

Philanthropy in Contemporary Africa: A Review

Jacob Mwathi Mati¹

School of Social Sciences, The University of the South Pacific,
Suva, Fiji Islands;

Society, Work and Development Institute, The University of the Witwatersrand,
Johannesburg, South Africa.

(V#4F)

¹ The author wishes to thank Professors Alan Fowler, Ebenezer Obadare and David Horton Smith for critical reviews of previous drafts of this article. Previous versions of the paper were also presented at the 12th International conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) at Ersta Sköndal University College, Stockholm, Sweden on June 28 - July 1, 2016 and at The University of the South Pacific School of Social Sciences seminar on August 12, 2016. I thank the audience for comments and suggestions received.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
CONCEPTIONS AND MANIFESTATIONS OF PHILANTHROPY.....	11
<i>Giving and Gifting.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Volunteering.....</i>	<i>18</i>
AFRICAN PHILANTHROPY	18
WHAT IS SPECIFIC ABOUT TRADITIONAL AFRICAN PHILANTHROPY?	30
<i>Reciprocity and counter-obligation.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Horizontality.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Interpersonal, face-to-face interactions.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Strong connections to place and people</i>	<i>38</i>
THE INDIGENEITY OF AFRICAN PHILANTHROPY	42
MOTIVATIONS: WHY DO AFRICANS GIVE?.....	44
RELIGIOUS/FAITH MOTIVATIONS FOR GIVING	44
CLASS, ETHNICITY AND GIVING IN AFRICA.....	49
AFRICA’S MARGINALITY, EXPLOITATION AND GLOBAL EXCLUSION	52
SPHERES OF AFRICAN PHILANTHROPIC ACTIVITIES	52
<i>Community foundations.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Corporate Foundations and CSR</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Institutionalisation of CSR activities in companies</i>	<i>71</i>
CONCLUSION.....	76
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	78

Abstract

Despite the availability of a wide range of literature on what is can be construed to be philanthropic behaviour in Africa, there is limited conceptual discussion on what constitutes philanthropy in African context(s). Yet, philanthropic behaviour is culturally rooted phenomena manifesting in diverse forms, expressions, and models. This review contributes to a growing body of literature on conceptions and manifestations of African philanthropy. The review illustrates a complex plurality of actions that fall under cultures and practices of giving in Africa. These include the giving of money, time, knowledge, influence and visibility in support of a cause, valuable goods, and body parts/organs from living and dead. While some of these actions conform to dominant Western notions of philanthropy, others do not. From an analysis of these practices, this paper proposes that African philanthropy can be conceptually structured on the basis of spheres of philanthropic practice, and the underlying bases and motivations for philanthropy. On spheres of philanthropic practice, at least three forms of philanthropy exist: institutional (formal); non-institutional (non-formal/informal/direct); and a hybrid form that blends practices from the formal and informal spheres. On motivations for giving, the predominant forms are based on mutuality, solidarity and counter-obligation inherent in collectivist and humanistic African philosophies of life. Further, motivations are drawn from religious obligations, institutional requirements on corporate bodies, and institutional arrangements in the development process. There are, nonetheless, significant overlaps between spheres of practice and motivations in contemporary philanthropic practices in Africa. For instance, philanthropic culture in Africa manifests as religious giving, donations to individuals or institutions, mutual aid, reciprocal, self-help revolving fund organisations, corporate social responsibility activities, and individual/family donations to public benefit organisations. These practices highlight a rich tapestry of spheres of practice and motivations for giving practices, where the wealthy and the poor are equally involved. The review, concentrates (by choice) on giving of money and time (volunteering, especially informal volunteering) due to dearth of academic literature on other forms of giving as philanthropy in Africa.

Key words: *Philanthropy; giving; gifting; African philanthropy; horizontal philanthropy; Ubuntu; mutual aid; self-help; pro-social behaviour; Corporate social responsibility (CSR); foundations; spheres of philanthropic practice; motivations for philanthropic/pro-social behaviour; helping; informal volunteering; philanthropy in Africa; philanthropy of community; philanthropy of affinity; economy of affection; vertical philanthropy; diaspora*

19 August 2016

philanthropy.

Introduction

A plurality of pro-social behaviours, practices and mechanisms of giving, gifting², self-help and mutual aid, through which individuals help each other or institutions assist those in need; their motivations, and how they address human suffering and promote a wide array of social development needs, have been the empirical fodder for the scholarship in an emergent field of philanthropy in Africa.³ Rooted in evolutionary psychology, feeding cultures, religion, and social structuration, these practices are not limited to African societies. Some of these pro-social behaviours are as old as human social organisation. In contemporary times, they play an 'important role in addressing human suffering, promoting social justice and equitable economic growth, and strengthening and supporting a broad array of civil society goals and organizations' world over (Johnson, 2010, p. 8).

Yet, while universal, these pro-social behaviours and practices come in diverse forms, expressions, and models and have varied levels of institutionalisation across different societies in the world (Smith, 2014; Joseph, 1989; Wilkinson-Maposa, Fowler, Oliver-Evans and Mulenga, 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009; Fowler, 2016; Moyo, 2005; 2011; 2010; Atibil, 2014; Johnson, 2010; el-Daly, 2012; Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010; Copeland-Carson, 2005; 2007; Adelman, 2009). The rich diversity of these pro-social behaviours and practices, has led to emergence of several concepts used to describe either the plural whole, or some specific ones. As would be expected, such concepts that try to describe the plurality of these pro-social behaviours have generated widespread disagreements over their meanings and precision in different contexts. In this regard, questions have for instance been raised as to whether philanthropy, a distinctly Euro-American concept, rightly captures the myriad of pro-social behaviours that some have been grouped together under its banner. The reason for such scepticism, as we shall see later, emanates from its explicit privileging of elite giving and gifting practices. Pro-social giving behaviour is definitely not elitist. However, in

² Gifting, according to Davies, Whelan, Foley and Walsh (2010), exists in two forms: transactional and relational. As a concept, gifting is used in this review to denote a form of giving not motivated by a direct, immediate, or obvious direct benefit or compensation to the giver (Fowler, 2016; Davies, Whelan, Foley and Walsh, 2010). Gifting is associated with altruism, compassion and generosity – acts promoting someone else's welfare and is informed by a human capacity for empathy (i.e., a capability to place oneself in another's position; Fowler, 2016, p. 5). While 'prototypically, the gift does not require reciprocity' (Belk, 2009, cited in Weinberger and Wallendorf, 2011, p. 75), Davies, Whelan, Foley and Walsh (2010, p. 414) note that, gifting involves an 'expectation of a return, be it reciprocity, a change in the relationship with the recipient, or a favor or another social or psychological benefit.' For Weinberger and Wallendorf (2011, p. 75) a gift 'creates a lingering obligation to maintain a tie to the giver, with reciprocal gifting as an important means of doing so.'

³ While references are made for the ethnically and culturally Arab North Africa, this review concentrates on Sub-Saharan Africa.

contemporary Africa, for instance, giving practices include old traditions of ‘self-help and mutual assistance, through which individuals in need are assisted and resources pulled for personal development and for the general advancement of the community’ (Atibil, 2014, p. 457; Fowler, 2016). They also include modern-day institutionalised forms that borrow heavily from the West, and sometimes, with modifications influenced by indigenous giving and gifting practices (Atibil, 2014; Fowler, 2016; Devlieger, 1995).

Further, as Moyo (2010; 2011), in his examination of philanthropic practices in Africa argues, ‘philanthropy is intrinsically embedded in the life cycle of birth, life and death of many, if not all Africans’ (Moyo, 2011, p. 1). As such, in many African societies, one is involved in some kind of philanthropic gesture either as a giver or a receiver from the time of birth, through life and even at or after death. Similarly, Fowler (2016, p. 5), notes widespread social exchanges and gifting in Africa when he argues that ‘at some time or the other all people everywhere provide or receive gifts (even if they do not want them).’ Copeland-Carson (2007) had earlier explained the widespread culture of giving in Africa to be based on the fact that

...most Africans, generally have strong extended family social obligations. From an early age youth are socialized to provide support even to remote relatives and members of their ethnic group, clan or village. In fact, as has been documented in much of the social science literature on Africa, the ethic of sharing is so strong that those who conspicuously accumulate wealth or status without sharing it are thought to be anti-social and even immoral in many indigenous African faiths and philosophies (Feierman, 1998; Iliffe, 1987, cited in Copeland-Carson, 2007, p. 8).

This paper reviews literature on a variety of contemporary African pro-social practices construed to be philanthropy-related with a view to identifying their contextual specificities in Africa. The paper commences by reviewing the conceptual parameters of what generally constitutes philanthropy in the dominant Western literature. It then moves to review literature that illustrates the particularities of philanthropy-associated practices in the African context. The specificities of African forms of philanthropy are understood and structured in this review in terms of: (1) the spheres of philanthropic practice, and (2) the underlying basis and motivations for philanthropy. Regarding spheres of philanthropic practice, it is argued that at least three main forms of philanthropy exist. The first is non-formal/informal (or what Moyo, 2009a calls traditional African philanthropy) and involves direct giver-to-recipient giving and

gifting devoid of institutional intermediation. The second is institutional or formal giving or gifting which is practiced through institutional intermediation. Such institutionalised philanthropy manifests through various types of foundations, trusts, community chests and even as part of social responsibility initiatives of corporations in African countries. This type, sometimes referenced in literature as vertical philanthropy, is the more dominant form written about. A third form, which is a hybrid of the indigenous informal/direct and the formal/institutional is represented in widespread mutual aid and self-help groups, as well as some of the emergent forms of community foundations in some African countries.

Hybridized philanthropic practices exhibit both formal and informality and are illustrated in existing literature, for example, through community foundations that mobilize funding using both local informal practices such as self-help and mutual-aid as well as from external donations (Mati, 2016). An example of hybrid philanthropic practices in Africa is well illustrated in Weru (2004, p. 47) in her description of the work of Pamoja Trust, a non-governmental agency in Kenya set up in 2000 to support urban poor communities to ‘organize themselves to oppose demolition and forced evictions, and to develop their own plans to get adequate housing and basic services.’ In mobilising for resources, Pamoja Trust utilises contributions from informal savings mechanisms of the urban poor who are mobilised and organised through Muungano wa Wanavijiji, as well as donations from both local and international donors (Weru, 2004; Mati, 2012. See also <http://www.pamojatrust.org>). In this case, a binary categorisation of these practices within such an institution as either formal or informal would be misleading.

While there is a lot of literature that is concerned with formal philanthropy (where some institution, organisation or group is involved),⁴ there is increasing attention towards informal manifestations of philanthropy exhibited through what Wilkinson-Maposa et al (2005) and Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009) have called the ‘philanthropy of community’, which manifests as people of similar socioeconomic backgrounds (including the poor and struggling middle classes) helping each other (see also Moyo, 2011; 2010; Ngcoya and Mottiar, 2016; Mati, 2016; Fowler, 2016 for similar arguments).

⁴ In an exercise at collecting and collating existing literature on philanthropy in Africa in 2013, Mati and Russell reported the existence of about 1281 different pieces of relevant literature covering all but two of the 54 countries on the African continent. Of these, 64% dealt with formal/institutional philanthropy, 12% covered informal and 24% covered hybrid (mix of formal and informal) philanthropy.

Regarding motivations for giving, this paper suggests that the predominant forms of giving are based on mutuality, solidarity and counter-obligation inherent in collectivist and humanistic African moral philosophies of life such as *Ubuntu*.⁵ But this African communalism, it is noted, is not without its own tenebrous aspects. Indeed, the African communalism and sociality has been blamed by some, for the lack of maturation of a moral civil ‘public’ in Africa (see for example Ekeh, 1975). This is because the same sociality has been exploited especially by political elites and senior state officials in fuelling widespread ethnic-political patron-client structures for looting from the state and distributing (donating) part of the loot to co-ethnic clients (‘primordial public;’ Pitcher, Moran, and Johnston, 2009). This has fuelled a common misperception in Africa that when one African big man steals from the state, it is the entire ‘tribe’ eating. Michella Wrong’s (2009) aptly titled book, *It’s Our Turn to Eat*, captures such a culture in Kenya. In the Kenyan case, part of the loot, obviously, found its way downstream as donations in the various *harambees* around the country by the unscrupulous politicians.

This illustrates that giving and gifting can also be deeply enmeshed into the politically strategic and perverse patron-client political economy relationships responsible for Africa’s bad governance. Specifically, there is, in some instances, a direct connection between giving and political calculation by politicians and state officials who donate part of their loot to constituents as a form of buying loyalty and patronage. Therefore, not all giving is altruistic. The discussion on the sometimes outright selfish and ‘dark’ motivations for individuals as well as private and corporate foundations to engage in philanthropy further accentuates this view.⁶ This review therefore opens the door to the broader questions of the politics of giving in Africa and further, an opportunity to bring into conversation two historically estranged literatures. Nonetheless, even with its relative pathologies, the communalism and associated African moral philosophies of life combined with the neo-patrimonial systems are the complex systems that have combined to ensure the social, cultural, economic survival of

⁵ In its basic usage, *Ubuntu* means human kindness or concern for other human beings.

⁶ Practices that Smith with Eng and Albertson (2016) refer to as the ‘darker side of philanthropy’ are not a recent happening, nor are they unique to Africa. The ‘darker side of philanthropy’ practices are reported by Bond (2011) to have been happening in ancient Roman Empire cities where, ‘Roman law aided less exalted philanthropists by giving legal status to trusts, charitable endowments, and mutual-aid societies. But the tendency for many donors to use such legal instruments for self-glorification, personally advantageous politicking, and the conservation of family wealth did little to help larger numbers of the destitute in growing Roman imperial cities’ (<http://sofii.org/article/philanthropy-in-ancient-times-some-early-examples-from-the-mediterranean>).

African communities especially in the face of growing socioeconomic and political adversities (see for example Chabal and Daloz, 1999; Pitcher, Moran and Johnston, 2009).

Further, motivations can be drawn from religious/faith obligations. Specifically, it is argued that giving is an imperative of the different religious faiths practiced in Africa, as they all encourage charitable giving. These two motivations (communalism and mutuality, and the religious inspired ones), it will be argued, prevalently manifest as individual (horizontal or direct) giving and involves both the rich and poor. Nonetheless, some emergent institutionalised forms of philanthropy as well as institutions tap into these horizontal forms of giving and gifting. This has resulted in the hybridized form of giving cultures in Africa.

At institutional levels, the motivations for corporations' engagement in philanthropic activities especially through corporate social responsibility (CSR) programmes, the paper argues, have been fuelled by emergent legal/regulatory requirements for commercial corporations to do engage in socially responsible investments. This is further buttressed by advocacy and pressure from civil society and other types of public benefit organisations for more socially conscious and responsible business practices. Corporations have reacted to such pressure by utilising corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices to make in kind or monetary grants or donations to nongovernmental public benefit organisations as well as establishing community development projects. In this regard, as Muthuri and Gilbert (2010, p. 477, citing Campbell (2007), observe "corporations are likely to engage in socially responsible ways if there are strong and well-enforced state regulations, industry associations and private independent organizations such as NGOs who encourage, monitor, enforce rules and regulations." However, while some of these CSR actions respond directly to some of the community needs, others have been done simply for companies to maintain 'a good image' (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010; Muthuri, 2008; Fioramonti and Regelbrugge, 2008; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004; Bench Marks Foundation; 2007; 2008a; 2008b; 2009a; 2009b; 2012).

Further drivers for the more recent institutionalised giving practices are the 'new' institutional arrangements in the development process. Specifically, the latest non-profit associational revolution that Salamon (1994) and many others have talked about has taken roots in Africa in the last three or so decades.⁷ The new non-profit organisations under this

⁷ Salamon (1994) has been criticized as having been very wrong on "nonprofit associations revolution," by the likes of Smith (2016), and Smith, Never, Mohan, Prouteau & Torpe (2016) who argue that there have been four global associational revolutions and the one that Salamon talks about is the fourth in human history. Smith,

revolution differed from earlier forms of associational life in Africa in that they have been positioned across the continent as the sponges for absorbing the toxic effects of economic neoliberal development; in meeting welfare and social development needs of the most vulnerable and marginalised populations, especially as state retreated from the provision of the same (Mati, 2014). The work of these non-profit organisations has been mainly funded especially through donations from foundations, bilateral and multilateral aid donors, and other non-profit organisations from the West, and to a lesser degree, corporations through their CSR programmes.

It follows from the propositions above, that in contemporary African societies, the wealthy as well as the poor either as individuals or through institutions, are involved in some pro-social behaviour that can be construed as philanthropy (Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008; Everatt, Habib, Maharaj and Nyar 2005; Friedman, Hudson and Mackay, 2005; Hodgson and Knight, 2012; Mahomed, 2008; 2009; Mati, 2016; Mombeshora, 2004; Moyo, 2010; 2011; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Williamson and Donahue, 2001). This is not unique to Africa. Indeed, even in the West, there is overwhelming body of evidence on involvement of both the poor and rich in philanthropic giving of time and resources (see for example, Messias, DeJong and McLoughlin, 2005a; 2005b; Olagnero, Meo and Corcoran, 2005). Nonetheless, dominant narratives of philanthropy in the West privilege the role of the socioeconomically advantaged as the key philanthropic players. Further, as we shall see shortly, some of these Western narratives denigrate direct informal giving, most likely to be practiced by the relatively poorer members of society, as mere charity: But is it? Where does charity end and philanthropy begin?

In what follows, the paper engages with conceptual literature on what constitutes philanthropy, before moving to the discussion of African philanthropy's contextual specificities. Thereafter, the paper discusses the motivations for Africans to engage in philanthropic activities before delving into scholarly deliberations on spheres of philanthropic activities. The paper concludes that the portrayal of what falls under the rubric of African philanthropic behaviour in existing literature is complex, manifesting in ways that may not necessarily count as philanthropy in the rest of the world. This can mean either two things. First, that most of the literature under philanthropy in Africa is in reality not about

Never, Mohan, Prouteau & Torpe (2016), for example, cite earlier works by Boulding (1953) and Smith (1973) as evidence of recognition of several prior 'associational revolutions' that Salamon (1994) either by design or ignorance, omitted.

philanthropy (though there is definitely some) in the puritanical Western sense of the term and that many scholars and practitioners writing about African philanthropy are mistaken. Therefore, multiple other concepts that capture pro-social behaviour such as helping, giving, volunteering are better suited in studying these practices. Conversely, this raises questions on the applicability of theories and conceptions drawn elsewhere in accounting for this phenomenon in Africa. A conceptual dialogue is therefore very much in order in building not just a theory of philanthropy in Africa, but also for a more ‘globally’ relevant theory. The starting point in such dialogue(s) towards a theory of philanthropy that is both globally and African relevant, requires an accurate and proper understanding of the concept philanthropy, its manifestations, and operational universe. As Kaplan (1964, p. 53) argues, ‘proper concepts are needed to formulate a good theory.’ This is especially so, as Sulek (2010a, p. 193) indicates, because ‘the meanings assigned to words fundamentally shape and direct the path of discourse.’

Conceptions and manifestations of Philanthropy

What is philanthropy? Given the Euro-American origins of the term philanthropy, is it a *sui generis* concept applicable in studying its practices in any society anywhere or are there social and cultural contextual specificities this phenomenon in Africa? Fowler (2016, p. 8) recently asked similar question: ‘is there a distinctive African philanthropy or a generic philanthropy with African characteristics?’

The term *philanthropy* is not new in social scientific literature, nor is it a new phenomenon world over (Copeland-Carson, 2001). Nonetheless, the etymology of the term is distinctly Western, originating from ancient Greeks in mid mid-5th century BC (Smith, 2014; Sulek 2010a), later reaching their Roman neighbours long before Greece was annexed into the Roman Empire. The two civilizations and their ‘citification’ led to emergence of a culture where wealthy citizens, through notions of good citizenship, were obligated to donate part of their fortunes to public good causes, such as promoting inhabitants’ common identity and welfare (Bond, 2011). David Horton Smith (2014), following Sulek (2010a; 2010b) offers a detailed chronology of the origins and development of the term philanthropy. I cite this (with permission) extensively in the next two paragraphs to illustrate this evolution.

Smith (2014) traces the first usage of *philanthropy* to ‘Greek dramatic play, *Prometheus Bound*’ (p. 178). From its origins, Smith (2014, p. 178) argues, *philanthropy* denoted ‘an

affectionate or kindly love of all humankind...' This initial usage of the term *philanthropy* was both philosophical and divine. The term's usage has since been expanded to include political and social dimensions (Sulek, 2010b; Smith, 2014). Specifically, in the 4th century BC '*philanthropy* was seen as a civic virtue, especially a virtue of ideal leaders or rulers' (Smith, 2014, p. 178). From 3rd century BC, *philanthropy* came to be seen 'as a general term for benevolence or kindness to others' (ibid. p. 178). This, according to Smith (2014), added not only a social meaning to the term, but also brought its practices to the level of everyday life. The term, therefore, became equated with altruism and 'financial generosity of private citizens toward public purposes' (Sulek, 2010b, p. 395 cited in Smith, 2014, p. 179). This was the 'beginning of a long-standing error that substituted only the act of philanthropy (or later, the gift itself) for the motivation or attitude of philanthropy. Both are important' (Smith, 2014, p. 179). From the 2nd century BC, *philanthropy* for Greeks was "'a state of 'well-educated habits'...stemming from 'love of humans'" (Sulek, 2010b, p. 393 cited in Smith, 2014, p. 179). But *philanthropy* also involved "being 'productive of benefit' ... to humans" derived from "a state of 'grace' [*cháritos*]" which led to both "mindfulness" and "good works" (Sulek, 2010b, p. 393, cited in Smith, 2014, p. 179).

Smith (2014) citing among others Sulek (2010a), Samuel Johnson (1755), and Noah Webster (1828) continues to argue that the term's usage acquired its modern day usage in the 17th century (see also Bond, 2011).⁸ Specifically, Smith (2014, p. 179) attributes the first modern sense usage of the term *philanthropy* to English philosopher Francis Bacon who used it in 1612 to refer to 'goodness by humans based on concern for the welfare of humanity (Sulek, 2010a: 194-195).' According to Smith (2014, p. 179),

Bacon further distinguished the inclination (tendency) to do good from the habit (practice) of doing good, which was a great virtue in his view (ibid., p. 195). ...Samuel Johnson...wrote in 1755 that *philanthropy* was "love of mankind; good nature" (ibid., p. 196). The American lexicographer, Noah Webster, defined *philanthropy* as "the love of mankind; benevolence towards the whole human family; universal good will" in his 1828 *Dictionary of American English* (ibid, p. 197).

⁸ Fowler (2016) citing the *Online Etymology dictionary* traces the modern usage of the terms philanthropy to 'c.1600, from late Latin *philanthropia*, from Greek *philanthropia* "kindliness, humanity, benevolence, love to mankind" (from gods, men, or things), from *philanthropos* (adj.) "loving mankind, useful to man," from *phil-* "loving" (see *philo-*) + *anthropos* "mankind" (see *anthropo-*). Originally in English in the Late Latin form; modern spelling attested from 1620s' (<http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=philanthropy>)

By 19th century, the term had come to be associated, in the West, with ‘beneficial giving’ either by individuals or by charitable organisations (Smith, 2014, p. 179). Modern-day usage of the term philanthropy has remained indebted to the Greek traditions, and to some extent, its usage has sometimes been ‘too narrow, conventional, and elitist’ (Smith and Stebbins, 2016, p. 2). As a result, some Africans and scholars of African philanthropy have questioned the term's transferability and validity in Africa, charging that its Western orientation and narrow definition obscures models in other geographies (African Grant Makers Network, 2013; Fowler, 2016; Manji, 2006; Ngondi-Houghton, 2006s).

While the usage of the term and the actions that can be construed to be philanthropic have been with us for long, the scientific study of philanthropy is still in its infancy in many parts of the world (Moyo, 2005; 2009a; 2010; 2011; Johnson, 2010).⁹ Moreover, it is only recently that relatively reliable data on the scope and size of philanthropy has started to emerge (see for example CAF, 2010; CAF, 2014; Gavelin and Svedberg, 2011; Inglehart, Basañez, Caterberg, Diez-Medrano, Moreno, Norris, Siemieniska & Zuasnabar, 2010; Jung, Phillips & Harrow, 2016; Salamon, Sokolowski & Haddock, 2011; Schofer & Longhofer, 2011; Wiepking & Handy, 2015). This is even more pronounced in Africa where lamentations over the dearth of research on scope and size African philanthropy is a recurrent issue highlighted in writings by scholars of African philanthropy (see for example, Atibil, 2014; Copeland-Carson, 2005; 2007; Fowler, 2016; Moyo, 2005; 2009a; 2010; 2011; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009). This paucity of information on size and scope of African philanthropy has ‘led to many myths and untruths about philanthropy, leading some to view Africa as lagging behind both in terms of its understanding and practice’ (Moyo, 2010, p. 262). Some charge that such assertions amount to ‘epistemicide’ of post-enlightenment knowledges supplanting and repressing other types and locations of knowing (See for example de Souza Santos, 2014). In this regard, Fowler (2016, p. i) recently wrote that African Philanthropy,

...is seriously under-researched, poorly or prejudicially understood as ‘traditional’ and anti-modern as well as developmentally under-appreciated. These conditions are overlain with external vocabularies and meanings, which are not adequately emanating from the continent’s history and lived experience of deeply rooted pro-social behaviour of giving or ‘gifting’. Hence, missing in today’s discourse is a deep

⁹ This is not to overlook important works such as Yu-yeu Tsu’s 1912 Ph.D. dissertation, *The spirit of Chinese philanthropy: A study in mutual aid*, at Colombia University.

understanding of African Philanthropy in its own right with what it can tell us about better ways to tackle the continent's many problems by building on its inherent potentials.

Moreover, 'the paucity and uneven documentation across the continent' make generalisations difficult and inconsistent (Fowler, 2016, p. 2).

Johnson (2010, p.10) further acknowledges the slippery slopes that this emergent field of inquiry has to navigate when he argues that any effort at studying philanthropy is confronted with challenges of boundary and contours setting and is most likely to be misleading. Such efforts, Johnson (2010, p. 10) continues to argue, 'are equally likely to obscure or at least only partially represent the rich diversity and complexity of philanthropy as it is practiced in countries and cultures around the world' (see also Copeland-Carson, 2005; 2007; Moyo, 2005 for similar arguments). As such, this review is also acutely aware of these shortcomings. Due to limitations in language as well as access to extant literature, what is presented here and the interpretations herein should be treated as indicative of what exists.

The challenge of boundary setting is especially accentuated by the dominant Western oriented conceptions of philanthropy which, for example, exclude from philanthropy or even charity, actions by a giver that are directed to recipients who are 'members of their extended family, group, or community... these actions are conceptualized in terms of mutual obligation, part of the responsibility of belonging to an extended family, group, or community' (The Report of the Wolfenden Committee, 1997, pp. 22–23 as cited in Everatt, et al., 2005, p. 280; See also Smith, Stebbins and Dover, 2006 for similar framing in the conception of what amounts to philanthropic actions). Moreover, another significant challenge emanating from the dominance of Western conceptions of philanthropy is the often-relative neglect of giving of time (volunteering), which plays a critical role in resourcing African communities (Fowler, 2016). This happens despite, for example, Salamon's (1992) widely accepted definition stressing that philanthropy is 'the private giving of time or valuables (money, security, property) for public purposes' (Sulek, 2010a, p. 201; Smith, 2014, p. 180; Bond, 2011). Many scholars ignore Salamon's inclusion of giving of time (volunteering) as part of philanthropy and instead concentrate their gaze on donations of money or other material things, especially by the wealthy. Exceptions here include Van Til (1990), Payton (1988), Smith, Stebbins, and Dover (2006) who conceive philanthropy as "voluntary action for the public good" (Smith, 2014, p. 180).

Nonetheless some of these scholars stress certain features of philanthropy that African manifestations of the same do not conform to. Specifically, Smith, Stebbins, and Dover (2006) for example, define philanthropy as the

allocation of one or more of the following to one or more individuals or nonprofit groups *outside the family*: money, goods, other property, or services (time). Such allocations are for altruistic . . . or *public service purposes*, and are given *without expectation of high probability of similar benefit in return* (as cited in Smith, 2014, p. 180-1. *My emphasis*).¹⁰

In African worldviews, philanthropic acts can be towards extended family, and also includes self-help and mutual aid type of giving and donations (Devlieger, 1995; Moyo, 2005; Moyo and Ramsamy, 2014). This blurs the lines between obligation and non-obligation helping and giving. As Moyo (2005, pp. 53-4) among others observes that in South Africa, giving and helping takes many forms:

In extended families ‘giving or helping’ means many things. An employed family member is a giver if he or she takes care of the extended family. This may also be viewed as a social and family expectation or demand. In this context, is it proper to say that giving or helping is an act of philanthropy? However, when does giving or helping begin and when does it stop? Is one giving or helping when one is performing a family duty? Would buying clothes for relatives for example or buying clothes for people outside the extended family be considered as ‘helping’ (Everatt, 2004)?

A further point of departure of African philanthropy from the dominant Euro-American narratives of philanthropy is the latter’s obsession with formal or institutional manifestations in its definition.¹¹ This has impacted on mainstream concerns for the scholarship on African philanthropy to be overly concentrated on the formal. This is attributed to among others,

¹⁰ Smith, Stebbins, and Dover forthcoming (2017) revised edition of the dictionary intends to clarify that such philanthropic giving must be *outside the nuclear family or household dwelling unit, but may include giving to extended family members, clan members, fictive kin, etc.* Also, the new definition will mention that the motivation for such giving *may be altruistic, based on reciprocity and reciprocal obligations, or other motivation.* However, there is no guarantee of reciprocity.

¹¹ Nonetheless, it is important to note that there are exceptions to this case as for example, Smith (2014, p. 180) demonstrates when he argues: ‘*philanthropy* can mean any or all of the following: (a) an altruistic feeling/attitude toward humankind in general, (b) charitable acts toward others generally, as motivated by such feelings/attitudes, and/or (c) (usually nonprofit) organizations/NGOs whose main purpose is to engage in such charitable acts, *especially by giving money* to needy people or to nonprofit groups serving human welfare and the public interest.’

‘systemic biases in Western-financed research [which] have tilted the knowledge field towards external interests, theories and ideological frames’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 2; Fowler, 2002; de Souza Santos, 2014).

This Euro-American bias is not limited to the relative neglect of scientific inquiry on what may be termed as traditional/informal forms of African philanthropy. As we shall see later in this paper, these biases have transcended to what is clearly the ‘modern’ institutional form of philanthropy in Africa. Given this, Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) in their study of corporate social responsibility in Kenya (treated here as one of the manifestations of corporate philanthropy), have for example asked: how relevant and applicable are concepts generated in Western contexts in developing countries given the dichotomies of culture, social values, norms and priorities between the West and the developing world? Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) citing Blowfield and Frynas (2005), Jamali and Mirshak (2007) continue to argue that some of the notions and practices of corporate social responsibility developed in Western developed contexts, may not suitably address the social issues in the developing world. This is because CSR continues to ‘legitimize and reproduce values and perspectives that are not in the interests of developing economies or the poor and marginalized’ (Blowfield and Frynas, 2005, p. 510 as cited in Muthuri and Gilbert 2010, p. 468). Because of this, companies in Africa are constantly being required to adapt their CSR to the ‘strong community values or *‘ubuntu’* philosophy instilled in African societies’ (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010, p. 479).

Given the foregoing, there has been an emergent advocacy among some scholars for the need to remedy what is obviously a major error in assumptions that philanthropy as conceived in the Euro-America settings serves public good beyond the atomised family structure. The argument here is that the bridging of African collective good orientation of giving and helping, with the public good orientation of giving in the West, requires a different theory or concepts. In this regard, Fowler (2016, p.1-2), who advocates for the use of the concept ‘gifting’ instead of ‘philanthropy’ to capture a plurality of pro-social transactional practices around the world, writes:

The imported notion of philanthropy, a foreign concept and vocabulary ... is difficult to marry with the continent’s endogenous philosophy, world views and languages. ...globally seen, modern philanthropy has emerged as one type of gifting, not the other way around. With this in mind, as a contemporary international concept and practice, philanthropy is treated as one ‘vertical’ variant of gifting, often now

associated with individual capital accumulation generating high personal wealth.

Giving and Gifting

Closely related to philanthropy are concepts 'giving' and 'gifting.' Smith, Stebbins and Dover (2006, p. 98) define *giving* as a

process of allocating money, goods, other property, or service (time) to an individual or group, *without expecting any direct, high probability, reciprocal transfer* (exchange, philanthropic) of money, goods, other property, or service in return. In giving something the net worth of the giver (donor) is (at least temporarily) reduced, while the net worth of the recipient (target of benefits) is increased. *Giving within the family is not philanthropic* (philanthropy), whereas giving outside it may be philanthropic if altruism or public service is the goal (cf., Magat 1989b, *passim*).

The definition above, yet again, stresses that giving must be *outside the family* and *without expecting any direct or high probability, reciprocity*. This issue is especially stressed in international quantitative comparative studies, which have been selective in excluding giving to family members, yet the very notion of family in traditional African society is not nuclear/atomised as is the case in West contexts.¹² As shall become clear, studies of African giving culture have been categorical that reciprocity and familial obligations are very much key features of what they study.

But giving, as a concept, has some downsides to it. It does not necessarily denote a pro-social act. This is well captured by Fowler (2016, p. 7), who in his advocacy for the need to move from usage of the term *giving* to *gifting*, writes:

A simple reason for speaking of gifting rather than giving is that the former is premised on a positive moral element while the latter needs to be qualified to understand its value. One can give someone a cold shoulder, influenza, misinformation, a helping hand, a job contact, an introduction which expands a social network and so on. Without the qualifier, giving is not, *a priori*, a pro-social act.¹³

Fowler (2016, p. 25) conceptualizes gifting to indicate that:

¹² In the West a family is usually defined as an atomised unit; in Africa it is who is where in what lineage.

¹³ In making this case, Fowler (2016, p.7) cites Aina and Moyo's (2013) edited volume *Giving to Help, Helping to Give* to argue that the 'title of the only substantive publication about African philanthropy qualifies 'giving' by alluding to 'helping'.' He continues to argue that 'a more complicated and substantive argument for gifting is that, from an ontological point of view, it is preferable because of its place in the evolution of the human behavioural repertoire...that is cooperative rather than competitive. In other words it is a type of transaction that co-determines the collaborative nature of the social order to be found within and across continents and countries' (Fowler, 2016, p. 7).

the anticipated social/societal value to the recipient(s) is at least equal to or greater than the economic value to the giver(s). If this is not the case, then the exchange is not a gift but a (social) money making enterprise...If the social gain cannot be demonstrated nor exceed the financial return, one can better speak of social enterprise than philanthropy.

Fowler (2016, p. 25) continues to argue that focus on gifting can, for example, stimulate 'corporate gifting from "box-ticking" corporate social responsibility (CSR) into, amongst others, creating shared value (CSV) (Moore, 2014) and adopting ethical practices ... (Ethical corporation).'

Volunteering

As already noted, volunteering is another concept closely related to philanthropy and giving. Volunteering is the giving of time either directly to others or to organisations. Philanthropy itself, is conceived to be a voluntary action, even though, by and large, obligation as already seen, has been very much part of philanthropy, since ancient Roman Empire times. As will be seen later in this paper, *volunteering, especially informal volunteering, is the most widespread form of giving and philanthropy in Africa.*

The next question then is: how is philanthropy in African contexts conceptualized and represented in existing literature?

African philanthropy

Despite a growing body of literature, there is a dearth of conceptual analysis of philanthropy in African context. Exceptions here are extensive works by Bhengkosi Moyo that include among other contributions:

- 2005 PhD dissertation at the University of the Witwatersrand, *Setting the development agenda? U.S Foundations and the NPO sector in South Africa. A case study of Ford, Mott, Kellogg and Open Society Foundation;*
- 2009 chapter 'Philanthropy in Africa' in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* edited by Helmut K. Anheier, Stefan Toepler and Regina List;
- A discussion paper 'Establishing the AfricanGrant Makers Network' at the launch of African Grantmakers Network in 2009;
- 2010 chapter 'Philanthropy in Africa: Functions, Status, Challenges and

- Opportunities' in *Global Philanthropy*, edited by N. MacDonald and L. de Borms;
- 2011 commissioned paper 'Transformative Innovations in African Philanthropy' by The Bellagio Initiative partners.
- His 2013 book (co-edited with Tade Akin Aina) *Giving to Help, Helping to Give*.

Other scholars who have engaged in this endeavour include:

- Christiana Lariba Atibil (2014) in her chapter, 'Philanthropic Foundations and Civil Society in Sub-Saharan Africa' in the *Handbook of Civil Society in Africa* edited by Ebenezer Obadare;
- Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., in their 2005 publication *The Poor Philanthropist: How and why the poor help each other*;
- Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009) *The Poor Philanthropist II: New approaches to sustainable development*;
- Wilkinson-Maposa (2009) *The Poor Philanthropist III: A practice-relevant guide for community philanthropy*;
- A forthcoming (2016) book *Variations of Philanthropy in South Africa: Social justice, horizontality, and Ubuntu* edited by Mvuselelo Ngcoya and Shauna Mottiar;
- *Philanthropy in East Africa* (2006) by Connie Ngondi-Houghton;
- A recent (2016) Chair in African Philanthropy Foundational Paper titled 'Concepts and Framework for Teaching, Research and Outreach of African Philanthropy' by Alan Fowler.

These authors converge on their agreement that globally, philanthropy is a contested concept and is defined in many different ways by scholars and practitioners (Copeland-Carson, 2007). Existing contestations arise from the fact that different cultures and traditions conceive philanthropy differently (el-Daly, 2012 as cited in Atibil, 2014, p. 458). The basic conception of philanthropy as already pointed out, denotes act of generosity/giving to others for the betterment of others (Grady, 2014; Moyo, 2005). But notions of generosity, as Atibil (2014, p. 458) observes, 'manifests... differently, from culture to culture, and [...are] sometimes motivated, not by voluntariness, but by a sense of moral obligation.'

In African writings, the practice in the conceptualisation and analysis of philanthropy has been two-pronged, though not necessary mutually exclusive. The first approach is to use

socio-historical and chronological analysis of development/evolution of philanthropy in Africa beginning from pre-colonial era to contemporary. The aim in this approach has been to demonstrate how past socioeconomic, cultural and political circumstances have co-evolved in shaping present philanthropy-related practices in the continent. A recent paper by Alan Fowler (2016) is illustrative of such a periodization approach and is useful in helping us understand present day manifestations of philanthropy-related behaviours in Africa.

In that paper, Fowler (2016) argues that in the pre-colonial era gifting¹⁴ was ‘not primarily an asymmetric form of altruism but a “horizontal” bonding mechanism’ (p. 11). During the colonial period, ‘institutionalised asymmetric and vertical interaction gained hold’ (Fowler, 2006, p.11). Another significant development during the colonial period was the introduction of ‘gifting as charity.... *caritas* introduced a form of gifting that did not rely on personal obligation between parties as such. Rather, theology decreed that all those suffering had a right to succour and comfort by the church’ (Fowler, 2006, p. 12). Further developments in colonial Africa’s philanthropic cultures were heavily influenced by 17th century charity legislation in England, which established ‘institutionalised form of gifting ... This British legislative history usually became incorporated in the legislation of colonized countries as it did in those of France with the Civic Code’ (Fowler, 2006, p. 12).

The second, and arguably the more dominant approach, has been to contrast practices and acts of generosity, gifting, giving, reciprocity and mutual aid in Africa with the dominant Western narratives of philanthropy earlier discussed (see for example, Atibil, 2014; Copeland-Carson 2005; Mati, 2016; Moyo, 2005; 2011; Ngondi-Houghton, 2006; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009). For instance, Atibil (2014), Copeland-Carson (2007), as well as Moyo (2005) whose conception conform to original Greek meaning (i.e. love of human kind or humanity), argue that such love is obviously present in all cultures and societies of the world (see also Smith, 2014 for similar arguments). However, today, the concept and practice of philanthropy has ‘undergone some transformation where in the West philanthropy has come to mean the giving of money away particularly by rich individuals, corporate institutions and private institutions’ (Moyo, 2005, p. 53; see also Atibil, 2014, p. 458).

¹⁴ Fowler (2016) insists on the use of the concept gifting as more appropriate. What he describes in his paper, however, is what largely appears in other writings as philanthropy, giving and volunteering. He offers convincing ontological reasons for his hesitation to use philanthropy.

Such ‘transformation’ or more appropriately, bias, is captured, for instance, in the *Cambridge International Dictionary of English* (1995) which defines philanthropy as ‘an act of generosity towards other people and a sincere wish to help them, especially by giving money to poor people’ (as cited in Moyo, 2005 p. 53). Clearly in many works of African philanthropy, the flow of generosity is not always vertically from the rich to the poor. Indeed, horizontal giving is the more pervasive form of philanthropic practices and actions in African societies (Mati, 2016; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al. 2005). As a result, as Moyo (2009a, p.1187) states:

The term “philanthropy” is not generally understood nor is it preferred in Africa – simply because it is not inclusive both in its scope and reach. The classical definition and indeed the very historical trajectory of philanthropy from the American and perhaps European understanding are not fully encompassing of the nature and character of what in Africa can be likened to “philanthropy” (see also Moyo, 2009b; 2010; 2011; 2013, Aina and Moyo, 2013; Moyo and Ramsamy, 2014).

The challenge in the conception of philanthropy in African scholarship is compounded further by lexical limitations, because many African languages not have a single word equivalence of philanthropy in their everyday usage (Copeland-Carson, 2007; Fowler, 2016; Moyo, 2010; Ngcoya and Mottiar, 2016). But the absence of a similar word in common language does not signify the absence of practices that fall under philanthropy in the Western sense of the word because, as Copeland-Carson (2007, p.9) observes of Kenya:

...although an exact translation for “philanthropy” does not exist in most indigenous African languages, the concept of love for humanity certainly does, but in a culturally distinctive way. Giving and helping are considered basic components of responsible social behavior manifested across society’s various institutions. Thus, in communities of even humble means, it is common to pool resources to build schools, send teenagers to college abroad, donate medical assistance, foster orphans and provide a wide range of mutual aid and support. This widespread culture of compassion persists ... and is in fact the glue that holds Kenyan and most African society together. This ethic of giving is a primary motivator for Kenyan diaspora remittances and other forms of philanthropy.

Moyo (2010, p. 259) argues that people in Africa in everyday language ‘prefer to use *simple expressions such as “helping” or “giving”* when referring to philanthropy’ (*Italics my*

emphasis). In this regard, studies of what may constitute philanthropic behaviour in South Africa for instance, include notions of giving and volunteering (giving of time) just as Salamon (1992), Payne (1988) and Smith, Stebbins, and Dover (2006) do in the West. Studies by Everatt and Solanki (2004), Everatt and Solanki (2008), Habib and Maharaj (2008), Everatt, Habib, Maharaj, and Nyar (2005) and Habib and Maharaj (2008) are illustrative of such an approach.

Giving of time is a ubiquitous pro-social behaviour that is deeply ingrained in community activities and long-established traditions of sharing and reciprocal exchanges in Africa. Volunteering in Africa is expressed formally and informally. What constitutes formal and informal expressions of volunteering are, of course, a matter of context. The most common distinction between formal and informal volunteering though, is on the basis of whether one engages in helping others either in/through a formal organizational setting or as part of informal networks of extended families, friends, and neighbours that are not coordinated by an organization or institution (Einolf, Prouteau, Nezhina and Ibrayeva, 2016; Hastinx, Cnaan and Handy, 2010; Taniguchi, 2012).

Informal volunteering is the most common type of human helping behaviour world-over (Einolf, Prouteau, Nezhina and Ibrayeva, 2016). It is this type of giving that has kept African societies going in the face of increasing precariousness especially aggravated by neoliberal economic policies. However, researchers' over-exuberant fetish for the formal means that informal volunteering is one of the least studied pro-social behaviours (Mati, 2016; Einolf, Prouteau, Nezhina and Ibrayeva, 2016; Hastinx, Cnaan and Handy, 2010). In many instances, informal types of volunteering are 'often so embedded in cultures and traditions that they may not even be considered volunteering' (Leigh, et al 2011, p.40). Rather, they see these pro-social behaviours as a 'way of life' (Russell, 2016, p. 1). The Egyptian CIVICUS Civil society Index (CSI) report for example, highlights this by noting a contradiction between many organisations indicating that they depend on volunteers for operations, and the fact that only 6.4% of surveyed individual citizens reported they had volunteered in the past one year prior to the survey:

...the survey results may have underestimated the level of volunteerism because it only measured formal volunteering, due to the salience of certain social values influencing people's responses: respondents conceptualized volunteering as an activity that is undertaken at an institution or organization. If they are volunteering outside

such a structure, for example, assisting neighbours or other community members in any way, it is likely that they would not have cited it as voluntary work. If the number of citizens engaged in "informal" volunteering were to be taken into account, it is likely that the percentage of Egyptians volunteering would be much higher than indicated in the survey (CDS, 2006, p.25)

Given these glaring gaps, some studies on African volunteerism and giving behaviour have deliberately tried to shift the gaze from the formal manifestations of volunteering. The table below illustrates some comparative figures of volunteering in different regions of the world.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Table 1. Average volunteering by world region (2010)

Region	% of citizens engaged in informal volunteering*	% of citizens engaged in formal volunteering**
1. North America	65%	42%
2. Pacific	64%	39%
3. Asia (Southeast)	27%	27%
4. Africa	51%	24%
5. Western Europe	45%	24%
6. Eastern Europe and Russian Federation	35%	17%
7. Latin America and Caribbean	47%	16%
8. Asia (South)	29%	12%
9. Middle East and North Africa	48%	9%
10. Asia (East)	30%	6%

Source: Gavelin and Svedberg (2011: 30–32; 71–73 as cited in Smith et al., 2016a).

**Note:* Interview item asks about “helping a stranger” in the past month, ignoring more frequent helping of people who are known.

*** Note:* Interview item asks about having “volunteered your time to an organization” in the past month.

As Table 1 above shows, there are relatively higher levels of informal volunteering in most developing and transition regions of the world. Africa and the Pacific have higher numbers in this area than many others, save for North America. Various other studies that have found higher levels of informal volunteering in some African countries (see for example various CIVICUS CSI country reports; Russell, 2016) attribute this to among other reasons, mutual aid type activities (including informal volunteering), which are very widespread in Africa. In

Morocco for instance, the CIVICUS CSI report noted that ‘volunteering is associated with traditional forms of solidarity, namely the practice of *Twiza*’- a term used to express ‘communal and collective solidarity (Akesbi with Meknassi and Bouja, 2011, p. 27). Akesbi with Meknassi and Bouja, (2011, p. 27) further note that *twiza* is a ‘widely spread practice, especially in rural and agricultural areas where they are part of an approach of mutual support and group survival.’ Similarly, the CIVICUS CSI report for Uganda noted that volunteering and other forms of community action, such as mutual help or church-linked groups, are very prevalent’ (DENIVA, 2005, p. 38).

Another reason advanced is weaknesses in the tools employed in data collection on volunteering, especially by international comparative studies. Such weaknesses ‘include the ways in which questions are asked, but also the contexts in which questions are asked (e.g. asking about volunteering within a labour force survey which immediately constructs it as a form of ‘work;’ Russell, 2016, p. 2). When the right tools are rightly administered, the results are bound to be different. In this regard, Russell (2016) illustrates how two surveys (CAF World Giving Index (CAF) 2012, and the 2014 Statistics South Africa which applied the ILO Manual methodology in its Volunteering Activity Survey ended up with data that, in her view, does not represent the reality. She compared the two surveys with another done by Social Surveys Africa which showed a huge discrepancy between the results. Specifically, the Stats SA/ILO Survey (2014) indicated that only four per cent (4%) of South Africans volunteer. The CAF World Giving Index Survey (2012) indicated 19 per cent volunteered while the Social Surveys Africa Survey (2013) reported that 59 per cent of South Africans volunteer.

Another feature of African volunteerism is the prevalence of volunteering among the income poor. Literature on volunteering in Western industrial societies suggests a strong correlation between social class and volunteering. Volunteers, especially in formal settings, are more likely to come from more privileged socio-economic and educational backgrounds such as middle class, slightly older women with a university education (Voicu and Voicu 2003; Einolf and Chambré, 2011).¹⁵ Some literature from the African continent corroborates this.

¹⁵ Einolf, Prouteau Nezhina and Ibrayeva (2016) suggest revision of this perspective when they argue that ‘the psychological motives for informal volunteering are similar to those for formal volunteering, but income and socio-economic status do not affect informal volunteering. Informal volunteering is common in both wealthy and poor countries, and welfare state service provision does not crowd out informal volunteering’ (p. 413).

The 2006 Egyptian CIVICUS CSI report by the Centre for Development Services (CDS) for example, reported:

It seems there is...a positive correlation between occupation and volunteerism. The higher the occupation an individual holds, the more likely s/he is to be involved in volunteer activity. This is mirrored in the CDS survey which showed that 70% of volunteers occupied white collar professions, such as doctors, engineers, accountants in addition to businessmen. Civil servants represented 19.3% of volunteers, while street vendors, workers, and other groups represented a negligible percentage of those undertaking volunteer work (CDS, 2006, p. 26).¹⁶

The results in Egypt and other countries have raised concerns over whether ‘NGOs are exclusive organizations that do not encourage or actively seek the participation of individuals from working class backgrounds, or whether the preoccupation with ensuring livelihoods reduces the time available for volunteer work’ (CDS, 2006, p. 26). This is a valid question in many countries. For example, the Ghanaian CIVICUS CSI report noted:

The likelihood of volunteering also differed depending on the income of respondents. In general, the lower one’s income, the less likely the person was to volunteer. Thus, only 8.5% and 13.5% of respondents in the lowest and second lowest quintile of income respectively had volunteered at least once over the past year as compared to 15.6% of individuals in the highest income bracket. Men were also more likely to volunteer than women’ (Darkwa, Amponsah and Evans Gyampoh, 2006, p. 33).

In Sierra Leone, the CIVICUS CSI reported that only 14 per cent of surveyed citizens did voluntary work through or for NGOs in the year preceding the survey (2005) and that ‘the participation of people particularly the rural poor in civil society activities is very poor’ (CGG with Christian Aid, 2006, p. 28). Ten years down the line, the 2014-15 wave of Afrobarometer reports that 63.2 per cent of Africans surveyed in 36 countries do not belong to any formal voluntary associations. The table below summarizes the percentage of citizens in 36 countries that belong to voluntary association. This is a good proxy indicator for the likelihood of people in these countries to volunteer for voluntary organisations.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Table 2. Percentage of membership in formal voluntary association in select African countries

¹⁶ It needs mention that in these cases, only formal volunteering for NGOs was measured.

Country	Membership in voluntary associations %	Country	Membership in voluntary associations %
Algeria	17.1	Mozambique	32.6
Botswana	24.2	Namibia	23.4
Burundi	37.7	Niger	35
Cameroon	59.9	Nigeria	46.5
Cape Verde	16.8	Sao Tome and Principe	25.3
Benin	44.3	Senegal	47.8
Gabon	27.7	Sierra Leone	57.5
Ghana	31.9	South Africa	29.1
Guinea	60.7	Zimbabwe	25.3
Côte d'Ivoire	47.4	Sudan	35.3
Kenya	50.1	Swaziland	34
Lesotho	39.3	Togo	45.6
Liberia	73.4	Tunisia	7.3
Madagascar	22.7	Uganda	47.3
Malawi	28.9	Egypt	10.9
Mali	52.4	Tanzania	36.9
Mauritius	18.2	Burkina Faso	39.4
Morocco	23.9	Zambia	35.7

Source: Afrobarometer (2014-15 wave)

Utilising Maslow's hierarchy of needs thesis, such studies advance the idea that people with higher-incomes volunteer more (as a form of higher self-actualization). However, such reasoning may be misleading as people are motivated by much wider reasons beyond self-actualization. In fact, a different pattern exists in many developing and transitional global South nations. Empirical evidence provided in academic and practitioner literature shows that the income poor give help enormously either to extended family, neighbours, clansmen and their communities in general etc. In many instances, researchers do not treat these forms of help as volunteering or philanthropic activities, but as just obligation. Further, there is substantial literature that suggests that the mutual aid and self-help orientations of volunteering and giving in Africa, are the bulwark in securing the financial and human capital assets of the income poor in Africa (see for example, Bebbington, 2010; Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008; Everatt et al., 2005; Gillette, 2003; Patel and Mupedziswa, 2007; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009; Wilkinson-Maposa et al., 2005; etc.). A study by the VOSESA in South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, and Malawi, for instance, found that volunteering was largely the domain of those from underprivileged backgrounds (Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008; Everatt et al., 2005; Kunljian, 2005; Patel and Mupedziswa, 2007;

Wilkinson-Maposa et al., 2005). Wilkinson-Maposa et al., (2005) label this as horizontal philanthropy of community.

While some of the existing studies of philanthropy in Africa include various forms and manifestations of giving (including volunteering), there are also many that offer qualifiers, caveats, and disclaimers in their usage of the term philanthropy in the African context. Despite these disclaimers and qualifiers, Moyo (2009a; 2009b; 2010) among others, argues that in Africa, ‘there is something that can be called “philanthropy” and it takes primarily two dimensions: indigenous – usually informal; and institutional’ and expressions of and acts of philanthropy are found among both the rich and the poor alike (Atibil, 2014; Copeland-Carson, 2005; Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008; Everatt, Habib, Maharaj, and Nyar 2005; Habib and Maharaj, 2008; Julien, Mahomed and Samuels, 2014; Mati, 2016; Mati and Russell, 2013; Mombeshora, 2004; Moyo, 2005; 2009; 2010; 2011; Moyo and Ramsamy, 2014; Ngcoya and Mottiar, 2016; Nkopane, 2016; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009). Indeed, as Moyo (2005, p. 53) argues:

Communities in Southern Africa identify with practices that describe the act of caring and contributing to the love of human kind. However, these communities do not call this act ‘philanthropy’; instead a number of indigenous concepts and terms are used to describe such a phenomenon [in common languages]. ‘Giving’ is one example and ‘helping’ is another. These concepts are expressed and manifested in a number of ways.

Copeland-Carson (2005, p.78) highlights the plurality of philanthropic activities in both informal and formal settings in multiple cultures that are not always acknowledged, when she writes:

Philanthropy is not limited to formal charitable institutions or developed nations. It also includes informal social networks, practices, and traditions that foster mutual aid and reciprocity that have existed throughout history in all societies among people of varying financial means. From this perspective, philanthropy, including practices in the African diaspora, consists of the voluntary means that any culture or social group uses to redistribute financial and other resources for the purposes of promoting the collective good.¹⁷ The institutional mechanisms and social obligations that surround these voluntary practices will vary across societies and their constituent communities

¹⁷ This departs from the mainstream conception of philanthropy as geared towards public good.

and may not be explicitly defined as philanthropic from a conventional Western perspective.

The mainstream conceptual bias in the conception of philanthropy is, in part, informed by traditions especially in the United States where institutionalised forms of giving took root as private philanthropic foundations were established from later 19th century (Anheier and List, 2005; Atibil, 2014; Copeland-Carson, 2007). Moreover, promoters of private wealthy philanthropic foundations, such as Andrew Carnegie in his 1889 famous essay 'The gospel of wealth,' did a lot to ensure that their worldviews and practices were privileged over others by disparaging every-day acts of generosity as mere 'charity that produce the very evils which it propose to mitigate or cure' (Carnegie, 1889, p. 11).

In this case, the distinction made between charity and philanthropy is that charity involves the alleviation of suffering, while philanthropy refers to a 'longer term, deeper commitment to public benefit that seeks to address the roots of social problems' (Anheier and List, 2005, p.196). This conception has influenced some African scholars like Ngondi-Houghton (2006), who writes that charity, 'can ameliorate' human suffering while philanthropy 'seeks to root out causes of poverty, suffering and inequality ... it inspires and promotes individual growth as it nourishes human welfare' (cited in Manji, 2006). Nonetheless, Ngondi-Houghton's work is criticised for her failure to further develop the distinction between charity and philanthropy in Africa. In this regard, in his review of Ngondi-Houghton's (2006) *Philanthropy in East Africa*, Manji (2006) writes:

This distinction, however, is lost sight of in the remainder of the book. Indeed, what she mainly writes about is charitable giving. As the book develops, she falls increasingly shy of defining what she means by philanthropy, offering instead examples of the activities it embraces, from microfinance to scout camps, from trade union solidarity to NGOs making money from providing services where the state has retrenched in response to externally driven economic policies.

The net result of privileging the viewpoint that philanthropy is better than charity has been an evolution of a definition of philanthropy that is 'overly American and deficient in accounting for the various forms of informal giving prevalent in especially non-Western cultures' (Copeland-Carson, 2007 as cited in Atibil, 2014, p. 458). Moreover, Carnegie, like many others of his time, was driven by the dominant perspectives of economics which 'assigned human beings with a self-seeking rationality –*homo Economicus*...' (Fowler, 2016, p. 5). The

self-seeking rationality goal of philanthropist Carnegie is, for example, clearly discernible when he proposed the solution to forestall violent overthrow of a dysfunctional capitalist system and ensure ‘ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship’ (1889, p. 1) was through the rich millionaires investing back into the community, their surpluses so that the aspiring poor can rise and are helped to improve their public tastes and general condition:

In this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good. Thus is the problem of Rich and Poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free; the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue... (Carnegie, 1889, p. 11-12).

The self-serving rational man economic orientation of philanthropy has been criticized for its failure to account for altruism, compassion, and generosity patterns of giving and gifting prevalent in many human societies. In this regard, Fowler (2016) for instance writes:

Over time, testing the *homo economicus* hypothesis, based on self-interest as the human behavioural norm, proved unsatisfactory in answering some fundamental questions, such as why generosity, what does altruism do for society, why does voluntary action and non-profit organisations exist? (p. 5).

Due to Andrew Carnegie’s denigration of informal giving, “charity has come to symbolize backwardness, lack of imagination, ineffectiveness” (Frumkin, 2006, p. 11, cited in Atibil, 2014, p. 459). By extension,

Some analysts have tended to regard African informal giving as “charity” and therefore, ineffective as a tool for bringing about social change (Ngondi-Houghton, 2006; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005). This sentiment may have led Western foundations such as the Ford, Charles Mott foundations, and multilateral donors like the World Bank to “promote the culture of giving” in Africa (Atibil, 2014, p. 459).¹⁸

¹⁸ This point will become more relevant in the discussion on community foundations. Indeed, scholars like Atibil (2014), Wilkinson-Maposa et al (2005), and Malombe (2000), criticise the obsession with the promotion of American style community foundations at the neglect of African models of giving. This theme is well captured in reports of community foundations where, for instance in Egypt, a country with rich cultural-religious traditions of giving and charity, is said not to have any giving culture (WINGS, 2008). On the contrary, the Egyptian CIVICUS CSI report notes ‘Irrespective of the type of social giving in question, what is evident is that Egyptians’ sense of passion and/or duty in charitable giving is greatly sustained and nurtured by religious sentiment. The challenge in the future may be how to encourage Egyptians to make charitable donations for non-charitable purposes’ (CDS, 2006, p. 25). But some of the promoters of Western-style have chosen to ignore this evidence. The same is seen, for example, in the assessments of the environment for civil society in Africa by the USAID CSO sustainability Index (2014) report that claims that the financial sustainability of civil society in Sub-Saharan African countries is constrained because it depends on external funding. However, the reality here is that such constraint is dependent on the fact that NGOs (the only category that the Index looks at) are

The net import of the dominant vertical giving bias in the conception of philanthropy, Payton and Moody (2008, p. 20 as cited in Atibil 2014, p. 458) argue, is that:

We make a mistake in measuring the scale and scope of philanthropy if we neglect or forget about the pervasive, character-shaping good works that are immediate, direct or personal...the domain of traditional benevolence, love of neighbor, civility, and tolerance.... We must think of philanthropy as encompassing both the spontaneous, individual acts of kindness and the planned, organized efforts that ensure acts of kindness are not ineffective or short-lived”.

Moreover, as Frumkin (2006, p. 5) argues, ‘there has never been a precise moment when charity was displaced by philanthropy.’

What is specific about traditional African philanthropy?

While philanthropic behaviour is universal, it is shaped by ‘social, economic, historical, and cultural conditions of a people ...each tradition or culture has its own unique characteristics and each its own manner of setting the parameters for the occasion of giving, for what is to be given, who is to give, and who is to receive’ (Atibil, 2014, p. 459). The question then is what are the specificities of philanthropy in African contexts? How have social, economic, historical, and cultural conditions in Africa shaped the nature of philanthropy? These are important questions especially because African social, economic, historical, and cultural influences on the varieties of giving behaviour are not limited to what is popularly referred as informal or traditional African philanthropy; they also influence practices in the formal. As Muthuri and Gilbert (2010, p. 478) argue:

African values of community spirit and social responsibility define the type of behaviour that is deemed appropriate for companies operating in Kenya and to remain legitimate, companies must respond to different stakeholders’ needs and expectations (see Ngondi-Houghton, 2006). ... It would be unthinkable for corporations not to conform to these values and norms as their legitimacy would be questioned (see also Muthuri, et al., 2008).

themselves a foreign category in Africa. If the USAID Index cared to look into the operations of the many so-called informal groups like *chama*’s in Kenya, which operate as mutual aid without any external support or funding and are self-sustaining, the picture would be very different. This points to the inability of some of these tools in giving a comprehensive picture of philanthropy as a social phenomenon in Africa and with it, their neglect or marginalisation of the indigenous in the search for Africa’s development solutions (Mammo, 1999; Atibil, 2014, p. 459).

Atibil (2014) provides a useful framework of the key features that distinguish traditional forms of African philanthropy (and which by extension, have influenced contemporary philanthropy in Africa) from the vertically oriented dominant Western conception. The framework is especially useful for answering the questions posed above. From her analysis, traditional forms of African philanthropy are separate from their manifestations elsewhere on three key parameters: Reciprocity and counter-obligation; interpersonal, face-to-face character devoid of the intermediation prevalent in Western/modern-day institutionalized/formal philanthropic activities; and strong connections to place and people.

To Atibil's characterisation, I would add a fourth variable, as another key defining feature of the indigenous forms of African philanthropy; its horizontal nature. In what follows, I explain how these shape the nature of philanthropy in Africa. This framework, it needs to be noted, describes what some have referred to as traditional African philanthropy. Nonetheless, as we shall see later in this paper, contemporary manifestations of philanthropy exhibit both the traditional as well as what a decade and so ago was inherently a Western perspective, illustrating that there has been cross-cultural fertilization in contemporary African philanthropic behaviour.

Reciprocity and counter-obligation

Following Feierman (1998), Everatt et al. (2005) Moyo (2005) Hyden (2006; 1983; 1980), MacLean (2010), and Wilkinson-Maposa et al (2005), Atibil (2014) argues that there is an underlying understanding of reciprocity (a quid pro quo like-situation) and counter-obligation, 'even as givers do not literally expect gifts to be directly returned' (Everatt, et al., 2005, p. 280; Fowler, 2016). This is because, as Moyo (2005, p. 54) notes, the 'responsibilities for welfare and well-being' in traditional African societies were communal and 'found expression in reciprocal and redistributive relationships where [tackling] poverty was a social responsibility' for all. Fowler (2016, p. 5), citing Beinhocker (2005, p. 121), traces this trait of African giving culture to a long history of our human ancestors 'living in small bands for which cooperative behaviour and survival were highly correlated. Today, people inhabit networks of social survival.... We are all better if we help each other out.' Arguing along the same lines, Nxumalo (2013), citing Graça Machel, argues that 'African philanthropy is about solidarity, not hand-outs from obscenely rich elites.'¹⁹ This is because

¹⁹ It is important to note the obvious normative bias in this. As already noted, there are many instances of philanthropic giving in Africa as elsewhere in the world where solidarity is not really the motive, and even when

African societies thrive on the basis of what Hyden (2006; 1983) calls the ‘economy of affection’. For Hyden (1983, p. 82), ‘economy of affection’ refers to “‘a network of support, communications, and interactions amongst structurally defined groups connected by blood, kin, community, and other affinities, for example, religion” which tend to be *ad hoc* and informal, rather than regular and formalized’ (cited in Everatt, et al. 2005, p. 280). Ngondi-Houghton (2006; 2004) argues that the African economy of affection survived the turmoil of colonization, post-colonial compromises, and the devastating results of imposed neoliberal economic policies (Manji, 2006). The economy of affection is prevalent because of either inability, or in some cases, total absence of state or market mechanisms to provide social safety nets in some of the African communities. In such excluded communities, ‘the economy of affection and its informal institutions are among the key mechanisms by which resources are [mobilised,] allocated and redistributed and aids collective survival’ (Atibil, 2014, p. 460; Fowler, 2016).

The economy of affection is ‘informed by customary affinities and ties, networks that are relatively proximate, as well as through Diaspora resource channels that involve residence in other settings, cultures, life experiences, and sources of information and so on’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 30). In this context, the economy of affection is a self-sustaining system deployed by communities where, as Fowler (2016, citing Mauss, 1969, p. 3) argues:

gifts are a transaction of social caring, which is simultaneously bound up with self-interest in mutual survival and reproduction. In other words, what is treated as gifting are in fact acts of strong reciprocity. What are exchanged are not only material goods, wealth and personal property and items of economic value. To serve both collective and self-serving purposes, exchanges include: “... courtesies, entertainments, ritual, military assistance, women, children, dances and feasts; and fairs in which the market is but one element and the circulation of wealth but one part of a wide and enduring contract” (p. 9).

it could be a motive, there are ethical-moral questions on some of the givers, especially those that loot from the public and give part of their loot to the same or a different public. The same can be said of high network individuals who are mainly businessmen running corporations that sometimes are heavily exploiting poor people and the environment, but are also some of the highest givers on the continent. Indeed, there are way too many cases of African big men in politics and commerce with questionable credentials who are some of the big donors. There are also many cases of abuse of otherwise good practices of gifting to fuel corruption in public service, reported in countries like Kenya (see for example The Kenya Parliament *Hansard*, March 13, 2003, p. 446-465), parliamentary debate on the second reading of the *Public Officer Ethics Bill*, which illustrates some of the ills that befell the *harambee* spirit in Kenya.

Some scholars and practitioners have questioned whether activities and principles such as reciprocity inherently embedded in this ‘economy of affection’ and characterised by acts of survival and community based organisations, qualify to be labelled philanthropy, especially in view of the Western understanding of philanthropy as ‘altruism’ (Moyo, 2005, p. 54; Everatt, et al., 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Copeland-Carson, 2005; 2007). In this regard Moyo (2005, p. 54) for instance asks:

Are indigenous survival mechanisms, philanthropic acts or survival mechanisms to cope with the effects of poverty, state policies and other forms of iniquities? Can an argument be developed [for example] that ‘*stokvels*’ (stockfair) or ‘*amalimo*’ are philanthropic acts? Do people in these contexts give because they want to or because they must? Do they give because they are able to or do they give because the society coerces them to? Can people choose not to give?

Empirical examination of these questions lead Moyo (2005; 2010; 2011) as well as Everatt et al. (2005), and Wilkinson- Maposa, et al. (2005) among others, to conclude that in the African context, many of the actions within the economy of affection, are akin to philanthropic giving in the Western context. Such economy of affection-type giving and helping manifests, for example, as what Wilkinson- Maposa, et al. (2005) calls ‘philanthropy of community’ (which is sometimes erroneously referred to as the pervasive informal realm of African philanthropy). Philanthropy of community is horizontal and involves members of a community (especially the poor) giving help to each other (Mombeshora, 2004; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005).

There is no doubt that reciprocal and counter-obligation nature of philanthropic behaviour in Africa acts as a form of social insurance, an instrument for social safety net, and also a contemporary manifestation of collectivist coping mechanisms especially for marginalised African communities (Fowler, 2016; Habib, Maharaj and Nyar, 2008; Mati, 2016; Moyo, 2004). These reciprocal and counter-obligation practices have evolved as complex adaptive social system ‘driven by the pro-social principle of philanthropy ... [i.e.] caring for others - as an enduring human behaviour found across the world’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 3). Phrases like ‘*Umntu Ngumuntu Ngabantu*’ (you are because I am) in IsiZulu or ‘*mtu ni watu*’ (A person is, because of other people) in Kiswahili serve to capture these deeply embedded values and norms that one’s existence is ‘intrinsically linked to that of others’ (Moyo, 2011, p. 2). Atibil (2014), Ngcoya and Mottiar (2016), Wilkinson-Maposa, et al. (2005), among others,

acknowledge similar notions that individual wellbeing is interconnected and dependent on others for survival or advancement, and for the good of a common humanity.

This African worldview, captured in African philosophies of collective wellbeing such as *Ubuntu* in southern Africa (Moyo, 2005), *harambee*²⁰ in Kenya (Makhanu, 2006; Copeland-Carson, 2007), *ujamaa* in Tanzania (Moyo, 2005) *Umuganda* in Rwanda (CCOAIB, 2011), *twiza* in Morocco (Akesbi with Meknassi and Bouja, 2011), stress the importance of community, solidarity, caring, sharing and counter-obligation (Atibil, 2014; Feierman, 1998; Iliffe, 1987; Kunljian, 2005). Other indigenous African words used to describe what may constitute philanthropic activities throughout Africa include ‘*Qogelela* (savings) and *ilima/letsema*, *amalima* (cooperation) in Zimbabwe, *stokvels*²¹ and savings clubs or burial societies in South Africa, *Edir* and *Ikub* in Ethiopia (Salole, 1991). These terms describe cooperative interrelatedness web of mutual social responsibility among individuals in African societies.

Given these systems of survival and mutuality in many African societies, Kunljian (2005, p.7), citing Everatt and Solanki (2004), stresses the point that ‘much of what is termed philanthropy in a Western context is seen as an obligation and duty in many developing countries, including South Africa.’²² The *ubuntu* worldview, for instance, stresses that ‘one

²⁰ Sibilike Makhanu (2006, pp. 3-4) describes three types of *harambees*: 1) public, organized to supplement government public work projects; 2) private/personal for family-oriented needs; and 3) group, which includes fundraising for grassroots organizations and/or projects not related to government initiatives (cited in Copeland-Carson 2007, p. 9). ‘Among the many positive benefits of *harambees* noted by Makhanu are promotion of sharing and cooperation for development, supplement of government services, and support of vulnerable people. *Harambees*’ impact on Kenyan education is most notable. According to Makhanu, most students from poor backgrounds have been able to access primary, secondary, and college/university education through *harambees*. Many of these *harambees* are evolving into on-going funds called Constituency Educational Development *Harambees*. Recent controversy about the abuse of *harambees* for unscrupulous political or NGO fundraising has led to government efforts to regulate them as well as policies to both promote and regulate charitable activity’ (Copeland-Carson, 2007, p. 10).

²¹ *Stokvels* are similar to what Kenyans call *chama* or merry-go-rounds, which are essentially ‘a type of revolving fund organised for self or community-help groups formed by individuals to pull their resources together for the purpose of uplifting their standards of life (Copeland-Carson 2007, p. 10). In Africa, there have been ‘multiple attempts by international aid projects and governments to formalise these kinds of revolving pools into micro-credit and investment pools as well as philanthropy funds, although they have met with very mixed results’ (Siebel, 2000 cited in Copeland-Carson 2007, p.10; Weru, 2004). *Stokvels* are South African social-economic phenomena. Essentially, they are community-based revolving/rotational savings clubs used for individual or community development purposes. For a detailed discussion on how they work, please see Habib, Maharaj and Nyar (2008).

²² While this may seem like we end up with two clashing worldviews, it needs mention that the narrow definition of philanthropy in the West, as already seen, is a later-day adaptation because, even in ancient Greek cities, Bond (2011) argues, there was considerable pressure and obligation on the wealth to be philanthropic. She writes: ‘In Greek cities, many forms of philanthropy combined to strengthen urban culture. Most important were the civic duties rich men assumed either voluntarily or under heavy peer pressure. These responsibilities

can only fully experience one's own humanity by supporting others; and another person's suffering diminishes one's own humanity. As such, *ubuntu* denotes a profoundly dynamic process of interdependence underscored in the belief that 'true human potential can only be realized in partnership with others. In this way, philanthropic interactions are judged by how well they promote the mutual reinforcement of the self and the other in a community' (Mottiar and Ngcoya, 2016, p. 151).

The African indigenous pro-social practices such as *Ubuntu* operate on the basis of trust and reciprocity and are not always about just altruism. As Fowler (2016, p. 5), citing Beinhocker (2005, p. 419), argues:

Human beings are neither inherently altruistic or selfish; instead they are what researchers call *conditional co-operators* and *altruistic punishers*. ... a behaviour of *strong reciprocity* [...i.e.] a predisposition to cooperate with others and to punish ... those that violate the norms of cooperation ... People have a highly developed sense of whom they can trust and whom they cannot, to whom they owe favours and who owes favours to them, and whether they are being taken advantage of.

Some of the giving and gift exchange practices inherent in traditional African settings, as we shall see later, have been appropriated and institutionalized by modern-day philanthropic institutions in Africa (Fowler, 2016).

Horizontality

While modern as well as traditional forms of philanthropy arguably exhibit vertical elements, it follows from the notion of reciprocity and counter-obligation, that in traditional African contexts, no 'one is too poor to give or receive' (Atibil, 2014; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Everatt, et al., 2005; Kunljian, 2005). Wilkinson-Maposa et al (2005, p. x) among others argue that 'help between the poor is widespread, deeply embedded, morally grounded and operates as a vital element for both survival and progress.' It is neither random nor disorganized, but exists within proven, clear, unwritten, acculturated rules and punitive measures for non-compliance. A cardinal rule exists: 'if you have, you must give, no matter how little' – with adages such as, 'give so that you can be given to', 'I help those who help

obligated wealthy citizens to subsidise personally the cost of temples, city walls, armouries, granaries, and other municipal amenities promoting inhabitants' common identity and welfare. Prominent citizens vied with one another in the performance of these indiscriminate gifts to show the superiority of their own civic virtue. Personal vanity was a prime motive for donors, but rich citizens risked being ostracised by peers and plebeians alike if they failed to appreciate their wealth as a trust in which the community had a share' (<http://sofii.org/article/philanthropy-in-ancient-times-some-early-examples-from-the-mediterranean>). It follows from the foregoing that obligation has been a part of the tradition in philanthropy for a long time.

me’ (Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005, p. xi). It is believed that one’s humanity is tainted if another person’s humanity is not recognized. The existence of such unwritten rules are lived as a second nature and do not require conscious thinking and reinforces pro-social norms and codes of behaviour (Fowler, 2016, p. 4). In view of this, Wilkinson-Maposa, et al. (2005), insist that the poor do not place value on the quantity of assistance, but on the very act of giving and helping: ‘From a poor person’s point of view, their “community of help” is a needs-related network’ (p. x), which serves both survival and community developmental objectives.

The above observations are supported by the CIVICUS CSI studies in several countries, which show relatively high percentages of those interviewed indicating that they often donated to charitable goals. Much of this giving is of course to causes close (geographical, religious, ethnic, familial, etc.) to the givers. Atibil (2014) characterises this as the ‘African connection to place and people.’ Table 3 below, summarises these findings.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Table : 3 Charitable giving in select African countries

Country	Charitable giving among surveyed population (%)
Rwanda	84.80%
Guinea	87.80%
Egypt	62.00%
Ghana	57.30%
Mozambique	43.00%
Nigeria	79.00%
Uganda	72.00%
Senegal	86.40%
Sierra Leone	63.00%
Tanzania	59.00%

Source: CIVICUS CSI reports of the respective countries.

In presenting the case for why African philanthropy exhibits horizontality and reciprocal counter-obligation, Atibil argues:

Unlike Western notions of philanthropy in which wealthy individuals or well-endowed institutions make vertical, unidirectional, supposedly altruistic grants to

recipients without any expectations that the latter reciprocate in the future, African indigenous philanthropy is based on reciprocity ... and a fact that “much of what we need and value in life...can only be obtained from others. People depend on one another for such valued resources, and they provide them to one another through the process of exchange” (Hyden, 2006, p. 87). Giving (as well as receiving) in the African context is, therefore, not just meant to alleviate immediate material need, but also to build relationships between the giver and the recipient (Atibil, 2014, p. 460; see also Fowler, 2016).

It is in this context that Africans define ‘poor’ not in terms of money or extrinsic possessions, but in terms of social or biological ‘relatives’ (Moyo, 2011). In light of this, Moyo (2011) asserts that philanthropic expressions in Africa are multi-dimensional and include deeply-embedded social aspects of giving and helping culture (see also Moyo, 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005). This, according to Moyo (2005, p. 54), ‘dispels the myth that philanthropy or giving is the domain of the rich.’ Indeed, as Wilkinson-Maposa (2005), Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009), Wilkinson-Maposa et al. (2005) show, horizontal giving and self-help among the poor is one of the most widespread forms of indigenous African philanthropy, but is usually largely overlooked by many development approaches and contributions, because in the eyes of the dominant Western notions of philanthropy, the poor are not in the position to be philanthropists (see also Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008; Everatt, et al., 2005; Leigh et al, 2011).

Interpersonal, face-to-face interactions

Traditional/customary African philanthropy is characterized by interpersonal, face-to-face interactions between the giver and receiver, and is devoid of intermediation prevalent in Western institutionalized/formal philanthropic activities (Atibil, 2014; Feierman, 1998; Hyden, 2006; Knight, 2012). This is not to ignore evidence of some level of institutionalisation of philanthropy even in pre-colonial Africa as well articulated by Atibil (2014).²³ Fowler’s (2016) account of the adaptations of the customary into modern forms of giving since the colonial era is further evidence of this institutionalisation. Moreover, in contemporary times, it is also important to take note of the emergence of telecommunications

²³ Citing Feierman (1998), Atibil (2014, p. 461), argues that in pre-colonial traditional African societies, there existed ‘a variety of philanthropic institutions including healing societies that people joined not just to be healed but to learn how to heal others, sanctuaries and shrines for protecting the vulnerable, providing security for those seeking refuge from disasters, and for speaking truth to power on behalf of those in need.’

technology has taken root in intermediating giving in some countries such as Kenya. This is especially so because mobile/electronic money transfer platforms like M-Pesa have enabled people to give to others without the necessity of face-to-face interactions. These technologies might indeed turn out to be the future medium for giving in Africa. This is because it is far cheaper to transact through them than commercial banks; they have wider reach/coverage than other means of money transfers and are faster given their ability for real-time transfers even between countries.

Strong connections to place and people

Atibil (2014, p. 461) argues that ‘Africans are ...more likely to give to their own relatives (however distant), people who come from their place of origin, or people with whom they have some type of affiliation than to give to beneficiaries with whom they have little in common...’ (See also Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Fowler 2016, Tchouassi, 2011; Tchouassi and Sikod, 2010; Page, 2007; Page and Plaza, 2006). Fowler (2016, p. 9) argues that this characteristic of African helping and gifting can be traced to pre-colonial period and denoted a ‘complex, adaptive relational system ... gifting is an obligation tied to identities that underpin biological kinship and social belonging... gifting is a form of “obligatory altruism” that serves both cohesion and hierarchy.’ Indeed, there is some significant degree of obligation that exists and these practices are still found in modern day giving, because of a complex interplay of the past, the present, and future orientation of human relations in African societies (Fowler, 2016).

In their study in four Southern African countries (South Africa, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Namibia), Wilkinson-Maposa et al. (2005), for example, noted that the choice of who to help or seek assistance from, is based on the type of assistance sought and the proximity of the person (defined in terms of ‘physical presence, blood relationship and socio-economic similarity’ (p. x). More importantly, Wilkinson-Maposa et al (2005, p. x) reported that the nature of philanthropy at community levels reveals ‘altruism, reciprocity, and co-operation.’

Fowler (2016) provides a useful analytical explanation for the prevalence of forms of gifting among those people with prior affinities (e.g. kin and co-ethnics, etc.), which for him, can be found from the ways in which cultures act in “collective programming of the mind” (Hofstede, 1984, 1991), or in creating a *habitus* that structures ‘people’s pre-dispositions and schemata through which they interpret and ascribe value to what is happening to their lives

and the world around them’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 7).²⁴ Cultural modes of behaviour such as pro-social gifting therefore reflect ‘deeply grained, human nature with ‘innate’ personal world views, values and framing’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 7). Research in this regard by Hofstede (1991), for example, identifies reasons why in certain regions of Africa, especially West Africa (Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone) and east Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia), individuals are more ‘oriented towards collectivism and sensitivity to membership of a group’ (Hofstede, 1991 cited in Fowler, 2016, p. 7). From his reading of Hofstede (1991) Fowler (2016, p. 7) concludes that ‘with necessary cautions, Hofstede’s cultural profile of mutuality suggests that giving and gifting would be expected as prevalent relational norms on the continent.’

The connection to ‘place and people’ explains the phenomenon of hometown associations and diaspora philanthropy (Chazan, Lewis, Mortimer, Rothchild & Stedman, 1999; Orozco, Bump, Fedewa and Sienkiewicz, 2005; Uduku, 2002; Atibil, 2014; Fowler, 2016). Diaspora ‘remittances are finely targeted to recipients based on geo-ethnic origins and affinities. Fowler (2016, p. 22), as well as UNECA (2014), suggest that motivations for such remittances include pure altruism, exchange, investment, insurance and pure self-interest.’ Copeland-Carson (2006, p. 6) similarly noted that among migrants in the United States, philanthropic giving is higher among Africans, ‘reflecting their continuing commitment to aiding kin and community in countries of origin.’ This notion contradicts Western notions of philanthropy as pure altruism directed to others without necessarily expecting specific benefit to the giver (Everatt, et al., 2005; Smith, Stebbins, and Dover, 2006). Studies of Cameroonian hometown diaspora associations (see for example Tchouassi, 2011; Tchouassi and Sikod, 2010; Page, 2007; Page and Plaza, 2006), for example, show that the motivations for these associations to fund community development projects in places of origin of their members is driven both by reasons of altruism and obligation. Similarly, remittances by Kenyan diaspora in the US include mainly those directed ‘to extended family and hometown projects, grassroots practices such as giving circles, volunteer support, knowledge exchange networks, as well as institutional giving’ (Copeland-Carson, 2007. p. 2).

These diaspora giving behaviour and ‘practices do not fit neatly into established diaspora philanthropy definitions and theories’ (Copeland-Carson, 2007, p. 2). For example, in the

²⁴ French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1977; 1979) used *habitus* to refer to a system of dispositions through which people interpret and ascribe value to what is happening to their lives and the world around them. Such value dispositions are not static and can change/evolve over long periods of time.

Cameroonian case cited above, Tchouassi (2011) reports that diaspora hometown association's philanthropic projects benefits relatives of the members of these associations and by extension, the givers themselves. This happens because, when they for instance fund the building or equipping of a mortuary, they are in effect, investing in ensuring that there are good facilities to preserve bodies of the dead, who may be their relatives, or even themselves in future, as they await the elaborate funeral rites in Africa. In this regard, Tchouassi (2011, p. 489) writes that the Cameroonian diaspora hometown associations have 'driven the vogue for constructing mortuaries in many local areas... its two largest projects were the reconstruction of the water supply and the equipping of hospital and the mortuary.'

Tchouassi's (2011) observations on the Cameroonian diaspora associations corroborate similar findings of burial societies in Southern Africa (Habib, Maharaj and Nyar, 2008; Moyo, 2004). Habib, Maharaj and Nyar (2008, p. 26), following Moyo (2004) for instance, have written:

Burial societies are ...expression(s) of the intersection of economic necessity and associational giving traditions. Funeral costs are generally high in black communities because of the belief that burial has to take place in the land of the ancestors, which is the area where the person was born ... Burial societies have also assumed greater importance in the lives of poor people in the context of increasing fluidity and flexibility of borders due to high unemployment and conflict in the region as a whole. For example, there are a number of burial societies formed by Zimbabwean refugees living in South Africa, who pool money and other resources in order to transport the dead back to their home country...

The treatment of the role of diaspora remittance practices, though, is a particularly controversial issue in literature on philanthropy in Africa. Some scholars discount their philanthropic nature and treat them as purely an economic transaction. Nonetheless, others portray them as an altruistic form of philanthropy (see for example Copeland-Carson, 2007 Mukwedeya, 2009; 2012; Tchouassi, 2011; Tchouassi & Fondo, 2010). These scholars offer useful insights, historical contexts, key trends and profiles of the various social customs and institutions and treat them as constitutive of philanthropic aspects of remittances by the African diaspora. Indeed, while most diaspora remittances are mainly used for household consumption and investment, reducing the severity of deprivation and poverty, they have also 'become a major source of financing for developing countries and are particularly important

in Sub-Saharan Africa' (Fowler, 2016, p. 21). As such, irrespective of the ways they are viewed, there is no denying the fact that diaspora remittances are increasingly shaping the nature of development such as social welfare provisioning and even more transformative infrastructure developments on the continent.

In 2008 for instance, an estimated US\$ 40 billion were transferred as diaspora remittances to Africa (World Bank, 2011). A UN study in 2006 estimated that in the period 2000-2003 remittances from Africans working abroad 'averaged about \$17 billion per annum virtually overtaking foreign direct investment flows, which averaged about \$15 billion per annum during the same period' (cited in Copeland-Carson, 2007, p. 6). In 'the 1980s, international remittances covered 80 per cent of the current account deficit in Botswana; they were equal to almost three-quarters of total commodity export earnings in Sudan; and constituted more than half of Lesotho's foreign exchange earnings' (de Haan, 2000 cited in Copeland-Carson, 2007, p. 6; see also Adelman, 2009; Osili and Du, 2005; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007 for similar analysis of the role of private remittances from the United States migrants to various developing countries).

Some scholars have argued that 'remittances are thought to be more effective than either international aid or foundation grants in lifting people out of poverty' (Copeland-Carson, 2007, p. 4). In a study of Glen Norah, a poor high-density neighbourhood in Harare, Zimbabwe, for instance, Tatenda Mukwede (2009; 2011; 2012) reported that remittances were the 'saving grace' for poor families facing diminished livelihood options due to widespread unemployment occasioned by the country's socio-political and economic collapse. Similar observations are made by UNECA (2014, p. 16), which notes that while diaspora remittances may be only a small proportion of sub-Saharan African countries GDP, they 'may amount to a large share of the income of recipient households and may therefore have a substantial impact on the stability of these households' income and play a role in insuring the families against transitory shocks to income.' Reflecting on the role of diaspora remittances, Copeland-Carson (2007, p. 3) notes that dismissing them as non-philanthropic, would 'inhibit our ability to promote their role in equitable development' in the continent. Fowler (2016, p. 22) adds that because diaspora remittances as sources of development 'resourcing blends the values of accumulation and surplus generation with those of customary obligations...they need to be explored as potential pathways to local resource mobilization beyond kith and kin and for agendas that expand beyond provision of social welfare.'

While primarily benefiting people from their places of origin, the impacts of these diaspora philanthropic activities are also felt in host countries. As noted by Copeland-Carson (2007, p. 6):

A contemporary trend in U.S. African diaspora philanthropy is the creation of formal non-profit institutions, many of which combine services and giving, in some ways resembling a culturally specific operating foundation.... Others transcend ethnic or tribal affiliations and provide a conduit for the increasing interest in African-oriented transnational giving (also see Copeland-Carson 2004). They also provide a means for the U.S.- and African-based non-profits to tap into the growing wealth of the U.S. African diaspora. Furthermore, these cross-cultural and transnational partnerships provide an increased pool of intellectual capital for philanthropic learning and exchange, reviving dying grassroots, African-derived philanthropic practices among African-Americans and others such as various types of giving circles and exposing African immigrants to the intricacies and opportunities of U.S. institutional philanthropy.

The indigeneity of African philanthropy

An emergent theme in some of the more recent works on the conceptualisation of contemporary African philanthropy is the question of its indigeneity. Here, the debate is whether the terms *African philanthropy* and *philanthropy in Africa* are synonymous (see for example, Mati, 2016; Mati and Russell, 2013; Fowler, 2016, Moyo, 2010). It is in this context that Fowler asks the question, cited at the beginning of the conceptual discussion in this review: ‘is there a distinctive African philanthropy or a generic philanthropy with African characteristics?’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 8). In answering this question, Moyo (2010, p. 260) has argues:

Some writers have preferred to call the horizontal forms of philanthropy (or giving) “African philanthropy” or “philanthropy with African characteristics”. Is there a difference between these two definitions, though? “African philanthropy” would perhaps imply philanthropic action that is specific and unique to Africa, and researchers in the continent have made some attempts to define the very essence of this type of philanthropy: it is mainly indigenous and usually informal, although there have been movements towards institutionalising some of its forms.

Following Moyo (2010), Mati (2016) as well as Mati and Russell (2013) argue that philanthropy in Africa should be ‘defined on the basis of whether it is primarily ‘by and for’ Africans, or if it is just ‘for Africans’. For Mati (2016) and Mati and Russell (2013) African philanthropy refers to philanthropic activities “by and for” Africans and is marked by the mobilisation of local, national, and also external/transnational resources by Africans for the benefit of Africans.

While African philanthropy and philanthropy for Africa are distinct, there is, a thin line between the two as they often intersect and in many instances, are mutually reinforcing. This is especially so when one looks at the contemporary formal African philanthropy, which has, sometimes, been stimulated by philanthropy for Africa by organisations such as the Ford Foundation, Charles Mott Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation, The Foundation Centre, The European Foundation Centre, Charities Aid Foundation (CAF), Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS), and even the World Bank. In view of this, Fowler (2016, p. i) argues that complex social, cultural economic, political, linguistic and other processes have led to ‘a contemporary African landscape where gifting is expressed through three institutionalised gifting practices: endogenous, exogenous and blended.’ Fowler (2016, p. 8-26) continues to offer a useful analytic frame for these three (endogenous, exogenous and blended) manifestations of gifting practices in Africa. Fowler analyses changes within these frames chronologically over time-bound stages starting with the ‘precolonial; colonial penetration; post-colonial self-assertion; and New Age gifting starting around the beginning of this Millennium’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 8). From his analysis, Fowler (2016, p. 8-9) argues that

Africa’s externally enforced incorporation into the world order brought with it foreign norms, ideas, institutions and practices of gifting. Over some three hundred years African philanthropy today has evolved as a plural, layered system of gifting that includes mixes and blending of endogenous and exogenous practices.... each era contains what preceded them. In other words, gifting on the continent is built up from complicated overlays rather than practices being completely left behind in one area as the next takes hold.

Accordingly, to understand “African philanthropy” (by and for Africa), we cannot overlook “philanthropy for Africa” – (for Africa by others) (Mati, 2016).

Motivations: Why do Africans give?

Existing literature identifies faith/religious obligation, mutual aid, solidarity and counter-obligation, altruism, empathy, generosity, institutional requirements on corporate bodies, and institutional arrangements in the development process as the underpinnings of giving behaviour in Africa. We discuss in details these motivations below.

Religious/faith motivations for giving

One of the recurrent explanations in existing literature on motivations for giving of both material things and time (volunteering) in Africa, as elsewhere in the world, is religious-motivation (see for example Action Aid Nigeria, DevNet, CIVICUS and UNDP, 2007; CDS, 2006, CNOSCG, 2011; Copeland-Carson, 2007; Darkwa, Amponsah and Evans Gyampoh, 2006; el-Daly, 2012; 2007; Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008; Everatt, et al., 2005; FONGTO, 2006; Fowler, 2016; Forum Civil 2011; ForDIA, 2011; Zuki, 2012). This is consistent with explanations for motivations of philanthropic giving and volunteerism elsewhere in the world (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2007).²⁵ It is easy to see why this is the case. Africa has high levels of religiosity. The 2010-14 wave of the World Values Survey, for instance, shows that on average, 79.3% of those interviewed in Algeria, Ghana, Libya, Morocco, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Tunisia and Egypt, indicated that religion was very important in their lives. The table below summarises the responses to this question in these countries.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Table 4: Importance of religion to Africans in select African countries.

	Very important	Rather important	Not very important	Not at all important
Algeria	90.7	6.7	1.2	0.9
Ghana	91.1	7.4	1.5	0
Libya	94.9	3	0.3	0.1
Morocco	88.9	9.8	0.8	0.2
Nigeria	89.8	7.7	1.8	0.7
Rwanda	40.3	32	24.2	3.5
South Africa	55.8	28.1	9.8	4.8
Zimbabwe	83.5	12.1	3.7	0.7
Tunisia	95.4	2.7	1	0.6
Egypt	94.1	5.7	0	0.1
Mean	79.3	13.4	5.1	1.6

Source: WVS (2010-14). The relevant survey question asks how important religion is to the interviewee.

²⁵ For a detailed bibliography of research dealing with the linkages between religion and pro-social giving, please see Bekker and Wiepking's (2007) literature review of generosity and philanthropy.

Similarly, Afrobarometer (2014-5) data shows that approximately 89.3% of Africans in 36 countries are religious and practice religion. Religion plays a huge role in giving behaviour. In Togo, for instance, the CIVICUS CSI report noted that 25% of the population that are religious donate to charity regularly (FONGTO, 2006). In Egypt, the CIVICUS CSI report indicated that 62.3% of those who volunteered indicated that they do so as a religious duty (CDS, 2006). Table 5 below summarises the Afrobarometer findings on religiosity of Africans.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Table 5: Percentage of religious never practicing, religious practicing, and non-religious Africans.

Country	Religious but never practices religion (%)	Practices religion (%)	No religion (%)
Algeria	4.9	92.1	0.3
Botswana	12.6	79.6	7.8
Burundi	13.7	85.5	0.5
Cameroon	7.2	90.1	1.3
Cape Verde	26.1	67.1	6
Benin	7.5	91.5	0.8
Gabon	1.6	85.3	12.4
Ghana	7.7	88.2	2.6
Guinea	0.7	98.3	0.9
Côte d'Ivoire	8.6	86.1	5.4
Kenya	3	95.6	1.3
Lesotho	10.3	88.1	1.4
Liberia	10.1	86.1	0.7
Madagascar	7	89.1	3.9
Malawi	5.6	93.5	0.8
Mali	1	92.4	4.1
Mauritius	3.4	96.3	0.2
Morocco	20.5	77.4	0
Mozambique	10.4	75.3	5.9
Namibia	4.4	94.6	1.1
Niger	12.2	86.5	1.4
Nigeria	1.9	95.2	1.6
Sao Tome and Principe	4.2	84.9	8.2

Senegal	0.6	99.2	0.3
Sierra Leone	5.1	93.4	0.5
South Africa	2.5	87.4	7.4
Zimbabwe	5.3	88.2	6
Sudan	9.4	88.1	0.6
Swaziland	4.1	93.8	1.9
Togo	6.3	91	2.4
Tunisia	10.9	88.4	0.2
Uganda	2.1	97	0.9
Egypt	11.6	85.7	0.5
Tanzania	5.1	91.7	3
Burkina Faso	3.6	95.2	1.2
Zambia	2.1	96.6	0.4
Average/total	7.04	89.30	2.61

Source: Afrobarometer 2014-15 wave.

While pro-social habits predate organised religion, religion and faith have been important instruments in ‘hard wiring’, reinforcing, and standardising ‘pro-social behaviour such as gifting and caring, as a foundational feature of people's lives’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 5).²⁶ All modern-day major world faiths found in Africa (i.e. Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Judaism, Sikhism, Jainism, and the Baha’i) have moral imperatives of *caritas* (love for others) habits among their tenets (Fowler, 2016; Everatt, et al., 2005; Copeland-Carson, 2007; Bekkers and Wiepking, 2007). Bowman (2009, p. 1163) captures the influence of religion on pro-social behaviours such as philanthropy and giving when he wrote that ‘it is impossible to tell the story of philanthropy without reference to [religious-induced] charity in its more poor-focused, self-sacrificial sense.’²⁷ This is because religious institutions such as churches and mosques feature prominently as philanthropy’s intermediating institutions even for those in the diaspora (Copeland-Carson, 2007; Mombeshora, 2004). Among Christians for instance, charity or “love in action,” and tithing are obligatory forms of giving mandated by the Bible from early Christian traditions (Bowman, 2009). Along the same lines, Muslims ‘are obliged to contribute 2.5% of their yearly income toward community improvement, especially supporting those who are indigent (Everatt, et al., 2005, p. 280). *Waqf*, which are institutionalised forms of philanthropic endowments among Muslims, have also been important institutions in the provision of social welfare services throughout Islamic history

²⁶ In this regard, Bekkers and Wiepking (2007, p. 6) for example, cite a long list of studies that illustrate a positive relationship between religiosity with both secular and religious philanthropic giving.

²⁷ This, arguably, does not include gifting. Ontologically, gifting can be explained without reference to religion. I am grateful to Alan Fowler for alerting me to this.

(Zuki, 2012). Among the Hindus, 'generosity, hospitality, philanthropy, and charity' are important hallmarks of their faith (Everatt, et al. 2005, p. 280). *Tzedalah* in Judaism obligates the Jewish people to provide for the indigent, both Jews and non-Jews.

It follows therefore, that Africans give motivated by the different faiths that they profess. A study by Habib, Maharaj and Nyar (2008, p. 28) in South Africa, for example, reported:

...faith-based philanthropy is the single largest component of South African giving. Of the 89 per cent of respondents who profess some sort of religious belief, 96 per cent gave money, time and goods. This figure dropped to 80 per cent for atheists. Eighty per cent of respondents gave to religious institutions, while organisations of the poor followed at a distant second with 29 per cent of respondents privileging them with their resources (See also Everatt, et al., 2005; Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008 for similar arguments/findings).

The CIVICUS Civil Society Index (CSI) studies in several African countries (including Ghana, Guinea, Egypt, Uganda, and Togo) also revealed that most of charitable giving by citizens in these countries goes to religious institutions. In Guinea, for instance, 87.8 per cent of those interviewed reported that they regularly gave to mosques and churches and to private individuals anonymously (CNOSCG, 2011). In Egypt, a survey by Centre for Development Services (2004) reported in the 2006 CIVICUS CSI report noted:

Charity-givers were primarily driven by religious motives...as charity was seen as a religious duty or obligation. The most common forms of charitable donations stemming from a religious ethos comprise *Zakat* ...Almost all charity givers had made *Zakat* contribution (93%) and contributed to *Zakat el fitr* (92%), which is distributed during Ramadan (CDS, 2006, p. 24).

The same report indicated that another 46.4% of Egyptians reported having made the *Zakat el Mal* tithing. In 2004, Egyptians on average donated about 1.95 per cent of their net worth with about '86% of charity givers donating *sadaka* [voluntary charitable giving], mostly of a financial kind' (CDS, 2006, p. 25).

Moreover, many religious institutions in Africa have a development focus. They have historically been at the core of the establishment of welfare institutions such as orphanages, old age homes, healthcare and educational facilities throughout Africa from the colonial to the contemporary period (Atibil, 2014; Campbell, 1998; Copeland-Carson, 2007; Habib,

Maharaj and Nyar, 2008; Jacobs, 1982; Mati, 2015). The study by Habib, Maharaj, and Nyar (2008, p. 28) in South Africa cited earlier, for example, reported,

... despite the fact that South Africans privilege religious institutions in their giving, their primary motivation is to alleviate poverty. ... Respondents in the survey defined children and youth, HIV/AIDS and the poor as the primary stakeholders deserving of support. Respondents thus gave to religious institutions in the belief that it would be directed to worthy individuals who were confronted with hardships. This is disconcerting since, as ...a significant proportion of this giving is actually used for the reproduction of the religious institutions themselves.²⁸

Religion does not impact only on material or monetary giving, but also on volunteering. As comparative data on volunteering around the world by WVS (2000-2004) show, the highest percentage (41.1%) of volunteering in Africa went to religious organisations compared to 16 per cent sports or 13 per cent cultural organisations.

Moreover, faith and religion, as Fowler argues, are important variables for understanding the emergence of non-reciprocal forms of gifting in Africa:

The strong reciprocity in giving, which characterised the continent in the long past, was overlaid by colonial penetration. For economic and political reasons, the advent of colonial rule brought non-reciprocal gifting, such as charity, into the African relational landscape. The effects of the dualism of giving as mutual solidarity and gifting as ‘other serving’ is a pluralising feature of African Philanthropy... (Fowler, 2016, p. 7).

Such nonreciprocal giving is most prevalent within giving that is motivated by faith and religious reasons. Most of this, especially among Muslims, is also discreet and happens at a direct person-to-person level. Part of the reason for this, as the Togolese CIVICUS CSI report indicates, is because there is an Islamic religious dictum that ‘*When the right hand gives, the left hand shouldn’t know*’ (FONGTO, 2006, p. 28). Similar sentiments were expressed in the CIVICUS CSI report which stated:

‘With respect to the preferred channel for disbursing aid, the survey indicated that charity- givers were more likely to disburse aid directly to individuals in need rather

²⁸ Similarly, the CIVICUS CSI report for Senegal notes that giving to religious institutions does not always result to improvement in collective or public wellbeing such as advancement of democracy or good governance. Rather, due to the ‘considerable power of these religious organisations, donations to these institutions serves class interests rather than society as a whole (Forum Civil, 2011, p. 27).

than through a CSO (64% compared to 15%). One of the reasons explaining this preference lies in the salient socio-religious concept, that charity should be disbursed discreetly and privately, to be seen only by God, and second, to avoid social embarrassment for the recipient (CDS, 2006, p. 24).

To conclude, religion and faith have been key apparatuses of the continent's complex repertoire of experiences and lived geo-historical contexts and have generated 'a variety of institutions understood as patterns of rules and norms that are generated from and, in return, influence the behaviours from which they emerge as a never ending process of societal unfolding' (Fowler, 2016, p. 1).

Class, ethnicity, and giving in Africa

In addition to faith and religiosity, class, race and ethnicity have also been considered in studies of philanthropy in Africa as elsewhere in the world (see for example Bekkers and Wiepking, 2007). Existing literature has conflicting messages. Some of it suggests that unlike in the North where white, middle class, slightly older women with a university education are more likely to give both time (volunteer) and money for a collective/community good (see for example, Andreoni, Brown and Rischall, 2003; Bekkers, 2004; Belfield and Beney, 2000; CAF, 2005; Jackson and Latané, 1981; cited in Bekkers and Wiepking, 2007), a different pattern seems to exist in the global South. A research by Everatt and Solanki (2004) that investigated individual levels of giving behaviour (including volunteer time) among South Africans, for instance, found that poor non-white (Black and those of Indian descent) people are more likely to volunteer (Everatt and Solanki, 2004). Although race differences were small, people of Indian descent, followed by Black respondents seem to be most likely to give time, money, or goods to a cause or an individual. Importantly, poor and non-poor respondents were equally likely to give (Everatt and Solanki, 2008, p. 50) – interestingly, poor respondents and respondents from rural areas were more likely to volunteer than non-poor or respondents from urban areas (Everatt and Solanki, 2008, p.58). Poor respondents were also more likely to have given money to causes, charities, and organisations, albeit smaller sums of money (Everatt and Solanki, 2008, p. 54).

In another study from Southern Africa, by VOSESA, on patterns of service and volunteering in South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, and Malawi, Patel, et al. (2007) found that the patterns of volunteering are fairly different from social service volunteering in

industrialised countries in the global North, where those who volunteer their time or give money are generally more affluent than the beneficiaries. Specifically, this study found that in Southern Africa, where poverty is so prevalent, volunteering is largely the domain of the poor. Similarly, Wiechowska (2007), who explores voluntary participation of young women in poor urban neighbourhoods in Zambia and South Africa, reported that the hope that taking part in volunteering would open doors for employment in the future, was a motive for getting engaged in volunteering. This points at egotistic motivations for giving time. Nonetheless, the community benefits from such actions.

On the other hand, Mati (2016, p.10) argues that socioeconomic class and religion are less determinants of who gets involved in philanthropic activities across the different African countries. This is because,

African philanthropy is broadly practiced by diverse religious and socioeconomic groups and classes, in different parts of Africa, be they visible or not to us as researchers. Various aspects of philanthropy, including giving through recognised charities and NGOs as well as organic acts of reciprocity that are part of everyday life practices that may emanate from human impulses that privilege a collective life philosophy are a reality throughout Africa. In this regard, Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009, p. x) have observed that ‘the relative neglect of the poor, as agents of change brought about through their own acts of giving and receiving, points to a critical paradox’ of current development approaches that need to be redressed. Indeed, the current findings point to the need to correct this situation. As Africa rises, the long-term sustainability of her development efforts must remain deeply embedded in the participation of all her people, irrespective of their socioeconomic status.

Moreover, when one looks at the proportion of giving relative to the givers' net worth, research in Africa shows that poor people give more than the wealthy (see for example Everatt and Solanki, 2004; 2008; Theunissen, 2003; Moyo, 2005; 2009a; 2009b; 2010; 2011, Moyo and Ramsamy, 2014; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al. 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009; ForDIA, 2011).²⁹ In Tanzania, for instance, a study by ForDIA (2011) indicates that ‘the rate of volunteering is high amongst job seekers.

In addition, the influence of gender and age variables on formal volunteering seems not to be clear-cut. Specifically, in the few countries where gender disaggregated data exists (e.g.

²⁹ The CIVICUS CSI report for Egypt cited earlier does not support this conclusion.

Ghana, Morocco, and Tanzania), there are conflicting findings. In Tanzania, ForDIA (2011, p. 30) reported that ‘youth and women organisations are noted as having more members who tend to volunteer’. The Ghanaian CIVICUS CSI report noted:

57.3% of respondents donated money to charity in the previous year. The percentages varied widely depending on the community, the gender and the income bracket within which the survey was conducted. Respondents in peri-urban communities, females and those in the second highest income quintile were the most likely to have donated to charity in the past year; those in urban areas, men and the lowest income bracket were the least likely to have donated to charity’ (Darkwa, Amponsah and Evans Gyampoh, 2006, p.31).

The same report continues to indicate that men were more likely to volunteer than women. Specifically, 55 per cent men had volunteered at least once over the past year prior to the survey as compared to 44 per cent women (Darkwa, Amponsah and Evans Gyampoh, 2006). In Morocco, the CIVICUS CSI report indicated that the type of organisation most likely influences the likelihood of men and women as well as different age groups in volunteering as shown in Table 3 below which summarises the findings from the Moroccan CIVICUS CSI report.

[insert table 6 about here]

Table 6: Unpaid volunteering rates according to organisation type and age.

Type of organisation	Men	Women	Under 35	Over 35
Development organisations	4.60%	2.90%	4.30%	3.10%
Human rights organisations	0.90%	1.40%	1.30%	1.00%
Religious organisations	2.00%	1.90%	1.80%	2.10%
Sports or recreational organisations	9.10%	6.20%	10.70%	4.20%
Educational and or cultural organisations	6.90%	5.40%	7.60%	4.40%
Labour Unions	2.00%	0.20%	0.60%	1.60%
Political parties	1.50%		0.60%	0.80%
Environmental organisations	1.10%	0.90%	1.50%	0.50%
Professional associations	1.20%	1.10%	1.20%	1.10%

Humanitarian organisations and charities	2.20%	2.30%	1.60%	2.90%
--	-------	-------	-------	-------

Source: Akesbi with Meknassi and Bouja (2011, p.32-3).

Despite the evidence of the likelihood of more men being engaged in formal volunteering there is also evidence indicating that women are more likely to be involved in informal volunteering, especially in communities that have been hit hard by disease such as HIV/AIDS. This has led to a gendered ‘burden of care’ on women in such communities (see for example, Kipp, Nkosi, Laing and Jhangri, 2007; Ankitola, 2004).

Africa’s marginality, exploitation and global exclusion³⁰

Another driver for the prevalence of Africa’s pro-social behaviours such as giving, gifting and volunteering, emanates from the contradictions or the paradox of Africa’s exploitation from the colonial penetration and post-colonial marginalisation of and extraction from Africa's economies to the present day (e.g. illicit financial flows and tax avoidance). This marginalization, exploitation and exclusion have been and remain a key driver of mutual aid and gifting practices as a necessary way of life for Africans. Moreover, the very ‘denial’ of Africa's modernization by its position in the global economy and unfair trade regimes, a minimal contribution to global GDP, and the patronage politics that are abetting corruption, have maintained alternative economic modelling for a significant proportion of the population, which feeds substantial gifting resources out of the eye and reach of outsiders. Visible, formal philanthropy is loud but small by economic comparison (e.g., diaspora financing is already dwarfing official aid and it is set to increase).

Spheres of African philanthropic activities

The spheres of philanthropic activities in Africa can be analytically presented in four quadrants as shown in figure 1 below. While each quadrant represents a distinct form of philanthropic behaviours, the exact activities may not always strictly fit in a single category. This is because of overlaps between the different forms of philanthropy in Africa.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

Figure 1: *Spheres of African philanthropic activities*³¹

³⁰ I am grateful to Alan Fowler for pointing this to me.

Individual (traditional and modern) Foundations Horizontal, Reciprocal counter-obligation; interpersonal, face-to-face Strong connections to “place and people”. Vertical e.g. HNWI. (Expressed as One to one; one to many (AGN, 2013))	Institutions (contemporary) Waqf funds, foundations, formal, intermediation (different types of foundations); diaspora philanthropic organisations (Expressed as Many to one; Many-to-many (AGN, 2013))
Informal Horizontal, Reciprocal counter-obligation; interpersonal, face-to-face character devoid of intermediation and Strong connections to “place and people”. (Expressed mainly One to one; many to one (AGN, 2013))	Formal Waqf funds, foundations (Western/ modern-day institutionalized/formal philanthropic activities; different types of foundations); diaspora philanthropic organisations (Expressed as Many to one; Many-to-many, One to many (AGN, 2013))

Some African philanthropic activities contradict, while others also conform to those in the West. For instance, unlike the West where philanthropic giving is said to be mainly a preserve of the economically well off (Donati, 2003; Olson, 1965; Brown, Kenny and Turner, 2000; Becker, 1974; Wright, 2001; Salamon, 1995; The Report of the Wolfenden Committee, 1997), in Africa, the poor and the wealthy alike, as we have already seen, are equally active in giving (Everatt, et al., 2005; Moyo, 2005; 2009a; 2009b; 2010; 2011; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al., 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler, 2009). At the same time, contemporary African philanthropy is constantly being shaped by the plurality of socioeconomic, political and cultural changes in Africa and elsewhere.

As a result, we today have an emergent form of philanthropy in Africa that borrows heavily from the West as well as others that are essentially hybrids blend from African and Western traditions of charitable giving. Some of these, as already noted, are products either of institutionalised religious obligations, institutional requirements on corporate bodies, or of institutional arrangements in the development process that have catalysed the emergence of

³¹ These spheres are also compared with the African Grant Makers network (AGN, 2013) framework for categorising forms of philanthropic giving in Africa. The AGN typology of giving includes **One to One; One to Many; Many to Many; and Many to One**. ‘**One to one** giving covers the many acts of individual generosity among extended family and friends that cement social bonds.... **One to Many** is the category that best describes traditional definitions of philanthropy, which are characterized by large gifts from wealthy individuals towards causes that they care about but not beneficiaries that are directly linked to them, or at least not solely linked to them.... **Many to Many** involves mobilizing resources from a larger group of individual givers towards a shared cause or objective that does not directly impact their immediate circle. The category describes an initiative to get many individuals to pool resources and then support a cause similar to that in the previous category.... **Many to one** looks at situation where multiple givers are mobilized in support of a cause or individual that directly affects or is linked to them. Thus a community of whatever description raises funds to meet a need facing some subset of its members...’ (AGN 2013, pp. 7-8). For a detailed description of these typologies see AGN (2013) *Sizing the field: Frameworks for a new narrative of African Philanthropy*. Johannesburg: African Grantmakers Network & Southern Africa Trust.

an aided philanthropic sector in Africa. In view of these developments, Fowler (2016, p. 1) recently argued that an African narrative of its philanthropy must therefore be located,

within an institutional interpretation of the evolution of people's generosity when endogenous practices interact with external ideas, norms and economic systems which are imposed by brute force and co-optation. This process has given rise to a particular plurality of 'gifting' practices...

The net effect of the interactions between the endogenous and exogenous practices has been an increasing plurality of contemporary institutions and mechanisms that serve philanthropic purposes in sub-Saharan Africa. These include, as Atibil (2014, p. 457) points out, 'the extended family, labor pools, revolving community funds, rotating savings and credit schemes, the "*harambee*" movement in Kenya, *stokvels* in Southern Africa, and burial societies...' (See also Makhanu, 2006; Copeland-Carson, 2007). Nonetheless, heavily influenced by Western notions of who gives and the agendas of those who fund research in Africa, priority in both research as well as emphasis on contemporary philanthropy seems often to be given to 'modern and formal institutions of philanthropy at the expense of the informal ones. Even when there is an encounter between the two types, formal and institutionalised philanthropy often overrides everything else' (Moyo, 2010, p. 260). The 'modern' forms of philanthropy, popularly referred in the literature as *formal philanthropy*, are driven by institutions such as Islamic religious endowments known as *waqf*, foundations of various forms, corporations, federations, gift funds, trusts, and community chests (Lenkowsky, 2002; Moyo, 2010). Of these, foundations are the most prominent and include private independent foundations, operating foundations, community foundations, and corporate foundations (Atibil, 2014).

Figure 2 below captures the key feature of these various foundations. Following this, I explain what these forms of institutions of philanthropy are, as well as how they manifest.

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

Figure 2: Classification of foundations (constructed from Atibil, 2014).

Private Independent foundations.

These are ‘endowed institutions that make grants to charitable organizations using the interest from their investments.’

Operating foundations

Use interest on their endowments to fund programmes carried out by their own staff (i.e. the foundation does development work itself)

Community foundations.

Solicit their funds from residents of a particular geographical area (city, region, or country).³²

Corporate foundations.

Funded by corporate profits or endowment interest.

A key feature of these formal philanthropic organisations (arguably except, to a lesser degree, the community foundations) is their vertical character. These are often explained as manifesting in the rich giving to or helping the poor. At their worst, these have been criticised as a ‘form of disempowerment for the poor. The rich are made patrons for the poor, and yet the poor are philanthropic too...’ (Moyo, 2010, p. 263). Here, unlike the traditional forms of African philanthropy, greater emphasis is paid to the benevolence of the wealthy in Africa as well as from outside the continent, donating to charitable causes in African communities. Philanthropic giving in this case mainly takes the form of what AGN (2013) labels ‘**One to Many**’ where usually, high net worth individuals utilise private foundations to make donations to beneficiaries outside immediate personal circles.

The motivations as well as scope for some of these wealthy individuals in Africa to give have attracted some analytical attention, especially from practitioners. Among these are, for example, reports such as BoE Private Clients (2011). *The Giving Report 2010*; the Nedbank Private Wealth (2013) *The Giving Report II*; The Forbes report (2013) on the *most generous philanthropists in Africa in 2012*; Julien, Mahomed and Samuels (2014) report *Africa’s Wealthy Give Back*; ‘A new era for African philanthropy.’

These types of reports reinforce Western notions that the rich have surplus assets and resources to dispense through philanthropic giving to less resourced individuals or institutions in African communities (Fowler, 2016; Donati, 2003; Olson, 1965; Becker, 1974;

³² While Atibil (2014) indicates that this is the case, this not always so, because some of these foundations, as examples from Egypt show, mobilise resources even outside the communities they work on (Marwa el-Daly 2007; WINGS, 2008)

and Wright, 2001). But these reports also subordinate ‘African gifting to external definitions, perspectives and initiatives [...which] overshadow, if not undermine, a full understanding of how gifting operates beyond “elite” money’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 2).

One of the most enduring criticisms against this fixation on the rich in philanthropy in Africa is further offered by Wilkinson-Maposa, et al. (2005) in their study of ‘philanthropy of community’ in Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. The Wilkinson-Maposa, et al. (2005) study illustrates how the poor have developed systems of giving support to each other throughout communities in these countries. These efforts are largely ignored in mainstream Western oriented philanthropic literature. Moreover, as Maposa, et al. (2005) point out, even when philanthropic efforts of the poor are recognized, they are often overestimated and exploited as solutions to the lack of development performance. Maposa et al (2005) further stress that this deficiency in understanding these processes is a major gap in public and development policy and in the contemporary thinking of philanthropy itself.

Fowler recently added to this debate, the moral-ethical questions regarding the modern-day philanthropy in Africa. Among the most pertinent are ‘the moral incompatibility of economic processes generating great individual wealth and the values of personalised giving back’ (2016, p. 2). Fowler (2016) cites *The Economist* December 12 2015 article, ‘The gifts of the moguls’ in framing this moral/ethical question. Specifically, the *Economist* asks two thorny questions on what it terms ‘extreme philanthropy’: ‘The first concerns how such a staggering fortune could ever have been accumulated; the second whether philanthropy can salve the sting of the increasingly unequal distribution of wealth that it exemplifies’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 2). Fowler continues to highlight other questions that relate to ‘the impact of personalised and poorly accountable mega-philanthropy on public policies and governance, blurring public and private realms’ (p. 2). Moreover, he argues, a ten-year-old study of elite perceptions of inequality in South Africa suggests that ‘elites do not possess a more immediate and compelling sense of obligation to the poor within their own social segment’ (Kalati and Manor, 2005, cited in Fowler, 2016, p. 21). Attention also needs to be paid to ‘the actual performance and impact of what these elites and [high net worth individuals] HNWI contribute (Fowler, 2016, p. 21).

Furthermore, the obsession with the vertical misses other emergent forms of horizontal philanthropy by Africans that are transcending the continent but illustrate conformity to ‘strong connections to place and people’ that Atibil (2014) argues about. A good example of

this is the ‘Africans for Haiti campaign’ that was led by Mrs Graça Machel, TrustAfrica, CIVICUS, and the African Monitor in the wake of the devastating Haiti earthquake in 2009.

Africans for Haiti campaign appealed to ‘all Africans, poor and rich, to make contributions that would be channelled towards rebuilding Haitian communities’ (Moyo, 2010, p. 263-4). Another example is in the response by the African Union to the West African Ebola crisis in 2014-2015 (FrontPageAfrica, 2015; Musabayana, 2016). The African intervention, mainly through volunteer skilled health workers, was the game changer as the global community through WHO dithered. A further example that challenges the conventional vertical (rich giving to the poor) narrative is illustrated by a donation of cattle that Maasai elders in Enoosaen, a small Kenyan village made to express their solidarity with the American people and ease their pain and suffering after the September 11th 2001 tragic terrorist bombings (Copeland-Carson, 2007, p.1; VoA, 2006; Lee, 2006). These forms of philanthropy are illustrative of what AGN (2013, p. 9) categorise as ‘**Many to Many**’ and involve mobilisation and ‘aggregation of contributions from a range of givers to help address the needs of beneficiaries outside of [Africans] immediate circle. These examples also serve to illustrate that Africa is coming of age in working with others in confronting some of the challenges that her people and more generally, humanity as a whole, faces.

Foundations in Africa are products as well as manifestations of the institutionalisation of philanthropy, which has entailed ‘adapting indigenous traditions to the realities and opportunities’ as well as challenges presented by their new socioeconomic conditions (Copeland-Carson 2007, p. 11; Global Giving Matters, 2007; Kageni, 2009; Mati, 2016; Mwiria, 2010). In this regard, the initial community foundations in South Africa were for example, ‘established partly to promote and develop democracy and address years of racial segregation, resolve political conflict, and above all, to improve the quality of life in local communities’ (WINGS, 2008, p. 304). These community foundations in south Africa and elsewhere on the continent, are illustrative of “**Many to One**” type of philanthropy and entail ‘community initiated efforts [aimed at] marshalling the resources of the group to tackle a specific need within the community (AGN, 2013, p. 9). To some degree, they also exhibit ‘**Many to many**’ as well as ‘**One to Many**’ type of philanthropy as their resource mobilisation and targeting framework is a hybrid of the three (i.e. Many to one; one to many; and Many to Many).

The emergence of these types of philanthropic institutions have been fuelled in part, by the absence or inadequacy of the state to meet welfare needs of its citizens, especially within the present neoliberal economic development paradigm.³³ As a result, we have witnessed, for example, the emergence of mutual health insurance schemes in West Africa aimed at meeting health welfare needs of citizens. According to Nyssens and Vermer (2012), these mutual health insurance schemes are private initiatives characterized by a supportive risk-sharing among members and are aimed at reducing financial barriers to accessibility to health care. The schemes operate on the principles of risk sharing solidarity; a dynamic community-based participatory decision-making system; self-management by the members and participation free and voluntary; and finally a non-profit nature (Fonteneau, 2004). Though a recent development dating back to the 1990s in West Africa, mutual health insurance schemes have been rising steadily. In Benin, for example, their numbers have increased from 11 in 1997 to 90 in 2003 (La Concertation, 2003) and to 142 in 2005 (Lokossou, 2005).

These adaptations, as already noted, are further influenced by religious/faith imperatives. The many religious foundations and charities, such as *Waqf* funds among Muslim populations in Africa, are illustrations of this. *Waqf* funds are forms of contemporary philanthropy that borrow from ancient Islamic traditions (Hassan, 2006a, 2006b), which illustrate aspects of ‘**One to Many**’, ‘**many to one**’, as well as ‘**Many to many**’ type of philanthropy as per the AGN (2013) categorization. *Waqf* funds are essentially endowments that provide ‘welfare enhancing services to the society [and] are financed through the investment of the allocated resources’ (Zuki, 2012, p. 175). Such services include provision of infrastructure and social, health, and educational programmes for the benefit of humanity and especially for the vulnerable strata of society (Zuki, 2012). *Waqf* are deeply embedded in traditions of ‘piety, providing kindness and social justice, and promoting innovation, entrepreneurial dynamism and social development’ (Zuki, 2012, p. 176). An enduring impact of *waqf* institutions in the Muslim world, according to Zuki (2012), has been the creation of vibrant civil society that has assisted in

³³ Nonetheless, it needs mention that while the apparent failure of welfare state to meet the needs of citizens may spur voluntarism and philanthropic expansion, this universal welfare function of a state has never been established in Africa - perhaps with a possible exception of South Africa with social grants. Non-welfare state conditions for 53 of the continents 54 countries have reinforced mutual aid as a mechanism for survival and progress.

redistributing resources and reducing inequality in society ...[and because] many rich and powerful people opted for *waqf* to take their capital away from the arbitrary power of the state ... The *waqf* system played a major role in the development of a civil-political culture in the Muslim lands (Zuki, 2012, p. 176).

Contemporary institutionalisation of philanthropy in Africa, especially in their manifestation as foundations, have been influenced by the need to develop appropriate institutional mechanisms to address the social and economic challenges, as well as buoyed by an Africa on the rise (Mati, 2016), or institutional requirements for corporates to do more in terms of socially responsive investments. Corporate foundations (which alongside CSR are a form or instrument of corporate giving; Nahrlich, 2009), together with community foundations deserve a detailed analysis as their numbers has been growing throughout Africa (WINGS, 2008; Atibil, 2014).

Community foundations

Community foundations were first established in North America in late 1970s (Sacks, 2005). By the 1980s, they had become major players in ‘using local knowledge to act as brokers between people of means and local NGOs needing support’ (Gilbert, 2009, p. 1). Gilbert (2009, p.1, citing Eleanor Sacks, 2005) remarks that community foundations have progressed ‘from being participants in global civil society to being among the creators of global civil society.’ Community foundations have been increasing in numbers in Africa as elsewhere in the world. From about ten at the turn of the millennium, there are currently, according to WINGs Community Foundations Atlas (2016), about 31 community foundations as shown in the table below.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

Table 7. Growth in community foundations in Africa

Country/number of community foundations (2016)	Name of foundation	Date established
Kenya (2)	Kenya Community Development Foundation	1997
	Kilimani Project Foundation	2013
Tanzania (4)	Kinondoni Community Foundation	2008
	Arusha Municipal Community Foundation	2008
	Morogoro Municipal Community Foundation	2005

	Mwanza City Community Foundation	
Uganda (1)	Masindi Community Foundation	2011
DR Congo (1)	Fondation Communautaire Du Katanga, Lubumbashi, Republique Democratique Du Congo	
Mozambique (2)	Foundation for Community Development	1994
	Fundação Ilha de Moçambique	2009
Zimbabwe (2)	Community Foundation for Western Region of Zimbabwe	1998
	Uluntu Community Foundation	2008
Ghana (3)	Akuapem Community Foundation	2005
	Global Alliance for Development Foundation	2010
	Newmont Ahafo Development Foundation	2008
Egypt (2)	Community Foundation for South Sinai	2006
	Waqfeyat al-Maadi Community Foundation	2007
South Africa (14)	West Coast Community Foundation	2001
	UThungulu Community Foundation	
	Tswera Community Foundation	2009
	South Africa WHEAT Trust	1998
	Social Change Assistance Trust	1984
	Pitseng Trust	2000
	Nelson Mandela Children's Fund	1995
	Ikhala Trust	2002
	Greater Rustenburg Community Foundation	2000
	Greater Dukuduku Development Community Foundation	2011
	eThekweni Community Foundation	2001
	Community Development Foundation Western Cape	2007
	Community Chest of the Western Cape	1928
	DOCKDA Rural Development Agency	2002

Source: Community Foundations Atlas

(<http://communityfoundationatlas.org/explore/#directory=1|continent=Africa>)

Even with the reported growth, there are many others that have been established but ‘died’ due to lack of endowments or due to a restrictive legal or socioeconomic environment. The more successful ones have been established with part funding from other foundations (especially the American ones, such as the Ford Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation etc.). In South Africa for example, the Greater Rustenburg Community Foundation formed in January 2000 received the initial funding from Impala Platinum Mine,

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (for operational funding) and Ford Foundation (seed funding for endowed fund – grantmaking) (WINGS, 2008). Similarly, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and Ford Foundation were the seed grantors of the first community foundation in South Africa; The Uthungulu Community Foundation, in October 1999. A similar narrative exists in the establishment of the Community Foundation for South Sinai (*al mo'assessa al ahliya lijanoub sina* ') that was registered in South Sinai in November 2006 and had among its founders and donors, two British, two Egyptian and one Bedouin' (WINGS, 2008, p. 278; Gilbert, 2009; Gilbert and al Jebaali, 2012).

This reliance on external endowment to ensure their sustainability raises questions on whether these are not just a different way of organizing the distribution of international aid and grants. Nonetheless, community foundations are established in Africa with the idea that local resources can be harnessed for community development, albeit with some external support. Moreover, they are said to be 'remaking the face of global philanthropy to reflect local priorities and local needs' (Adelman, 2009, p. 32). Adelman (2009, p. 32) rightly predicts that these will 'continue to grow as developing countries themselves grow and prosper [... and their] high-networth individuals, and an expanding middle class, begin to fund home-grown' philanthropy initiatives.

The 2008 WINGS Community Foundation Global Status Report notes the existence of selective borrowing of practices in the creation and governance of community foundations, especially in Africa. In countries where there are strict government regulations (such as Egypt) this has helped in the creation of first truly community foundations (see also Gilbert and al Jebaali, 2012). In this regard, a noteworthy reference is the Maadi Community Foundation established in 2007 in suburb of Cairo (Egypt) in May 2007. The founders of the Maadi Community Foundation,

adapted the community foundation concept to Egypt to revive and modernize the traditional Islamic civic endowment structure, *al waqf*, using a secularized approach, in order to connect the community foundation to a deeply rooted endowment practice that could ensure sustainability and perpetuity' (WINGS, 2008, p. 277).

The creativity, ingenuity and adaptability displayed in developing a variant of community foundations from the original ones conceived in the United States are a testimony to the power and effectiveness of the idea that has made them earn the descriptive sobriquet, 'agile servant' to local communities (Magat, 1989; Gilbert, 2009). As more community foundations

are developed around the world, it is evident that every country, region, and community can find ways to take the concept and adapt it to their own circumstances.

Corporate Foundations and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Corporate foundations and CSR programmes are part of cultures of corporate giving that are fast spreading in Africa. Corporate foundations are essentially funded by corporate profits or endowment interest (Atibil, 2014). As a phenomenon, corporate foundations arguably owe their origins to Andrew Carnegie's advocacy for the American nouveau riche and other wealthy individuals to set up endowments for the purposes of distributing their wealth in order to address social justice and distribution of rewards issues in modern capitalist society. For Carnegie, if the rich do not do this, the revolutionary impulses of the socialists and anarchists would disrupt capitalism and overturn conditions of inequality and injustice in the distribution of the profits from capitalism. To forestall such inevitability, the wealthy have to be 'trustees for the poor; intrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself' (Carnegie, 1889, p. 12).

While Carnegie envisaged such endowed philanthropic institutions to be purely for the public good, businesses have utilised the concepts of corporate social responsibility (CSR), either in reaction to state or other forms of social coercion, as instruments for what has come to be known as 'philanthrocapitalism' (Edwards, 2008; 2009; 2011b; Bishop and Green 2008; Nxumalo 2013; McGoey, 2012; 2015; Birn, 2014); 'mega-philanthrocapitalism'³⁴ (Fowler, 2016); or even simply, corporate philanthropy. Corporate philanthropy, especially in its corporate social responsibility variant, has attracted substantial scholarly as well as activists' attention especially in countries with extractive as well as some manufacturing industries. In this regard, besides Southern Africa, there are numerous CSR studies also in Kenya and Nigeria. Among the instructive studies here are Bench Marks Foundation (2007; 2008a; 2008b; 2009a; 2009b; 2012); Idemudia and Ite (2006); Muthuri, (2012; 2008; 2007); Muthuri, Moon and Idemudia (2012); Muthuri, Chapple and Moon, 2008; Muthuri, Matten

³⁴ 'Mega-philanthropies... typically involve an individual accumulation of vast wealth made possible by a capitalist economic system which is then returned to society according to priorities set by those who govern the entity, appointed by those providing the resources. Their modality of gifting deploys business thinking, concentrating on market mechanisms to create social gains at a significant scale.... their arrival has energised a number of debates' (Fowler, 2016, p. 23).

and Moon (2009); Muthuri and Gilbert (2010); Msweli, Wushe, and Mandudzo (2013); Mottiar, 2015).³⁵

In one such study, Muthuri, Moon and Idemudia (2012) argue that some multinational corporations are playing important roles in redefining and shaping sustainable community development through their involvement in the communities where they do business or are located. Attracted to African countries by abundance of natural resources, cheap labour, and ambiguous structures of governance that usually aid business, multinational corporations are increasingly involved in philanthropy to address social issues in communities. In so doing, corporations are inventing or reproducing new ‘corporate community involvement’ techniques, models, processes and practices through employee volunteerism, business-community partnerships, and community enterprise development. Fowler (2016, p. 22) argues that such corporate ‘gifting’ is implemented through several strategies such as,

corporate social responsibility and investment (CSR/CSI); discounting products and making in-kind contributions for “good causes”; employer-supported volunteering; secondments; and partnerships, typically with non-profit organisations. It includes grant funding by a corporation’s own foundation...’

These interventions are framed within the discourses of ‘development, poverty alleviation’ and especially in addressing illiteracy, unemployment, disease, poor governance, and poor infrastructure (Muthuri, Moon and Idemudia, 2012, p. 358).

CSR/corporate philanthropy drivers

While these types of interventions aid community development, motivations or inducements for companies to undertake CSR initiatives or any other corporate giving programmes, vary. This is especially so, as the uptake of CSR by corporations to profile themselves as socially responsible has been forced by a confluence of a ‘simultaneous development of the antiglobalization movement, share-holder activism, and corporate governance reforms’ (Maignan and Ferrel, 2004, p. 3). In this regard, governments across several African states, at least on paper, stress the need for corporations to be involved in fair, ethical, and socially responsible investments or by corporations signing into voluntary ethical reporting initiatives such as the Global Reporting Initiative. South Africa, for example, has among others instruments, *The companies Act 2008*, *The King Report on Governance for South Africa*

³⁵ It needs mention that a component of CSR yet to get sufficient scholarly attention is employee volunteering, which, nonetheless, is being practiced by companies, especially South Africa, as part of their corporate social responsibility (Nujjoo, and Meyer, 2012; IDC, n.d.; Mail & Guardian, March 12, 2014).

2009, the *Consumer Protection Act or CPA 2009* which variously spell out social and ethical responsibilities of corporation. Likewise, Kenya relies on, among others, *The Companies Act of 2015*, *The Environmental Management and Coordination Act of 1999*.

At least four different, but not mutually exclusive, theoretical explanations have been advanced in literature to explain the allure of CSR for business entities. These are ‘**CSR as social obligation**’ (Maignan and Ferrel, 2004; Bowen, 1953; Carroll, 1979; Brown and Dacin, 1997; Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001); **CSR as stakeholder obligation** (Maignan and Ferrel, 2004; Clarkson, 1995; Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Jones, 1995; Wood and Jones, 1995; Henriques and Sadorsky, 1999); **CSR as ethics driven** (Maignan and Ferrel, 2004; Jones, 1995; Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Swanson, 1995); and **CSR as managerial processes** (Maignan and Ferrel, 2004; Ackerman, 1975; Wood, 1991; Wartick and Cochran, 1985).

CSR as social obligation: Bowen was the first to introduce the concept of CSR as social obligation in 1953 (Maignan and Ferrel, 2004). Bowen (1953) conceived ‘CSR as the obligation to pursue policies, decisions, or lines of action desirable to achieve the objectives and values of our society.’ Such social obligations, according to Carroll (1979), can be distinguished as: 1) economic obligations for the company to be productive and economically viable; 2) legal and ethical obligations to ‘follow the law and acknowledged values and norms’ and 3) philanthropic obligations to proactively give back to society (cited in Maignan and Ferrel, 2004, p. 4).

CSR as stakeholder obligation: The CSR as stakeholder obligation perspective narrows the obligations of a company to stakeholders directly or indirectly affected by the activities of a corporation. Such stakeholders includes the organisational stakeholders such as employees, customers, shareholders, suppliers; community stakeholders who are the local residents and special interests groups affected by the company’s activities; regulatory stakeholders such as governments and any other regulators; and media stakeholders (Henriques and Sadorsky, 1999, cited in Maignan and Ferrel, 2004, p. 4).

CSR as ethics driven perspective: This perspective advocates for a CSR driven by ethics independent of the self-interests orientation of the social or stakeholder obligations (Maignan and Ferrel, 2004, p. 4). This is the perspective that the Bench Marks Foundation, Fowler (2016), and Moore (2014), for example, advocate for. Fowler (2016, p. 25), following Moore

(2014), for example, argues that CSR needs to move beyond ‘box-ticking’ corporate exercise into ‘amongst others, creating shared value (CSV) and adopting ethical practices which may or may not constitute gifting.’ On their part, the Bench Marks Foundation in South Africa insists that:

CSR is more than philanthropy and reporting, it is also the strategic interventions that benefit both the corporation and society and that promotes a rights based approach and a developmental angle to companies CSR commitments. The Bench Marks Foundation believes that the gap between policy and corporate practice needs to be addressed and CSR integrated into the core of companies’ decision-making processes in order to overcome poverty, growing inequalities and degraded environments. [Bench Marks therefore calls for corporations in the extractive industry to] improve on their corporate responsibility programmes and to find innovative ways to promote development at community level that addresses some of the negative impacts mining brings’ (Bench Marks Foundation, 2009a, p. 3-4).

This is especially so, because the regulatory framework seems inadequate, if not outright incompetent, in delivering satisfactory social and environmental returns (Bench Marks Foundation, 2009b; Maphosa, 1997). This is because, as the Bench Marks Foundation (2009b, p. 53) observes, mining in South Africa is happening in an ‘unfolding legislative environment in which the primacy of the mining industry is often in conflict with environmental and community concerns [... and] the implementation and monitoring of ... policies ... problematic.’

The need for the private sector to do more in CSR is also stressed in the 2005 World Economic Forum *Global Governance Initiative Annual Report*, which calls on corporations to contribute:

Through hybrid business/philanthropic activities that have an economic rationale, though less than would be needed for a pure business case and thus include an element of philanthropy...[such as] corporate HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs that extend beyond workers to include their communities, some microcredit funds, public-private water partnerships that clean up watersheds to the benefit of both water-consuming industries and citizens in nearby communities, and technologies that foster the growth of millions of small farm enterprises (p. vi).

To achieve this, the WEF report (2005, p. 3) continues to argue, that corporations must align their ‘philanthropic and community investment programmes with a company’s core

competencies, skills and purpose—going far beyond simply writing checks.’ Corporations seem to have taken up some of this advice seriously if the numbers of social enterprises and corporate foundations mushrooming in Africa are anything to go by. The mutual health insurance schemes in Benin cited earlier are illustrative of such initiatives (Nyssens and Vermer, 2012). Another study by CIVICUS and the Zambian Council for Social Services (2010) in Zambia illustrates such initiatives where the private sector works closely with NGOs in developing HIV/AIDS workplace policies and strategies. In these partnerships, NGOs like Zambia Workplace AIDS Partnership (ZWAP) use their knowledge and technical expertise to gain access to both big and small companies.

CSR as managerial processes: The three conceptual approaches on motivations for businesses to engage in CSR so far discussed, coupled with a fourth one that looks at *CSR as managerial processes*, dominate analytical orientations in existing research (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004). CSR as managerial processes perspective analyses business’ corporate social responsiveness on the basis of (a) monitoring and assessing environmental conditions, (b) attending to stakeholder demands, and (c) designing plans and policies aimed at enhancing the firm's positive impacts’ (Ackerman, 1975 cited in Maignan and Ferrell, 2004, p. 4).

Further, instrumentalist or self-interest motivations are a frequent feature of CSR writings in Africa. These perceive CSR initiatives by companies as opportunities or instruments for improving their public image, because they enable businesses to gain legitimacy among their constituents for the purposes of furthering their corporate goals (see for example, Fioramonti and Regelbrugge, 2008; Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010; Fowler, 2016). Also thrown into this, are ethical debates that relate to ‘ways in which tax avoidance strategies and illicit flows of money out of the continent by corporations contradicts their public relations investment in social responsibility’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 2; *The Economist*, 2016; Bracking, 2015; UNECA, 2013; Smith with Eng and Albertson, 2016).

As such, CSR and its associated philanthropy have also been seen as simply a display of ‘conformity to both organizational and stakeholder norms’ while more often than not, companies are not doing enough to bring any real value to communities. This is clearly seen in Southern African countries studies where, for example, Mottiar (2015) report that some companies within the extractive industry produce superb reports of how their CSR activities

address environmental and social goals of the communities, yet there is nothing much to show for these. Bench Marks (2009b, p. v) also notes:

After 100 years of mining on the West Coast ... communities have little to show in terms of community development, infrastructure or an existence much above that of a subsistence level. There are extreme social problems and the perception of communities is that they do not benefit from mining corporate social responsibility programmes. Communities feel isolated and marginalized.... the area is seriously affected by water contamination - both ground and surface water are under threat... much of the area looks like a waste site that will take hundreds of years to rehabilitate (see also Maphosa, 1997 for similar expressions of communities and environments devastated by extractive industries in Zimbabwe).

That all this is happening despite the diamond-mining corporations producing environmental management and sustainability reports that claim that these companies have adopted international standards (which are largely voluntary codes of conduct and reporting instruments) and have third party reviews of their environmental management programmes, call into question the effectiveness of these voluntary reporting programmes.³⁶ Bench Marks (2009b, p. v, vii) therefore argues that CSR should not be a

mere window dressing or glossy annual sustainability reports. [Effective] CSR must address the social, environmental and economic impacts.... Sustainability is not just about profits and shareholder returns but also about the corporation's bigger role in society' (see also Mottiar, 2015 for similar reports).

The instrumentalist and value orientation motivations for CSR are also reported in Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) who, citing Maignan and Ralston (2002, p. 501), identifies three categories of motivations for corporations to engage in CSR activities in Kenya:

value-driven "(as being part of the company's culture, or as an expression of its core values)", performance-driven ("an instrument to improve its financial performance and competitive posture") and stakeholder-driven ("as a response to the pressure and

³⁶ Companies operating in South Africa have for example, one of the highest uptakes of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards. Part of the reason for this is a requirement that all Johannesburg Stock exchange listed companies must produce annual sustainability reports and the GRI, which is voluntary, comes in handy for this purpose. However, its voluntary nature means that it lacks the teeth for enforcement of standards for those that do not conform. Moreover, the GRI sustainability reporting lacks serious interrogation of the ethical/moral standards of companies.

scrutiny of one or more stakeholder groups”) motives’ (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010, p. 475).

Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) further report that the motives for the companies they surveyed in Kenya to engage in CSR varied from being motivated by values of a ‘desire to “give something back” to the communities in which they operate’ and that CSR was the ‘right thing to do’ (mentioned by 59.2% of the surveyed companies); the need to gain and maintain legitimacy from stakeholders (mentioned by 44.4% of all companies surveyed – 31.6% of these, domestic companies, and 84.2% foreign international companies; and the prospect of enhancing financial performance (mentioned by 5.3% of domestic companies and 12.5% of international companies in Kenya) (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010, p. 475).

Moreover, within contemporary economic neoliberalism, interventions by private multinational corporations may further endanger the image of the state and additionally entrench the notion of an illegitimate uncaring state as corporations get more engaged, especially in areas where governments are said to be lacking adequate capacity, or even care for delivery of services to its citizens (Muthuri, Moon and Idemudia, 2012; Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010; Fowler, 2016). Fowler (2016, p. 2) pushes this idea further when he throws in the question about ‘the interface between African gifting and politics in ways that may work against democracy and social justice.’

Moreover, Fowler (2016) argues that mega-philanthrocapitalists (who are involved especially in private foundations or sometimes through corporate foundations) usually cherry pick the public goods that they have an interest in. Such cherry picking, as Ricciuti and Spicer (2016, p. 2) notes, is usually, but not necessarily, driven by community interests, needs or concerns, but by ‘recognition [which] is of utmost importance for foundations, and innovation is instrumental to get recognition. Concerns are raised on the extent to which recognition is relevant for priority-setting, compared to other factors – such as the assessment of needs.’ Furthermore, such ‘picking and choosing among gifting agendas and recipients, introduces a lottery of chances amongst the poor’ (Fowler, 2016, p. 27). The net effect is that there are many, sometimes far deserving cases that corporation’s CSR lottery net is bound to miss. In addition, a study of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Wellcome Trust engagement in health by Ricciuti and Spicer (2016, p. 6) notes foundations concentrate more of their philanthropic work on easily measurable things, which does not necessarily mean that they are the most effective ways to tackle the issues they

chose.

The nature, suitability, and impacts of corporate philanthropy, especially in its corporate social responsibility manifestations, are therefore persistent themes in existing literature. Examples here include studies of corporate social responsibility in Kenya by Muthuri and Gilbert (2010), and the various Bench Marks Foundation studies of corporate social responsibility programmes of multinational corporations involved in mineral extractions in the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) (see for example, Bench Marks Foundation 2007; 2008a; 2008b; 2009a; 2009b; 2012). Another is Kharas (2007) study *Trends and issues in development aid*. It however needs mention that, either due to specific industry factors or peer company mimicry, more companies are embracing CSR. As a result, CSR is increasingly becoming the new normal in business practices in Africa (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2011; Muthuri, 2012; 2007; 2008; Muthuri, Chapple and Moon, 2008; Muthuri, Matten, and Moon, 2009; Muthuri, Moon and Idemudia, 2012; Bench Marks Foundation 2007; 2008a; 2008b; 2009a; 2009b; 2012). As Muthuri and Gilbert (2010, p. 478) have observed in Kenya, ‘the language of CSR (and its variants) has become institutionalized as more and more companies respond to these normative calls for more socially responsible behaviour.’ What has however been lacking is scrutiny of the actual performance and impact of many of these CSR initiatives (Fowler, 2016).

As already noted, there are mixed portrayals in existing literature. Some celebrate contributions of corporations’ giving through their CSR programmes. Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) in their analysis of 70 (domestic, Kenyan international and foreign international) company websites, publications and survey responses, for example, reveal the divergent nature and orientation of CSR activities among companies in Kenya. They report that a great majority (90.7%) of companies in Kenya are ‘truly altruistic’ in their CSR programmes, because they place community issues such as health, HIV/AIDS, poverty, education, high on their CSR agendas (see also Gilbert, 2008). This is followed by 74% of companies that placed environmental issues high in their agenda. Nonetheless, only 35.2% of companies acted on commitments to environment management practices, with 25% of Kenyan international companies addressing the issue with mainly philanthropic donations or promoting employee volunteering in environmental activities. Furthermore, the high priority of community issues illustrates that CSR is being introduced as part of new institutional business norms to address national concerns such as HIV/AIDS, health, education, and

environmental issues. Another area where private corporations have been active in philanthropic giving in Africa is in sponsorship of sporting activities and clubs as well as in the production and reproduction of arts and culture reproduction (see for example Angonoticias, 2010; Muthuri and Gilbert, 2012; Gilbert, 2008).

The study by Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) already cited shows increased uptake of CSR initiatives by companies. For example, 54/70 of the companies surveyed made some reference to elements of social responsibility activities on their websites. A third of the 16 companies that did not make explicit reference to CSR, however, made reference to certain economic responsibilities of the corporation. Companies that made more explicit reference to CSR are generally more global/multinational and ‘tend to “lead the way” both in industry sectors and in the Kenyan business environments as a whole in attempts to keep up with their global competitors to maintain legitimacy and ensure their survival’ (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010, p. 479). Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) attribute the lower rates of Kenyan domestic companies making explicit mention of CSR (61%), compared to 88.8% of Kenyan international companies, to the fact that CSR is still a fairly new concept in developing countries. However, the lack of explicit mention of CSR, these authors note, does not always imply that these companies are not doing anything that could be construed as CSR. Indeed, Muthuri and Gilbert (2010) argue that the findings suggest that some companies fulfil certain tenets of CSR issues even without identifying them in terms of CSR.

Further, Muthuri and Gilbert (2010, p. 474) reported that companies within sectors, such as ‘media and communications and transportation companies displayed no references to CSR [while those] in the technology, manufacturing, finance, wholesale/retail and other industries mentioned CSR on their website.’ This finding is corroborated in other countries of Africa. In Angola for instance, a private mobile telephone company, UNITEL has been active in CSR activities, such as donating essential goods in health care (such medicine and other hospital use materials) (Portal da Filantropia 2013). Likewise, a study by Hounyovi (2013) reports active CSR activity by the telephone operator MTN. Results from this study show that customer’s perceptions of the actions of MTN’s social responsibility affected customers continued commitment to the company (Hounyovi, 2013, p. 2).

Institutionalisation of CSR activities in companies

The level of institutionalisation of CSR activities in corporations in Africa has also received attention in scholarly analysis. Muthuri and Gilbert (2010), for example, report that some companies have designated CSR departments or Managers, while others delegate this responsibility to human resources or public relations departments. The ‘location’ of CSR functions in companies is an important indicator for whether a company takes CSR as a risk and reputation management exercise, or whether it is driven by deep values of wanting to do good. In this regard, the location of CSR activities under public relations departments, Muthuri and Gilbert (2010, p. 475) argue, suggests that ‘CSR is implemented for risk management and reputational benefits as opposed to as a business opportunity or for moral reasons.’

But the legal regulatory environment plays a big role in the nature of CSR or other corporate giving activities that companies engage in. It is easy to see why this is the case because, as Charen (2001) observes in the United States, corporations can be highly vulnerable to intimidation and shakedowns. As such, companies are continuously donating even to causes that may be at odds with their self-interests simply because of greater or better-structured regulations. Leading automotive and oil companies, for example, heavily bankroll environmental groups that seek to impose greater regulation on these very industries. The import of this for African governments interested in building stronger support for indigenous civil society and community development initiatives is to ensure the legal-regulatory environment is enhanced to ‘compel’ companies to engage more or institutionalise corporate giving, including CSR activities. Such institutionalisation could take the shape of corporate foundations along the same lines as older ones like the Ford Foundation, which can support a variety of social, political and economic development objectives in the continent.

Civil society, especially NGOs, have also played an important role in pushing for transformation of business practices in Africa as elsewhere in the world. In this regard, Muthuri and Gilbert (2010, p. 478) observe:

NGOs have played an important role in the institutionalisation of CSR practice in Kenya.... International NGOs such as Oxfam, Ethical Trading Initiative, and Transparency International have attracted worldwide attention regarding the supply chain, human rights, and labour conditions in Kenya. At the national level, there is increasing attention focussed on labour and human rights abuses in the export

processing sector (KHRC, 2002; Opondo, 2009) and in the cut flower industry (Dolan and Opondo, 2005). These NGOs set new norms in society and create expectations amongst other stakeholders. Furthermore, international frameworks such as the ETI and GRI are responsible for institutionalising a normative climate, which corporations conform to in order to remain socially relevant.

Philanthropic CSR uptake in Africa is therefore directly related to existence of a vibrant civil society pushing for embedding of CSR activities and corporate philanthropy in corporations' work (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2010). Such CSR philanthropy can benefit African civil society. Nonetheless, in Africa, as the 2014 USAID civil society sustainability Index report indicates, 'international donors are [still] the most important source of financial support' for CSOs in all countries surveyed, except for Angola' (p. x). This leaves them more vulnerable to constantly changing funding priorities of external donors (Pratt, et al., 2012). This is reported, for example, in Botswana where 'International donors are leaving Botswana because it is now viewed as an upper middle-income country with a GDP sufficient to sustain CSOs through individual and government donations' (USAID, 2014, p.11). The resulting gap in funding can, be filled or example, if diamond-mining companies like De Beers committed to doing more to fund local community development initiatives (Bench Marks Foundation, 2009a). Similar vulnerabilities of CSOs are reported in Gabon, where CSOs sustainability is impeded because CSOs have 'struggled to build constituencies and lack resources to put into place long-term initiatives or maintain support for constituents' (USAID, 2014 p. 43).

The same 2014 USAID Civil Society Sustainability Index report gives comparative data for CSO financial sustainability dimension³⁷ shown in table 8 below. The table shows some marginal deterioration of CSOs financial sustainability in at least Angola, Ethiopia, Gabon, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, South Sudan, and Sudan.

[Insert table 8 about here]

Table 8: CSO financial sustainability in Sub-Saharan Africa

³⁷ This dimension in the USAID CSO Sustainability Index is measured using indicators of a) **local support** (which is defined by whether CSOs are able to: 1) raise a significant percentage of their funding from local sources, 2) draw upon a core of volunteer and non-monetary support from their communities and constituencies and identification of local sources of philanthropy); b) **diversification of sources of funding** c) existence of sound **financial management systems** and transparent operations, independent financial audits and the publication of annual reports with financial statements; d) **fundraising** (defined by whether CSOs have a loyal core of financial supporters and engagement in membership outreach and philanthropy development programs); and finally, e) **earned income** (USAID CSO Sustainability Index, 2014, p. 211).

Financial sustainability	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Angola	5.9	5.9	6.1	6.2	6.2	6.3
Botswana			4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Burundi	6	6	6	6	6	6
DRC	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.6
Ethiopia	5.8	5.9	6.1	6.2	6.2	6.2
Gabon	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.2
The Gambia			6.5	6.2	6.2	6.2
Ghana	5.5	5.6	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7
Guinea	6.2	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.2	6.2
Kenya	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Liberia	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8
Malawi			5.8	5.9	5.9	5.9
Mali	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.5
Mozambique	5	5	5	5	5	5
Nigeria	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.6
Rwanda	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.5
Senegal	5	5	5	4.9	4.9	4.9
Sierra Leone	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7
South Africa	3.8	4	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3
South Sudan				5.9	5.9	6.1
Sudan				5.8	5.9	6
Tanzania	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Uganda	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	5
Zambia			5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6
Zimbabwe	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9

Extracts from USAID CSO sustainability Index, 2014 report, p. 219. The USAID Civil Society Sustainability Index assesses civil society sustainability on a scale of 1-7 where score of between 1-3 denotes sustainability enhanced, 3.1-5 denotes sustainability evolving while 5.1-7 denotes sustainability impended.

Private foundations

Private philanthropic organisations have emerged in Africa as elsewhere in the world and are increasingly playing an important role in shaping the size and scope of philanthropy in Africa (Pratt, et al., 2012; Mati 2016). Further, private philanthropy (through private foundations of the super wealthy in developed to developing countries) are supplementing, if not supplanting the traditional donor-to-recipient model of aid (Adelman, 2009, p. 23). These represent ‘public-private partnerships’ which, at their best, are celebrated for their flexibility as they are unencumbered by politics and bureaucracy (Adelman, 2009). Furthermore, they are said to be making ‘development efforts more sustainable, work in partnership with local institutions and

communities, and encourage the poor to become active partners and co-investors in the development process' (ibid). Adelman (2009, p. 27) continues to argue that private philanthropy of large and diverse private sector has dramatically transformed the way industrialized nations are engaging with the developing world.

Private philanthropic foundations in Africa are also said to be fuelled in part, by a renascent Africa (Mati, 2016) as well as by changes in the global political economy of aid distribution especially after the 2008-10 financial crisis in the West (Pratt, et al., 2012). As such, we have witnessed increasing numbers of indigenous private foundations by HNWI in Africa such as Aliko Dangote in Nigeria, Mo Ibrahim across the continent, Patrice Motsepe in South Africa, and Manu Chandaria in Kenya, among other (Lemma, 2014). Moreover, increasing uptake of democratic change of regimes in Africa has also led to a number of former presidents and high-ranking politicians in many countries establishing private foundations engaged in different governance and development initiatives in the continent. Those better known in this category include but are not limited to the Nelson Mandela Foundation, the FW De Klerk Foundation, the Thabo Mbeki Foundation, Fundação Joaquim Chissano, Graça Machel Trust, and Moi Africa Institute. These institutions join newer and older private foundations from the West such as Bill and Melinda Gates, Open Society, Wellcome Trust, Carnegie, and the Rockefeller Foundations and are 'working on international development issues through a range of mechanisms: as direct operators, in partnership with governments, and with international NGOs and civil society organisations as grant-givers and partners' (Pratt, et al. 2012, p. 1). Their contributions on issues such as health, education and even democratization have generally been painted in glowing light in some of the literature.

Despite the largely positive portrayals, evidence of the total amount given by private foundations is nonetheless scattered (Kharas, 2007, p. 13-4). Moreover, the level of awareness of philanthropic funding by these foundations remains scanty (Pratt, et al., 2012, p. 1). Nonetheless, available data in the United States (from a decade ago) for example, 'from, among others, the Urban Institute, The Foundation Center and the Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy, the Index of Global Philanthropy estimates total US private aid to developing countries at \$33.5 billion in 2005' (Hudson Institute, 2007, as cited in Kharas, 2007, p. 13). This figure includes contributions by private foundations, voluntary organizations, universities, corporations and religious groups. Specifically, estimates indicate that there are about 18,000 NGOs who contribute about \$21.4 billion of private giving to the

developing countries every year. Africa features highly in these contributions. This implies that \$21.4 billion of private giving from the United States goes to development projects and programs.

Moreover, what has been largely lacking in some of the existing analysis, is the accountability pitfalls of the practices of private as well corporate foundations. As highlighted by Ricciuti and Spicer (2016) as well as Fowler (2016), foundations' accountability practices are:

often weak, and unacceptable due to their increasing power in policy-making (Sridhar & Batniji, 2008; Williams and Rushton, 2011). Moreover, foundations suffer from a lack of legitimacy, not only because they are not representative of any public interest, but also because they are considered too close to business actors and not able to manage well their conflict of interests (Global Health Watch 2011). Foundations' lack of legitimacy is often criticized also for the [harm] they may cause on political priorities in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) (Ollila 2005; Edwards 2011a; Rushton & Williams 2011), and on the roots of their motivation to exist, due to the double effect of their lack of representativeness and the generous tax policies which they benefit from (Anheier & Leat 2013; Birn 2014). Finally, their effectiveness in responding to recipients' needs is often under attack due to short-term views of funding and the lack of data on foundations' impact (Shiffman 2006; McCoy, Kembhavi *et al.* 2009; Esser 2009; Black *et al.* 2009; Esser & Keating Bench 2011) (Ricciuti and Spicer, 2016, p. 4-5. See also Smith with Eng and Albertson, 2016; Eisenberg, 2004; Nielsen, 1985; Stern, 2013; Wagner, 2000; White, 2006 for many relevant examples of foundation misconduct and dark side of philanthropy illustrations).

Further questions need to be asked on the market orientations of some of these foundations who, for example while arguably doing a lot to link local African producers to global markets (see for example Adelman's (2009) description of the work of One Acre Fund work in Western Kenya), might be entrenching the global division of labour relations often criticized by the dependency and underdevelopment theorists (see for example, Frank, 2008; Cardoso, 1972; Wallerstein, 1974). These concerns should not be wished away.

Conclusion

Since the origins of human social organisations, human beings have exhibited a variety of universal pro-social behaviours. These pro-social behaviours are overlaid by geo-historical, social, political, economic, and cultural specificities. In the West, as severally noted in this review, assumptions about a sufficiently separate public and private realms in the modern Western conception of philanthropy are insufficiently cognisant of the 'collective' nature of African societies' norms, philosophy and institutional interactions (with gifting an important connective tissue between private/collective or communal/public). Specifically, while philanthropy in the West may be a response to the anomie and alienation associated with capitalist economic systems (a la 'Carnegie doctrine'), these conditions do not exist near the same degree on the Africa continent. As such, philanthropy-associated pro-social behaviours in Africa are precisely about bonding, kinship and mutual aid for collective wellbeing. Specifically, in contemporary African context, such pro-social behaviours consist of the voluntary means that social groups or individuals use to mobilise and redistribute financial and other resources for the purposes of promoting collective wellbeing. Moreover, as the literature reviewed in this paper shows, giving and gifting practices (which are integral to understanding of manifestations of philanthropy anywhere the world) in Africa are also induced by a number of social, cultural, economic, and moral imperatives, some of which fail, or rather, question the Western yardsticks of what constitutes philanthropy. This points to complexity and plurality of these pro-social phenomena globally. The question then is: is philanthropy, especially, as conceived in the dominant Euro-American model the right concept for studying the variety of pro-social giving behaviours in in Africa?

The discussions in this paper, have highlighted the conceptual complexities of the term philanthropy due to the plurality of actions that fall under philanthropy in African continent. In view of these complexities, it is safe to conclude that an understanding of philanthropy in different contexts, especially in Africa, needs to apply models that accommodate institutional and non-institutional forms in diverse contexts. Copeland-Carson (2007, p. 4) is right in her advocacy that in conceiving philanthropy, researchers need to utilise approaches which, instead of drawing definitive conclusions, outline broad contours of philanthropic activities and can therefore, be able to incite further research. Such an approach would be useful in the African context where 'indigenous philanthropy is characterised by, among other things, reciprocity, and interdependence, disintermediation (absence of institutional intermediaries to filter giving), and the connectedness of individuals and groups to their places of origin, their

kin, and ethnic groups' (Atibil, p. 459). Such a conception needs to start from the very basics of reconceptualising and expanding the definition of philanthropy and giving to include *giving to outside the primary household/private living space of the individual, but including extended family, fictive kin/clans people, and all non-relatives* for them to concretely capture the reality of giving in African context.

Further, the conclusion made by Everatt et al. (2005, p. 275) on patterns of giving for South Africa can, indeed, be extended to the rest of the continent. Thus:

South Africa is richly resourced with a diverse and multicultural spectrum of giving behaviors, which are commonplace in everyday life. The spectrum of giving behaviors is so diverse in shape and form that it contradicts many of the basic assumptions of the philanthropic literature, which locate the act of giving primarily in the domain of the wealthy and powerful.

Moreover, giving in Africa 'must not be conceived in a unilinear direction from rich to poor communities' (Everatt et al., 2005, p. 279; Swilling and Russell, 2002); in contemporary Africa, philanthropy-associated pro-social behaviour exhibits increased fusion between the horizontal and the vertical manifestations of giving and gifting practices.

This increased fusion of the horizontal and vertical giving practices in the shaping of contemporary forms of philanthropic behaviour in Africa has led to Fowler's (2016) plea on the need to revisit the term 'economy of affection.' He suggests that a new term, '*economy of affinity*' to,

take into account the socio-economic stratification, geographical dispersion, the shifts in corporate thinking and a pluralising evolution in philanthropic practices that are now underway, all of which are attracted by something worth gifting to. Put another way, the affections of kith and kin around which socio-political life revolves is being incorporated into a broadening to affinity – to a cause, to an institution, to a faith, to a population group. As a working idea, an *economy of affinity* may be a useful concept to hold together the disparate nature of this dedicated field of study, now influenced by rapid movement in philanthropic forms, norms and practices...(Fowler, 2016, p. 23).

Such an economy of affinity would draw in social, ecological, and economic affinities which can create hybrid organisational forms blending together, 'the logics of accumulation and commoditization associated with capitalist market economies and the collaborative processes

which assert rights and values, such as social justice which permeate much of social development' (Fowler, 2016, p. 29). It follows therefore, that the debate should be whether as currently conceived in the West, philanthropy as a concept needs revisions to accommodate the realities from other cultural contexts, or as Fowler (2016) puts it, a new concept or concepts are required, for which Western-styled philanthropy is just but one variable in the list of human pro-social giving behaviours. The jury is still out on this.

Nonetheless, the growing number of studies by Africans and other scholars from developing country contexts questioning the conceptual premise of Western oriented philanthropy is a welcome development. This will ultimately, at least, force a conversation between the different academics with a view to developing a concept that can relate to the variety of behaviours that constitute philanthropy in different contexts. In this regard, either the modern western concept of philanthropy will be reconsidered to take into account African and other developing countries specificities, or a more endogenous and grounded perspective that is required for studying Africa's pro-social behaviours associated with philanthropy in Africa will emerge; One that, as Ngondi-Houghton (2006) and Manji (2006), put it, allow philanthropy to be what the people, where ever they are, say it is for them, other than being defined strictly as a Euro-American culture.

References

- Ackerman, R.W. 1975. *The social challenge to business*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Adelman, Carol. 2009. Global philanthropy and remittances: Reinventing foreign aid. *Brown Journal of World Affairs* XV (ii), 23-33.
- African Grantmakers network (AGN). 2013. *Sizing the field: Frameworks for a new narrative of African Philanthropy*. Johannesburg: African Grantmakers Network & Southern Africa Trust.
- Aina, Tade Akin and Bhengkosi Moyo (eds.). 2013. *Giving to Help, Helping to Give*. Dakar: Amalion Publishers.
- Akesbi, Azeddine with Saâd Filali Meknassi, and Mohamed Bouja. 2011. CIVICUS civil society index analytical country report for Morocco. Espace Associatif & CIVICUS. Retrieved August 30, 2016
http://www.civicus.org/images/stories/csi/csi_phase2/morocco%20acr.pdf
- Andreoni, James, Eleanor Brown & Isaac Rischall. 2003. Charitable Giving by Married Couples. Who Decides and Why Does it Matter? *The Journal of Human Resources* 38 (1) 111-133
- Angonoticias. 2010. Filantropia traz futebolistas de luxo a Angola. Retrieved July 30, 2013
<http://www.angonoticias.com/Artigos/item/25810>.

- Akintola, Olagoke. 2004. A gendered analysis of the burden of care on family and volunteer caregivers in Uganda and South Africa. Durban, South Africa, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Health Economics and HIV / AIDS Research Division [HEARD].
- Anheier, Helmut, K. and Diana Leat. 2013. Philanthropic Foundations: What Rationales? *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 80 (2), 449-472.
- Anheier, Helmut, K. and Regina A. List. 2005. *A dictionary of civil society, philanthropy and the non-profit sector*. London and New York: Routledge
- Atibil, Christiana, L. 2013. Does it matter where the money comes from? African civil society and the question of dependency on foreign donors: Implications for citizen participation and sustainability. Paper presented at the ISTR/Africa Network Conference, Nairobi, Kenya, July 11-13, 2013.
- Atibil, Christiana, L. 2014. Philanthropic foundations and civil society in Sub-Saharan Africa. Pp. 457-474 in *The Handbook of civil society in Africa* edited by Ebenezer Obadare. New York, USA: Springer International.
- August, Oliver. 2013. Africa Rising: A hopeful continent. *The Economist*. 12 March 2013 Retrieved September 20, 2013 (<http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21572377-african-lives-have-already-greatly-improved-over-past-decade-says-oliver-august>).
- Bebbington, Anthony. 2010. *Social Movements and Poverty in Developing Countries*. (UNRISD Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper). United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Becker, Gary. S. 1974. A theory of social interactions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82 (6), 1063–1093.
- Bekkers, René 2004. *Giving and volunteering in the Netherlands: Sociological and Psychological Perspectives*, Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands. Retrieved July 10, 2016, <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal/files/2973374/bekkersrhfp-uu-diss.pdf>
- Bekkers, René & Pamala Wiepking. 2007. *Generosity and philanthropy: A literature review*. Retrieved July 10, 2016 (https://generosityresearch.nd.edu/assets/17632/generosity_and_philanthropy_final.pdf).
- Beinhocker, Eric. 2006. *The origin of wealth: Evolution, complexity and the radical remaking of economics*. New York: Random House.
- Belfield CR & AP Beney. 2000. What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economics*, 8 (1): 65-80
- Belk, Russell W. 2009. “Sharing,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (5), 715–34.
- Bench Marks Foundation. 2007. *Policy gap: A review of the corporate social responsibility programmes of the platinum mining industry in the North West Province*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Bench Marks Foundation.
- Bench Marks Foundation. 2008a. *Policy gap 3: Corporate social responsibility in the Zambian mining industry*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Bench Marks Foundation.
- Bench Marks Foundation. 2008b. *Review of corporate social responsibility programmes of the platinum, coal, gold and uranium mining sectors in South Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Bench Marks Foundation.

- Bench Marks Foundation. 2009a. *Policy gap 5: Corporate social responsibility in the diamond mining industry in Botswana. De Beers, Botswana and the control of a country*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Bench Marks Foundation.
- Bench Marks Foundation. 2009b. *Corporate Social Responsibility in the diamond mining industry on the West coast of South Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Bench Marks Foundation.
- Bench Marks Foundation. 2012. *Policy gap 6: Communities in the platinum mine fields, a review of platinum mining in the Bojanala district of the North West Province*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Bench Marks Foundation.
- Birn, Anne-Emanuelle. 2014. Philanthrocapitalism, past and present: The Rockefeller Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the setting(s) of the international/global health agenda. *Hypothesis* 12 (1): 1-27. Doi:10.5779/hypothesis.v12i1.229.
- Bishop, Mathew and Michael Green. 2008. *Philanthrocapitalism: How the rich can save the world*. New York, USA: Bloomsbury
- Black, Robert E., Maharaj K. Bhan, Mickey Chopra, M., Igor Rudan, I. & Cesar G. Victora. 2009. Accelerating the health impact of the Gates Foundation, *The Lancet*, 373 (9675): 1584-1585.
- Blowfield, Michael & Jedrzej George Frynas. 2005. Setting New Agendas: Critical Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility in the Developing World, *International Affairs*, 81 (3): 499-513.
- BoE Private Clients. 2011. *The Giving Report 2010: A survey on the philanthropy practices of high net Worth individuals in South Africa: Summary Results*. Retrieved September 11, 2013 (https://www.nedbankprivatewealth.co.za/nedbank_wealth/action/media/downloadFile?media_fileid=369)
- Bond, Sarah. 2011. Philanthropy in ancient times: some early examples from the Mediterranean. Retrieved September 11, 2016 <http://sofii.org/article/philanthropy-in-ancient-times-some-early-examples-from-the-mediterranean>
- Boulding, Kenneth. 1953. *The Organizational Revolution*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bowen, Howard, R. 1953. *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bowman, Woods. 2009. Philanthropy and Religion, Christianity. Pp.1163-1166 in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* edited by HK. Anheier, S. Toepler and R. List. New York, USA: Springer.
- Bracking, Sarah. 2015. *Philanthropy and development in Southern Africa: Philanthropy and illicit flows: Options for African philanthropy to support better economic governance and reduce illicit financial flows*. Johannesburg: Southern Africa Trust.
- Brown, Kevin M., Susan Kenny and Bryan S. Turner. 2000. *Rhetorics of welfare: Uncertainty, choice, and voluntary associations*. London, UK: Macmillan.

- Brown, Tom, J. and Peter, A. Dacin. 1997. The Company and the Product: Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 61 (1): 68-84
- Campbell, James T. 1998. *Songs of Zion: The African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States and South Africa*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Campaign for Good Governance (CGG) with Christian Aid. 2006. *A Critical Time for Civil Society in Sierra Leone: a CIVICUS Civil Society Index Report for the Republic of Sierra Leone*. CIVICUS. Retrieved August 30 2016, http://www.civicus.org/media/CSI_SierraLeone_Country_Report.pdf
- Cardoso, Fernando Enrique. 1972. Dependency and development in Latin America. *New Left Review*, 74 (July/August): 83-95.
- Carnegie Andrew. 1889. The gospel of wealth. *North American Review*, 148: 653-64.
- Carroll, Archie B. 1979. A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance?' *Academy of Management Review* 4 (4): 497-505.
- Center for Development Services (CDS). 2006. *An Overview of Civil Society in Egypt: Civil Society Index Report for the Arab Republic of Egypt Cairo 2005*. Johannesburg, South Africa: CIVICUS. Retrieved August 30, 2016 http://www.civicus.org/media/CSI_Egypt_Country_Report.pdf
- Chabal, Patrick and Jean-Pascal Daloz. 1999. *Africa Works: Disorder as Political Instrument*. Oxford: James Currey
- Charen, Mona. 2001. Preface. Pp. iii-v. In *Patterns of corporate philanthropy: A Mandate for reform*, Studies in Philanthropy #31 by Christopher Yablonski. Capital Research Center. Retrieved June 2, 2016 (http://www.issuelab.org/resource/patterns_of_corporate_philanthropy_a_mandate_for_reform)
- Charities Aid Foundation (CAF). 2005. *UK Giving 2004/05*. West Malling Kent, UK: CAF.
- Charities Aid Foundation (CAF). 2010. *The World Giving Index 2010*. West Malling, Kent, UK: CAF.
- Charities Aid Foundation (CAF). 2014. *The World Giving Index 2014*. West Malling, Kent, UK: CAF.
- Chazan, Naomi, Peter Lewis, Robert A. Mortimer, Donald Rothchild, Stephen J. Stedman. 1999. *Politics and society in contemporary Africa*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- CIVICUS and Zambian Council for Social development. 2010. The status of civil society in Zambia: challenges and future prospects. Johannesburg, South Africa: CIVICUS. Retrieved May 23, 2013 (<https://civicus.org/downloads/CSI/Zambia.pdf>)
- Clarkson, Max B.E. 1995. A Stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance? *Academy of management review*, 20 (1): 92-117.
- Community Foundations Atlas. 2016. Retrieved 10, July 2016 (<http://communityfoundationatlas.org/explore/#directory=1|continent=Africa>)
- Conseil de Concertation des Organisations d'Appui aux Initiatives de Base (CCOAIB). 2011. *The state of civil society in Rwanda in National Development*. CIVICUS. Retrieved August 30, 2016 http://www.civicus.org/images/stories/csi/csi_phase2/rwanda%20acr.pdf

- Conseil National des organisations de la société civile Guinéenne (CNOSCG). 2011. *Guinean civil society: Between activity and impact. CIVICUS civil society index report for Guinea*. Retrieved August 30, 2016.
http://civicus.org/images/stories/csi/csi_phase2/guinea%20acr.pdf
- Copeland-Carson, Jacqueline. 2005. Promoting diversity in contemporary black philanthropy: Toward a new conceptual model. Pp. 77-87, In *New directions for philanthropic fundraising (Exploring Black Philanthropy)* edited by P. Rooney & L. Sherman. 2005(48).
- Copeland-Carson, Jacqueline. 2007. *Kenyan diaspora philanthropy: Key practices, trends and issues*. Prepared for The Philanthropic Initiative, Inc. and The Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University.
- Copeland-Carson, Jacqueline. 2011. Pan-Africanizing Philanthropy: Toward a Social Theory of an Emerging Sector. Pp. 125-153. In *Transnational Africa and globalization* edited by Mojúbàolú Olúfúnké Okome and Olufemi Vaughan. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Curtis, Mark. 2016. *Gated development: Is the Gates Foundation always a force for good?* Global Justice Now. Retrieved May 24 2016
(<http://www.globaljustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/resources/gated-development-global-justice-now.pdf>)
- Daley, Patricia. 2013. Rescuing African bodies: celebrities, consumerism and neoliberal humanitarianism, *Review of African Political Economy*, 40 (137), 375-393, DOI: 10.1080/03056244.2013.816944
- Darkwa, Akosua, Nicholas Amponsah & Evans Gyampoh. 2006. *Civil society in a changing Ghana: An assessment of the current state of civil society in Ghana. CIVICUS civil society index report for Ghana*. CIVICUS and GAPVOD. Retrieved August 30, 2016. http://www.civicus.org/media/CSI_Ghana_Country_Report.pdf
- Davies, Gary, Susan Whelan, Anthony Foley & Margaret Walsh. 2010. Gifts and Gifting *International journal of management reviews*, 12 (4): 413–434
- de Haan, Arjan. 2000. *Migrants, livelihood and rights: The relevance of migration in development policies*. Social Development Working Paper no. 4. London: Department for International Development.
<http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0708/DOC7584.pdf>
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Publishers.
- DENIVA. 2005. Civil society in Uganda at the crossroads? The CIVICUS civil society index project report. CIVICUS. Retrieved August 30, 2016.
<http://civicus.org/index.php/en/media-centre-129/reports-and-publications/csi-reports/africa-country-reports/321-uganda>
- Devlieger, Patrick. 1995. From self-help to charity in disability service: the Jairos Jiri Association in Zimbabwe, *Disability & Society*, 10 (1): 39-48. DOI: 10.1080/09687599550023714
- Dolan, Catherine S. & Maggie Opondo. 2005. Seeking common ground: Multi-stakeholder initiatives in Kenya's cut flower industry. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 18: 87–98.

- Donaldson, Thomas and Lee E. Preston. 1995. The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence and implications? *Academy of Management Review*, 29 (1): 65-91.
- Donati, Pierpaolo. 2003. Giving and social relations: The culture of free giving and its differentiation today. *International Review of Sociology*, 13 (2): 243-272.
- Easterly, William. 2006. *The white man's burden: Why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*. New York, USA: Penguin Books.
- Edwards, Michael. 2008. *Just another emperor? The myths and realities of philanthrocapitalism*. London: Young Foundation.
- Edwards, Michael. 2009. *Small change: why business won't save the world*, New York: Berrett-Koehler.
- Edwards, Michael. 2011a. Impact, accountability and philanthrocapitalism. *Society*, 48 (5): 389-390.
- Edwards, Michael. 2011b. *The role and limitations of philanthropy*. The Bellagio Initiative partners: Institute of Development Studies (IDS), the Resource Alliance and the Rockefeller Foundation. Retrieved May 24, 2016 (<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/123456789/3717/Bellagio-Edwards.pdf?sequence=1>)
- Einolf, Christopher & Susan M. Chambré. 2011. Who volunteers? Constructing a hybrid theory' *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16 (4): 298-310.
- Einolf, Christopher J., Lionel Prouteau, Tamara Nezhina & Aigerim R. Ibrayeva. 2016. Informal, Unorganized Volunteering. In *The Palgrave handbook of volunteering, civic participation, and nonprofit associations* edited David Horton Smith, Robert A. Stebbins, Jurgen Grotz. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eisenberg, Pablo (edited by Stacy Palmer). 2004. *Challenges for Nonprofit and Philanthropy*. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.
- el-Daly, Marwa (2007) *Philanthropy in Egypt: A comprehensive study on local philanthropy in Egypt and potentials of directing giving and volunteering towards development*, Cairo, Egypt: Center for Development Services, The American University in Cairo. Retrieved June 4 2016 (<http://dar.aucegypt.edu/handle/10526/1678>)
- Esser, Daniel E. & Kara Keating Bench. 2011. *Does Global Health Funding Respond to Recipients Needs? Comparing Public and Private Donors' Allocations in 2005-2007*, *World Development*, 39 (8): 1271-1280.
- Esser, Daniel E. 2009. More money, less cure: Why global health assistance needs restructuring. *Ethics and International Affairs*, 23 (3): 225-234.
- Everatt, David and Geetesh Solanki. 2004. *A nation of givers? Social giving among South Africans*. Durban/South Africa: Centre for Civil Society, University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Everatt, David and Geetesh Solanki. 2008. A nation of givers? Results from a national survey of social giving. Pp.45-78 in *Giving and Solidarity: Resource Flows for Poverty Alleviation in South Africa*. Edited by A. Habib & B. Maharaj. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

- Everatt, David, Adam Habib, Brij Maharaj & Annsilla Nyar. 2005. Patterns of giving in South Africa. *Voluntas* 16(3): 275-291
- Feierman, Steven. 1998. "Reciprocity and Assistance in Precolonial Africa, Pp.3-24. In *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions* edited by Warren E Ilchman, Stanley N. Katz, and Edward L. Queen. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Fioramonti, Lorenzo and Regelbrugge, Laurie. 2008. From Corporate Philanthropy to Social Responsibility and Accountability: the unfulfilled potential of civil society-business engagement. Pp.289-305 in *CIVICUS Global Survey of the State of Civil Society, Volume 2, Comparative Perspectives*, Edited by VF Heinrich & L. Fioramonti. Bloomfield, USA: Kumarian Press, Inc.
- Fletcher, P. 2013. Analysis: Africa's rise pays out dividends for democracy. Reuters. Retrieved November 27, 2014 (<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/05/us-africa-elections-idUSBRE9340BN20130405>)
- Fongto. 2006. *A diagnostic study of Togolese civil society*. CIVICUS. Retrieved august 30, 2016, http://www.civicus.org/media/csi_togo_country_report.pdf
- Fonteneau, Bénédicte. 2004. *Les défis des systèmes de micro-assurance santé en Afrique de l'Ouest: cadre politique, environnement institutionnel, fonctionnement et viabilité*, KUL-HIV A, Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad/Direction Générale de la Coopération au Développement.
- ForDIA. 2011. *Civil society index (CSI) project Tanzania country report 2011*. CIVICUS. Retrieved August 30, 2016, http://www.civicus.org/images/stories/csi/csi_phase2/tanzania%20acr%20final.pdf
- Forum Civil. 2011. *Engaging together for real change. CIVICUS civil society index analytical country report for Senegal*. CIVICUS. Retrieved August 30, 2016, http://www.civicus.org/images/stories/csi/csi_phase2/senegal%20acr%20final.pdf
- Fowler, Alan. 2002. NGOs as a moment in history: Beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation? *Third World Quarterly*, 21 (4): 637-654.
- Fowler, Alan. 2016. Concepts and framework for teaching, research and outreach of African philanthropy. Chair in African philanthropy foundational paper. Johannesburg: Wits Business School (University of the Witwatersrand) and Southern African Trust (Unpublished Draft).
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 2008 [1969]. The development of underdevelopment pp.257-268 in *Development and Underdevelopment. The political economy of Global Inequality*, edited by Mitchell A. Seligson & John T. Passe-Smith. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Freeman, Steven. 2011. Conducting an interdisciplinary literature review: publishing interdisciplinary research. Beyster fellowship symposium San Diego June 26-29, 2011 Retrieved May 25, 2016 (http://sffreeman.com/docs/sf_BeysterFellowshipSymposium110629.pdf)
- Friedman, Steven, Judi Hudson & Shaun Mackay. 2005. *Like cheese, like chalk? 'professionalism' and 'whim' in corporate giving at Anglogold Ashanti and Pick' N' Pay*, Durban, South Africa: Centre for civil society, University of KwaZulu Natal.
- Friedman, Steven, Judi Hudson & Shaun Mackay. 2008. 'The Color of Giving: Racial identity and corporate social investment.' Pp. 207-239 in *Giving and Solidarity:*

- Resource Flows for Poverty Alleviation in South Africa*. Edited by A. Habib & B. Maharaj. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.
- FrontPageAfrica. 2015. African Union declared 'Ebola champion' for Liberia intervention. In *FrontPageAfrica* December, 24, 2015. Retrieved June 10, 2016 (<http://allafrica.com/stories/201512240687.html>)
- Frumkin, Peter. 2006. *Strategic giving: The art and science of philanthropy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gavelin, Karin, and Lars Svedberg. 2011. Estimating the Scope and Magnitude of Volunteerism Worldwide. Bonn, Germany: United Nations Volunteers, External Paper BP1, State of the World's Volunteerism Report Project.
- Gilbert, Hilary and Mohammed Khedr al Jebaali. 2012. 'Community Foundation for South Sinai Not Philanthropists but Revolutionaries.' *Promoting Bedouin Participation in the 'New Egypt': A Case Study from South Sinai*. Voices on Arab Philanthropy and Civic Engagement working paper. Cairo: The John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement, American university in Cairo.
- Gilbert, Hilary, C. 2009. Walking a tightrope in South Sinai, Egypt: Testing the universality of the community foundation concept. *Giving: Thematic Issues on Philanthropy and Social Innovation*. 01/09: 139-157.
- Gilbert, Victoria Emma. 2008. *An Insight into Corporate Social Responsibility in Kenya*. University of Nottingham. Unpublished MA Thesis. Retrieved June 20, 2016 (<http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/id/eprint/22223>).
- Gillette, Arthur. 2003. Taking people out of boxes and categories: voluntary service and social cohesion, pp. 61–70. In *Service Enquiry: service in the 21st century*, edited by H. Perold, S. Stroud, & M. Sherraden. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute; VOESA.
- Global Giving Matters. 2007. Philanthropy in Kenya. Retrieved 3, July 2016 (<http://www.synergos.org/globalgivingmatters/features/0710kenyaphilanthropy.htm>).
- Global Health Watch. 2011, 'Conflict of interests within philanthrocapitalism. Pp. 276-274, in *Global Health Watch 3, People's Health Movement*. By Medact, Health Action International, Medicos International and Third World Network. London: Zed Books.
- Grady, Heather. 2014. *Philanthropy as an emerging contributor to development cooperation*. Background paper for the United Nations Development Program conference *International development cooperation: Trends and emerging opportunities – perspectives of the new actors* in Istanbul, June 2014. Retrieved April 30, 2016 (http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/documents/partners/civil_society/UNDP-CSO-philanthropy.pdf)
- Habib, Adam and Maharaj, Brij. 2008. Preface. Pp. 9-14, in *Giving and solidarity: Resource flows for poverty alleviation in South Africa*. Edited by A. Habib & B. Maharaj. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.
- Habib, Adam, Brij Maharaj and Annsilla Nyar. 2008. Giving, development and poverty alleviation. Pp. 17-44, in *Giving and solidarity: Resource flows for poverty alleviation in South Africa*. Edited by A. Habib & B. Maharaj. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

- Hagen-Zanker, J and Mallett R. 2013. How to do a rigorous, evidence- focused literature review in international development: A guidance note. Retrieved May 23 2016 (<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8572.pdf>)
- Hasan, Samiul. 2006a. *Philanthropy and social justice in Islam: Principles, prospects, and practices*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: A.S. Noordeen.
- Hassan, Samiul. 2006b. *Muslim philanthropy and social security: Prospects, practices, and pitfalls*. Paper presented at the 6th ISTR Biennial Conference held in Bangkok.
- Henriques, Irene and Perry Sadowsky. 1999. The relationship between environmental commitment and managerial perceptions of stakeholder importance? *Academy of Management Journal*, 42 (1): 89-99.
- Hodgson, Jenny & Barry Knight. 2012. *A different kind of wealth. Mapping a baseline of African community foundations*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Global fund for community foundations. Retrieved May 4 2016. (<http://www.globalfundcommunityfoundations.org/information/a-different-kind-of-wealth-mapping-a-baseline-of-african-com.html>)
- Hofstede, Geert. 1984. *Culture's consequences: Culture and work related values*, Vol. 5, Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology Series. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hofstede, Geert. 1991. *Cultures and organisations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hounyovi, Maxime Jean-Claude. 2013. La responsabilité sociétale de l'entreprise et les réactions des parties prenantes: le cas de l'opérateur téléphonique MTN et des utilisateurs de téléphonie mobile au Bénin. www.rag.sn N°4. Avril 2013 (http://www.rag.sn/IMG/pdf/Houyevimax_-tire-a-part-2.pdf)
- Hudson Institute. 2007. *The Index of Global Philanthropy*. Hudson Institute. Retrieved August 3, 2013 (<http://www.hudson.org/content/researchattachments/attachment/980/indexglobalphilanthropy2007.pdf>).
- Hustinx, Lesley, Ram A. Cnaan & Femida Handy. 2010. Navigating theories of volunteering: A hybrid map for a complex phenomenon. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 40(4): 410-434.
- Hyden, Goran. 1980. *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hyden, Goran. 1983. *No shortcuts to progress: African development management in perspective*. London: Heinemann.
- Hyden, Goran. 2006. *African politics in comparative perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Idemudia, Uwafiokun and Uwem E. Ite. 2006. Demystifying the Niger Delta conflict: Towards an integrated explanation. *Review of African Political Economy*, 33 (109): 391-406.
- Iliffe, John. 1987. *The African poor: A history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Industrial Development Corporation (IDC). n.d. Employee volunteering and giving. Retrieved September 15, 2016 <http://www.idc.co.za/home/csi/employee-volunteer-programme.html>

- Inglehart, Ronald, Miguel Basañez, Gabriela Caterberg, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Alejandro Moreno, Pippa Norris, Renata Siemieniska, and Ignacio Zuasnabar, eds. 2010. *Changing Human Beliefs and Values, 1981-2007: A Cross-Cultural Sourcebook Based on the World Values Surveys and European Values Studies*. Mexico, D.F: Sigo XXI Editores.
- Jackson Jeffrey M. & Bibb Latané. 1981. Strength and Number of Solicitors and the Urge Toward Altruism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 7 (3): 415-422
- Jacobs, Sylvia M. (ed.). 1982. *Black Americans and the Missionary Movement in Africa*. Oxford: Greenwood Press.
- Jalali, Samireh & Claes Wohlin. 2012. Systematic literature studies: Database searches vs. backward snowballing. *Proceedings of the ACM-IEEE international symposium on Empirical software engineering and measurement (ESEM)* 12, September 19-20, 2012, Lund, Sweden. Retrieved May 25, 2016 (<http://www.wohlin.eu/esem12a.pdf>)
- Jamali, Dima & Ramez Mirshak. 2007. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): Theory and Practice in a Developing Country Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72 (3): 243-262.
- Johnson, Paula D. 2010. *Global institutional philanthropy: a preliminary status report*. WINGS and TPI. Retrieved May 25, 2016 (<https://www.cbd.int/financial/charity/g-regionaloverview.pdf>)
- Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English language: Vol. I*. Retrieved July 4, 2016 (<https://ia801406.us.archive.org/21/items/dictionaryofengl01johnuoft/dictionaryofengl01johnuoft.pdf>)
- Jones, Thomas M. 1995. Instrumental stakeholder theory: A synthesis of ethics and economics? *Academy of Management Review*, 20 (2): 404-437.
- Joseph, James A. 1998. *The charitable Impulse: Wealth and social conscience in communities and cultures outside the United States*. New York, USA: The Foundation Center.
- Julien, Lisa Anne, Halima Mahomed & Shaun Samuels. 2014. *Africa's wealthy give back*. UBS and Trust Africa. Retrieved December 20, 2015 (http://wings.issueab.org/resource/africas_wealthy_give_back_a_perspective_on_philanthropic_giving_by_wealthy_africans_in_sub_saharan_africa_with_a_focus_on_kenya_nigeria_and_south_africa)
- Jung, T., Phillips, S., & Harrow, J. (Eds.). 2016. *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. London: Routledge.
- Kageni, Brenda. 2009. Taking philanthropy a notch higher with cancer patients. *Standard*, 12 August 2009. Retrieved June 3, 2016 (<http://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/1144021307/taking-philanthropy-a-notch-higher-with-cancer-patients>)
- Kalati, Noushin and James Manor. 2005. Elite perceptions of poverty and poor people in South Africa. Pp. 156 - 181. In *Elite perceptions of poverty and inequality* edited by Elisa Reis and Mick Moore. London: Zed Books.
- Kamau, Alan. nd. A new era for African philanthropy. Retrieved May 23, 2016 (<http://www.portland-communications.com/publications/communicating-global-giving/a-new-era-for-african-philanthropy/>)

- Kaplan, Abraham. 1964. *The conduct of inquiry*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing.
- Kharas, Homi. 2007. *Trends and issues in development aid*. Wolfensohn Center for Development working paper 1 (2007). Brookings Institution. Retrieved June 4 2016 (http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2007/11/development-aid-kharas/11_development_aid_kharas.pdf).
- KHRC (Kenya Human Rights Commission). 2002. *Exposing the Soft Belly of the Multinational Beast: The Struggle for Workers' Rights at Del Monte Kenya*. Nairobi: KHRC.
- Kipp, Walter, Thomas Matukala Nkosi, Lory Laing, and Gian S. Jhangri. 2006. Care burden and self-reported health status of informal women caregivers of HIV/AIDS patients in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo." *AIDS care* 18 (7): 694-697.
- Kivuitu Mumo, Kavwanga Yambayamba and Tom Fox. 2005. *How can corporate social responsibility deliver in Africa? Insights from Kenya and Zambia*. Retrieved June 4, 2016 (<pubs.iied.org/pdfs/16006IIED.pdf>)
- Kunljian, Christa L. (2005). *Philanthropy and equity: The case of South Africa*. Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University.
- La Concertation. 2003. *Inventaire des mutuelles de santé en Afrique*. Retrieved June 4, 2016 (<http://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/RessourcePDF.do?ressource.ressourceId=82>)
- Lecy, Jesse D. & Kate E. Beatty. 2012. Representative literature reviews using constrained snowball sampling and citation network analysis. Retrieved May 13 2016 http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1992601
DOI:10.2139/ssrn.1992601
- Lee, Mathew. 2006. Kenyan Maasai cattle forge 9/11 bond with US. *Mail and Guardian*, September 11, 2006. Retrieved June 13, 2016 (<http://mg.co.za/article/2006-09-11-kenyan-maasai-cattle-forge-911-bond-with-us>)
- Leigh, Robert, David Horton Smith, Cornelia Giesing, María José León, Debbie Haski-Leventhal, Benjamin J. Lough, Jacob Mwathi Mati, and Sabine Strassburg. (2011). *2011 State of the world's volunteerism report: Universal values for global well being* (P. Hockenos, Ed.). Bonn, Germany: United Nations Volunteers (UNV).
- Lemma, Salome. 2014. African philanthropy, the new drivers of development. *The Guardian* (May 7, 2014). Retrieved June 13, 2016 (<http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2014/may/07/africa-diaspora-philanthropy-development>)
- Lokossou, C. 2005. Diagnostic sur le mouvement mutualiste au Bénin, Atelier au Bénin, 6-8 juillet, du projet BIT-STEP d'Appui à la construction d'un cadre régional de développement des mutuelles de santé dans les pays de l'UEMOA.
- Magat, Richard. (ed.). 1989. *An agile servant: Community leadership by community foundations*. New York: Foundation Center.
- Mahomed, Halima. 2008. *Philanthropy and social justice in South Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: University of the Witwatersrand, Unpublished MA Thesis.
- Mahomed, Halima. 2009. Conceptual frameworks influencing social justice philanthropy: A study of independent funders in South Africa in *The state of philanthropy*, in Africa. Dakar: TrustAfrica.

- Maignan Isabelle & O.C. Ferrel. 2004. Corporate social responsibility and marketing: An integrative framework. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 32 (1): 3-19.
- Maignan, Isabelle & David A. Ralston. 2002. Corporate social responsibility in Europe and the US.: Insights from businesses self-presentations, *Journal of International Business Studies* 33(3): 497–514.
- Mail & Guardian. 2014. Employee volunteers contribute to skills development in South Africa. *Mail & Guardian Online* 12 Mar. 2014. Retrieved September 12, 2016 <http://mg.co.za/article/2014-03-12-employee-volunteers-contribute-to-skills-development-in-south-africa>
- Makhanu, Sibilike, K. 2006. Resource mobilization for re-construction and development projects in developing countries: The case of Kenya. A paper presented at an international conference and student competition on post-disaster reconstruction, Florence, Italy, May 17-19, 2006
- Manji, Foroze. 2006. *Philanthropy in East Africa – Connie Ngondi-Houghton*. Book Review in *Alliance Magazine*, March 2006. Retrieved July 16, 2016 (<http://www.alliancemagazine.org/book-review/philanthropy-in-east-africa-connie-ngondi-houghton/>)
- Maphosa, France. 1997. Corporate social responsibility in Zimbabwe: A content analysis of mission statements and annual reports. *Zambezia*, XXIV (ii): 180-193.
- Marsden, Chris. 2005. In defence of corporate responsibility. *ZFWU (Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Unternehmensethik)* 6 (3): 359-373.
- Mati, Jacob Mwathi. 2012. *The power and limits of social movements in promoting political and constitutional change: The case of the Ufungamano Initiative in Kenya (1999-2005)*. Johannesburg, South Africa: University of the Witwatersrand, Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
- Mati, Jacob Mwathi. 2014. Neoliberalism and the forms of civil society in Kenya and South Africa. Pp. 215-232 in *Handbook of civil society in Africa*, edited by E. Obadare. New York, USA: Springer International.
- Mati, Jacob Mwathi. 2015. Constraining Political Transformation: The Two Faces of Activist Religious Organizations in the Search for a New Constitution in Kenya. *Journal of Civil Society*, 11 (4): 348-365.
- Mati, Jacob Mwathi. 2016. Horizontality: The peculiarity of African volunteering? A paper presented at the 12th ISTR conference, at Ersta Sköndal University College Stockholm, Sweden June 28 – July 1, 2016.
- Mati, Jacob Mwathi. 2016. Omnipresent yet invisible: A review of African Philanthropy. In *Variations of philanthropy in South Africa: Social justice, horizontality, and Ubuntu* edited by M. Ngcoya & S. Mottiar. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.
- Mati, Jacob Mwathi and Bev Russell. 2013. *African philanthropy project resource base*. Unpublished report by Social Surveys Africa for Trust Africa. Johannesburg, South Africa: Social Surveys Africa.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1969[1954]. *The Gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*. London: Cohen & West.

- McCauley, Lauren. 2015. Gates Foundation's seed agenda in Africa 'another form of colonialism,' warns protesters. Retrieved May 24 2016 (<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/03/23/gates-foundations-seed-agenda-africa-another-form-colonialism-warns-protesters>)
- McCoy, David, Gayatri Kumbhavi, Jinesh Patel & Akish Luintel, A. 2009, 'The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's grant-making programme for global health. *The Lancet*. 373 (9675): 1645–1653.
- McGoey, Linsey. 2012. Philanthrocapitalism and its critics. *Poetics*. 40 (2): 185–199.
- McGoey, Linsey. 2015. *No such thing as a free gift: The Gates Foundation and the price of philanthropy*. London: Verso.
- Messias, DeAnne K. Hilfinger, Margaret K. DeJong and Kerry McLoughlin. 2005a. Being involved and making a difference. Empowerment and well-being among women living in poverty. *Journal of holistic nursing*, 23 (1): 70-88.
- Messias, DeAnne K. Hilfinger, Margaret K. DeJong and Kerry McLoughlin. 2005b. Expanding the concept of women's work: Volunteer work in the context of poverty. *Journal of Poverty*, 9 (3): 25-47.
- Mombeshora, Solomon. 2004. *Philanthropy of community in Zimbabwe: past, present and future*. A paper prepared for the building community philanthropy project at the Centre for Leadership and Public Values, Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Moore, Carol. 2014 *Corporate social responsibility and creating shared value: What's the difference?* Little Rock: Heifer International. Retrieved July 5, 2016 (https://sharedvalue.org/sites/default/files/resource-files/CFR-047%20Corporate%20Social%20Responsibility%20White%20Paper_FINAL.pdf)
- Mottiar, Shauna. 2015. Philanthropy and resource governance. In *Philanthropy and development in Southern Africa Series*. Retrieved 2 March 2016 (<http://www.southernafricatrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Paper-One-Philanthropy-and-Resource-Governance.pdf>)
- Mottiar, Shauna and Mvuselelo Ngcoya. 2016. 'Indigenous philanthropy: challenging Western conceptions. Pp. 151-161, in *The Routledge companion to philanthropy*, edited by Tobias Jung, Susan D. Phillips, Jenny Harrow. London, UK and New York, USA: Routledge.
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi & Katiana Ramsamy. 2014. African philanthropy, Pan-Africanism, and Africa's development. *Development in Practice*, 24 (5-6): 656-671, DOI: 10.1080/09614524.2014.937399
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2004. *Philanthropy in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities, a study of southern Africa*. Prepared for the Ford Foundation Philanthropy Retreat, Jinja, Uganda, 28 March–02 April.
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2005. *Setting the development agenda. U.S foundations and the NPO sector in South Africa: A case study of Ford, Mott, Kellogg and Open Society Foundations*. Johannesburg, South Africa: University of the Witwatersrand, Unpublished PhD Dissertation.

- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2008. Optimizing institutional philanthropy in Africa by 2020. Salzburg Global Seminar. Retrieved October 14 2014 (<http://www.bellagioinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/OIP-in-Africa.pdf>).
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2009a. Philanthropy in Africa. Pp. 1187-1192, in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* edited by HK. Anheier, S. Toepler and R. List. New York, USA: Springer.
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2009b. Establishing the African GrantMakers Network.' Discussion document prepared for the launch of AGN, Accra.
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2010. Philanthropy in Africa: Functions, status, challenges and opportunities. Pp. 259–70 in *Global Philanthropy*, edited by N. MacDonald and L. de Borms. London: MF Publishing.
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2011. Transformative innovations in African Philanthropy. The Bellagio Initiative partners: Institute of Development Studies (IDS), the Resource Alliance and the Rockefeller Foundation. Retrieved May 24, 2016 (http://www.bhekinkosimoyo.com/downloads/transformative_innovations_in_african_philanthropy.pdf)
- Moyo, Bhikinkosi. 2013. Funding a more equal future: Philanthropy and social justice in Africa. In *OpenSpace*, Special edition on Money, Power & Sex: The Paradox of Unequal Growth. Issue 3. June 2013, Johannesburg, South Africa: OSISA. Retrieved 14/10/2014 (<http://www.osisa.org/sites/default/files/gamechanger02-bhekinkosimoyo.pdf>).
- Moyo, Dambiso. 2009. *Dead aid: why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa*. New York, USA: Farrar, Straus and Giroux
- Msweli, Pumela, Tawaziwa Wushe, and Wedzerai C. Mandudzo. 2013. Corporate community engagement: Literature search for construct validation. A case of the extractive industry in Zimbabwe. *International journal of social science and humanity*, 3 (4): 354-359.
- Muchie, Mammo. 1999. *Problems of Sub-Saharan Africa's renewal in the era of globalisation*. Aalborg: Institut for Historie, Internationale Studier og Samfundsforhold, Aalborg Universitet. Retrieved November 27, 2014 (http://vbn.aau.dk/files/19951074/DIR_wp_70.pdf).
- Mukwedeza, Tatenda. 2009. *Exploring the role of remittances in household livelihood strategies in Glen-Norah, Harare*. Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand. Unpublished thesis.
- Mukwedeza, Tatenda. 2011. Zimbabwe's Saving Grace: The Role of Remittances in Household Livelihood Strategies in Glen Norah, Harare. *South African Review of Sociology* 42 (1): 116-130.
- Mukwedeza, Tatenda. 2012. Enduring the crisis: Remittances and household livelihood strategies in Glen Norah, Harare. Pp.42-61 in *Crisis! What Crisis? The multiple dimensions of the Zimbabwean crisis* edited by Sarah Chiumbu, Muchaparara Musemwa. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Musabayana, Wynne. 2016. The African Union's intervention in the Ebola crisis was a game changer. African Union support to Ebola outbreak in West Africa (ASEOWA)

- February 11, 2016. Retrieved June 10, 2016
(<http://allafrica.com/stories/201602121153.html>).
- Muthuri, Judy N. & Victoria Gilbert. 2011. An institutional analysis of corporate social responsibility in Kenya. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98 (3): 467-483, DOI:10.1007/s10551-010-0588-9.
- Muthuri, Judy N. 2012. 'Corporate Social Responsibility in Africa: Definition, Issues and Processes' Retrieved November 27, 2014,
<https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/management/documents/pdf/events/2012-judy-muthuri-seminar.pdf>
- Muthuri, Judy N., Ditten Matten & Jeremy Moon. 2009. Employee volunteering and social capital: contributions to corporate social responsibility. *British Journal of Management*, 20 (1): 75-89.
- Muthuri, Judy N., Jeremy Moon & Uwafiokun Idemudia. 2012. Corporate innovation and sustainable community development in developing countries. *Business & Society*, 51 (3): 355-38. DOI 10.1177/0007650312446441.
- Muthuri, Judy N., Wendy Chapple & Jeremy Moon. 2008. An integrated approach to implementing community participation in corporate community involvement: Lessons from Magadi Soda Company in Kenya. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85 (supplement 2): 431-444 DOI 10.1007/s10551-008-9739-7
- Muthuri, Judy, N. 2007. Corporate citizenship and sustainable community development: Fostering multi-sector collaboration in Magadi Division in Kenya. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Issue 28 (Winter 2007): 73-84
- Muthuri, Judy, N. 2008. Participation and accountability in corporate community involvement programmes: a research agenda. *Community Development Journal*, 43 (2): 177-193.
- Mwiria, Kilemi. 2010. Equity has set pace in philanthropy that could propel Kenya to greater heights. *Standard 1 May 2010*. Retrieved June 10 2016.
<http://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2000008777/equity-has-set-pace-in-philanthropy-that-could-propel-kenya-to-greater-heights>
- Nährlich, Stefan. 2009. Corporate giving. Pp. 570-576, in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* edited by HK. Anheier, S. Toepler and R. List. New York, USA: Springer.
- Nedbank Private Wealth. 2013. The giving report II: A survey on the giving practices of high-net-worth individuals in South Africa. Nedbank Private Wealth. Retrieved November 9, 2013
https://www.nedbankprivatewealth.com/nedbank_wealth/action/media/downloadFile?media_fileid=1333.
- Nielsen, Waldemar A. 1985. *The Golden Donors: A New Anatomy of the Great Foundations*. New York: Dutton Adult.
- Ngcoya, Mvuselelo and Shauna Mottiar. 2016. Understanding horizontal philanthropy. In *Variations of philanthropy in South Africa: Social justice, horizontality, and Ubuntu*. Edited by M. Ngcoya & S. Mottiar. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

- Ngcoya, Mvuselelo and Shauna Mottiar. (eds). 2016. *Variations of philanthropy in South Africa: Social justice, horizontality, and Ubuntu*. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.
- Ngondi-Houghton, Connie. 2004. *Philanthropy in East Africa: Challenges and opportunities*. Paper prepared for the Ford Foundation Retreat, Ford Foundation, Jinja, Uganda.
- Ngondi-Houghton, Connie. 2006. *Philanthropy in East Africa*. London, UK: Allavida.
- Ngondi-Houghton, Connie. 2008. *Promoting philanthropy in Kenya: The case for tax law reform*. Farnham, UK: Allavida.
- Nkopane, Puseletso. 2016. *Giving Back: The rise of African philanthropy*. Retrieved 23 May 2016 (<http://africandevjobs.com/devstories/rise-african-philanthropy/>)
- Nsehe, Mfonobong. 2013. The most generous philanthropists in Africa in 2012. Forbes com. Retrieved June 10 2016 (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/mfonobongnsehe/2013/01/20/the-most-generous-philanthropists-in-africa-in-2012/#51dedb9c76a3>)
- Nujjoo, Aleeshah & Ines Meyer. 2012. The relative importance of different types of rewards for employee motivation and commitment in South Africa. *SA journal of human resource management*, 10(2), Art. #442, 10 pages, doi: 10.4102/sajhrm.v10i2.442 Retrieved August 23, 2016, <http://www.sajhrm.co.za/index.php/sajhrm/article/viewFile/442/532>
- Nxumalo, Manqoba. 2013. 'The rise of African philanthropy.' In Mail & Guardian, 26 APR 2013. Retrieved May 23 2016 (<http://mg.co.za/article/2013-04-26-00-the-rise-of-african-philanthropy>).
- Nyssens, Marthe & Vermer, Marie-Catherine. 2012. La régulation des mutuelles de santé au Bénin. Pp. 123 -140, in *L'Etat, acteur de développement*, edited by F. Leloup, J. Brot & H. Gérardin. Paris, France: Karthala. Retrieved June 29, 2013 (<http://hdl.handle.net/2078.1/111640>).
- Olagnero Manuela, Antonella Meo & Mary P. Corcoran. 2005. Social support networks in impoverished European neighbourhoods. *European societies*, 7 (1): 53-79.
- Ollila, Eeva. 2005. Global health priorities: priorities of the wealthy? *Globalization and Health*, 1 (6), doi doi:10.1186/1744-8603-1-6.
- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The logic of collective action*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Opondo, Maggie. 2009. *The Impact of Chinese firms on CSR in Kenya's garment sector*. Working Paper Series No. 7. The International Research Network on Business and Development Society. Retrieved 2, Jun 2016 (<http://bdsnetwork.cbs.dk>).
- Osili, Una Okonkwo and Dan Du. 2005. Immigrant assimilation and charitable giving. *New directions in philanthropic fundraising* 48:89-104
- Orozco, Manuel, Micah Bump, Rachel Fedewa and Katya Sienkiewicz. 2005. *Diasporas, Development and Transnational integration: Ghanaians in the U.S., U.K. and Germany*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of International Migration and the Inter-American Dialogue.
- Page, Ben. 2007. Slow going: the mortuary, modernity and the hometown association in Bali-Nyonga, Cameroon. *Africa*, 77 (3): 419-441.

- Page, John & Sonia Plaza. 2006. Migration remittances and development: A review of global evidence. *Journal of African Economies*, 15 (suppl 2): 245-336.
- Patel, Leila & Rodreck Mupedziswa (eds.). 2007. *Research Partnerships Build the Service Field in Africa* [Special Issue on Civic Service in the Southern African Development Community]. Johannesburg: The Social Work Practitioner-Researcher, University of Johannesburg and the Journal of Social Development in Africa, School of Social Work, University of Zimbabwe Joint issue.
- Pitcher, Anne. Mary H. Moran, Michael Johnston. 2009. Rethinking Patrimonialism and Neopatrimonialism in Africa. *African Studies Review*, 52 (1): 125-156.
- Portal da Filantropia. 2013. Angola: Unitel doa bens de saúde' retrieved July 4, 2013 http://portaldafilantropia.org/pt/news_text-2-14-707-angola-unitel-doa-bens-de-saude#.UjH91SRwblU
- Pratt Brian, John Hailey, Michela Gallo, Rebecca Shadwick, and Rachel Hayman. 2012. Understanding private donors in international development. INTRAC policy briefing paper 31. <http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/747/Briefing-Paper-31-Understanding-private-donors-in-international-development.pdf>
- Ricciuti, Elisa and Neil Spicer. 2016. 'It's my innovation, not yours': How recognition, visibility and innovation influence grant-making among foundations for global health. Paper submitted to the 12th International conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) at Ersta Sköndal University College, Stockholm, Sweden, June 28 - July 1, 2016.
- Roxburgh, Charles, Norbert Dörr, Acha Leke, Amine Tazi-Riffi, Arend van Wamelen, Susan Lund, Mutsa Chironga, Tarik Alatovik, Charles Atkins, Nadia Terfous, Till Zeino-Mahmalat. 2010. *Lions on the move: The progress and potential of African economies*. Seoul, San Francisco, London, Washington: McKinsey & Company. Retrieved May 24 2016 (<http://www.mckinsey.com/global-themes/middle-east-and-africa/lions-on-the-move>)
- Russell, Bev. 2016. Measuring the contribution of volunteering to the sustainable development goals: The measurement of volunteering in the global South. Paper presented at Twelfth International Conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR), at Ersta Sköndal University College, Stockholm, Sweden, June 28 - July 1, 2016.
- Sacks, Eleanor, W. 2005. *WINGS 2005 Community Foundation Global Status Report*. Brussels: Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support.
- Salamon, Lester M. 1994. The rise of the nonprofit sector. *Foreign Affairs*, 73 (4): 109-122
- Salamon, Lester M. 1995. *Partners in public service*. Baltimore, USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Salamon, Lester M., S. Wojciech Sokolowski, and Megan A. Haddock. 2011. Measuring the Economic Value of Volunteer Work Globally: Concepts, Estimates, and a Roadmap to the Future. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 82 (3):217-252.
- Salole, Gerry. 1991. Not seeing the wood for the trees: Searching for indigenous non-government organisations in the forest of voluntary self help associations. *Journal of social development in Africa*, 6 (1): 5-17.

- Schofer, Evan and Wesley Longhofer. 2011. The Structural Sources of Association. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(2): 539-585.
- Sen, Sankar and C.B. Bhattacharya. 2001. Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of marketing research*, 38 (2): 225-243
- Shiffman, Jeremy. 2006. Donor funding priorities for communicable disease control in the developing world. *Health policy and planning*, 21 (6): 411–420.
- Siebel, Hans Dieter. 2000. Informal Finance: Origins, Evolutionary Trends and Donor Options. Paper presented at a conference on *Advancing Microfinance in Rural West Africa*, Bamako, Mali, Feb. 22–25, 2000.
- Smith, David H. 1973. Modernization and the emergence of voluntary organizations. Pp. 49-73 in *Voluntary Action Research*: edited by D. H. Smith. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company.
- Smith, David H. 2014. The global spirit of philanthropy and altruism: Meanings, experiences, and some biological roots. *The China nonprofit review*, 6 (2): 177-196.
- Smith, David H. (in press) 2016. Four Global Associational Revolutions: Explaining their causes and setting straight the socio-historical record. *Civil Society in Russia and Beyond* 7.
- Smith, David H., Brent Never, John Mohan, Lionel Prouteau and Lars Torpe. 2016. Prevalence Rates of Associations across Territories. Chapter 50 in *The Palgrave handbook of volunteering, civic participation, and nonprofit associations*, edited by David Horton Smith, Robert A. Stebbins, and Jurgen Grotz. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, David H., Brent Never, Lars Torpe, Samir Abu-Rumman, Amer Afaq, Steffen Bethmann, Karin Gavelin, Jan H. Heitman, Trishna Jaishi, Ambalika D. Kutty, Jacob Mwathi Mati, Yevgenya J. Paturyan, Rumen G. Petrov, Tereza Pospíšilová, and Lars Svedberg. 2016. Scope and Trends of Volunteering and Associations. Chapter 51 in *The Palgrave handbook of volunteering, civic participation, and nonprofit associations* edited David Horton Smith, Robert A. Stebbins, Jurgen Grotz. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, David H. and Robert A. Stebbins. 2016. Introduction. In *The Palgrave handbook of volunteering, civic participation, and nonprofit associations*, edited by David Horton Smith, Robert A. Stebbins, Jurgen Grotz. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, David H., Robert A. Stebbins, and Michael Dover. 2006. *A Dictionary of nonprofit terms and concepts*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Smith, David H., with Sharon Eng and Kelly Albertson. 2016. The darker side of philanthropy: How self-interest and incompetence can overcome a love of mankind and serving the public interest. Pp. 273-286, in *The Routledge companion to philanthropy*, edited by Tobias Jung, Susan Phillips, and Jenny Harrow. London: Routledge
- Sridhar, Devi & Rajaie Batniji. 2008, Misfinancing global health: a case for transparency in disbursements and decision making, *The Lancet*, 372 (9644): 1185–1191.
- Stern, Ken. 2013. *With Charity for All*. New York: Doubleday.

- Strassburg, Sabina. 2010. Volunteering among the poor. Unpublished background paper for UNV's SWVR 2011.
- Sulek, Marty. 2010a. On the modern meaning of philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39 (2): 193-212.
- Sulek, Marty. 2010b. On the classical meaning of *philanthrôpía*. *Nonprofit and voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39 (3), 385-408.
- Swanson, Diane L. 1995. Addressing a theoretical problem by reorienting the corporate social performance model? *Academy of management review*, 20 (1): 43-64.
- Swilling, Mark and Bev Russell. 2002. *The size and scope of the non-profit sector in South Africa*. Durban, South Africa: Centre for Civil Society.
- Taniguchi, Hiromi. 2012. The determinants of formal and informal volunteering: evidence from the American time use survey. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23 (4): 920-939.
- Tchouassi, Gérard & Benjamin O. Nosseyamba. 2011. Corporate governance and maximization of shareholder value: Theoretical analysis from Francophone countries in Africa. *Journal of public administration and policy research*, 3 (6): 198-206.
- Tchouassi, Gérard & Fondo Sikod. 2010. Altruistic preferences as motivation for migrants in the diaspora to remit to home communities. *Research in applied economics*. 2 (1): 1-18.
- Tchouassi, Gérard. 2011. Do Samaritan migrants really work for the development of local communities? Evidence from Cameroon in Central Africa. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 4 (8): 482-491.
- The Economist. 2000. 'Hopeless Africa' *The Economist*, May 11, 2000. Available online at (<http://www.economist.com/node/333429>)
- The Economist. 2015. 'The gifts of the moguls: Extreme philanthropy is the upside of a worryingly unequal distribution of wealth.' *The Economist*, December 12, 2015. Retrieved July 3, 2016 (<http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21679796-extreme-philanthropy-upside-worryingly-unequal-distribution>).
- Theunissen, Connie. 2003. *How do people in Rustenburg Give?* Survey Report. Rustenburg: The Greater Rustenburg Community Foundation.
- Trust Africa and WINGS Global Fund for Community Foundations. 2008. *Philanthropy of Africa*. Dakar, Senegal: Trust Africa.
- Trust Africa and WINGS Global Fund for Community Foundations. 2008. *Trust Africa discussion paper: Philanthropy of Africa*. Trust Africa and WINGS Global Fund for Community Foundations.
- Tsu, Yu-yeu. 1912. *The spirit of Chinese philanthropy: A study in mutual aid*. New York: Colombia University. PhD dissertation.
- Uduku, Ola. 2002. The socio-economic basis of a diaspora community: 'Igbo bu ike'. *Review of African Political Economy*, 29 (92): 301-311.
- UNECA, 2013, *Track It! Stop it! Get it! Illicit financial flows: Report of the high level panel in illicit financial flows from Africa*. Ababa: United Nations Economic Commission from Africa, Addis.

- UNECA, 2014, *Diaspora Remittances and Other Financial Flows in Africa*. Addis Ababa: United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.
- USAID. 2014. The 2014 CSO Sustainability Index for Sub-Saharan Africa. Retrieved June 1, 2016 (<https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/2014%20Africa%20CSOSI%20FINAL.pdf>)
- Voice of America. 2006. Kenya's Maasai commemorate 9/11 victims. *Voice of America* October 31, 2009. Retrieved November 6, 2015 (<http://www.voanews.com/content/a-13-2006-09-11-voa22/400080.html>).
- Voicu, Mălina & Bogdan Voicu. 2003. Volunteering in Romania. In: P. Dekker and L. Halman (Eds). *The values of volunteering: cross-cultural perspectives*. New York: Kluwer Academic; Plenum.
- Wagner, David. 2000. *What's Love Got to Do with It? A Critical Look at American Charity*. New York: The New Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. The Rise and demise of the World System: concepts for comparative Analysis. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16 (4): 387-415.
- Wartick, Steven L. and Philip L. Cochran. 1985. The evolution of the corporate social performance model? *Academy of management review*, 10 (4): 758-769.
- Webster, Noah. 1928. *American Dictionary of the English Language*. Retrieved July 10, 2016 (<http://webstersdictionary1828.com/>)
- Weinberger Michelle F. & Melanie Wallendorf. 2012. *Journal of consumer research*, 39 (1): 74-92.
- Weru, Jane. 2004. Community federations and city upgrading: the work of Pamoja Trust and Muungano in Kenya. *Environment & Urbanization*, 16 (1): 47-62.
- Whelan, Glen & Judy N. Muthuri. 2015. Chinese state-owned enterprises and human rights: The importance of intra-organizational pressures. *Business and Society*, (Online first) DOI: 10.1177/0007650315612399.
- White, Doug. 2006. *Charity on Trial*. Fort Lee, NJ: Barricade Books.
- Wiepking, Pamala & Femida Handy. 2015. *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wilkinson-Maposa, Susan. 2005. The rich not the only ones who can help the poor, p. 6. *Sunday Times: Business Section*, 13 February.
- Wilkinson-Maposa, Susan (ed.). 2009. *The Poor Philanthropist III: A practice-relevant guide for community philanthropy*. Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town & The Southern Africa-United States Centre for Leadership and Public Values.
- Wilkinson-Maposa, Susan, & Alan Fowler. 2009. *The Poor Philanthropist II: New approaches to sustainable development*. Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town & The Southern Africa-United States Centre for Leadership and Public Values.
- Wilkinson-Maposa, Susan, Alan Fowler, Ceri Oliver-Evans & Chao FN Mulenga. 2005. *The Poor Philanthropist: How and why the poor help each other*. Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town & The Southern Africa-United States Centre for Leadership and Public Values.

- Williams, Owain, David & Simon Rushton, S. 2011. Private Actors in Global Health Governance. Pp.1-28 in *Partnerships and Foundations in Global Health Governance*, edited by Williams, O. & Rushton, S. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Williamson, John and Jill Donahue. 2001. *A review of the COPE program and its strengthening of AIDS committee structures*. Displaced children and orphans fund, Washington D.C.
- WINGS. 2008. *WINGS 2008 Community Foundation Global Status Report*. Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS). Retrieved 27 July 2013 (http://wings.issuelab.org/resource/2008_community_foundation_global_status_report)
- Wood, Donna J. 1991. Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of management review*, 16 (4): 691-718.
- Wood, Donna J. and Raymond E. Jones. 1995. Stakeholder mismatching: A theoretical problem in empirical research on corporate social performance. *The international journal of organizational analysis*, 3 (3): 229-267.
- World Bank. 2011. *Remittances in Africa: A catalogue of studies and technical assistance by the World Bank, development agencies and government in Africa*. Washington, DC.: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2012. Poverty & Equity Data. Retrieved 27 November 2014 (<http://povertydata.worldbank.org/poverty/region/SSA>)
- World Economic Forum. 2005. *Global governance initiative annual report 2005*. World Economic Forum.
- Wright, Karen. 2001. Generosity vs. altruism: Philanthropy and charity in the United States and United Kingdom. *Voluntas*, 12 (4): 399-416.
- Wrong, Michella. 2009. *It's Our Turn to Eat: The Story of a Kenyan Whistle Blower*. London, UK: Harper Collins.
- Zuki, Mazrul Shahir Md. 2012. 'Waqf and its role in socio- economic development.' *ISRA International journal of Islamic finance*, 4 (2): 173-178.