organizational, human resources) by an entity with the sole purpose of benefiting human beings, or fulfilling an unmet social need, regardless of any specific ‘return on investment’ for the donor (Klaus and Schmitt, 2011).

1.7.3 Fundraising

An activity undertaken with the goal of eliciting charitable or philanthropic giving (Worth, 2012).

1.8 Chapter Summary

Chapter One of the study introduced the study, giving a background of the study and putting the problem that prompted the study into perspective. The chapter included purpose of the study, outlined the research questions, significance of study and its scope. It also provided the definition of the key terms used throughout the study.

Chapter Two reviews the available literature on the topic of employee involvement in the workplace with reference and application to educational institutions. Chapter Three describes the methodology used in the study, including population, sample size, sampling techniques, data collection methods and analysis. The remaining Chapters Four and Five present the study findings and study summary with conclusion and recommendations respectively.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an empirical literature review on employee involvement on philanthropy programs at the workplace. It starts with Section 2.2 which gives a background on what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A. Section 2.3 discusses what contributes to employee involvement in the philanthropy at the workplace and Section 2.4 addresses the impact of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace.

2.2 Philanthropy at USIU-A

United States International University (USIU) was founded by William C. Rust on 18th September, 1969. In 1999, USIU received its accreditation from the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) in Kenya and subsequently in 2008 the institution received accreditation as an independent university from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in the United States of America. In 2014, the university changed its name to USIU-Africa. USIU-A boasts of a population of 145 employees. It has a student population of 5938 enrolled. The university has four schools offering various undergraduate and graduate degree programs. The schools are The Chandaria School of Business, The School of Humanities & Social Sciences, School of Pharmacy & Health Sciences and The School of Science & Technology. USIU also offers financial aid opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students (USIU-A, 2015).

2.2.1 Philanthropy at USIU-A

The university has several areas that enable giving. These include research, teaching, bursaries and scholarships. The university awards scholarships at both undergraduate and graduate levels and therefore financial support is important (See Appendix 1). In addition, there are unrestricted gift areas for core academic areas and buildings. Funds have been received from staff and students for various philanthropic projects that USIU-A engages in to support the community as well as the university itself. Of note are the activities surrounding the annual Frieda Brown Day in celebration of the Vice Chancellor (See Appendix 2). These projects are an initiative of the Vice Chancellor's support to the community. The university provides to the Frieda Brown beneficiaries from the university
funds and does not solicit financial support from staff and faculty. The university also has the Annual Fund campaign where donations are sought from alumni, parents, friends of the university, students and employees to meet the university’s most pressing needs. In addition to these annual priority areas, the university engages in ad-hoc fundraising projects as needs arise like the Book Fund and 2014 KES 45 million Coffee shop campaign. However, the Book Fund and Coffee shop campaign saw solicitation of funds from every member of the university community (USIU-A, 2015).

According to O'Connor and Miller (2012, p.15) in pursuit to expand philanthropic income, universities need to consider certain key factors, that is, the commitment of the board, the university head and its leadership team. The university should also have a board structure that supports the fundraising function and a strong management team. It should have a properly resourced fundraising function with a fundraising strategy that is aligned with the realities of the philanthropic market with an ability to show that a public good is being served”.

Glier (2004) cited in (Hodson, 2010, p.39-40) mentions that “fundraising is a shared responsibility among a broad group of institutional leaders, most notably university presidents and deans of colleges because they play a key role in establishing and sustaining a vibrant culture of philanthropy and support”.

Looking broadly worldwide, universities have different ways of involving faculty in fundraising and philanthropy. Emory University (USA) has founded an ad-hoc Faculty Fundraising Committee. The Committee comprises of nine faculties from various departments serving two year terms. This committee is responsible for assisting the deans in determining priorities for fundraising, represent the vision, values and interests of the university to internal and external audiences, and develops strategies to get faculty, staff and students more engaged in fundraising mission of the university. In addition, they cultivate and nurture relationships with key leaders on campus and promote the work of the Development Office by accompanying deans and development officers on site visits, special campus events and also help to review development publications (Emory University, 2011).

The Chinese University of Hong Kong lists four goals towards opportunities to enhance resources and these include establishing a fundraising culture in the university, coordinate fundraising campaigns via university-wide effort and encourage giving in every student
and alumni without being specific to staff and faculty (Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2006)

The University of Zimbabwe promotes fundraising initiatives aimed at improving student life and disadvantaged individuals and highlights the involvement of alumni and stakeholders without particular reference to staff and faculty (University of Zimbabwe, 2015).

2.2.3 Faculty and Staff Participation in Philanthropy

Breeze and Gouwenberg (2011, p.10) reveal that the task of raising funds from philanthropic sources can be allocated to various people and departments within universities, and occasionally even delegated to an external body, but most often the responsibility for raising funds rests with individual research staff (in 59% of cases), a development office (57%) or an alumni office (39%); clearly these responsibilities are being pursued simultaneously by multiple individuals and departments within the same institution. The managers and governors of universities are felt to be slightly more committed to fundraising than the academic staff.

Research about philanthropy at the workplace, in particular educational institutions has shown that the involvement of the management, faculty and students is imperative to successful philanthropy programs. Strickland (2007, p.104) states that today’s donors are not interested in building institutions, rather how the institutions build communities”.

Strickland (2007) further mentions that while further research is needed to ascertain the facts, today’s donors and the avenues for their giving seem to highlight an opportunity for affecting change in the institution’s internal operations and furthermore in making a transformative impact on the institution’s role in society. Nonetheless, Strickland (2007) argues that faculty can be skeptical or even condescending about fundraising. In agreement with the fact that faculty can be condescending about giving, a study at Bowling Green State University revealed that there was a significant difference in the giving rate by different employee groups. In this study, the administrative staff were more likely to give than faculty staff. Also those employees who were alumni, were high salaried, and had more years of employment at the university were most likely to give, Knight (2004).
Institutions develop their own unique approaches to engagement by “adopting the notions of civic engagement and engaged scholarship according to the relevance of those concepts to their particular institutional mission and capacity” (Holland (2005) cited in (Langseth and McVeety, 2007, p.118). Langseth and McVeety (2007) based their study of university engagement on Portland State University to define how its engagement has been influential in defining the university’s past and shaping its future. Engagement in the early years at Portland State University was local in that it met the specific local need training local workforce. Second, engagement was survival focused ensuring the survival of the university in its first years. Third, engagement was two-way, creating an opportunity for the Portland community to engage with PSU as the University created programs to meet community needs. The first presidents of Portland State College nurtured relationships with influential groups in the Portland business and civic community to help convince individuals in government and business that the development of graduate degrees and transition to university status were vital for the community as a whole Langseth and McVeety (2007).

The engagement of employees begins with ensuring that they understand the reasons and benefits of being involved. Langseth and McVeety (2007) agree that staff leadership in fundraising processes continue to be an important element of any program. Further mention that while the Portland State University has gained reputation about its information dissemination on engagement, it has been equally valuable in assisting the internal community to understand the term “engagement”. In terms of fundraising, Knight (2003, p.221) agrees that internal faculty and staff giving campaigns are an important part of fundraising efforts. Knight (2003) researched on Midwestern University provided information on which kind of employees are more likely to contribute as well as the perceptions of faculty on the giving process. In the study, faculty had a general understanding of the purpose of employee giving and agreed that campaign representatives in the department were a good means of communicating about the campaign.

Involvement of faculty can never be over-emphasised. Campus-wide engagement, especially from faculty who are the key stakeholders within the community campus is important as faculty engagement in fundraising can help institutions create relationships with their alumni. Institute for Capacity Building (ICB) recommends best practices in faculty involvement in fund development, suggesting Institutional Advancement
programs which include training for faculty in appropriate donor cultivation strategies, grant proposal writing, and Principal Investigator grant stewardship. ICB suggests that more specifically, institutions should encourage faculty engagement in fundraising in order to build relationships with prospective donors by promoting and communicating institutional priorities and advancing teaching, learning, and research. Also, to foster engagement between faculty and development officers, which is very important in collaboratively securing program funds, promote university public relations efforts through the development and communication of philanthropic messages about the strategic direction that the institution intends to take, as well as student and faculty goals and outcomes, not forgetting telling stories about the faculty and students who demonstrate the vision, mission, and value of the institution (Myrick-Harris, Curey-Butler, Curiel & Davis, 2011).

2.3 Factors that Contribute To Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at the Workplace

2.3.1 Communication

Nesbit et al. (2012) study hypothesised that the respondents are expected to notice types and frequency of communication and to respond to those messages. This was based on the premise that an organization’s communication strategies will have an impact on individual donative behavior. The findings revealed that there is a strong indication that the net effect of repeated communication had a positive effect on the number of donors and the amounts donated. The study reinforces findings by other organizational scholars who have discovered the relationship between organizational identification and organizational communication and concur that employees who identify with their organization are more likely to pay attention to official messages from management and subsequently voluntarily engage in appropriate workplace behavior like engaging in acts of corporate citizenship and make personal sacrifices for the benefit of co-workers. They further studies cite research that suggests that “individual workplace giving is, in part, structured and facilitated by organizations seeking to elicit, through communication, their members’ philanthropy” (Healy, 2004, p. 387).

With reference to specific communication techniques used by the organization to promote charity drive, the findings of the study further revealed that employees who donated attributed their actions to the frequency of emails and print messages sent. These were
considered effective communication strategies for motivating their participation especially online donation system, email reminders, and the repetition of email messages. However, there were contrasting responses from employees who found the stream of emails to be somewhat intrusive. This finding shows that there will be employees who feel motivated and those who will be alienated by various communication strategies. Some felt like it was an organizational obligation to give more than a philanthropic opportunity. In addition, the campus campaign manager responded that the days when the reminders were sent either by video, email or campus newsletter, the pledge activity rose especially at the beginning of the campaign (Nesbit et al.2012)

On the other hand, Smith and Sypher (2010) when examining corporate philanthropy from a communicative perspective discovered that the organization always communicated its philanthropic values in its mission statement, employee newsletter and through frequent charitable giving talks. The finding confirms that an organization whose employees knows and understands its mission statement and values succeeds at its philanthropic efforts and getting the employees involved. Conversely, bombarding employees with frequent communication puts them under pressure as each message announcing philanthropic activity meant that there would be some people working to implement it and this added more time and stress to the workload. Nonetheless, communicating philanthropic efforts frequently and in various messages, as in this study through thank you notes and presentation of past charitable events, can contribute positively to getting employees involved and make philanthropic values of the organization to become a solid part of the organizational culture and stay in the hearts and minds of its members.

2.3.2 Employee Needs and Behaviours towards Philanthropy

Bauman and Skikta (2012) discuss four basic psychological needs that represent the origins of four distinct paths through which corporate social responsibility (CSR) can affect employees’ relationship with their company. Borrowing from previous research, they specifically explain how CSR can provide employees with (1) a sense of security and safety that their material needs will be met, (2) self-esteem that stems from a positive social identity, (3) feelings of belongingness and social validation of important values, and (4) existential meaning and a deeper sense of purpose at work. In reference to this paper, these can be considered to contribute to employee involvement in philanthropy at
the workplace. Bauman and Skikta (2012) infer that employees and prospective employees may infer from CSR that their company is moral and conclude that it is safe to invest their time and effort into the success of the company. Addressing the second point of self-esteem, employees who participate in volunteerism programs alongside their co-workers are therefore more likely to interpret their activity as evidence that they share important values with their firm. In this way, volunteerism programs may increase employee pride. They refer to growing empirical literature that indicates that CSR does indeed influence employees’ and prospective employees’ attitudes about companies and behaviour in the workplace. They conclude that CSR that satisfies belongingness needs and promotes feelings of fit should be positively associated with in-role performance and organizational citizenship behaviour.

On the other hand, for their study, Nesbit et al. (2012) discuss multiple level of analysis in their study of Charitable giving in the workplace. They reveal that at the micro-level, there has been extensive research on individual attributes that influence philanthropic behaviour, with research suggesting that many individual factors influence charitable behaviours. These include individual philanthropy and link individual charitable behaviours to socio-economic status. Studies cite that those in high-status groups tend to give more, join more associations, and volunteer more (McPherson, 1981). Other strong correlates of philanthropy are age, income, religiosity, education, and volunteering (Gittell & Tibaldi, 2006). For instance, people with more education tend to donate more of their money to charitable causes (Andreoni, Brown and Rischall, 2003; Brown, 2005). Income is also positively related to charitable giving, although many people without large incomes can be seen to give generously (Schervish & Havens, 1998). People with a religious background are also more likely to give, and generally give larger amounts than the nonreligious (Wu, 2004; Yen, 2002).

Dennis, Buchholtz and Butts (2007) use Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behaviour (TBP) and Fishbein’s Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) to provide the theoretical foundation in understanding corporate philanthropic behaviours. They examine how altruistic and strategic forces, perceived behavioural control, self-identity and slack influence philanthropic behaviours. They do so in part, examining the CEOs attitudes and values towards philanthropy. “According to the TRA, behaviour is founded in two factors: one’s attitude to engage in the behaviour and the subjective norms surrounding the behaviour” (Dennis et al., 2007, p.7)
The study had hypothesised that decisions to engage in corporate philanthropy may be driven by a sense of moral obligation. This hypothesis stated that the degree to which the CEO believes that he or she has a moral obligation to ensure that the firm engages in philanthropy will be positively related to firm levels of corporate philanthropy. The results of this hypothesis indicate that the relationship between moral obligation and actual giving was not significant and therefore not supported. Although this study focused on CEOs, it could also be understood from the point of view of other employees. In Knight (2004, p.227) among many reasons cited by employees form not participating, “one employee cited lack of participation due to disagreements with the priorities of the particular campaign. One said it is because of a fundamental philosophical disagreement with the idea of asking the employees of an organization to give money to their employees. This shows that employees do not always get involved out of moral obligation”.

2.3.4 Leadership Involvement

Nicholson (2007) cites Cook (1994) agreeing that the role of university and college Presidents as fundraisers have become important. The success of the university or college depends on its President's ability to successfully integrate an effective leadership style with their fundraising activities. Nicholson (2007) study, focused on successful university and college Presidents to assess the varying degrees that transformational, transactional and transformative leadership attributes may have on fundraising activities. Reference was made to previous scholar’s definitions of these characteristics and behaviours.

Transformational leadership is defined as the engagement of people in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Nicholson (2007) adapts four is of transformational leadership (Avolio et al., 1997). Firstly, they idealize influence in that they are admired, respected and trusted and their followers want to emulate this character type. Secondly, they inspire motivation by behaving in ways that motivate those around them and arouse team spirit and provide meaningful and challenging teamwork. Thirdly, they exhibit intellectual stimulation by stimulating innovative and creative ideas from their followers and including them in the decision-making. Lastly, they provide individualized consideration as they are attentive to each person’s growth and personal need for achievement.
Transactional leadership on the other hand, Nicholson (2007) explains it through Bass (1985) that transactional leaders exhibit four behaviours. The first behaviour is contingent reward, where the leader clarifies the work that must be done and rewards accomplishment with incentives. Second behaviour is passive management by exception. Through this behaviour the transactional leader uses correction or punishment as a response to unacceptable performance or deviation from acceptable standards. The third behaviour is active management by exception, where work is actively monitored and corrective methods are used to ensure acceptable standard are met. The last behaviour is the lasses-faire, where the transitional leader is indifferent and ignores the needs of others and does not monitor their performance. Nicholson (2007, p.259) quotes Clark (1992) explaining that “transactional leaders are better suited for successful institutions that need incremental change instead of transformational change to improve fundraising”.

For transformative leadership, Nicholson (2007, p.257) quotes Bornstein (2003) who defines transformative leadership as “the exercise of either both presidential authority and constituent as appropriate to the situation”.

Nicholson (2007) study findings revealed that Presidents who were successful at fundraising exhibit transformational behaviour and characterises in their fundraising activities, by first using transactional approaches to ascend to a more transformational position. The Presidents, Vice Presidents, and major donors in the study suggested that both transformative and transactional approaches worked hand in hand to assist the leader and donor in accomplishing high-order change in fundraising. It was found that the president’s transformational leadership behaviours and characteristics create successful fundraising when implemented at the right time and situation. Further leadership behaviours and characteristics of presidents should integrate into their leadership approach to help strengthen their fundraising success. For example the successful President connected the donor’s vision with the identity of the institution, motivates donors, and takes risks.

Further addressing leadership involvement, according to Nesbit et al. (2012), employee stratification influences individual giving in workplace settings. Employee stratification, commonly in public organizations, exhibits individuals are often hierarchically arranged in workplace settings (e.g., entry level, middle management, upper management). For this study a hypothesis was developed, assuming that employees in higher strata (reflecting
education and compensation) will be more likely to donate and will give larger gifts than employees in lower strata. The results showed that there was a difference in the giving habits of faculty and staff in various categories. The results were mixed for the expectation that employment stratum (correlated with an individual’s income and education) would influence workplace giving. In terms of frequency of giving, entry-level staff and non-tenure-track faculty gave at the lowest rates as expected. Tenured faculty gave at the highest rate, followed by senior staff and untenured faculty. Overall, these results followed the hypothesis. Senior staff members were more likely to give than entry-level staff. Tenure-track faculty were more likely to give and gave more than non-tenure-track faculty, and tenured professors gave more than untenured professors. In terms of donation size, as expected, tenured faculty gave the largest gifts and senior staff gave larger gifts than non-senior staff.

The 2007 Australian Business Higher Education Roundtable (B-HERT), hosted conferences, courses and training programs for Vice Chancellors and senior university staff on topics related to philanthropy and fundraising in higher education. Rice (2007) emphasised the role of Vice Chancellor as most important. Rice (2007) states that in the US, university presidents spend more than 50% of their time in fundraising work. The academic community also shares part of the responsibility in fundraising roles because their work benefits. Hayter (2007), demonstrated participation of faculty stating the impotence of forming a collaborative effort and developing priority initiatives with the faculties and volunteers who understand their roles in the teams. Hayter (2007) attributed the success of a $175m camping to the confidence that the faculty and senior management had as being part of a team. Hayter (2007) further demonstrated the involvement of faculty at Laurier University. Deans attended a conference on “Fundraising for Deans” and as a result were motivated to support fundraising efforts so long as faculties were represented. Involvement of Deans also resulted in the creation of a model where fundraising staff worked with faculties, reporting to the Assistant Vice-Chancellor and also with some level of reporting to the Faculty Dean as well. This motivated the Deans as they shared the salary and development event-related costs. They were also motivated by the fact that faculties also benefited from the long-term relationship established and funds raised for their priorities.
2.4 The Effects of Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at the Workplace

2.4.1 Employee Satisfaction and Commitment

Nesbit et al. (2012) hypothesised in their study that at the meson-level, which is relational based between the individual and the organization, respondents who identify with their organization will be more likely to give to the organization’s workplace giving campaign.

The study revealed three (3) sets of employee donor clusters. First, the \textit{willing employee donors}, second cluster were the \textit{reluctant employee donors} and lastly the \textit{resistant non-donors}.

The results of the study revealed that the willing donors directly cited their identification with the university as a primary reason for participating in its philanthropy campaign. These donors expressed that contributing to the university charity drive was the right thing to do simply because they were employees and also to support the university’s goal. The willing donors cited reasons for donating as a demonstration of their loyalty, dedication, and identification to their employer and felt a strong connection more with their employer than the charity being served, Nesbit et al. (2012,).

On the contrary, there were some employees who had differing views about their giving and commitment to the organization. These reluctant donors only participated in the campaign because they felt there would be negative professional consequences if they did not. Additionally, these workers did not give money to the campaign because they wanted to support the university’s goals. Instead, they stated that they donated to avoid negative personal repercussions within the work environment, Nesbit et al. (2012). From this study it is very evident that not all employees who participate in philanthropy at the workplace do so out of commitment, loyalty or satisfaction. Hence, it is important for an organization to establish the impact of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace. For these reluctant donors, giving money was not an example of member identification, but rather an act of self-defence. Over time, participation in charity campaigns may breed resentment rather than loyalty to the organization or even toward the charities themselves. It is unclear what impact workplace giving campaigns might have on the long-term philanthropic behaviour of these individuals, Nesbit et al.(2012).

The resistant non-donors were members who refused to donate as a form of protest against their employing organization or its policies for example, those who cited that it is
hard to donate when employees are required to pay for facilities like parking and those who felt they were underpaid and did not have enough to donate. This cluster demonstrated their lack of organizational commitment, Nesbit et al. (2012).

The study demonstrated that an employee’s failure to participate, on the other hand, did not necessarily indicate a lack of desire to donate to charity, but could possibly mean that the employee feels alienated from the employing organization. Nesbit et al. (2012, p.465) conclude their analysis of employee-organization relationship by citing that organizations that struggle to promote charitable giving in the workplace may need to consider the extent to which employee identification issues may be creating unique barriers or challenges to the success of their philanthropic efforts. Workplace charity programs may not necessarily foster identified and committed workers, but might instead highlight divisions between those employees who feel connected to the larger system and those who do not.

Nesbitt et al. (2007, p.468) conclude their study on workplace giving by mentioning that publicly employed, tenured faculty were more likely to give than untenured faculty and non-tenure track faculty. They identified that senior staff were also more likely to give than non-senior staff. The study further supported previous research that education and income are related to donor behaviour. Nonetheless, they recommend further research to ascertain the extent to which job socialization or length of employment affects workplace giving. It could be explored if more senior staff and faculty members who had worked at the university for a long time feel more attached to the organization or might their giving be a result of being put under pressure by colleagues because of their ranks and status in the organization or their participation be out of their attachment to the local community. Furthermore, the study recommends that it would be of greater benefit to explore other models that include job satisfaction with variables like sex, organizational tenure and position stratum.

2.4.2 Organizational Performance and Image

Scholars have argued that corporate philanthropy positively affects corporate financial performance because decisions regarding charitable contributions can be made strategically to raise a company’s image and reputation, as well as to increase the value of its “moral capital” (Brammer & Millington, 2005; Godfrey, 2005; Porter & Kramer, 2002; Saiia, Carroll, & Buchholtz, 2003 cited in Wang and Qian (2011). On the other
hand, other scholars have argued that corporate philanthropy has a negative net impact on corporate financial performance because it may represent a pure corporate expenditure that diverts valuable resources to areas unrelated to operations (Friedman, 1970) cited in Wang and Qian (2011).

With specific reference to employee involvement, Muller and Kraussl (2011) found that donation announcements that did not include employee involvement were associated with negative abnormal returns, while those that included explicit reference to employee involvement were associated with normal returns. On the contrary, Berman, Wicks, Kotha, and Jones (1999) found that corporate involvement in community relations, which includes philanthropic activities, has little influence on corporate financial performance. This finding resonates with Orlitzky, Schmidt, and Rynes (2003) finding that corporate philanthropy is positively correlated with corporate financial performance; moreover, this relationship is stronger than that between other measures of corporate social performance and financial results.

Muller and Kraussl (2011) study addressed the mixed empirical results that charitable contributions have clear relevance for firm performance and conversely that corporate philanthropy can yield tangible benefits for the firm if there is a clear philanthropic strategy in its overall business objectives. The study proposed that when an organization’s philanthropy news highlight employee involvement in the donation, it sends the signal about corporate philanthropy’s potential value to the firm and helps create buy-in among the investors who might otherwise have been skeptical. It further goes on to mention that employee involvement may send the signal that employees are comfortable in an organizational environment which reveals their pro-social identities. This means that revealing the pro-social behaviours reinforces them and in turn strengthens the employees’ sense of organizational commitment which leads to increased organizational performance. In addition, employee involvement can create an impression that this philanthropic behaviour is sincere and therefore result in a positive moral evaluation by the society.

To conclude the discussion on organizational performance and image, Dennis et al. (2007) mention economic, political and pure altruism as drivers of corporate philanthropy and how these relate to organizational image and performance. According to these scholars, the economic view of strategic philanthropy posits that firms engage in
philanthropy as a means by which to enhance the financial performance of the organization (Sanchez, 2000; Young & Burlingame, 1996). The political perspective holds that firms engage in corporate philanthropy because of the political and institutional pressures exerted on the firm by key environmental actors (Neiheisel, 1994). In the altruistic model, firms engage in corporate philanthropy with the intention to make society a “better place”, Shaw & Post, (1993) in Dennis et al. (2007). The rationale behind philanthropy is of a moral nature—managers have a moral responsibility to distribute the firm’s resources in a manner that promotes the overall welfare of society, regardless of whether or not these actions result in such firm, specific outcomes as improved profits or enhanced image.

2.5 Chapter Summary

In conclusion, this chapter has successfully reviewed studies that give mixed results to the research questions, what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A, what contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace and what is the impact of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace?

The next chapter talks to the research methodology. It presents the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures and data analysis methods to be used in the study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology that was used in the study. It addresses the research design, population and sampling design, data collection, research procedures and data analysis methods. A summary of these procedures is provided at the end.

3.2 Research Design

The function of a research design is to ensure that the evidence obtained enables us to answer the research question as unambiguously as possible” (Vaus, 2001, p.9). The study used the descriptive research method. The purpose of a descriptive research is “to examine a phenomenon that is occurring at a specific place(s) and time” (Picciano, 2004, p.52). A descriptive research is concerned with conditions, practices, structures, differences or relationships that exist, opinions held, processes that are going on or trends that are evident. The reason why this study used this research design is that it enabled the study to check for the structure and relationship between employee involvement and philanthropy as well as opinions about philanthropy at the workplace.

Various data collection methods can be used with the descriptive research design including interviews and questionnaires, which will be used for this study. The reason why this study used questionnaires survey was that it allows for the collection of large amount of data, a range of questions, sample management, control of the data collection environment, number of data, response rate and expenditure (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999).

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Picciano (2004) states that one of the benefits of quantitative-descriptive study is that it enables generalization, where a random sample of a larger population can be selected and a researcher suggests that the findings be applied to the larger population. According to Smith, Thorpe and Jackson (2008) a population is a collection of all items from which the sample is taken to represent some unique characteristics. This means that researchers collect data from a sample to get the reliable characteristics of the population, the idea
being that by selecting some of the elements in a population we may come to conclusions about the whole population. The study population of this study consisted of employees of USIU-A. USIU-A has a total population of 145 permanently employed employees. Only fulltime permanent employees at USIU-A constituted the sampling frame for this study.

Table 3.1 Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>(%) Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMISSIONS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUMINI AFFAIRS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELLING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN STUDENT AFFAIRS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS AND FUNDRAISING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SERVICES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL AUDIT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT ACADEMIC SUPPORT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACEMENT AND CAREER SERVICES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RELATIONS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRAR’S OFFICE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH AP DEVLPT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF BUSINESS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF PHARMACY &amp; HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USIU-A (2015)

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Sapsford and Jupp (2006, p.28) mentions that “when a survey is being set up, the sampling units are organized by the researcher into a sampling frame”. Sapsford and Jupp (2006) further describe a sampling frame as anything used to identify the elements in each sampling unit, provided that it exhausts the total population. A sampling frame was developed from the staff list provided by USIU-A.
3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

There exist two main sampling methods, probabilistic sampling and non-probabilistic sampling, Sapsford and Jupp (2006). Further, Schutte (2008, p.156) states that “the most important distinction that needs to be made about the samples is whether they are based on a probability or non-probability sampling method”. Schutte (2008, p.156) continues to mention that “a probability sampling method is a sampling method that relies on a random, or chance, or selection method so that the probability of selection of population elements is known”. Probability sampling technique was used for this study for the following reasons (a) to ensure fair representation and (b) to make statistical inferences of the findings to the general population. The study used simple random sampling to select units from the sampling frame so that there is an equal chance for each unit to be selected. The budget and time that was available to distribute the questionnaire was also instrumental to the choice of simple random sampling.

3.3.2.3 Sample size

There are 145 permanent and fulltime administrative and fulltime faculty members of USIU-A in total. According to Adanza (1995), a formula by Slovin (1960) is one of the easiest and most convenient to use in determining the size of the sample. The formula is given as follows:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

where:

- \( n \) = sample size
- \( N \) = the Population size
- \( e \) = the desired margin of error

Using a margin of error of 8% and applying the formula a sample size of 74 was obtained.

3.4. Data Collection Methods

The study applied both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) explain that quantitative data collection methods rely on random sampling and structured data collection instruments that fit diverse experiences into predetermined response categories. Further, they produce results that are easy to summarize, compare and generalize.

The study used primary and secondary data. Both primary and secondary data were applied because before collecting primary data it is advisable to perform a secondary data
Search to determine the necessity and scope of a primary data collection effort. The reason for using primary data is that it is specific to the purposes of the study. Its practicality also provides solid real-life information and a practical foundation to be used in the decision-making process (Reid and Bojanic, 2010, pp.222-223).

The researcher conducted an interview with staff at Fundraising and External Relations Office to solicit information and gain some insight into the issue. Subsequently, questionnaires were designed and were chosen as the appropriate major data collection tool for the study because one of the advantages of questionnaires is that according to Cargan (2007, p.116), “administered to a random sample, questionnaires can give a comprehensive view of attitudes, beliefs, and values of the larger population with a small sampling range error. A five-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree) was used to make the responses standard. The scaling procedure determines quantitative measures of subjective and abstract concepts (Chin, 2003). Some questions in the survey questionnaire were open, allowing for the interviewee to specify their answers so as not to restrict responses.

Section A of the questionnaire focused on the background (demographic) information of the respondents. Section B focused on what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A. Section C addressed factors contributing to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace. Section D contained questions relating to the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace.

3.5 Research Procedures

The research procedure started with the designing of questionnaires which were distributed to pre-test their reliability. After pre-test the final questionnaire was designed to be used for the collection of data. The study, being a case of USIU-A, required for the researcher to seek permission from the Research Office to conduct research because it is the policy of USIU-A to ensure that research carried about the institution adheres to ethic and legal considerations of the university. A letter was written applying for the research to be carried out and permission was granted. Subsequently, questionnaires totaling 74 were distributed to the various employees of the university. A trained research assistant was recruited to assist with the questionnaire distribution, data collection and data entry. The research assistant was trained on the topic enabling him to understand it prior to
collecting data. The questionnaire distribution and data collection took fifteen days and the data entry, data cleaning and data analysis procedures took a week following data collection.

The study attempted to achieve a high response rate by (a) a short paragraph on the questionnaire explaining the purpose of the study (b) no identification of respondents thereby ensuring anonymity and (c) stimulated response through follow-ups. Through these techniques, out of the 74 questionnaires distributed, 67 were returned, giving a response rate of 90%.

3.6 Data Analysis Method

The appropriate data analysis method for this study was to analyze the data through statistical analysis using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 21 and the quantitative approach in terms of descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics include frequencies, mean, percentages and variance. The data presentation method includes tables and figures. Qualitative data was summarized and categorized according to common topics and presented in tables. It also used chi-square to determine the relationship between the variables of age, gender, level of education and length employed against the involvement in philanthropy at the workplace, as well as to compare the variables that were weak or strong against the dependent variable of philanthropy.

3.7 Chapter Summary

The major items discussed in this chapter were the sample size, and the type of research design that the research will settle for. Given the number of employees at USIU-A, it is worth noting that it was not guaranteed that they all participated in the study. Hence the chosen sampling approach. Print questionnaires were appropriate for this study because of the constraints that exist with online questionnaires where the respondent does not understand or takes time to respond. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AN FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
Chapter four provides the study results and findings. The chapter presents the results of the findings regarding the background information. The second part of the chapter presents the results regarding what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A. The third and fourth parts present what contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace and effects of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace; respectively.

4.2 Background Information
During the survey study, the research sought to obtain background information of the respondents. The following are the results which were obtained.

4.2.1 Gender of the Respondents
Out of 67 respondents, majority were males at 56.5% and female respondents made up 43.5%, indicating a gender disparity of 16% between the study participants which in most part does not indicate a strong gender bias in terms of involvement of males and females in philanthropy at the workplace, illustrated in Figure 4.1 below.

Figure 4.1: Gender of Respondents
4.2.2 Age of the Respondents

Majority of the respondents (28.47%) were between ages of 26 years-36 years, followed by 47 years and above at 16.27% and 37-47 year olds at 14.23%. The least age group was 18 years-25 years at 2.3%. Figure 4.2 below illustrates the age groups of the respondents. Age was relevant in the study so that it provides in understanding the age composition of USIU-A employees, their maturity and possible understanding of the with regard to involvement in philanthropy at the workplace.

![Age of Respondents (in Years)](image)

**Figure 4.2: Respondents’ Age**

4.2.3 Time Employed With USIU-A

The respondents were asked how long they have been working at USIU-A and the illustration below in Table 4.1 indicates their responses, where the mean number of years was 8.4, mode was 3 years and median of 6.5 years. The lowest was 1 month and highest 33 years. The period of employment with USIU-A was a relevant factor in the study because it enabled the study to associate length of employment with the employee involvement in philanthropy at USIU-A. Employee tenure is often related to motivation and engagement at work, factors which themselves are relevant to involvement in philanthropy.
Table 4. 1: Period of Time Respondents Have Been Employed With USIU-A

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.4823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>559.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Highest Education Level of the Respondents
The respondents were asked their highest level of education in order to relate their education level with their involvement in philanthropy. The level of education is a significant factor because it informs about the level of understanding and awareness of at least the basic concepts and issues surrounding philanthropy, which is critical as people would not be enthusiastic to engage in something they do not understand. 51.6% had Masters Degrees, 29.7% had Bachelor’s Degree, and 15.6% had Diploma and 3.1% PhD holders. Table 4.2 below indicates the qualifications among the respondents.

Table 4. 2 Respondents’ Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Philanthropy at USIU-A
The important part of this study was to find out if respondents are aware of what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A by asking them about their engagement in various philanthropy activities at USIU-A in terms of volunteering, donating, fundraising and sponsorships. This section sought to find out what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A. Respondents were asked questions associated with their engagement in the university’s philanthropy activities.

4.3.1 Respondents’ Engagement in Philanthropy Activities

Respondents were asked how often they engage in philanthropy activities at USIU-A. The results in Figure 4.3 below show the response percentages. 73.1% of the respondents said
they “sometimes” engage in the university’s philanthropy activities, 16.4% responded “always”, 6% responded “never” while 4.5% of the respondents said they were “not aware of any” philanthropy activities. There is a great disparity of 56.7% between the answers of “always” and “sometimes”. This informs the study that although employees are not always involved philanthropy activities at USIU-A, the fact that they mostly do sometimes shows there is a steady and consistent engagement.

![Bar chart showing respondents engagement in university’s philanthropy activities]

**Figure 4.3: Respondents Engagement in the University’s Philanthropy Activities**

### 4.3.2 Volunteering

Figure 4.4 below shows how the respondents answered when asked to indicate how they volunteer at USIU-A. There is a slight difference between females (40.5%) and males (39.6%) when it comes to volunteering skills and talents for community service for the university. There is 38.10% females who support community initiatives within campus compared to 35.8% of males for the same. 14.30% was recorded for females who participate in collaborations between university and industry compared to 17% male. On the least, there is also a slight difference between the male and female respondents who said they never volunteer for anything at their workplace, males at 7.5% and females at 7.1%. It can therefore be interpreted that on the high responses more males participate in collaborations with industry while more women support community initiatives which is good for the image and reputation of the university among its stakeholders and the public at large.
In terms of engaging in donations, the study analysis shows that males donated more than females to the Coffee shop project and Frieda Brown day activities. For the Coffee shop, males donated 43.8% while females donated 40.4% and for the Frieda Brown day activities males donated 27.1 and females 23.4%. Females donated more to the Annual fund (12.8%) as compared to males (8.3%) and females donated 23.4% with males donating 20.8% to the Book fund. This breakdown is shown in Figure 4.5 below. The Coffee Shop campaign was a once off campaign and received the most responses. The Annual Fund is an ongoing annual campaign and received the least responses, this could allude to the fact that people do not want to be continuously asked to contribute.

**Figure 4.4: Respondents’ Volunteerism at USIU-A**

### 4.3.3 Donating

In terms of engaging in donations, the study analysis shows that males donated more than females to the Coffee shop project and Frieda Brown day activities. For the Coffee shop, males donated 43.8% while females donated 40.4% and for the Frieda Brown day activities males donated 27.1 and females 23.4%. Females donated more to the Annual fund (12.8%) as compared to males (8.3%) and females donated 23.4% with males donating 20.8% to the Book fund. This breakdown is shown in Figure 4.5 below. The Coffee Shop campaign was a once off campaign and received the most responses. The Annual Fund is an ongoing annual campaign and received the least responses, this could allude to the fact that people do not want to be continuously asked to contribute.
4.3.4 Fundraising

The study shows that more females have fundraised for philanthropy activities that the university supports than males. 69.25% of females responded “yes” against 65.6% of males. 34.40% of males responded “no” to 30.8% of females (See Figure 4.6 below). This leads to the conclusion that establishing fundraising through gender lines and understanding motivations is important for organizations in order to reduce barriers for one gender being more involved in a particular activity than the other.

![Chart showing donation pattern at USIU-A](chart.png)

**Figure 4.5: Respondents’ donation pattern at USIU-A**

**Figure 4.6: Participation in Fundraising for Philanthropy Activities at USIU-A**
4.3.5 Sponsorships

In addition to volunteering, donating and fundraising, the respondents were also asked to indicate how they engage in sponsorships. For those who engaged in sponsorships, more females (29.4%) solicited for sponsorships than males (28.6%). Further, more males sponsored scholarships (14.3%) than females (11.8%). However, the remaining females who did not sponsor anything at the workplace were more than males by 1.7% as shown in Figure 4.7 below. A trend observed in these results is that a slight difference of 1.7% between genders is recorded where makes and female agree that they do not sponsor anything but those who do majority solicit sponsorships or at the least sponsor scholarships.

![Figure 4.7: Respondents’ Sponsorship Activities at USIU-A](image)

4.3.6 University’s Engagement in Philanthropy

The study sought to find out if USIU-A is optimally engaged in philanthropy activities. The responses are in the below table where majority of the respondents at 42.4% agree that the university is optimally engaged in philanthropy activities, followed by 18.2% who strongly agree, 16.7% who are neutral, 13.6% who disagree and 9.1% who strongly disagree. Table 4.3 below shows this breakdown. These figures interpret the university’s optimal engagement which far most important before the involvement of its employees and shows that the university’s philanthropy is embedded in its mission.
Table 4.3 USIU-A’s Optimal Engagement in Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7 Employees’ Reliance on The Fundraising Office To Identify Opportunities

The level of employee involvement was assessed on the basis of whether the employees should rely on the Fundraising Office to initiate philanthropy activities or employees themselves should identify and decide which non-profits to fund on behalf of the university. Most respondents at 25.8% disagreed that the employees should rely on the Fundraising Office to initiate philanthropy activities, while most respondents at 36.4% agreed that employees themselves should identify and decide which non-profits to fund on behalf of the university.

4.3.8 Philanthropy Involves Money, Talents and Time

Often, philanthropy is thought in terms of giving money. So, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement on whether philanthropy involves not only money but also talents and time. Their response is shown in Table 4.4 below which shows that 58.2% strongly agreed that philanthropy not only involves money but also talent and time, followed by 20.9% who agreed, 10.4% who were neutral, 4.5% who disagreed and 3.0 who strongly disagreed. This revelation is a very important one to the philanthropy strategy of the organization as the respondents embrace a holistic approach towards philanthropy, giving the organization various options to have employees involved.
Table 4.4: Philanthropy Involves not only Money but also Talent and Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 What Contributes To Employee Involvement in the Workplace

The results of this section are most important to the study as they reveal what contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace in terms of communication, employee needs and behaviour and leadership involvement.

4.4.1 Communication

The respondents agree at 45.3% that the university communicates its philanthropic values very well in its mission statement, 14.1% disagree, 21.9% are neutral while 7.8% and 10.9% strongly disagree and strongly agree respectively. Figure 4.8 below provides an illustration of this finding. Majority at 37.9% agree that the university’s communication strategies have an impact on the way they will donate. However, 33.3% were neutral to the statement that the university always communicates very well in a way that encourages them to participate in fundraising or donate. This is important because communicating the philanthropic values clearly encourages participation.
Majority of the respondents wanted to be reminded through email, newsletters and by fundraising staff in order for them to be involved in philanthropy. Even if they want to be reminded, most at 29.2% disagree that when they receive regular reminders about fundraising and donations they feel pressure to give or participate in philanthropy. Majority of these respondents (41.5%) strongly agree that they do not want to be pressurized to give or participate in philanthropy, followed by 26.2% who agree, 15.4% who are neutral, 12.4% disagreeing and 4.6% strongly disagreeing. Responses are shown in Figure 4.9 below. These results are a key indicator to the university not to pressurize its stakeholders with persistent reminders, despite the fact that there are preferred methods of communication among the stakeholders.

**Figure 4.8: The University’s Communication of its Philanthropic Values in its Mission Statement**
In response to whether the university communicates the outcomes of its philanthropy programs very well, the respondents mostly agreed (27.3%) that it does. They also agreed (42.4%) that when the university gives feedback on the outcomes of its philanthropy, they are encouraged to be involved. The respondents mostly agree (50%) that philanthropy news that mention employee involvement have positive impact on the image of their workplace.

Figure 4.10 communications below shows the responses when the respondents were asked to indicate their challenges to engaging in university-wide philanthropy campaigns. Most of them at 53.2% said that the messages about philanthropy are not clear, 33.3% cited that the university sends a lot of messages and puts them under pressure. Only 13% said the university does not communicate anything about philanthropy.
4.4.2 Employee Needs and Behaviour

In order to find out the personal motives behind involvement, the respondents were asked if Charitable giving at work boosts their self-esteem and gives a positive social identity, belonging and a sense of purpose at work. The results are shown in the table below (Table 4.6), where mostly at 35.8% agreed to this statement and the least at 7.5% strongly disagreed. The high degree in accepting that charitable giving boosts self-esteem and provides a positive social identity is a clear indicator that the employees have a potential to drive philanthropy beyond the current level if the appropriate strategies are applied.

Table 4.5 Charitable Giving At Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.10: Communication Challenges to Engaging In University-Wide Philanthropy Campaigns.
According to the respondents, mostly at 48.5% agreed that the main reason for being involved in philanthropy at work is simply that they support the university's goal and values about philanthropy. They mostly agreed (32.3%) that they are involved in philanthropy at work because they identify more with the workplace than the charity being served. The study revealed that the respondents donate not because they are avoiding negative repercussions within the work environment. Mostly at 30.8% disagree that they are avoiding negative repercussions.

Asked whether they refuse to be involved in philanthropy at work because the organization itself is not philanthropic about their needs, most respondents at 28.8% were neutral to the statement, 22.7% disagreed, 18.2% strongly agreed, 16.7% strongly disagreed. The results to this response are illustrated below in Figure 4.11. Most of the responses were within the negative half of the grid presenting no strong perceptions from the employees about the university's philanthropy towards them.

Figure 4.11 Participant’s Reluctance To Be Involved in Philanthropy at Work

The study also sought to find out why the respondents are involved in philanthropy at their workplace. Different reasons given are illustrated in Figure 4.12 below. These figures present a very interesting revelation about people’s perception on philanthropy. They are mostly driven by personal values towards philanthropy at 52%, followed by culture at 16%, then religion at 14% and lastly income at 7%.
4.4.3 Leadership Involvement
The involvement of leadership plays an important role in the purpose of this study. The study revealed that most of the respondents at 46.3% strongly agree that the role of the Vice Chancellor (VC) is important for employee involvement. Only 1.5% of the respondents disagree to this. Table 4.8 below illustrates the responses received.

Table 4.6: Importance of the Role Of VC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still in reference to leadership involvement, when asked if the role of HoDs and Deans in philanthropy at USIU-A is important in getting employees involved, 36.4% of the respondents agreed while 4.5% disagreed and 18.2% remained neutral. A graphical representation of this data is in Table 4.8 below.
Table 4. Importance of the Role of HODs and Deans In Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literature mentions that the leadership still needs support in order to perform their roles in philanthropy successfully. So the study also found out if the respondents will support any philanthropy initiative supported by their Dean/HoD. In response the respondents agreed at 29.9% majority that they will support any philanthropy initiative supported by the VC and an equal 29.9% majority were neutral if they will support any philanthropy initiative supported by their HoD or Dean.

Most respondents (28.8%) agree that management encourages them to be involved in philanthropy at work and management seems to care (mostly agree at 28.4%) about philanthropy at work.

![Employee Involvement in Philanthropy in Relation to Management’s Recognition](image)

**Figure 4.13**: Employee Involvement in Philanthropy in Relation to Management’s Recognition

Figure 4.13 above illustrates the responses given by the respondents strongly agreeing (32.8%) that their involvement in philanthropy would mean a lot to them if management
recognized their input, 22.4% agreed, 17.9% were neutral and the same number disagreed. Only 9% disagreed.

4.5 Effects of Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at the Workplace

This study sought to find out what are the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy in the workplace on employee satisfaction and commitment and organization performance, reputation and image.

4.5.1 The Effect of Employee Involvement in Philanthropy At The Workplace On Employee Satisfaction And Commitment

The respondents were asked if employee involvement in philanthropy programs at work has the ability to boost employee morale. 37.9% agreed with 22.7% strongly agreeing. 24.2 of the respondents were neutral, 12.1% disagreed and only 3% strongly disagreed that it has the ability to boost employee morale. This is illustrated in Figure 4.1 below.

Figure 4.14: Employee Involvement in Philanthropy Programs At Work And The Ability To Boost Employee Morale

To find out further effects on employee satisfaction and commitment, respondents were asked if they are motivated when people talk about how philanthropic employees of the organization are and if they associate their motivation and satisfaction to their involvement. The study found out that respondents are motivated to be involved in philanthropy when people talk about how they (respondents) are involved in philanthropy.
at the workplace. This was alluded to by the majority 33.3% who agreed. On associating respondents' motivation to satisfaction, 39.1% of the respondents were mostly neutral to the association. However, majority of the respondents at 28.8% strongly agreed that the less motivated they are at work, the less they are involved in philanthropy at the workplace. The responses on associating satisfaction and motivation are illustrated in Figure 4.15 below.

![Graph showing motivation and satisfaction in association with employee involvement in philanthropy](image)

**Figure 4.15: Motivation and Satisfaction in Association with Employee Involvement in Philanthropy**

In order to determine the effect of involvement on motivation, the study found out if there is an effect on involvement if respondents are less or more motivated. The responses indicated that the respondents agree that the less motivated they are, the less involved they are in philanthropy. 28.8% of the respondents strongly agree to this point and only 13.6% strongly disagreed as shown in Table 4.9 below.
However, this does not necessarily mean that if they are more motivated, they will be more involved. This is shown in Table 4.10 below, where 33.3% strongly disagree that the more motivated, the more they are involved. Only 6.3% agreed with this statement.

**Table 4.8: Employees’ less motivation and Involvement in philanthropy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When discussing employee involvement, literature often links satisfaction and motivation to rewards. So the study sought to find out if the respondents are more motivated to be involved if philanthropy at work was rewarded. Figure 4:16 below shows that most disagree at 28.1%.

**Table 4.9: Employees’ More Motivation and Involvement In Philanthropy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When discussing employee involvement, literature often links satisfaction and motivation to rewards. So the study sought to find out if the respondents are more motivated to be involved if philanthropy at work was rewarded. Figure 4:16 below shows that most disagree at 28.1%.
4.5.2 The Effect of Employee Involvement In Philanthropy At The Workplace On Organizational Performance And Image

The respondents were asked if people view the organization positively when employees are involved in philanthropy at the workplace. 47% of the respondents strongly agreed followed by 42.4% who agreed, 7.6% who were neutral and 1.5% each disagreeing and strongly disagreeing. Figure 4.17 below illustrates these responses.

Figure 4.17: People’s Positive View of the Organization when Employees are Involved in Philanthropy

The respondents were further asked if their organization has a good reputation based on its support for philanthropy. 41.8% agreed while 29.9% strongly agreed. The rest of the
respondents were neutral at 19.4% and others either disagreed or strongly disagreed both at 4.5%. Figure 4.18 gives an illustration of these responses.

**Figure 4.18: The Organization’s Good Reputation Based on its Support for Philanthropy**

Lastly on the effect of employee involvement in the reputation of the organization, respondents were asked if support of management in philanthropy at work creates an even better image and reputation, the respondents agreed at 52.5% that it does, while 31.3% strongly agreed, 13.4% were neutral and 1.5% each disagreed and strongly disagreed. See Figure 4.19 below.

**Figure 4.19: Support of Management in Philanthropy at Work and Image and Reputation**
4.6 Relationship / Significance Using Chi Square

4.6.1 Time Employed with USIU-A and Involvement in Philanthropy

Table 4.10 below indicates the results that were obtained where there respondents indicated their length of time employed with USIU-A. The study revealed that there is no significant relationship between the period of time one has been employed and their involvement in philanthropy.

Table 4.10: Time Employed and Involvement In Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>91.084a</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>53.924</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 Age and involvement in philanthropy

Most of the respondents were aged between 26 years – 36 years. The study shows that this age group is the one that mostly engages in the university’s philanthropy activities at 45%. However, the chi-tests show that there is no significant relationship between age and involvement in philanthropy (p >0.05), despite the fact that the 26 years – 36 years age group in actively involved. Hence the results of the study happened by chance (Tables 4.11).
Table 4.11: Age And Involvement in Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.896</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.241</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.3 Gender and Involvement In Philanthropy
The study shows a big difference in involvement between genders. More males engage but there is no significant relationship between gender and engagement in the university’s philanthropy activities, (p>0.05) as illustrated in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12: Gender And Involvement in Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>How often do you engage in the university’s philanthropy activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not aware of any</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.625a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.4 Level of Education and Involvement

The respondents of this study consisted mostly of Master’s degree holders (51%). Nonetheless, this does not say that there is a significant relationship between the level of education and involvement in philanthropy at the workplace (p>0.05) Table 4.13.
Table 4. 13 Level of Education And Involvement in Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education</th>
<th>How often do you engage in the university's philanthropy activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not aware of any</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.758a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>5.256</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented data that was obtained from the field study. The Chapter has shown that out of 74 data collection instruments that were issued to respondents only 67 were returned putting the response rate at 90%. Descriptive statistics were used to represent the data. The chapter has also shown the results of the correlation analysis. Chapter five provides the summary, discussion of the findings, conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
Chapter five is the final chapter of the study. It provides a discussion of the major findings of the study. The chapter also provides the conclusion and the recommendations deemed viable in consideration of the findings of the study.

5.2 Summary
The general objective of this study was to assess and discuss the employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace through a case study of USIU-A. Three research questions were identified to form the major discussion of the subject. These were to find out what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A, what contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace and what are the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace.

The study applied a descriptive research design, which enables a generalization where a random sample of a larger population can be selected and a researcher suggests that the findings be applied to the larger population (Picciano, 2004). Data collection was done only once at the time of study through the distribution of questionnaires.

Subsequent to data collection, the raw data was cleaned, coded and analysed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. The frequency analysis on the descriptive data was computed and chi-square carried out to test the existence or non-existence of a relationship between the variables investigated. The research questionnaire was tested for reliability to reduce measurement error. This procedure enabled the discussion, conclusions and recommendations to be addressed.

The study sought to answer what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A. This research question specifically addressed the engagement of the university and its communication of philanthropy values. It focused in the participation of employees at USIU-A in terms of the commitment of the university board and its leadership team. It also addressed employee involvement in activities of fundraising, donating, volunteering and sponsorships. The study found that USIU-A is optimally engaged in philanthropy activities and communicates its philanthropic values very well in its mission statement.
USIU-A, employees who are involved in philanthropy are within the ages of 26-36 years. The time which these employees have been employed with USIU-A does not reveal any relationship to their involvement, despite the fact that most of them are involved in philanthropy at work.

Philanthropy at USIU-A experiences participation of more females than males in fundraising. As for sponsorships, males sponsor more while females solicit more for sponsorships. Employees at USIU-A concede that philanthropy activities should not be left to the Fundraising Office but employees as well should initiate philanthropy activities as philanthropy does not only involve money but also time, skills and talents.

The study found that philanthropy at USIU-A consists of fundraising, donating, sponsorships and volunteering. Most employees at USIU-A volunteer to support community service initiatives by volunteering their skills and talents doing community service on behalf of the university. In terms of donating, employees have donated to Frieda Brown Day activities as well as the Coffee Shop, Annual Fund and Book Fund Campaigns. Out of these four campaigns, employees donated mostly to the Coffee Shop Campaign, followed by Frieda Brown Day activities and the Book Fund respectively.

In the second research question, which was to discuss what contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at USIU-A. This study reveals the importance of communication on the part of the employees and the institution itself. The university is found to be communicating its philanthropic values very well in its mission statement. As much as the employees acknowledge that communication strategies about philanthropy have an impact on the way they will donate, it seems that these communication strategies are not effective enough to encourage participation. Challenges cited included messages that are not clear and receipt of a lot of messages which seem to pressurize the employees. Employees want to be reminded regularly through various media but not in a way that pressurizes them. A strategy that stands out as preferable to the employees is when the university communicates outcomes of philanthropy activities. This strategy seems to build trust and display transparency and as a result encourages future involvement.

On the part of the employees’ individual behavior and needs, involvement brings self-esteem, give a positive social identity, belonging and a sense of purpose at work. The employees’ involvement in philanthropy is also more out of personal values towards
philanthropy, culture and religion and least out of income. Further, employees get involved as a result of their support for the university’s goals and values about philanthropy and not necessarily the charity being served. The reluctance of employees to be involved at USIU-A is not due to avoidance of negative repercussions or an indication of retaliation to the institute’s lack of philanthropy towards the needs of the employees.

Leadership involvement contributes significantly to employee involvement, especially the role of the Vice Chancellor although the roles of the Deans and Heads of Departments also matter. Employees concede that their involvement would mean a lot if management recognized their input.

The third research question was to discuss the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace, in terms of effects on employee satisfaction and motivation as well as on the organization’s reputation and image.

At USIU-A the popular consensus that involvement has the ability to boost employee morale and motivation comes especially when people talk about how philanthropic the employees are. There were uncertainties in terms of directly linking motivation and involvement. Employees at USIU-A contend that the less motivated they are, the less involved they become. However, employees alluded to the fact that this does not necessarily mean that when they are more motivated, they will be more involved. Rewarding involvement has a negative effect on motivation as employees disagree that they would be motivated if involvement was rewarded.

There is a general impression that the institution is viewed positively when employees are involved in philanthropy and it also earns the institution a good reputation for its support for philanthropy. The support of management again, comes as a positive effect on reputation and image.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Philanthropy at USIU-A

Philanthropy at USIU-A consists of fundraising, sponsorships, donating and volunteering. McVeety and Langseth (2007) states that any successful advancement effort around engagement should be strongly informed by a specific institution’s interpretation and capacity to carry out engagement activities. USIU-A’s philanthropy strategy seems to be engaging the audience as most employees responded that they sometimes engage in
philanthropy activities. Philanthropy at USIU-A is practiced under the umbrella of fundraising, through the Fundraising and External Relations section whose work is to coordinate the university’s fundraising activities and social investment programs. The core functions being researching and cultivating funders to the university programs and projects. Secondly, being the generation of non-tuition revenue to support university development and doing so through the fundraising strategy of the Annual Fund. Third, leading support for the implementation of the university’s corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs. USIU-A achieves its fundraising through the involvement of its students, employees, alumni, local communities, partners, government and international community. With regards to the role of the fundraising office, this study established that employees agree that they should also assist the office and be able to initiate philanthropy activities, as well as identify and decide which non-profits to fund on behalf of the university.

In a study conducted at the Midwestern University which sought to establish which sort of employees are more likely to contribute and faculty perception about the giving process revealed that employees who were significantly more likely to give were fulltime staff, mostly administrative, were alumni, had given previously and had been employed for a greater number of years. In addition, faculty in general understood the purpose of employee giving. A similar study conducted at Bowling Green State University (BGSU) revealed a similar between BGSU and Midwestern University – fulltime, alumni employees who lived in the vicinity of the school and had previously given were more likely to give subsequently (Knight, 2003). USIU-A displayed a different trend where the length of employment had no association to their involvement, exhibited a varied participation between females than males in different philanthropy activities, creating a balance in gender participation. For example, where 11.80% of females sponsor scholarships, 14.40 % of males is recorded for the same. Where 40.50% of females volunteer their skills and talents doing community service for the university, 39.60% of males is recorded for the same.

This study established that, similar to O’Connor and Miller (2012), a properly resourced fundraising strategy that is aligned to the personal values of the donors and the philanthropic market is important to an organization. Previous studies concluded that employees who were highly salaried and had more years of employment at the university were more likely to give (Strickland, 2007; Knight 2003). However, employee
involvement at USIU-A did not investigate the relationship between salaries and likelihood to contribute, when investigating the association between the number of years and likelihood to give, it did not establish any association between the two. It rather found that income has no bearing on involvement in philanthropy, instead involvement is out of personal values, culture and religion.

In general, the study showed that the university itself is optimally engaged in philanthropy, perhaps explaining the active employee involvement at USIU-A and their general agreement that philanthropy not only involves money but also time and talent.

5.3.2 Factors Contributing To Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at the Workplace

This study has shown that communication has a contribution on employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace. The contribution of communication on employee involvement in philanthropy cannot be refuted in this study. From the study it has been determined that a major proportion of the respondents indicated that 37.9% agree that the university’s communication strategies have an impact on the way they will donate. This finding was in line with Nesbit et al (2012) assertion that an organization’s communication strategies will have an impact on individual donative behaviour and that the effect of repetitive communication has a positive effect on donative behaviour. This is true to the fact that employees react to the communication about philanthropy; that is the type of communication and the medium used to communicate.

As in other studies (Nesbit et al, 2012; Smith and Sypher, 2010) employees will donate because they have been reminded by email, newsletters, fundraising staff but they do not prefer to be pressurized to be involved in philanthropy. Most of the respondents wanted to be reminded through email, newsletters and by fundraising staff in order for them to be involved in philanthropy. Even so, most at 29.2% disagree that when they receive regular reminders about fundraising and donations they feel pressure to give or participate in philanthropy because they do not want to be pressurized. Smith and Sypher (2010) elude to the fact that messages about philanthropy like thank you notes and presentation of past charitable events make employees to be involved. This study has also showed similar trend and concludes that feedback on the outcomes of the philanthropy encourage them to respond.
The communication strategies used around philanthropy aim at involving all stakeholders at participating in the initiative. The reason that many strategies are used is an attempt to appeal to different personalities, attitudes and emotions within employees. The repetitive nature of the messages are intended to arouse action from the employee. As the study has shown, employees do not want to feel pressurized, at the same time, they need to hear the messages in order for them to act.

The psychological needs discussed by Bauman and Skikta (2012) through which corporate social responsibility (CSR) can affect employees’ relationship with their company include (1) a sense of security and safety that their material needs will be met, (2) self-esteem that stems from a positive social identity, (3) feelings of belongingness and social validation of important values, and (4) existential meaning and a deeper sense of purpose at work. These needs are evident in this study where 35.8% agreed that charitable giving at work boosted their self-esteem and gives me a positive social identity, belonging and a sense of purpose at work. This means that the employees’ involvement feeds the need to acquire some satisfaction from the feeling that they are involved in philanthropy for the common good of the community as well as attaining some sense of satisfaction and increased morale.

Similar to the previous studies about involvement of leadership in philanthropy (Nicholson, 2007; Cook, 1994), this study found out that the involvement of leadership is very crucial to getting employees involved. The respondents of this study agree that the role of the VC in philanthropy at USIU-A is important in getting employees involved.

Nicholson (2007) addressed the factor of leadership involvement in terms of the various leadership qualities. In the backdrop of Nicholson (2007) study, what this study resonates most with is the transformational leadership. The VC at USIU-A is most typically portrayed to be admired, respected and trusted. The VC inspires motivation by behaving in ways that motivate those around her and arouse team spirit and provide meaningful and challenging teamwork. This can be attributed the results of the study which show that majority of the respondents will support philanthropy initiative supported by the VC and not necessarily by the Head of Department of Dean.

Leadership support impacts positively on employee involvement, especially at the top level. Effective leadership in philanthropy has an effect on the sustainability of philanthropy programs in the workplace. Leadership support compliments the strategic
objectives surrounding philanthropy, as it shows that leadership is walking the talk. That is why this study shows neutrality in the involvement of HoDs and Deans but agreement in the involvement of the VC. Similarly in corporate entities CSR initiatives led by CEOs achieve more success than those led by other managers.

To employees, the involvement of the leader is a confirmation that the initiative is important to the individual as well as the organization. Although this study does not reveal the level of engagement by the various managerial positions, other studies have positively associated organizational hierarchy to involvement.

5.3.3 The Effects of Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at the Workplace

With regards to employee satisfaction and commitment, employees at USIU-A can be described as willing donors, when using the description of Nesbit et al (2012) which defined willing donors as those who directly cite their identification with the university as a primary reason for participating in its philanthropy campaign. This is in tandem with the results of this study. The respondents cited their reasons for involvement as simply that they support the goals and values of the university about philanthropy. As employees of the university, they felt that they have a personal responsibility to the university and the communities it supports. From the respondents’ perspective, employee participation in the institution’s philanthropy programs seems to be motivated by personal benefits.

Conversely, Knight (2004) cited among the reasons for not participating in philanthropy due to disagreements with the priorities of the particular campaign. This creates conflict of interest where an individual wants to contribute because of their belief in supporting the institution, but does not believe in the cause being supported. In this study, employees claim that their lack of involvement is often due to the fact that they do not support the charity being served.

Previous studies particularly Muller and Kraussl (2011) proposed that when an organization’s philanthropy news highlight employee involvement in the donation, it sends a positive buy-in from investors and as well as a positive signal that employees are comfortable in that organizational environment. This study showed that employees’ morale is boosted when their contribution is mentioned in philanthropy news. There were signs of motivation and satisfaction when employees are supported by management and when people talk about how philanthropic the employees. Rewarding employee
involvement in philanthropy did not yield positive responses, as the employees did not associate rewards with their involvement in philanthropy. The primary mission for organizations therefore should be to foster a culture of employee involvement which is aligned to the personal values of the donors in order to achieve a sustained commitment to philanthropy in the workplace.

With regards to the effects of employee involvement in philanthropy on organizational performance and image, perhaps it is important to first apply to the discussion Dennis et al (2007, p.3) two schools of thought. They used these to explain the rationale behind philanthropy and classified it as being altruistic or strategic. The altruistic nature is described as where corporate giving is done out of giving the resources of an organization out of moral obligation to make society a better place. The strategic perspective on the other hand, is where corporate giving is implemented as part of the organization’s strategy to enhance financial performance.

Employers are seen to benefit from enhanced corporate or brand image as a result of the enhanced positive perceptions of consumers in response to a firm’s increased commitment and effort on behalf of the charity (Peloza, J. and Hassay D., 2006, p.357). This study showed resonated with this claim, proving that employee involvement creates an impression of a sincere philanthropic behaviour, which results in a positive image and good reputation for an organization. It discovered that respondents support the notion that involvement of management gives the institution a better image, reputation and even when employees are involved in philanthropy at the workplace, people view the organization positively.

5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Philanthropy at USIU-A

It is concluded in the study that philanthropy is practiced through various forms and in the case of USIU-A, through volunteering, donating, sponsorships and fundraising. The strategies applied are important especially their alignment to personal values and their potential to incite action on the part of the donor. For example, donating to the Coffee shop was the most popular and the least popular was donating to the Annual Fund. Perhaps reasons could be that the annual fund is repetitive and people lose interest with time, and the coffee shop is a more social initiative which people are interested in. Several conclusions could be made.
In this study, factors like age, gender, length of employment and level of employment showed no bearing on employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace, although the study showed that the involved people were the ones between the ages of 26 years – 36 years, and could conclude that age matters in the level of involvement.

5.4.2 Factors Contributing To Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at the Workplace

From the study, it is concluded that communication about philanthropy in the workplace, starts from employees understanding the mission of the organization towards philanthropy. If employees understand the organization’s objectives on philanthropy they are able to initiate philanthropy programs and identify charities to support without necessarily relying the responsible office, in the case of USIU-A, the office of Fundraising and External Relations.

On the part of employee needs and behavior, the study established that the philanthropic pattern of employees is majorly due to various personal motives. Factors of income, culture, religion, peer pressure from colleagues and personal values towards philanthropy were put forth and mostly attributed their reasons for involvement as being personal values and least as income. The study further concludes that being motivated at work plays a role in employee involvement. The less motivated employees are at work, the less involved they will be. However, it does mean that when employees are motivated they will be involved. This is an interesting fact which explains although motivation is important, it is not a determining factor.

Leadership involvement has been found to be important. Dennis et al (2007, p.4) states that the degree to which the CEO considers corporate philanthropy as a component of their self-identity will likely influence the decision to engage in corporate philanthropy. This assertion is justified by this study as a conclusion can be made from the employees’ involvement in Frieda Brown Day philanthropy activities. The Frieda Brown Day is a self-identity of the VC of USIU-A.

5.4.3 The Effects of Employee Involvement in Philanthropy At The Workplace

The study concludes that employee satisfaction and commitment are critical to their involvement in philanthropy. Employees who feel a strong sense of belonging in their organization will most likely be highly involved in philanthropy at the workplace. The emphasis is not so much on rewarding employees for motivating them to be involved,
rather on recognizing their involvement, mentioning it in philanthropy news and management being involved to show value in the initiative.

The study further concludes that employee involvement is a factor the social performance-financial performance relationship of an organization. The fact that an organization is showing that it has a moral obligation towards social welfare gives it a good image and reputation. It is general understanding that a good image and reputation subsequently translate into recruitment privileges and market performance.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Philanthropy at USIU-A

USIU-A has potential to become successful in its philanthropy efforts if the university could assess its weak areas, such as donations to Scholarships and Annual Fund which receive the least support according to this study. The university should re-visit the current strategies used for these areas and find out what the employees prefer. Collaborations with industry is another weak area which could be improved as it is very important for the university to align itself with industry players. This area has potential to improve since employees believe that philanthropy does not only involve money but also time, talents and skills. Some universities have a Fundraising Committee which is responsible for assisting the Deans to determine fundraising priorities and develop strategies to get faculty, staff and students more engaged in fundraising mission for the university, something that USIU-A could adopt.

5.5.1.2 Factors Contributing To Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at The Workplace

Prior studies including this one have indicated that employees do not want to be pressurized to participate in philanthropy. Organizations should appreciate that employees have many factors influencing them to be involved in philanthropy most of which are personal. As such organizations should seek to find the appropriate communication strategies that match the employees’ personal values and also the organizational culture into which employees have been socialized at their workplace. A contingency approach
cannot be applied as what works in one organization may not necessarily work for another.

Organizations also should make their philanthropy objectives clear and communicate them so that anyone entering the organization, is able to understand them, be it current or prospective employees. Organizations should cultivate the culture of philanthropy from the top leadership down. Employees are not going to be motivated unless they realize the involvement of management in philanthropy. Leadership should inspire involvement, especially where the employees are reluctant to participate.

5.5.1.3 The Effects of Employee Involvement in Philanthropy at the Workplace

Perhaps organizations should not so much seek recognition in their philanthropy efforts and to outsmart their competitors. Organizations should earn the reputation by aligning their philanthropy efforts to their mission and objectives, where employees would know how to share impart their knowledge, talents and abilities without it being an extra effort to be involved in philanthropy. If employees are aware of how they are expected to contribute to the philanthropic objectives of the organization through their individual roles, then they become involved as a way of supporting the organization to achieve a good reputation and positive image instead of being involved as a job requirement.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

Future researchers should conduct more study in the issue of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace. Such further studies should examine the involvement of the individual in involvement at the workplace and outside the workplace to compare if similar factors for within the workplace are exhibited for outside the workplace. Further studies should also be carried out to compare involvement of employees in various employment sectors. Also studies should be carried out to challenge the validity of current study and contribute more additional literature to employee involvement in philanthropy.
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## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Undergraduate and Graduate Sponsorships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USIU-A Scholarships</strong></td>
<td>- Full 100% USIU-A scholarship on tuition, books computer lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partial USIU-AFRICA scholarship Female students only; 100% tuition for room &amp; board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-time scholarships for Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>Scholarship for Kenyans 25% tuition; 8 scholarships annually (1 per province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Grant for International Students (IGU) 25% tuition; 5 scholarships annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>Scholarship for freshman 40% tuition in relevant sports discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports scholarship for continuing students 25% tuition only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>- Scholarships for under-represented communities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 100% tuition, 2 Scholarships for under-represented communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 100% tuition, 2 Physically challenged 100% tuition grant with serious mobility problems, students from Arid and Semi-arid areas and 1 student from urban slums in the university vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Scholarships for under-represented communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 100% tuition, 2 Physically challenged 100% tuition grant with serious mobility problems, students from Arid and Semi-arid areas and 1 student from urban slums in the university vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice-Chancellor's scholarship for undergraduate students</strong></td>
<td>25% tuition only scholarship for deserving continuing students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus work opportunity</strong></td>
<td>25% tuition only scholarship for students who demonstrate financial need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident Assistantship</strong></td>
<td>Free room and board in the university hostels for students who meet minimum requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Scholarship for graduate</strong></td>
<td>MBA scholarship 25% tuition only for 6 MBA students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special need grant</strong></td>
<td>40% tuition only for graduate students facing sudden financial setbacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Frieda Brown Beneficiaries and nature of gift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Nature of Gift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Tree Side Special School</td>
<td>Tree planting, painting of classes, donations of food stuffs and educational items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Marurui Primary School</td>
<td>Painting of toilets and water points, Planting of trees and flowers and donations of foodstuffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Ndii-Ini Primary School</td>
<td>Renovation of office, donation of seedlings, purchase of office table, donation of paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Garden Estate Primary</td>
<td>Renovation of Pre-school, purchase of uniform, desks, landscaping for Pre-school, purchase of foodstuff for school feeding program, donation of printer and filing cabinets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Murema Primary School</td>
<td>Paint interior surfaces, replace window panes, upgrade school gate, planting of trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 5: Research Questionnaire

SURVEY TITLE: EMPLOYEES' INVOLVEMENT IN PHILANTHROPY PROGRAMS AT THE WORKPLACE: A CASE STUDY OF UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY – AFRICA

The purpose of this study is to assess employee involvement in philanthropy programs at the workplace. The researcher is specific in obtaining information regarding three areas of interest, namely; what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A, what contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace and what is the impact of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace.

For purposes of common understanding, philanthropy in this particular research means voluntary, active, non-reciprocal efforts (financial, organizational, human resources etc.) by an entity or individual with the sole purpose of benefiting other human beings, or fulfilling an unmet social need, regardless of any specific ‘return on investment’ for the donor.

Please read each question carefully and answer it to the best of your ability. There are no correct or incorrect responses.

Thank you for your participation in the study

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age 18-25 [ ] 26-36 [ ] 37-47 [ ] 47 and above [ ]

2. Gender Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. Period of time employed with USIU ..........................................................

4. Highest Education level
   PhD [ ] Bachelor’s Degree [ ]
   Master’s Degree [ ] Diploma [ ]
   Others........................................

5. Management level
   Middle management [ ] Top management [ ] Low management [ ]

6. Indicate your department or school ........................................................
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SECTION B: WHAT CONSTITUTES PHILANTHROPY AT USIU-A

The following questions relate to what constitutes philanthropy at USIU-A in terms of; Volunteerism, Donations, Fundraising and Sponsorships.

7. How often do you engage in the university’s philanthropy activities?
   I am not aware of any [ ] Never [ ] Sometimes [ ] Always [ ]

8. Indicate how you engage on the following at USIU-A (Tick all that applies)

**VOLUNTEERING**

- [ ] I volunteer my skills and talents doing community service for the university.
- [ ] I support community initiatives within campus.
- [ ] I participate in collaborations between the university and industry.
- [ ] I never volunteer for anything at my workplace.
- [ ] Other (Specify): ________________________________

**DONATING**

- [ ] I donate to various projects like Coffee Shop
- [ ] I donate to the Book Fund
- [ ] I donate the Annual Fund
- [ ] I donate to the Frieda Brown Day activities
- [ ] I never donate to anything at my workplace
- [ ] Other (Specify): ________________________________

**FUNDRAISING**

I have fundraised for philanthropy activities that the university supports  Yes [ ]
No [ ]
Which one(s): ________________________________

**SPONSORSHIPS**

- [ ] I solicit sponsorships for philanthropy activities
- [ ] I sponsor Scholarships
- [ ] I do not sponsor anything at my workplace
- [ ] Other: ________________________________

9. How would you improve philanthropy at USIU-A?

...........................................................................................................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................................................
10. On a scale of 1-5 do you agree with the following?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USIU-A is optimally engaged in philanthropy activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees should rely on the Fundraising Office to initiate philanthropy priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees should identify and decide which non-profits to fund on behalf of the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for the university as a whole to encourage civic responsibility and engagement through philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy involves not only money but also talent and time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be interested to help the university to solve social problems by raising funds, volunteering my talent, skills and time for a charitable cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C: WHAT CONtributes TO EMPLOYEE INVOLvEMENT IN PHILANTHROPY AT THE WORKPLACE**

The following questions relate to what contributes to employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace in terms of; Communication, Employee needs and behavior and Leadership involvement.

**COMMUNICATION**

11. On a scale of 1-5 do you agree with the following?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The university communicates its philanthropic values very well in its mission statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university’s communication strategies have an impact on the way I will donate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university always communicates very well in a way that encourages me to participate in fundraising or donate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be reminded constantly through email, newsletters, fundraising staff to give in order for me to donate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I receive regular reminders about fundraising, donations etc. I feel pressure to give.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want to be pressurized to give or participate in philanthropy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university communicates the outcomes of its philanthropy programs very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the university gives feedback on the outcomes of its philanthropy I am encouraged to be involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy news that mention employee involvement have a positive impact on the image of my workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in philanthropy programs at work because I am concerned about the reputation of my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What are your communication challenges to engaging in university-wide philanthropy campaigns?

[ ] Messages about philanthropy are not clear

[ ] The university sends a lot of message about philanthropy and it puts me under pressure

[ ] The university does not communicate anything about philanthropy

Others..................................................................................................................................................
EMPLOYEES NEEDS AND BEHAVIOUR

13. On a scale of 1-5 do you agree the following?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charitable giving at work boosts my self-esteem and gives me a positive social identity, belonging and a sense of purpose at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main reason for being involved in philanthropy at work is simply that I support the university’s goals and values about philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an employee of USIU I believe that I have a personal responsibility to the university and the communities it supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in philanthropy at work because I identify more with my workplace and not necessarily the charity being served.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I donate to avoid negative repercussions within the work environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refuse to be involved in philanthropy at work because the organization itself is not philanthropic about my needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I am involved in philanthropy at my workplace because of my (Tick all applicable answers):

[ ] Income                  [ ] Peer pressure from my colleagues

[ ] Culture                 [ ] Personal values towards philanthropy

[ ] Religion                Other

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
15. On a scale of 1-5 do you agree the following?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The role of the VC in philanthropy at USIU is important in getting employees involved in philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the HoDs and Deans in philanthropy at USIU is important in getting employees involved in philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of involvement in philanthropy should match one’s position. Top management be the most involved and give the most, mid-management be more involved and give more, low-management be less involved and give less.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will support any philanthropy initiative supported by my Dean / HoD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will support any philanthropy initiative supported by the Vice Chancellor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management in my department/faculty encourages us to be involved in philanthropy at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management in my department/faculty does not seem to care about philanthropy at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My involvement in philanthropy would mean a lot to me if management recognized by input.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE EFFECTS OF EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT IN PHILANTHROPY AT THE WORKPLACE

The following questions relate to the effect of employee involvement in philanthropy at the workplace.

16. On a scale of 1-5 do you agree the following?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When employees are involved in philanthropy at the workplace, people view the organization positively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has a good reputation based on its support for philanthropy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support of management in philanthropy at work creates an even better image and reputation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee involvement in philanthropy programs at work has the ability to boast employee morale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to be involved in philanthropy when people talk about how employees at my organization are philanthropic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I associate my motivation and satisfaction at work with my involvement in philanthropy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The less motivated I am, the less involved in philanthropy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more motivated I am, the more involved in philanthropy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be more motivated to be involved in philanthropy at work, if it was rewarded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Any other comment on philanthropy at the workplace.

............................................................................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you for taking time to respond to this questionnaire.