GROWING GIVING...
IN KENYA
March 2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About this report</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Charities Aid Foundation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key themes from the research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons for Government, Civil Society and the wider world</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya in context</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research approach</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view from civil society</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO internal practices</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO resource mobilisation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO capacities, challenges and needs</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The external environment</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view from individuals</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving by individuals</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving to civil society</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1 – Detail on research approach</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic guide – Interviews with CSO leaders</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic guide – Focus group discussions</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOREWORD

It is a pleasure to present CAF’s dedicated report into the giving culture in Kenya. This latest report, which takes an in depth look at Africa’s ninth largest economy, was borne of a desire by partners in Kenya to better understand the obstacles and opportunities to grow charitable giving.

Kenya provides an ideal basis for study, as a relatively recent entrant into the ranks of middle-income countries. With the accompanying growth in jobs, innovation and a modernised industrial outlook comes a growing middle class that has the power to both fund and shape civil society.

Moreover, this cohort has firm roots in the societies in which they live. As we work to make the most of the tremendous potential that comes with a fast-growing middle class, research such as this can provide a roadmap for those organisations working to ensure that new found prosperity translates into a strengthened and healthy civil society, one that is shaped by the people it aims to serve. It can also provide crucial insights for other nations on the cusp of reaching middle-income status.

In Kenya, as in other countries around the world, the freedoms and flexibility of civil society are being restricted by at-times wary Governments and there is often a lack of public trust in large institutions. At the same time Governments are revisiting budgets for overseas development assistance, while international NGOs and multi-lateral agencies still generate most of the non-government funding for development work.

But while there are challenges, there are also opportunities to source local answers to local challenges. To identify those opportunities, we needed to know more. Some of the findings here will ring familiar to many of us, regardless of where we live and work – one good example is the reluctance by donors to fund so-called ‘charity overheads’ – while others reflect very specific local traditions, most notably the deep-rooted and powerful culture of informal support for families and neighbours.

We are grateful for the chance to undertake this research in partnership with the Aga Khan Foundation, CS Mott Foundation and the UK National Lottery Community Fund. I am, as ever, humbled by the generosity that exists – particularly among those with the least to give – and take inspiration from the scale of giving captured in these pages. I hope it proves helpful in your work. At CAF, we view this as a starting point on a journey to grow giving in all its forms.

Michael Mapstone
Director of International Charities Aid Foundation
ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report from CAF (Charities Aid Foundation) in partnership with the Aga Khan Foundation, CS Mott Foundation and the UK National Lottery Community Fund, looks at individual giving, the enabling environment and challenges for civil society in Kenya. This forms part of a series that also includes reports on South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda as well as an amalgamated report covering the three East African countries. It complements the international research into giving that CAF has conducted for decades, including our renowned CAF World Giving Index¹ which celebrated its 10th anniversary in 2019.

Some years ago, CAF identified a once in a lifetime opportunity to harness the growth of the middle classes in emerging economies into contributing more to civil society². We estimated that with as many as 2.4 billion people set to join the world’s middle classes by 2030, it is crucial that we ensure that the groundwork is put in place to support and encourage mass giving; movements in support of civil society. We estimate that if the world’s middle classes were to give just 0.5% of their spending – less than the average UK household and about the same as people in the Republic of Korea – that could amount to $319 billion in resources for civil society organisations (CSOs) annually by 2030.

Harnessing the power of mass giving could release unprecedented resources to achieve the SDGs and tackle poverty, disease and many other social and environmental problems. But it would do much more than that. Growing domestic giving means giving money but it also means volunteering, sharing skills and advocacy. It would produce essential unrestricted funds for domestic CSOs, a healthy balance between local, regional and international organisations, and public engagement which would strengthen civil society, and democracy with it.

We identified a need to understand more about current individual giving behaviours in key countries. In partnership with the Aga Khan Foundation, CS Mott Foundation and the UK National Lottery Community Fund, we were able to commission the research agency Ipsos MORI to conduct a three pronged research programme, augmented with input from sector practitioners and experts through workshops in London and Nairobi, and desk research by CAF.

These reports include the findings of the Ipsos MORI research as well as policy context and recommendations developed by CAF.

We hope you find this report both interesting and useful.

If you have any questions on this research, we would love to hear from you and can be contacted at: research@cafonline.org

Charities Aid Foundation is a leading international charity registered in the United Kingdom. We exist to make giving go further, so together we can transform more lives and communities around the world. We are a champion for better giving, and for over 90 years we’ve been helping donors, companies, charities and social organisations make a bigger impact.

CAF is a founding partner of the CAF Global Alliance, a leading international network of independent and locally-led organisations working at the forefront of philanthropy and civil society. The CAF Global Alliance includes partners from Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, India, Russia, South Africa, United Kingdom, and the United States.

We are CAF and we make giving count.
CAF – Charities Aid Foundation

CAPI – Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing

CBO – Community Based Organisation
A public or private non-profit organisation that represents a community or a significant segment of a community and works to meet community needs.

CSO – Civil Society Organisation
Formal or informal organisations that are not part of Government and are self-governing. They can be private or non-profit and include a range of actors such as advocacy groups, development agencies, community-based organisations and more.

FBO – Faith Based Organisation
Religious, faith-based, and/or faith-inspired non-profit organisations which may be registered or unregistered.

GDP – Gross Domestic Product

INGO – International non-governmental organisation

LGBT+ – Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender plus

KSh – Kenyan Shilling

NGO – Non Governmental Organisation

ODA – Official Development Assistance

PBO – Public Benefit Organisation

SDGs – Sustainable Development Goals

---
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The view from individuals

A strong culture of generosity exists, but it is predominantly informal rather than to CSOs. Kenya’s growing middle classes are giving away 22% of their monthly income, often through informal gifts and support to family, friends and neighbours. Charitable giving, while generous, does not seem to lead people to incur hardships, signalling that there is capacity to give more. CSOs’ work is largely perceived as valuable and aligned with the needs of the community, but greater transparency, knowledge about individual organisations and understanding of how donations are spent could further encourage formal giving (i.e. giving to CSOs).

Religion and local traditions are strong drivers for individual giving. Focus group participants highlighted the cultural tradition of Harambee, rooted in self-help and cooperative work, as a key driver for their giving. They engage with a wide range of individual and community giving, but feel most positively about faith-based organisations. Religion is the second biggest motivation for giving behind personal attachment to a cause. This shows the potential of utilising partnerships with churches and religious institutions, and the importance of tapping into local traditions when engaging individuals around growing their giving.

A mixed picture emerged when it comes to the use and role of technology. Cash was the most prominent way to give, followed by mobile payment services, such as M-Pesa, but use of other online services was rare. Few respondents reported finding out about CSOs online or through social media. However, CSOs reported the use of online tools and social media for fundraising and supporter mobilisation. This raises questions around the role of technology in fundraising strategies, potential barriers (e.g. internet access, trust in platforms) and the need to tailor online solutions to individual needs and invest in their uptake.
The view from civil society

**International aid dependency of CSOs and the potential of individual giving.** CSOs are still reliant on external international aid, but cite a diverse range of income sources and some promotion of individual giving through online campaigns, crowdfunding, social media and more traditional radio campaigns. Donations are mostly received through mobile money services. Kenya is also seeing the growth of some of the more developed philanthropic infrastructure in the region aimed at building community philanthropy and engagement with giving, but this is in need of further investment.

**Trust and making the case to local populations for support remains an issue for local CSOs.** Challenges to obtaining individual donations include a lack of awareness about and demands for greater accountability from CSOs. Despite many positive views on the effectiveness and impact of CSOs, civil society could do more to raise awareness of the sector, spread knowledge about individual organisations and demonstrate accountability around the spending of donations in order to positively affect levels of public confidence.

**Mission-drift, short-termism of international funding and competition around resources.** Inflexible and fluctuating donor funding exacerbates the difficulties of maintaining skilled staff and covering core costs such as fundraising expenses. Dependency on foreign aid can also cause CSOs to drift from their own mission and priorities, all in the wider context of a decline in aid and international actors (such as INGOs) looking towards directly raising funds in local markets. Despite Kenya’s (fairly new) middle income status, the transition of foreign aid needs to equip local civil society infrastructure, resource organisations’ core costs, help them diversify their income streams and ensure financial sustainability.

**Partnerships within the sector exist, but volunteer bases need to grow and increase their skillset.** Some CSOs boast highly skilled volunteer support which helps to reduce costs, but for others it is underutilised, or creates an over-reliance on a fluctuating group to carry out core functions. Funders cannot only provide core funding but invest in infrastructure that helps improve and upskill volunteer bases through improved partnerships and skills-matching. While CSO collaborations are commonplace, the private sector could do more beyond donating to CSOs to build meaningful partnerships and provide varied, non-financial support.
The role of Government

While civil society in Kenya feels it retains an independent voice, Government could do more to protect civic space and champion the sector. CSO participants were split on whether they believed they have freedom to express opinions and challenge Government. While those CSOs that fill gaps in service provision and align better with Government priorities are received positively, concerns remain around those speaking out on political issues meeting resistance or even state harassment. There also appears to be difficulty around whistleblowing on Government corruption or malpractice. Besides stopping obstructive practices, there is much room for improvement in Government’s active support for civil society.

Government oversight is generally welcomed, but issues remain around the fair, transparent and consistent application of regulation. The regulatory landscape has been characterised by a politicising of the (de-)registration process and legal stalemate between Government and civil society around key legislation (such as the Public Benefit Organisations (PBO) Act). While Kenya has a lot of progressive legislation, CSOs argue that it often ignores vital differences between them and that there is an implementation gap meaning that they are not reaping the benefits.

Awareness of tax incentives for individual giving and CSOs is very low. Despite the frequency of giving money to CSOs, most survey respondents were unaware of whether tax incentives exist or not, or believed that none exist. Among those who were aware that they exist, the vast majority had not used them in the past. Simplified access would enable citizens to make better use of them.
This research demonstrates the generosity of the middle classes and shows the potential of giving by people in Kenya to have a transformative effect and to strengthen their role as active citizens in their community. However, international partners, national Government, and civil society need to help put the right conditions in place for unlocking mass engagement with individual giving to local CSOs, whilst not cannibalising on existing informal giving within the country. This is CAF’s view on steps needed from each:

- **Recognising the importance of individual giving in building civil society resilience is essential to sustainable development:** Individual giving, formal and informal, financial and non-financial, needs to be seen as the foundation for civil society resilience and key to delivering on the SDGs. Although there are significant levels of informal giving happening in Kenya, there is an opportunity to grow individual giving to CSOs. This is integral to their credibility and legitimacy; and more broadly to civil society’s role in protecting civic freedoms, holding Government to account and underpinning stable societies.

- **Sector and funder leadership:** strengthening local cultures of giving requires an open discourse around power dynamics that exist between large institutional partners and less powerful parts of local civil society. Many INGOs and multilaterals are also gearing up to tap into local giving in emerging economies. This can be at odds with empowering local actors and can potentially undermine solidarity in the sector and upset the social safety nets underpinned by informal giving. INGOs should work to support local CSOs and be an active participant in growing a local eco-system for civil society.

- **Funding civil society infrastructure to mobilise mass engagement in giving:** investing in local infrastructure and alternative financing models for CSOs to limit their dependency on aid. Local infrastructure is a network of institutions and platforms that provide crucial services upon which civil society and giving to good causes can flourish. It is present across Kenya but needs further investment. This infrastructure can take on many forms, such as fundraising portals and CSO validation services, philanthropy advice, sector representation, standard-setting bodies and self-regulation, or research, advocacy and capacity building, as well as sector-specific financial services.

- **Building on local cultures of giving:** by supporting a shift in the working mind-sets of local CSOs. The culture of support for family and community that exists in Kenya is powerful, and a foundation upon which to build. While local CSOs may focus on the requirements of external partners, they can work differently. However, CSOs could address this by diversifying their funding models to include local income generating activities and individual giving, in particular in their funding mix, as well as recognising other forms of support such as in kind and volunteering.

- **Telling the story:** communicating the value of local civil society is crucial to addressing public trust and awareness. This requires investment in campaigns for local resource mobilisation that highlight the value of civil society, and story-telling by CSOs that connects people with their causes and explains their impact and added value to communities and individuals, using language that empowers people to understand the causes that they are supporting. This will help to motivate them to continue their giving journey and deepen their engagement with civil society.

- **Fostering an enabling policy environment:** strengthening local cultures of generosity requires an enabling environment for mass participation in giving and civil society. Inconsistencies in the way civil society is regulated in Kenya needs to be addressed, and incentives for giving known and utilised by the public and CSOs. Civil society should also be considered in the wider policy environment to minimise indirect or unintended impacts.
This section of the report is based on desk research conducted by CAF.

**Middle class growth and the opportunity it brings**

With as many as 2.4 billion people set to join the world’s middle classes by 2030 there is an opportunity to encourage mass engagement in giving and grow local generosity movements. CAF has estimated that if the world’s middle classes were to give over just 0.5% of their spending, that could amount to $319 billion in resources for civil society annually by 2030.

Kenya has made significant political, structural and economic reforms that have largely driven economic growth in the country by 5-6% annually over the past decade. The country has also undergone social development and political change, which has enabled sustained growth of the middle class. Kenya’s economy is the largest and most diverse in East Africa, accounting for 40% of the region’s GDP. The country has become a hub for technological innovation and has been described as Africa’s ‘Silicon Savannah’, and is host to East Africa’s largest corporation, the telecommunications and financial services provider Safaricom.

All of this makes Kenya an interesting case: a growing middle class could dedicate more disposable income to local causes and organisations, while a growing technological and service infrastructure could make giving easier. At the same time, however, economic development has been impaired by weak governance, corruption, and external factors such as a prolonged drought. There are wider questions to be asked around the fragile state and vulnerability of Kenya’s middle class to economic shocks. Estimates of the size of the Kenyan middle class vary widely, and it is highly concentrated within service-based industries and large cities. However, there is consensus that the middle class is expected to grow and Kenya is already classified as a middle-income country.

**Recent history of civil society in Kenya**

Kenya has experienced political turmoil in recent years, including a disputed election followed by civil unrest in 2017. Freedom House ranks Kenya as partly free, with recent human rights violations including abusive police operations against opposition strongholds and a hostile working environment for journalists, activists and opposition members.
Political unrest and governance issues can undermine stability, impacting Kenya's capacity to tackle persisting inequality and contributing to a closing space for civil society.

**Challenges facing civil society organisations**

Kenya received USD 2.475 billion of overseas development assistance (ODA) in 2017, but there is little data on how much is channelled directly to local CSOs. The East Africa Philanthropy Portal provides information on philanthropic organisations in Kenya and recorded 1,874 grants worth USD 17 million. Civil society organisations still rely heavily on external aid and funders can exert influence over the organisation's priorities which can cause mission-drift and concentration on short-term objectives. CSOs also feel pressure to hire staff on a short-term basis, which can exacerbate high turnover rates.

With overall donor funding becoming scarce, CSOs are starting to develop new funding models such as charging for services, collecting membership fees or consultancy and service contracts. However, most are not involved in profit-making activities due to small returns that may not cover their financial needs. Despite some recovery in sustainability, CSOs' service provision and sectoral infrastructure has weakened recently as international funders temporarily shift their attention to specific issues (such as elections). Civil society coalitions have declined due to a lack of funding, but many inter-sectoral partnerships have emerged around social accountability initiatives, technological support for public participation in governance processes, and finding common cause on policy issues.

**Local infrastructure and corporate giving**

Philanthropic infrastructure exists and a range of organisations promote local giving and philanthropy, including cross-sectoral regional networks, indigenous grant-makers that support local CSOs, intermediary institutions and community foundations. For example, the Yetu Initiative, set up by the Aga Khan Foundation and USAID, promotes local philanthropy and supports fundraising campaigns by local CSOs. The Kenya Community Development Foundation (KCDF) follows a community foundation model, tapping into local giving and reciprocity. Communities are encouraged to value and pool their own assets before seeking funding from partners so they can build their own long-term funds. Corporate giving, while not widespread, is a growing field. Companies in certain industries (e.g. mining) are mandated to invest a percentage of their profits in corporate social responsibility, and CSOs working on health and community needs receive in kind donations (e.g. medicines) from multinationals such as pharmaceutical companies. However, there is limited data on levels of annual corporate giving or partnerships with CSOs. Opportunities have also opened up through the process of devolution, in terms of localisation of civil society-government relations. For example, the Merti Integrated Development Programme is supported by the Isiolo county government, which pledged 10% of its allocation from the Constituency Development Fund to the organisation on an annual basis.

---

22 Yetu Initiative website: http://yetu.org/
Cultural traditions and giving

As this research shows, many Kenyans engage in giving, something which is linked to the cultural tradition of *Harambee*, rooted in self-help and cooperative work\(^\text{26}\) and visible in many *Harambee* organisations across Kenya. These pooled resources are often important social safety nets for the financially excluded in the country.\(^\text{27}\) As an example, the ‘Kenyans for Kenya’ campaign saw 1 billion KES raised by everyday Kenyans to support disaster relief efforts; a significant portion being raised through M-Pesa.\(^\text{28}\)

Local resource mobilisation through *Harambees* is recognised and must adhere to the Public Collections Act, which is generally enabling.\(^\text{29}\) Informal giving to individuals such as family members when they need support is most common, as compared to regular giving.

There is a wide range of individual and community giving that people engage with: merry-go-rounds (savings and/or credit cooperatives), religious tithing, community revolving funds (e.g. stokvels) and chamas.\(^\text{30}\) Women mainly give as part of religious and self-help groups, while men do so as part of peer groups, family groups and business partnerships. Many CSOs have been unable to capitalise on the *Harambee* tradition due to issues around transparency and accountability.\(^\text{31}\)

Impacts of technology

Kenyans are comfortable giving via Mobile Money or in cash, and are unlikely to make donations via an online platform.\(^\text{32}\) Indeed, the volume and value of Mobile Phone Money Transfers increased from 1,577.68 million transactions worth KSh 3,574.43 billion in 2016/2017 to 1,619.97 million transactions worth KSh 3,747.33 billion in 2017/2018.\(^\text{33}\)

The increased use of digital lending apps in Kenya has led to rising levels of individual debt and has been described as a ‘national crisis’.\(^\text{34}\) This could impact giving, as individuals take out loans to make up for shortfalls and fall into perpetual and over-indebtedness, minimising their ability to contribute to kin networks over time. Subsequent exclusion from the formal financial services system, as people become blacklisted, implies a concerning reversion to cash transactions. There is also evidence that fin-tech platforms are being used to extract value from poor households through predatory lending and gambling.\(^\text{35}\) Furthermore, in 2018, Kenya increased the excise tax on money transfer services by banks from 10% to 20%, for telephone services (airtime) from 10% to 15%, and on mobile phone-based financial transactions from 10% to 12%.\(^\text{36}\) Such developments could act as a barrier to giving that is facilitated via mobile transactions.

Tax incentives

In theory, Kenya provides tax incentives for cash donations made by an individual or corporation to a charitable organisation registered or exempt from registration under the Societies Act or the 1990 NGO Coordination Act (and if further conditions on income tax exemption are fulfilled).\(^\text{37}\) CSOs can apply for tax exemptions from the National

---

\(^{26}\) ICNL (2013): My Brother’s Keeper: Challenges in Gifting in the Kenyan Context.


\(^{31}\) ICNL (2013).


\(^{34}\) Loans can come with costs as high as 100 percent annualized. Kevin P. Donovan, Emma Park (2019).

\(^{35}\) Kimani, Elijah (2020): Fin-tech in Kenya should not cause poverty in pursuit of financial inclusion. LSE blog.


Treasury but the process is burdensome and involves high levels of scrutiny. A waqf law, based on anecdotal evidence, is still in use. There are no specific laws relating to cross-border giving, and the receipt of foreign funds by NGOs. There seems to be an ineffective and arbitrary application of tax incentives and reliefs, and a lack of awareness and guidance available for CSOs about the income tax regime.

**Regulation**

Kenya has a legal environment that accounts for a diverse civil society landscape and different organisational and legal forms. Around 10,000 NGOs are registered by the NGO Coordination Board and governed by the 1990 NGO Coordination Act. Societies (around 70,000) can be established under the Societies Act, companies limited by guarantee under the Companies Act, and trusts are incorporated under the Trustees Act. Grassroots organisations include Harambee or self-help groups and community-based organisations (CBOs); these operate primarily at the village and community level.

Regulatory complexity can, however, be used to undermine registration processes. Efforts pushing to reform are blocked and official sector representation is weak. The NGO Council is the national umbrella body representing the interests of registered organisations, but it has recently been described as inactive. The widely supported PBO Act is set to replace the NGO Act as a new regulatory framework and was signed into law in 2013. However, little progress has been made on implementing the Act despite CSOs’ calls on Government to do so. Due to such legal limbo and stalemate between Government and civil society, many CSOs use a legal category least vulnerable to pressure (such as company limited by guarantee). This takes them out of the remit of the NGO Coordination Board, where they can be arbitrarily struck off the register.

**Closing space for civil society**

Kenya has a stable and well-established civil society sector and organisational capacity, advocacy, service provision and sectoral infrastructure which have been improving recently. However, with the legal environment for civil society under pressure and state harassment intensifying in the aftermath of the 2017 election, the global phenomena of a closing civic space and declining trust in civil society can also be observed in Kenya. CIVICUS describes Kenya’s civil society as ‘obstructed’ with constitutionally granted rights not respected in practice. General civil society participation is increasingly deteriorating, and Government responses to CSO involvement in past elections has amounted to negative profiling or even harassment.

---

43 The NGO Act grants wide discretion to the NGO Coordination Board and the responsible Minister to make changes to the terms and conditions of the registration process, and registration of societies can be denied on vague grounds. ICNL (2019).
46 Jerving, Sara (2017).
49 Ibrahim Index of African Governance: http://iag.online/
Summary

Kenya exemplifies global trends: a closing civic space; declining trust in institutions and; low levels of international funding channelled directly to local CSOs. However, with the designation of Kenya as a middle-income country and growing numbers of people entering the middle classes, there is an opportunity to harness a generous culture as a mass public movement of giving with which to resource a strong and healthy civil society. It can help strengthen legitimacy and responsiveness to local needs, thus bolstering the sector's voice, independence and resistance to closing civic space.

A cautious approach is nonetheless necessary: many observers have pointed to the economic vulnerability of Kenya's emergent middle class. Any formalisation of local giving must form part of a wider reorientation in the international development sphere whereby funds are channelled directly to CSOs. Transition funding from abroad remains an essential component in building an enabling legal and operating environment through technical assistance, philanthropic infrastructure and charity support bodies.

While acknowledging informal systems of mutual aid, one must not overestimate the 'poor philanthropist' as a panacea to development performance, nor cannibalise resource transfers in communities. Individual giving also sits in the wider context of vast diaspora remittances: World Bank data shows that Kenya received personal remittances worth USD 2.72 billion in 2018, more than all countries in eastern Africa, another important resource into which further research is necessary.

The research contained within this report aims to fill some data gaps and move us towards developing informed solutions that will enable us to answer questions such as:

- How do we make the most of this opportunity?
- How do we better understand existing cultures of giving?
- How do we support and encourage the middle class to embrace all that civic activism is about and proactively engage in giving?

---


CAF commissioned the research agency Ipsos MORI to conduct a broad, mixed-methods landscaping study of civil society and individual giving in Kenya, as well as Tanzania, Uganda and South Africa which are detailed in separate reports.

The research was developed with CAF’s key objectives in mind, to understand:

- The enabling environment in Kenya, including how and why people give and what causes they give to, as well as obstacles and challenges in giving;
- What would make the public engage with civil society and social issues; and
- The challenges faced by the civil society sector and the impact of the challenges on civil society’s ability to address local needs.

Ipsos MORI’s research combined both qualitative and quantitative methods:

- 11 qualitative, semi-structured interviews with CSO leaders;
- 1 focus group discussion with urban, middle-income adults; and
- A face-to-face survey with urban, middle-income adults – 501 interviews in total.

The rationale for this was that qualitative research is best suited to answer some of the research questions: the focus on understanding behaviours, motivations, barriers, and attitudes necessitated the more open, discursive and generative nature of qualitative research. Compounding this, the need to draw out narratives of individual giving, and to explore how civil society is understood and viewed by adults required participants to be given space to give testimonials, and for researchers to follow emerging lines of inquiry and probe for more information. However, to understand the landscape of giving and the extent to which charitable giving takes place, a quantitative approach was more appropriate.

These research activities were coordinated centrally by Ipsos MORI’s Social Research Institute in the UK, who had overall responsibility for research design and analysis. Research was managed, and fieldwork conducted by Ipsos Kenya.

Complementing these activities, the CAF policy team also undertook a separate strand of desk research to understand the current landscape in terms of broader issues facing civil society in Kenya, including the regulatory environments. Prior to finalisation of these reports, the CAF team also conducted a series of workshops in London and Nairobi with key people, to seek further perspective on the results as they were evolving. Some insight from these workshops is included in the narrative of this set of reports.

Full details on the research objectives and the research approach can be found in Appendix 1.
CSO Internal practices

Organisational structure

Ten CSO participants were interviewed in Kenya representing a range of organisation sizes and staffing structures. Staffing varies widely across the different organisations, with the smallest organisation having no permanent staff members (relying solely on volunteers), to having over 100 permanent staff members. One CSO participant indicated having designated staff members for specific tasks; however, this was not the case for many of the other organisations, most of which relied heavily on volunteers.

The annual turnovers provided by CSO participants ranged from KSH 5 million to KSH 350 million (approximately USD 48,000 to 3.4 million). Only one organisation was founded less than five years ago, while two were founded between five and ten years ago. Seven have been in existence for longer than ten years, of which two came into existence more than twenty years ago.

Most of the CSOs in Kenya have a governing body in place, such as a management committee, Board of directors or an advisory committee. Having a management committee was not contingent on having a large number of permanent staff, as even those CSOs with a very small number of permanent, paid staff tended to have a management board.

CSO participants explained that the role of the management committee was to determine the CSO’s strategic planning (in the case of some CSOs, to establish five-year plans for the organisation), as well as to oversee the CSO’s activities. One CSO also explained that its board is responsible for compiling weekly updates and publishing monthly reports, as well as organising annual meetings.

Organisational strategy

Most CSOs interviewed do have a formalised strategy. Strategic planning is most commonly established through collaboration with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders. CSO participants explained that this was carried out through post-implementation consultations to identify what had previously worked well and what had not, in order to suitably design new projects. This included engaging community members in a participatory approach to collect stories and feedback and to determine what they would most benefit from.

Furthermore, in addition to consulting beneficiary representatives, one organisation explained that their strategic planning involves consultation with other CSOs working in their same field and with local Government to avoid duplicating efforts.

Another organisation explained that because they are a branch of an international organisation, their objectives are set by the global headquarters, and strategic plans are created at the country level on the basis of the headquarters’ pre-established goals.

Our strategic plan process starts with the involvement of the stakeholders. […] Design of a program revolves around the need at that point in time. The need in 2011 is totally different from the need now so what we do whenever we are doing our strategic planning process, is we involve our stakeholders, our beneficiaries […], the representative of the children, we involve the [relevant government] ministry, and we also involve like-minded civil society organisations and we do a process of data collection going through such processes. Sharing with them our previous strategic plan, what worked and what did not work, and finally we narrowed down to getting what are the current needs in terms of our mission and vision. From there we finally start on a strategic plan that will be able to address the needs of the community. We finalised our strategic plan to make sure that it is also aligned to the county […]. Strategic plan is formed by the county strategic plan so that we work with the government as a complementary partner and not running parallel programs.

CSO leader, Kenya
Communications

CSO participants in Kenya cited various methods of communicating and engaging with donors (both individuals and donor agencies), beneficiaries, and community members, and relied on technology to varying degrees. Some specific methods involved distributing a newsletter to donors and partners or engaging the community through suggestion boxes.

The use of social media as part of communication strategies varies across the CSOs. Some CSOs stated that they use platforms such as Twitter, WhatsApp and Facebook to promote their work, raise donations, keep donors or members informed, and organise meetings; such engagement allowed communication both nationally and abroad. Furthermore, one organisation mentioned using a crowdfunding app as a communication platform. One participant, whose organisation uses WhatsApp and Facebook for their communications, explained that the organisation was in the process of building a website, suggesting that the use of more recent forms of social media does not equate to the use of more traditional digital methods such as websites.

A few others said social media was beginning to be used as a platform for voices on political issues. They also explained that social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter allow for much easier access to supporters (most notably younger generations) and are particularly helpful in raising urgent funds or support for emergencies.

One organisation reported they had not found social media effective in raising awareness or understanding of the issues which are their focus, and another felt that people do not engage through social media in as positive a way as they do with more traditional media, such as radio. They did, however, feel Twitter, WhatsApp, Instagram and Facebook were effective tools to reach younger people, and that they needed to increase their online presence to engage with this audience.

Some CSOs also mentioned using other more traditional media outlets as part of their communication strategy, such as television and radio.

CSO resource mobilisation

Sources of funding

Overall, CSO participants identified five sources of funding, with no clear patterns in terms of the sources used by CSO type, sector or size:

- Foreign Government aid agencies such as the UK Department for International Development (DFID), Scandinavian aid agencies, and USAID;
- INGOs such as Care International, Comic Relief, World Vision, and Plan International;
- Individual donations raised from the community, notably through fundraisers;

Through sending messages on Facebook and Twitter, that has really brought a lot of change and attention; this has forced the government to pay attention to particular areas that have not been in existence.

CSO leader, Kenya

We use social media also to reach out to our members, updating them on what was happening in the organisation and inviting them for meetings.

CSO leader, Kenya

With email, with website, with social media fraternity, you see you are able... to communicate the fight of your organisation locally and even internationally and that is a positive change and everybody... can communicate with you through social media... and it is a good, it is a positive change which is bringing a lot of good things to the organisation.

CSO leader, Kenya
Corporate donations (in particular from financial institutions) who support CSOs as part of their corporate social responsibility agenda, such as the Nairobi Sports House, Safaricom, and Standard Chartered Bank; and

Income-generating activities, for instance through selling goods or hiring out a function room.

One participant also mentioned that the CSO receives funds from the Kenyan Government, and another also mentioned being part of a Rotary Club.

Fundraising strategies

When asked how the CSO raised funds from these sources, a number of different strategies were mentioned depending on the source in question. When it comes to raising funds from aid agencies or INGOs, participants explained that they sought project grants by submitting proposals. One participant explained that they look for donors who want to implement programmes in the region that the CSO is active in. The CSO then determines whether the donor programme fits into their strategic plan, and if so, they apply to implement this programme.

CSOs are adopting a variety of approaches to overcome financial challenges; with some branching out into income-generating activities, such as organising a taxi fleet, and some seeking partnerships to provide funds or matched funds. Others are collaborating with other CSOs to win funding as a consortium.

Individual giving to CSOs

CSOs mentioned a variety of methods for receiving individual donations, and there were no patterns in methods across CSO size (as measured by budget). M-Pesa and Pay Bill (a mobile money payment option) were the most frequently mentioned method of receiving donations, and this was mentioned by CSOs of every size category. A few CSOs also mentioned using fundraisers, and a few mentioned membership fees or subscription fees. One large CSO mentioned raising donations overseas.

Other CSO participants mentioned raising funds from the local community through social media and radio campaigns. However, survey participants who supported CSOs in the past 12 months primarily found out about the CSO through word of mouth (66%). Only 15% found out about them through an event, 10% online or through social media, 5% through meeting an organisation, and 2% via radio.

One CSO participant, representing a larger organisation, explained that they carry out donor mapping to identify which causes individuals support, and target individuals who are most aligned with the CSO.

In terms of barriers to individual giving, most CSOs mentioned the public’s general lack of awareness of their needs, as well as misconceptions about how they are funded. For example, a perception that funds were provided by the Government, or a more general misconception that CSOs do not need funds. Closely tied to the issue of awareness was a sense that the public seek accountability and may not give if they did not understand the impact of their donation. A few CSOs noted that individuals lacked awareness of things that were needed by the CSOs, and so sometimes gave gifts in kind that were not needed.
Indeed, for one advocacy organisation, because their work had intangible benefits, they found it too difficult to overcome this barrier and so specifically do not seek individual donations.

A few CSOs mentioned a lack of trust as a barrier. Participants explained that donors want to see what their contributions are used for, because of a general climate of mistrust and fear of corruption. Alongside this, they explained that the general public is often not aware of the needs of the sector, notably because they have the misperception that charities already have enough funding.

Finally, two CSO participants felt that Kenyan culture does not encourage generosity or charitable giving, and this acts as a barrier when raising support from the public.

However, in contrast to this, as described in the section below on individual giving, charitable giving to both individuals and CSOs was found to be common among survey participants, and in the focus group discussion, participants did indeed see giving as associated with feelings of national identity and the concept of Harambee, although few survey participants (11%) explicitly stated that their culture motivated them to give when they last supported an individual or charitable organisation.

**Giving in kind**

All CSOs mentioned receiving non-financial support. Most CSOs mentioned receiving the support of volunteers, and they typically mentioned a reliance on highly skilled volunteers who provided technical support, legal support and evaluation services. In some cases, these volunteers are provided by CSOs’ external partnerships, such as those with a university resulting in volunteers providing health services. A benefit of this type of support is that it allowed the CSOs to reduce their staffing requirements and employment costs.

Some CSOs also mentioned receiving voluntary support from beneficiary communities; for example, one CSO described how even those who could not afford to donate to cover children’s school fees could help take children to school. Another CSO who operated on a membership basis relied on volunteers to support governance and manage projects.

One advocacy organisation relies on voluntary support from beneficiary communities for building a social movement that extends the impact of its activities.

Gifts in kind were also mentioned by many CSO participants; these included a donation of a plot of land, computers, school equipment, clothes and food.

---

*The rich might not be aware of what happens in the community, especially if they did not grow up there. Unless someone can bring the story to them through a documentary, they may never know – or, by taking them there to see for themselves what happens. There are some who when they got there, they say they are willing to sacrifice anything to support.*

CSO leader, Kenya

*Generosity is not our culture. Individualism is hitting us too much.*

CSO leader, Kenya

*There are some educated community members who support of the work that we do, we don’t need to go to that community, we organise and tell them to conduct training, we have empowered them and a number of times they have done that.*

CSO leader, Kenya
CSO capacities, challenges and needs

Organisational strengths

When asked to identify their organisation’s strengths, CSO participants cited many and diverse facets; however, these can be grouped into two broad themes: collaboration, network, and communication; as well as management and funding. In the first category, CSOs mentioned that their strengths are around working in partnership with different Government ministries, collaborating with other institutions, or having good relationships with the Government, donors, or the community. In terms of management and funding, participants explained that their strengths are around having succeeded in diversifying their funding, being well-managed (including strong financial management and accountability), resource mobilisation, or using resources effectively.

Capacity limitations

All of the CSO participants explained that there were numerous capacity limitations within their organisations and that these greatly hindered their efficiency and ability to deliver projects. The capacity limitations identified are:

- **Skills**: this included lacking individuals with specific skillsets, such as fundraising, monitoring and evaluation, proposal-writing, and financial management. While these limitations posed a challenge to day-to-day operations, it was also noted that not having the required qualifications hindered the organisation’s ability to bid on certain projects.
- **Permanent employees**: a lack of sustainable and predictable funding made it difficult to hire full-time employees and have long-term strategic planning. This inability to hire permanent staff limits the scope of the work which can be undertaken and leads to an over-reliance on volunteers.
- **Training**: a lack of funding also makes it difficult to provide employees with the training that they need.

Key challenges

The biggest challenge identified by all of the participants was an issue around funding. Numerous causes of limited funding were identified, such as:

- Competition with other CSOs for funding, notably because of an increase in the number of active CSOs in Kenya and competition from INGOs;
- Funding cuts from international donors;
- Funding being more short term than previously, and therefore only sustaining projects for 6 months to a year;
- Limited funding from the public, notably due to community perceptions that the CSO is international donor funded, and therefore does not require donations from community members;
- Convincing donors that funds are used effectively;
- Donors stipulating how funds must be used, which is seen to lead to an inefficient use of resources and can be frustrating to the organisation; and
- Donald Trump’s ‘America First’ rhetoric which has shifted American donor funding away from foreign countries such as Kenya.

Funding was described as an old and persistent challenge, although changes in donor funding levels and conditions were somewhat new.

I think the donors have really shrunk and not so many donors are available to finance your work. Every day these donors tell you that they are changing their strategic positions; today they are working on human rights and tomorrow they are working on a different direction. As an institution we don’t want to say that this is our niche and then change the niche because the donor has shifted his goal.

CSO leader, Kenya
With regards to raising funds from income-generating activities, one CSO participant whose organisation engaged in this noted that there were challenges with low demand for the service. A different CSO participant said that they would like the Government to relax laws that restrict the ability of CSOs to undertake profit-making activities.

Funding challenges posed concerns for the effectiveness and impact of CSOs’ work, as well as their financial sustainability, especially:

- Difficulty maintaining staff and continuing work;
- Constrained scope of the CSO’s work due to limited financial resources and donor stipulations;
- Struggling to meet strategic target plans; and
- Difficulty covering non-project-related costs, such as infrastructure and vehicles.

Although funding was the primary concern of CSO participants, they did raise a number of other challenges faced. Some of these were related to the internal management of the organisation, such as the quick turnover of volunteers, or inefficiency in management due to under-staffing. Other challenges cited revolved around collaboration and Government relationships, with CSOs explaining that one challenge was the duplication of effort, with other CSOs working on similar issues, as well as the perception of Government corruption. Lastly, CSOs cited challenges related to beneficiaries, such as beneficiary dependency, and the difficulty of accessing beneficiaries in rural areas.

Key support needs

In line with the key challenge mentioned by CSOs—which revolved around funding—most of the CSO participants mentioned that the most valuable support they would like to receive would be provision of resources. Some said they would like to receive funding, while others said that this support could also come in the form of volunteering or gifts in kind, such as necessary equipment. All CSO participants who stated this suggested they could get this through better partnerships or collaborations. One cited access to microfinance for CSO beneficiaries as a need.

Other forms of welcome support which were mentioned are capacity building, and assistance in bringing local CSOs together to allow for the better sharing of knowledge and best practice.

Most of the time you’ll find the funding goes to international NGOs. And now it is the international NGO who would want to sub-grant the local NGO. The reason is the local civil society organisations do not have the capacity that they expect as bilateral partners [to] be able to manage their grants. [...] As a local society organisation, we really don’t have that capacity, but the international organisations have and... [...] We are very experienced in writing proposals, reacting to proposals but we do not have capacity completely; for example, for me [...] I can’t write a very good proposal to USAID.

CSO leader, Kenya

Right now, the programs we are implementing they are only serving orphans, vulnerable children due to HIV/AIDS. Now you find that we have other types of people in the community who are vulnerable, maybe they are from very humble backgrounds, we have children who are maybe mentally challenged, who have various disabilities, or there may be others who are vulnerable in terms of their conditions maybe they are living in slums, and maybe their parents are drunkards but you see we cannot serve these children because this money from the donor we have is for these vulnerable children. So sometimes you find that we also have other people who are suffering but we are limited because of the agreement with the donor that we are going to spend the money specifically on this line.

CSO leader, Kenya

I think we really need to team up and join other movements for one common goal, learning from each other and strengthening each other, exchanging ideas and knowledge and making sure that we all are serving a common goal.

CSO leader, Kenya
Some stated that more support from government was needed to help them address the challenges they face. This might be changes to policy, e.g. relaxation of laws which restrict CSO activities, or changes to working practices, e.g. better signposting to enable CSOs to reach and work with the right people within government. A few mentioned that capacity building was needed within their organisation, either through recruitment of new staff or training of existing staff.

A few CSO participants stated that they would like the government to provide funds instead of donations in kind, while another mentioned that government would help by organising networking and meetings with potential donors, but not financially support travel and transport to facilitate these meetings.

One CSO complained about both a lack of funding and corruption from the government.

**The external environment**

**Policy and regulatory environment**

Many CSO participants said that government is helpful to them in their work, though they often also stated more that could be done. Some also reported a lack of trust between CSOs and government, and government approaches that, intentionally or unintentionally, act to stifle their work.

CSOs reported that government usually provides in kind support rather than funding, including government staff time (for example, primary workers to staff public facilities owned by the CSO), supplies, capacity building training, introductions to international donors, and policy support (such as helping CSOs target beneficiaries). In kind support is useful but sometimes problematic, particularly if it is suddenly withdrawn, leaving the CSO unable to “pace” service delivery across the year.

Many participants specifically raised funding as an area where government could do more, and one pointed to new suggested amendments to the NGO Act which would place restrictions on the proportion of funding that can come from overseas without an organisation needing to submit to additional government scrutiny.

Challenges related to government were also identified. Competition between CSOs and government was mentioned explicitly by one participant, and implied by others, as the role of both civil society and government evolve and sometimes overlap. The CSO reported a difficult political environment, in which government officials do not appreciate being held to account by advocacy groups, and there is suspicion towards CSOs by the government.

---

85% of the resources are supposed to be local- only 15% should be external […] what will happen if the external resources are more than 15% then the Government has a responsibility to […] [ap]prove your work plan and monitor how you spend your money.

CSO leader, Kenya

The corruption from the government – they should be the ones financing, but they often ask for bribes in return.

CSO leader, Kenya

The government has been working very hard to regulate CSOs in bad faith… the government is really trying to squeeze and make sure that the CSOs can’t effectively do their work.

CSO leader, Kenya
In addition to these challenges at a national level, one CSO spoke about how devolved government had created noise and distraction, reducing focus on bigger issues.

A few CSO participants welcomed Government regulation and oversight in the sector, while others found regulation more problematic, speaking of “fierce” regulation of CSOs, and “suspicion” towards CSOs from Government. One spoke of trying to overcome this.

When asked explicitly whether regulation was fair and consistent, CSOs were split in agreement and disagreement. Some felt fairness of regulation varies by sector or as a result of Government perceptions of the specific CSO, while one stated that blanket regulation of CSOs ignores vital differences between them. Unpredictable implementation of regulations, intentional Government attempts to “stifle” CSOs through regulation, and conditions on how many board members a CSO should have were each cited by different CSO participants as policy and regulatory challenges.

Participants were split on whether the CSO sector has an independent voice. Those who felt the sector does not have an independent voice reported being stymied by the Government environment or pointed to the difficulty of whistleblowing on Government corruption or malpractice. Others felt confident CSOs could use their voice to challenge and influence Government and policymaking. One participant pointed to the need for CSOs to work together on this.

Philanthropic infrastructure, knowledge and support services

Various other institutions, including networking bodies for businesses and service providers also provide financial and non-financial support to CSOs. This includes volunteers, or donations of time or services that would normally be charged for. This could be indirect, through sponsors paying fees for services, or direct, through individuals or organisations waiving fees that would normally be charged, such as speaking fees for events or training fees.

In some cases, support was through information provision and insight, for example, one CSO participant spoke of receiving support from institutions in the health sector.

---

The [...] unexpected consequence of devolved Government because everyone wants to be seen as big and the national Government is also fighting for space in these other forty-seven counties, so you find there are more conflicts and wanting to be visible than focusing on what is truly transformational.

CSO leader, Kenya

There’s space for the government to speed up the overall system, so to speak, so it’s finding points of collaboration. [...] What’s our space as a CSO, and are we able to work together more collaboratively [...] because there is the perception that CSOs are mostly combatant.

CSO leader, Kenya

Those who have a problem are those who are dealing with the human rights. There is that conflict between the government and maybe the donor, saying that they are being funded maybe to be anti-government.

CSO leader, Kenya

I think CSOs need to team up, there is a need for CSOs to team up and speak as one voice, if they speak in one voice they will be heard rather than speaking separately [...] The government should provide a platform where CSOs come together once a year so as they can get their views because they are all serving the people, I think that will be a fantastic way of moving forward.

CSO leader, Kenya

It’s mostly access to the current information on new guidelines, new policies.

CSO leader, Kenya
All CSO participants reported working with other CSOs in some capacity, and many also work with academia or other networks. Collaborations with other CSOs take place for capacity building, training and knowledge sharing, but also on service delivery. They also mentioned that academics sometimes provide training or research support to their organisations. A few mentioned more informal support, including social contact with other CSOs. One mentioned working collaboratively with other CSOs to avoid duplication in their work. Conversely, at odds with the general picture, one CSO participant explained that there is a lot of mistrust between CSOs in the sector, and this mistrust is driven by competition. This mistrust and lack of collaboration leads to, in their opinion, inefficiencies within the sector.

Many CSOs in the research had worked with the private sector as partners, often through in kind support, e.g. private sector provision of goods or services to the charity, such as healthcare, food products and technical support. In one case the CSO has started to partner with companies who use it as part of their CSR initiatives.

Most CSO participants reported close working relationships with at least one religious institution. Churches were mentioned specifically in most instances, alongside “religious institutions” more generally. The church or institution’s role was varied, but for many it plays a role in gathering and disseminating information. For example, ensuring CSO messages or opportunities reach the ears of those who might benefit from them, or, conversely, churches might provide information about the needs of the community or specific individuals.

CSOs also reported that their beneficiaries receive spiritual and social support from churches, including close relationships with pastors. One CSO reported receiving financial support from the church, and one reported partnering with a church to provide civic education. Another CSO reported receiving in kind support from churches, such as donations of clothing for beneficiaries. One organisation receives donations of goods, for example sanitary pads, from foreign churches.

Where CSOs do not work with religious institutions, participants usually reported that this was part of a formal policy of independence or lack of religious affiliation. Further to this, one organisation felt that their work was at odds with the beliefs or priorities of the church.

**Role of social movements**

Where CSOs felt social movements were relevant or impactful, they referred to their role in providing feedback on what is happening on the ground, and their role in advocacy and roll-out of change. A few CSO participants explicitly said they would like to or need to work with social movements in order to achieve their aims.

**If I give you my secrets you take them and get more funding? So, I hold knowledge. I hold best practices which again to me doesn’t make sense. Competition has been a big thing and [there is] a lot of mistrust [...] Furthermore, we have not been able to synergise some of the things that we do [...] Could we co-fund a particular project and I will take this aspect of education, you take care and treatment for HIV, you take orphans so that it becomes one big comprehensive project – again, people don’t want to do that. It’s our project. We even have laid claims to communities. This is our community.**

CSO leader, Kenya

There has been this discussion about LGBT, the church does not sit in any of these meetings, it is fine, and we understand. You remember the issues of family planning which are very serious issues in the country but the church rarely speaks about those issues, they do not want to be part of these issues and other critical issues around human rights.

CSO leader, Kenya

**If there are any changes, the changes have to come from the people on the ground. You need to involve everyone for changes to take place, people have to talk and show what is working or what is not working.**

CSO leader, Kenya
One CSO participant felt that the social movement landscape is less vibrant and vocal than it had been in the 1990s. Another felt that social movements are more of an urban than a rural phenomenon in Kenya.

**Media**

CSO participants in Kenya generally painted a positive picture of the role of the media on the civil society landscape. They explained that the media played an important role in raising awareness of the work of CSOs and helped bring attention to issues that were previously largely ignored, such as children’s rights, FGM, or health. In addition to providing a useful platform for bringing issues to the attention of the general public, participants also explained that the media plays a more active role in supporting CSOs by providing services at a subsidised rate or free of charge. This was notably the case for radio channels providing airtime for free or at a discounted rate.

This being said, some participants mentioned that because the Government limits the media’s ability to criticise it, this means that the media is unable to comment on some types of CSO activities and messages.
PEN PORTRAITS

The supporter of individuals

I like to give to individuals, like my family, my community, and even people I don’t know. I give because of my personal connection to them, because my religion teaches me to give, and because I want to give back to those who are less fortunate than me. I give a lot, but I would be more likely to support charities if there was more transparency in the sector, and maybe if I knew more about the organisation or through my church. In general, I do think donating to charities makes an important difference in society, but I worry they wouldn’t use my donation effectively.54

“I bought clothes for my friends’ children. I even paid school fees for them. I have a friend who could not pay the rent; I have [a] house and she is staying there as we speak until she stabilises. With some family members, I give them money, and even some food stuffs to the lady who does laundry for me; sometimes, you see that she is in need.”55

54 This pen portrait was based on the responses of survey participants who gave any form of support to strangers in the last 12 months. The three most common motivations for giving were personal attachment to a cause (57%), their religion (57%), and a desire to give back to the less fortunate or society (52%). The three most common factors that would make the participants more likely to give to charitable organisations were more transparency in the sector (51%), their religion or faith (47%) and knowing more about the organisation (44%). When asked about their attitudes toward charitable organisations, the statement most frequently agreed with was that donating to them makes an important difference in society (75%) and the statement least frequently agreed with was they generally use donations effectively (41% agree).

55 Focus group participant.
The charity supporter

I give to charities every few months. I’m motivated to give to charities because of my religion, and I support charities when I feel a personal connection to the cause. I want to give back to those who are less fortunate than me. I would give even more if I felt the sector was more transparent and because of my faith. In general, I do think donating to charities makes an important difference in society, but I’m not really sure they have a strong influence over Government policies.56

“Compassion motivates me to give. Sometimes I give. There is this program [...] where we buy sanitary towels, they were asking me to at least buy sanitary towels for the girls in need so I would say I am compassionate because if I can afford to buy that for my daughters, then even for another girl I will.”57

The charity sceptic

I haven’t given any support to CSOs in the last year. When I give, it’s because I feel a strong personal attachment to someone. I would give money to the charity sector if there was more transparency in the sector, and if I had a better understanding of how the money would be spent and knew more about the organisation. I don’t give money to charities because I prefer to give them other forms of support like food. I can’t always afford to give to charitable organisations, and I’m not sure they would use the money well. I think that donating to them does make an important difference in society, yet I’m not sure they use those donations effectively.58

“When you are giving to an individual, you have some measure of control because like if you would want someone to take a child to school you can actually come back tomorrow and question why is the kid not going to school, but you see now when you donate [to] organisations, once you donate you have no idea of what will happen.”59

56 This pen portrait was based on the responses of survey participants who gave any form of support to CSOs in the last 12 months. Of these, 14% give more than once a week, 34% about once a month, and 20% about every two to three months. The three most common motivations for giving were personal attachment to a cause (60%), their religion (61%), and a desire to give back to the less fortunate or society (50%). The three most common factors that would make the participants more likely to give to charitable organisations were more transparency in the sector (53%), their religion or faith (52%) and knowing more about the organisation (44%). When asked about their attitudes toward charitable organisations, the statement most frequently agreed with was that donating to them makes an important difference in society (76%) and the statement least frequently agreed with was that they have a strong influence over Government policies (46% agree).

57 Focus group participant.

58 This pen portrait was based on the responses of survey participants who did not give any form of support to CSOs in the last 12 months. The most common motivation for giving was personal attachment to a cause (56%). The three most common factors that would make the participants more likely to give to charitable organisations were more transparency in the sector (42%), having a better understanding of how the money would be spent (40%) and knowing more about the organisation (39%). The most common reasons stated for not giving to CSOs were a preference to give other forms of support like gifts in kind (45%), being unable to afford to give to CSOs (33%), and not trusting that the organisation would use the money well (23%). When asked about their attitudes toward charitable organisations, the statement most frequently agreed with was that donating to them makes an important difference in society (70%) and the statement least frequently agreed with was that they generally use donations effectively (34% agree).

59 Focus group participant.
THE VIEW FROM INDIVIDUALS

Giving by individuals

The survey and focus group in Kenya revealed a vibrant culture of giving by individuals to both individuals and organisations. Indeed, the share of monthly income that individuals estimate that they gave away in the last month, either to individuals or to charitable organisations, is significant at 22% on average. Giving to individuals was more common than giving to CSOs, and for both groups, giving money was more common than giving gifts in kind. For the most part, this giving appears ad hoc, with more than four in five of those who have previously given to an individual or a charitable organisation saying that they do not set aside a fixed amount of their household or monthly income to give away every month (83%, compared with 17% who say they do).

Giving to individuals or groups of individuals

Within the survey, participants were first asked about giving to individuals or groups of individuals before being asked about CSOs and other organisations specifically. The decision was taken following the focus groups with individuals where it became apparent that people do not necessarily think of giving to individuals as ‘giving’ as this was seen as a normal thing to do. This is something CAF also tested within the Nairobi workshops where we discussed preliminary research results, and this was very much seen to be the case. When the CAF team suggested that this ‘obligation’ would be regarded as ‘giving’ in many other cultures, this was often faced with questioning.

Figure 1: Whether done anything to support an individual or group of individuals in last 12 months

- Given money to a blood relative or paid for something on their behalf: 82%
- Given clothes, food, time, services or other gifts in kind to a blood relative: 75%
- Given money to an extended family member, a friend, or someone else you know, or paid for something on their behalf: 69%
- Given clothes, food, time, services, or other gifts in kind to an extended family member, a friend, or someone else you know: 64%
- Given shelter to a blood relative: 61%
- Given money to a stranger or paid for something on their behalf: 57%
- Given shelter to an extended family member, a friend, or someone else you know: 51%
- Given clothes, food, time, services or other gifts in kind to a stranger: 50%
- Given shelter to a stranger: 20%
- None of the above: 2%

Source: Ipsos MORI
Base: All adults aged 18+ (501)
Blood relatives were the most common recipients of individual giving among survey participants, with 82% having given them money or paid for something on their behalf; 75% having given them gifts in kind; and 6 in 10 (61%) having given them shelter in the last 12 months. Extended family members, friends, and other individuals known to the participant were also common recipients of support, including money, gifts in kind or services, and shelter, with at least half of survey participants reporting they had given in each of these ways in the last 12 months.

This was mirrored in focus groups, where the family, including extended family, was described as the most common recipient of individual giving. Examples given in the focus group included financing the education of a deceased relative’s dependents.

Yet focus group participants also described giving to their friends, wider social networks (such as colleagues), and even strangers. Examples given by focus group participants included supporting a colleague with their rent payments, paying for a friend’s children’s school fees, and giving food to someone in exchange for washing their laundry.

Giving to strangers was also a common occurrence among focus group participants and was notably facilitated through religious institutions. Examples of giving to strangers included giving to someone who knocked on their door and asked for support, giving to street children, and paying for a stranger’s bus fare. Two in ten survey participants (20%) had given shelter to strangers in the last 12 months.

Focus group participants described giving money, as well as time, material goods (like clothes and books), and food to individuals. Participants described sometimes preferring to give cash to allow the recipient to decide how the donation should be used, whereas other times, they preferred to give gifts in kind to ensure the donation was not misused. Participants noted that issues of trust might be more common in urban areas, where although individuals may have more money to give, they may also be more worried about being conned, which could potentially make giving to individuals more common in rural areas. Data from the survey suggests that concerns about whether the individuals’ needs are genuine is an important barrier to giving, with 30% of those who have not given money to individuals in the past 12 months citing this as a reason why. Yet participants also felt that in rural areas, gifts of material goods and time, as well as informal self-help groups, may be more common, so provision of financial support to CSOs may be less common in rural areas.

Focus group participants offered many reasons for giving to individuals. The positive impact on the recipient was mentioned; this could be as simple as giving someone hope, or as significant as saving their life, such as by paying medical bills. Giving was also motivated by a sense of obligation, particularly in the case of giving to immediate family, which was seen as an obligation rather than an act of charity, although this was nonetheless described in positive terms.

However, this sense of obligation also extended more broadly for one participant, who described giving as “our obligation as human beings”. The amount given was determined by the recipient’s level of need and their relationship to the giver, with those recipients who were more dependent on the giver receiving more. This could occur, for example, if the recipient had only a small circle of support.

"Family members, most of us, we support for example orphans that we have in the families or even the widowed, everyone I’m sure does that, what else? The sick, we do contributions."

Focus Group Participant

"I have heard my friend talking about, you know sometimes even in the plots (single or doubles rooms in urban areas where people live together, they are mostly like more than five houses/rooms) if one of us is in any need, maybe someone has passed away we do support the family, most of us do that. Last week we sponsored someone who died, so we come together as a plot and we say we must be together in unity and we are going to do this."

Focus Group Participant
Other reasons for giving to individuals included giving out of mercy, being fortunate enough to be in a position to give back, finding inner peace or feeling good, religious reasons, and the idea of “paying forward” in case one day they needed help.

The Kenyan tradition of Harambee, or holding self-help events, was also mentioned by focus group participants; for example, one could call for a Harambee for their child’s school or university fees, inviting the community to contribute funds for this purpose. Various religious and cultural traditions were also cited in the focus group as important determinants of giving. For example, some participants referenced Bible verses which encouraged giving, whereas others referenced concepts of clan and kinship, which affected the extent to which they considered giving an obligation.

**Giving to civil society**

Overall, more than three quarters (77%) of survey participants were aware of at least one charitable organisation that is active in Kenya. However, while 82% of Kenyans had given money to a blood relative and 57% had given money to a stranger, 62% of survey participants had supported the charitable work of these organisations in the last 12 months. Specifically, 48% had supported a faith-based organisation (FBO), 16% had supported a community-based organisation (CBO), and 11% had supported an NGO.

*Figure 2: Whether supported the charitable work of any of these types of organisations in the last 12 months*

- Faith-based organisation: 48%
- Community-based organisation: 16%
- Non-governmental organisation: 11%
- No, I have not supported the charitable work of any of these types of organisations in the past 12 months: 38%

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

*Base: All adults aged 18+ (501)*

Among those who have supported CSOs in the past 12 months, the most common cause was children and young people, with 73% of those survey participants supporting this, followed by helping the poor or hungry at 50%, and religious institutions at 33%.
Figure 3: Causes supported in the last 12 months

- Children and young people: 73%
- Helping the poor or hungry: 50%
- Religious organisations (including to places of worship): 33%
- Older people: 25%
- Disabled people: 23%
- Homeless people, housing or refuge shelters: 22%
- Supporting medical institutions (hospitals, hospice care, etc.): 6%
- Disaster relief (floods, terrorist attacks, earthquakes, etc.): 6%
- Community development and support: 5%
- Supporting education, schools, colleges, or universities: 5%

Source: Ipsos MORI

Base: All adults aged 18+ who have supported the work of a charitable organisation in the past 12 months (311)

*Causes that were supported by less than 5% of respondents have been excluded from this chart

The most common ways of providing support to CSOs in Kenya was giving money or volunteering time, with 69% of participants who had supported a CSO in the last 12 months doing each of these. Over six in ten of these participants gave gifts in kind, and more than half (57%) attended a fundraising event. Similarly, while most focus group participants described supporting CSOs by giving cash, one focus group participant mentioned giving to the Red Cross, including donating blood through the Red Cross in response to a disaster.
Survey participants who indicated having given money to individuals or a charitable organisation in the past 12 months were asked to estimate how much they give each month. The survey results indicate that urban, middle-class Kenyan adults give an average of 8,470 KSh (approximately USD 82) each month to family members (blood related), and around 5,400 KSh (approximately USD 52) to charitable organisations. Slightly less is given to friends, acquaintances, or colleagues on average each month (3,260 KSh, approximately USD 31), and 1,280 KSh is gifted to strangers (approximately USD 12).

When giving money to individuals or CSOs, the most common method of giving was cash (91%), followed by mobile payment services such as M-Pesa (72%). Donation boxes in public spaces like shops were used by 15% of participants, 12% used SMS or text, and 8% gave through their workplace. The vast majority (96%) consider these payment methods that they use to be convenient for them.

Among survey participants who had not given to charitable organisations in the past 12 months, the primary reason given was that they preferred to give other support like food or gifts in kind, with 45% selecting this reason. Affordability was given as a reason by a third (33%) of those who had not supported charities, and 22% cited a lack of trust that the organisation would use the money well.
Some negative attitudes were expressed in the focus group in regard to the idea of giving to CSOs. Trust was highlighted as a key reason for not giving to civil society; this was tied to concerns about accountability for how donations would be used as well as concerns about corruption. It was suggested that participants might give more if they had higher awareness of how their donation was used and could see its impact. In line with this, the primary reason for not having given money to a charitable organisation in the past 12 months is the preference for giving food or gifts in kind. Nevertheless, among survey participants, 65% said they were familiar with the activities of charitable organisations that are active in Kenya, and 59% said the media paints a positive picture of them.

One focus group participant also mentioned a preference for giving to individuals to avoid the costs of administration.

Mistrust of civil society was also common among focus group participants, who described civil society as “just there to eat money” or “money making ventures to those working in them”. Indeed, when asked what the impact would be if international donors stopped supporting CSOs, participants described that those who manage CSOs would suffer the most. There was also a feeling that CSOs do not accomplish their missions.

Some focus group participants also felt that CSOs were too heavily influenced by the Government, and more than two in ten (22%) of survey participants in Kenya disagreed that charitable organisations active in Kenya act independently of the Government.

If I have KSH 1,000 and I chose between to give someone who is suffering from cancer and there is this organisation that is asking us to give to that foundation that helps the people who have cancer, I look at this 1,000 shillings and my preference would be to give to this person as opposed to giving to the organisation in the sense that if I give to the organisation I will know there is like 300ksh that will go into administration while 700ksh will go to helping people. That is just a notion that you know might determine who I chose or whether to give to the organisation or to the individual.

Focus Group Participant
Across all survey participants, having more money would make more than a third (36%) more likely to give money to charitable organisations, and affordability was a barrier for those who do not currently give. Among survey participants who had not given money to individuals who are not blood relatives, the most common reason given was affordability (36%). Similarly, those survey participants who had not given money to CSOs cited affordability as the second most common reason for not giving (33%) after a preference for giving other forms of support (45%).

Despite giving to CSOs, few survey participants were aware of tax incentives for giving to CSOs. Two thirds (66%) said they were not aware of whether tax incentives exist or not, 15% responded “don’t know”, and 6% believed no tax incentives exist. Of the 13% who said that tax incentives are available, 94% had not used them in the past.

When those who said they were aware of CSOs in Kenya were asked how positively they felt about different types of CSOs, with a score of 1 being the least positive and 10 being the most positive, survey participants on average felt most positively about FBOs (7.1), followed by international charitable organisations (6.6), and NGOs (6.5). CBOs (5.8) and local organisations (5.0) had the least positive average scores.

Most survey participants in Kenya agreed that donating to charitable organisations that are active in Kenya makes an important difference in society (74%), that they are effective in solving existing problems in society (71%), and that they have a strong influence over their area of work (63%). While aid dependency and restrictions imposed by foreign donors around scope of work was brought up by several CSO participants, survey participants do not seem to consider that there is a gap between the work of charitable organisations in Kenya, and the needs of their beneficiaries. Indeed, nearly seven in ten agree that the work of charitable organisations contributes positively to the country’s development and that their work supports the local community (both 68%).

However, views were slightly less positive in some regards, with only half of participants agreeing that charitable organisations act independently of the Government (49%), are generally trustworthy (49%), have a strong influence over Government policies (47%), are generally well managed (46%), and generally use donations effectively (42%).

“We even have cases where some NGOs and civil societies have received a lot of donations from the foreign countries, yet they are unable to account on the ground what they have done with those donations.”
Focus Group Participant

I think they are in touch but most of them they have been politicised and used by the government, so their main role is sort of to check the government but what they are doing now is that they are working as per the government wishes.
Focus Group Participant
Figure 6: How much agree or disagree with statements about charitable organisations that are active in Kenya

Donating to them makes an important difference in society: 74% Agree, 12% Disagree
They are effective in solving existing problems in society: 71% Agree, 18% Disagree
Their work contributes positively to my country’s development: 68% Agree, 18% Disagree
Their work supports my local community: 68% Agree, 20% Disagree
I am familiar with their activities: 65% Agree, 21% Disagree
They have a strong influence over their area of work: 63% Agree, 17% Disagree
The media paints a positive picture of them: 59% Agree, 17% Disagree
They act independently of the government: 49% Agree, 22% Disagree
They are generally trustworthy: 49% Agree, 30% Disagree
They have a strong influence over government policies: 47% Agree, 26% Disagree
They are generally well managed: 46% Agree, 33% Disagree
They generally use donations effectively: 42% Agree, 33% Disagree

Source: Ipsos MORI

Base: All adults aged 18+ who are aware of any charitable organisations that are active in their country (384)
In order to put the right conditions in place for strengthening mass engagement with individual giving in Kenya CAF makes the following recommendations.

All stakeholders should:

- Recognise the importance of Kenya as a regional hub for both the East Africa economic region and for philanthropy infrastructure.
- Support and engage with the continued development of civil society infrastructure which is vital to ensuring mass engagement in giving is accessible and available to all.
- Invest in national campaigns on the value of civil society and local cultures of giving (such as Harambee) underpinning it.
- Promote new ways of safe and secure giving which builds on current generosity. This should be done with a view on how growth and innovation of the technology, banking and telecom sectors could be leveraged to support mass engagement with giving. The aim should be to ‘grow the pie’ and potential for mass engagement with individual giving without taking away from existing forms of giving.

International partners (including INGOs) should:

Invest in infrastructure to enable local CSOs to tap into local resource mobilisation

- Invest in existing and new local civil society infrastructure, and the development of alternative financing models that can help local CSOs to tap into local giving cultures.
- Provide technical assistance and work with Government for improving regulation and registration of CSOs, including independent validation and open data.
- Engage in policy conversations and advocate on unblocking stalemates between civil society and Government on crucial legislation (e.g. the PBO Act).

Fund programmes that integrate local priorities and accommodate CSO needs

- Develop CSO-specific funding strategies that include feedback loops, embed local voices, increase domestic accountability, and incentivise collaboration between CSOs.
- Embrace localism and increase the share of funding going directly to local CSOs, providing flexible, predictable, multi-year and unrestricted funding for core costs.

Make funding available for additional CSO needs across programmatic priorities

- Pool funds, back-office infrastructure and skills across programmatic areas to support civil society.
- Provide funding to support CSOs’ strategic communications and outreach activities to help raise awareness of their needs and impact. This should include more traditional forms of media alongside online campaigns.
Focus on capacity building and sector leadership

- Invest in community hubs and shared spaces for local CSOs, creating neutral spaces for networking and collaboration (especially between CSOs and religious institutions) and facilitate cross-sector partnerships for campaigning, fundraising and service delivery.
- Facilitate networks between stakeholders, including the private sector (financial, telecom), to advocate for policy change and an enabling environment for mass participation in giving and civil society.
- Invest in capacity building that helps local CSOs to grow mass engagement with individual giving, for example funding legal support, a leadership pipeline and up-skilling of CSOs (volunteer management, fundraising and domestic resource mobilisation, income diversification, partnership development).

Government should:

Recognise the importance of local civil society in inclusive sustainable development

- Recognise the key role civil society plays in achieving the SDGs; linking (existing) traditions of individual giving (Harambee) with agendas around the SDGs, and a civil society strategy linked to Kenya’s National Action Plan.
- In processes of devolution, ensure civil society organisations have a stake in local development plans (e.g. through involvement in the design of Constituency Development Funds and receiving a portion of their funding).
- Fund awareness raising campaigns with civil society actors on the needs and importance of a strong and vibrant civil society, which includes both service provision and advocacy and human rights organisations.

Create a positive operating environment for CSOs

- Pass the PBO Act and help revive the NGO Council as a sector voice and meaningful vehicle for formal consultation on future policy changes.
- Streamline the multitude of regulations that apply to different types of CSOs, making sure to review the current regulatory regime before adding to its complexity.
- Keep registration and reporting requirements for CSOs transparent, accessible and consistent across different layers and devolved administrations on county-level.
- Refrain from de-registering CSOs without clear legal grounds from the NGO Coordination Board.
- Integrate applications for tax exemption into the registration process by automatically granting tax exemption status to registered CSOs with charitable status.

Promote a positive local culture of giving

- Legislate for tax relief for individual and organisational charitable giving, and recognise the broader spectrum of ways of giving in the tax regime (such as the giving of gifts, assets, time for advocacy, volunteering, etc.).
- Ensure that conditions (e.g. donations having to be made in cash/via cheque) do not hinder effective use of the tax incentives for charitable donations.
- Conduct awareness campaigns on existing tax incentives for giving and make them accessible for individuals and charitable organisations (e.g. by providing options to claim reliefs on annual tax returns).
Ensure that financial systems are inclusive for CSOs (e.g. by avoiding disproportional de-risking of CSOs due to the implementation of international AML and anti-terrorism regulation), and refrain from introducing caps on foreign funding.

Review excise tax on mobile phone-based financial transactions (12%) to remove barriers to giving via mobile transactions and ensure fundraising costs are low.

Local CSOs should:

Adapt the way they tell their stories to local context and audiences

- Use story-telling and case studies to communicate the value of (informal and formal) giving (financial and non-financial) and CSO impact on communities in language that resonates with individuals, using traditional channels (word of mouth, newspaper, radio) as well as social media.
- Let beneficiaries, community leaders and other influencers speak on behalf of the CSOs.
- Link up with social movements, as well as other role models and celebrities to engage a wider audience with causes and giving.

Build on existing cultures of giving

- Recognise individual giving as integral to income diversification and the overall sustainability of CSOs, and take advantage of public participation principles, processes and mechanisms available to involve local communities.
- Build on traditional forms of giving to create a culture of giving that works to the strengths of the local context, integrating the language of traditional giving cultures into fundraising communications.
- Build up networks of givers and supporters through community building and leveraging partnerships (for example with FBOs, schools, youth groups and identity-based giving circles).
- Develop corporate partnerships to increase in kind or skilled volunteering support, calling on funders and Government to help through leveraging their contacts and expertise.
- In collaboration with others in the sector, raise awareness of the availability of existing tax incentives for charitable donations.

Support, engage with and participate in civil society infrastructure

- Where feasible, engage with existing self-regulation initiatives (e.g. benchmarking, peer review, quality improvement exercises, ethical leadership) to build trust in the sector.
- Develop domestic accountability systems drawn from traditional values, using mechanisms such as participatory approaches, social audits, inclusive boards and ethical leadership practices to better mirror the communities served.
- Strengthen the independence of national infrastructure bodies (like the NGO Council) which can address issues around the closing of civic space and policy reform with a more unified voice, and represent neutral spaces for CSO collaboration.
APPENDIX 1

Detail on research approach

CAF commissioned the research agency Ipsos MORI to conduct a broad, mixed-methods landscaping study of civil society and individual giving in Kenya and three other countries.

The research was developed with CAF’s key objectives in mind, to understand:

- The enabling environment in selected countries, including how and why people give and what causes they give to, as well as obstacles and challenges in giving;
- What would make the public engage with civil society and social issues; and
- The challenges faced by the civil society sector and the impact of the challenges on civil society’s ability to address local needs.

Ipsos MORI’s research combined both qualitative and quantitative research methods in Kenya:

- Qualitative, semi-structured interviews with CSO leaders;
- Three mini focus group discussions with urban, middle-income adults; and
- A face-to-face survey with urban, middle-income adults.

The rationale for this was that qualitative research is best suited to answer some of the research questions: the focus on understanding behaviours, motivations, barriers, and attitudes necessitated the more open, discursive and generative nature of qualitative research. Compounding this, the need to draw out narratives of individual giving, and to explore how civil society is understood and viewed by adults, required participants to be given space to give testimonials, and for researchers to follow emerging lines of inquiry and probe for more information. However, to understand the landscape of giving and the extent to which charitable giving takes place, a quantitative approach was more appropriate.

These research activities were coordinated centrally by Ipsos MORI’s Social Research Institute in the UK, who had overall responsibility for research design and analysis. Research was managed by Ipsos Kenya and undertaken in the field by Ipsos Kenya. All research tools were reviewed by staff from Ipsos Uganda and Ipsos Kenya.

Complementing these activities, CAF also undertook a separate strand of desk research to understand the current landscape in terms of broader issues facing civil society in Kenya, including the regulatory environments. Prior to finalisation of these reports, the CAF team also conducted a series of workshops in London and Nairobi with key people from the CSO space, including leaders from CSOs, partners and academics and other experts in the area, to sense check the results as they were evolving. Some of the insight from these workshops is included in the narrative of this set of reports.
**Desk research approach**

CAF's project team conducted an online review of media reports, policy literature, and other material from organisations such as think tanks and larger charities. This was augmented by relevant academic literature and databases (UN, WHO, IMF, World Bank) along a set of common topics (such as the closing space for civil society, local infrastructure, philanthropy and giving, as well as a set of socio-economic indicators). CAF staff also reached out to a number of CSOs who were invited to take part in the formal interviews and other local infrastructure bodies, in order to obtain additional insights on the situation on the ground, pointers for additional sources, as well as clarification on particular aspects that were unclear or needed confirmation. Information from the desk research phase was used to provide a top-level overview of the political and economic situation, the regulatory landscape for CSOs, overall civil society development, and the wider giving environment for Kenya.

**Interviews with CSO leaders**

Ipsos undertook twelve depth interviews with CSO leaders in Kenya. CAF developed a sample of CSOs in the country and following the receipt of the sample of 20 contacts from CAF, recruitment began in April 2019.

The Ipsos and CAF teams worked closely together to design a 45-minute qualitative questionnaire to address CAF's research aims, including qualitative topic areas, questions and probes. The final topic guide subject areas are included as an annex. Interviews were carried out face-to-face or by telephone by Ipsos Kenya’s qualitative research team in English.

Based on the descriptions of the CSOs provided by CAF in the sample, these were categorised, with some CSOs coded as belonging to multiple categories. A total of twelve interviews were completed. The total sample size provided and achieved number of interviews are shown by category in the table below.

**Table 1: CSO sample in Kenya**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation category</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery⁶⁰</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure⁶¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total unique contacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

**Focus group discussion with urban, middle-income adults**

A two-hour focus group discussion was held in Nairobi at Ipsos Kenya offices on 28th June 2019 with 10 participants. Participants were screened to be urban, middle-income adults and to include a mix of those who have given only to individuals in the past, as well as those who have given to both individuals and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs).

---

⁶⁰ Service delivery organisations are those which provide a service to the community, such as medical services or schools.

⁶¹ Infrastructure organisations are those which provide knowledge and support to other CSOs.
A topic guide for this research was developed by Ipsos MORI and agreed with CAF and was used across all four countries. The topic guide focussed on what types of individuals participants give to, drivers for giving to individuals and CSOs, how often giving occurs and how much is given, attitudes toward civil society, and participants’ understanding of key terms. The focus group was conducted in English. Respondent categorisation is shown in the table below.

**Table 2: Focus group composition in Kenya**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-Above</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior giving experience</td>
<td>Has given to individuals only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has given to individuals and CSOs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

**Household survey**

Working closely with CAF, Ipsos designed a 20-minute quantitative questionnaire, inclusive of demographic questions, to address CAF’s research aims. Questionnaire development was informed by a rapid desk review of available literature, formative interviews with two key informants with knowledge of civil society in the region, and a review of the findings from the focus group discussion. The questionnaire covers the following themes:

- Charitable giving habits: giving to individuals and to charitable organisations,
- Drivers of charitable giving,
- Barriers to giving, and
- Attitudes toward charitable organisations.

The survey was conducted by Ipsos Kenya staff, face-to-face using CAPI technology, from 31st August to 6th September 2019. Research was conducted in Nairobi, Mombasa and Kisumu in both English and Kiswahili, with urban, middle-income adults (age 18+). A total of 501 interviews were conducted.

The sample was drawn from the 2009 Kenya national census data, and participants were screened for age and middle-income status. Participating households were selected randomly using the random walk method from an identified landmark at each sampling point.

**Analysis and reporting**

This report contains final, high-level findings from the research conducted in Kenya. Findings from Ipsos MORI’s research findings are organised thematically in the chapters on “The view from civil society” and “The view from individuals”, following the themes and issues that arose during discussions, rather than rigidly following the structure.

---

62 Middle-income status was determined using a screening tool based on Ipsos’ 2018 study; “African Lions: Who are Africa’s rising middle class?” available at https://www.ipsos.com/en/african-lions-who-are-africas-rising-middle-class.
Transcripts from CSO interviews and the focus group discussion were translated into English. The Ipsos MORI team worked to immerse themselves in the data, working systematically through the transcripts and organising these in a summary analysis grid. Findings were organised thematically, using themes derived from the research questions. Ipsos worked across the sample to draw out findings by sub-groups where possible.

Data processing for the quantitative survey was conducted by Ipsos Uganda to ensure consistency. Data are unweighted. Topline findings from the household survey are displayed in charts where relevant. To illustrate the findings from the quantitative and qualitative research conducted with middle-income adults, Ipsos MORI developed three pen portraits, which are fictitious illustrations of individuals who give to other individuals, give to CSOs, and do not give to CSOs. The survey responses for individuals who matched these three groups were analysed, and the results are presented as descriptive text to illustrate the behaviours and attitudes of these groups; these were paired with illustrative quotes from the focus group discussion.

CAF developed summary findings and recommendations on the basis of Ipsos MORI’s research and CAF’s desk review as well as the preliminary findings workshop it conducted.
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Topic guide – Interviews with CSO leaders

The topic guide used for the CSO leader depth interviews contained the following topic areas:

- **Introduction**
  - name,
  - explanation of research.

- **CSO overview**
  - sector/cause area,
  - key activities,
  - specific role,
  - involvement with other CSOs previously,
  - geographical coverage,
  - mission.

- **Finance and support**
  - annual funding amount,
  - where revenue comes from,
  - most important sources of funding,
  - unrestricted funding,
  - individual giving as an income stream and ways this income is given,
  - in kind support.

- **CSO capacities**
  - key organisational strengths,
  - collaboration with other CSOs,
  - support from others in the sector,
  - networks associated with,
  - role of churches and religious institutions in the CSO landscape.

- **Challenges**
  - biggest challenges the CSO faces,
  - limitations on capacities,
  - financial challenges,
  - interaction between CSOs and Government in the country,
  - regulatory or policy challenges,
  - whether Government is supportive of CSOs,
  - mistrust in the sector.

- **Opportunities**
  - solutions which could improve identified challenges – support available with these,
  - biggest challenges for individual giving within the country,
  - changes in country which may have an impact on CSOs,
  - social movement landscape in countries,
  - opportunities for improving organisation’s communications strategy.
APPENDIX 3

Topic guide – Focus group discussions

The topic guide used for the Individuals focus groups contained the following topic areas:

- **Introduction**
  - name,
  - explanation of research.

- **Warm-up**
  - introduction to the idea of giving and giving landscape in the country,
  - how participants think about and understand the term 'giving',
  - the extent to which participants give to individuals vs CSOs.

- **Past and current charitable giving habits in relation to giving to individuals or informal groups**
  - how participants think about and understand informal giving – including motivations, who influences giving, obligations, commitments, community and cultural norm,
  - what types of individuals or groups of individuals they give to,
  - drivers for giving to individuals or groups of individuals,
  - how often giving occurs to each group, and how much income is spent on giving to individuals or groups of individuals.

- **To understand participants attitudes toward civil society**
  - determine what terminology participants use/understand to define ‘civil society’,
  - how participants feel about civil society.

- **Supporting charitable organisations**
  - understanding how individuals engage with civil society,
  - where individuals place responsibility for funding civil society.
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