

---

CGAP Working Paper

# Corporate philanthropy on the shop floor: what drives employee fundraising?

April 2013

Beth Breeze

---

**This paper presents findings from a research project exploring the ‘shop floor’ experience of participating in corporate philanthropy. Observation methods and interviews were used to explore employees’ views on the selection of charity partners and the experience of participating in fundraising activities in ten workplaces in the south-east of England.**

The project reveals the distinct processes by which lower-paid and lower-status staff engage in philanthropic activity in the workplace. The findings suggest that, whereas the board and senior managers emphasise the business case for corporate philanthropy (such as reputational benefits and strategic alignments with suitable charity brands), ‘shop floor’ staff prioritise charitable causes with which they have a personal connection in order to provide enjoyable fundraising experiences that break the monotony of the working day.

This paper provides a new perspective on corporate philanthropic activities, and sheds original and much-needed light on the attitudes of non-wealthy people towards beneficiaries. Findings should be useful to fundraisers in their efforts to attract and maintain relationships with corporate supporters.

## Introduction

Corporate philanthropy has existed in the UK for centuries. For as long as money has been made through commercial endeavour, some of it has been donated to support charitable activities (Elischer 1999a, p18; Sargeant and Jay 2004, pp16–17).

Despite its longevity and wide-ranging activities, corporate philanthropy accounts for only a small fraction (3%) of total charitable income in the UK (CGAP/CaritasData 2011, p13), yet enjoys a much higher public profile than other more lucrative sources of income. Whereas individuals contributed around £11 billion in 2010/11 (NCVO 2012, p45) and over £2.5 billion of funding came from the top 400 charitable trusts and foundations (DSC 2010), the total value of voluntary support from corporations is only estimated at around £750 million in 2010/11 (DSC 2011, pxvii, NCVO 2012, p36).

## Decision-making in corporate philanthropy

While corporate philanthropy has a long history, its *modus operandi* has shifted somewhat. There has been a shift from the 'philanthropic stage' or 'chairman's choice', whereby business was viewed primarily as an altruistic benefactor and the chosen causes were closely related to the philanthropic preferences of the chair or chief executive, to the 'transactional stage', also known as 'dual agenda' corporate philanthropy, whereby both business and social goals are simultaneously pursued (Burlingame and Young 1996).

Whilst this shift relates to the overall *purpose* of corporate philanthropy, recent years have also seen a shift in the *processes* by which it takes place, notably the increasing involvement of the workforce in the selection of charitable beneficiaries through procedures that involve consulting employees, establishing charity committees with representatives from across the company and the use of staff ballots to vote for beneficiaries. In 2009 just one in seven companies used some form of democratic measure to decide which cause would benefit from their corporate fundraising activities (Harvey 2009), but two years later in 2011, a quarter of all corporate partnerships were selected as a result of pitching to the staff as a whole (Ribeiro 2011).

This paper explores situations in which the wider workforce has some say in the selection of charitable beneficiaries.

## Methodology

This research is primarily based on observational methods used to study the charitable behaviours and attitudes of shop floor staff in ten different workplaces. These observations took place in regular staff meetings within which fundraising was on the agenda, at specialist charity committee meetings, or in informal settings such as over coffee in the staff canteen.

In order to gain access to the sample, in all but one case it was necessary to initially interact with more senior management staff, either on the telephone or in a face-to-face meeting. Therefore data from these 'gateway' interviews was also collected and analysed.

Finally, participant-observation was undertaken at a major gathering of people involved in corporate-charity partnerships,<sup>1</sup> where the formal presentations were observed and notes were taken during the informal discussions during coffee breaks, lunch and at the end of the event.

## Findings

### **1 Corporate philanthropy appears still primarily controlled from the top and driven by a business case**

In the companies where the fieldwork took place, a large portion of the corporate philanthropy budget appears to continue to be driven by a business case that seeks benefits such as improved reputation and brand-building, and is delivered through strategic alignment partnerships chosen by senior managers. It is the smaller donations that are allocated with any type of staff involvement, and that tend to be generated by fundraising rather than from profits. Managerial comments made during the 'gateway process' to gain access to the shop floor reflect their desire to retain control and guarantee benefits:

*'We're quite hard-nosed when we give at a company level.'*

*'This money [for corporate donations] has to be used to work as hard as the marketing budget.'*

Willingness to loosen control on the corporate philanthropy budget when the numbers are smaller is revealed in this comment:

*'If we're investing a large sum, say half a million pounds or more, then we have to think it through and have rigour and be sure we're leveraging all the value. But if it's smaller sums we're more relaxed about it.'*

When democratic procedures were introduced, the goal of improving staff morale through 'gestures of goodwill to employees' is frequently cited. For example:

*'The main aim is to give staff a feelgood factor.'*

But the most frequent explanations of corporate philanthropy from managerial staff related to the need to recruit, develop and retain good staff, such that corporate philanthropy is most often harnessed to achieve the goals of the human resources department, as this comment from a senior manager demonstrates:

*'We look to the third sector for non-traditional skills development that offers employees meaningful and memorable opportunities.'*

### **2 Despite some devolution of decision-making, there is a continuing expectation of alignment with company objectives**

Although a trend away from 'chairman's choice' and towards procedures involving a wider input for selecting beneficiaries was apparent in most of the cases studied, the management retained an expectation that corporate philanthropy would still serve

---

<sup>1</sup> This event was the Third Sector Corporate Partnerships event held in London on 23 November 2011.

business objectives. This was particularly the case when donations were made from company profits, as this quote illustrates:

*'At the end of the day, it's shareholders' money.'*

But even when the donations came from fundraising rather than being allocated from the annual budget, managers strove to achieve business benefits:

*'We are directed by a business need to be visually active in certain areas.'*

Or at the very least to avoid dis-benefits, particularly when significant sums are involved:

*'There are certain charities we would steer away from, if they were going to cause us issues.'*

### **3 Staff involvement in selecting charitable beneficiaries can be rather tokenistic**

Shop floor staff involvement in corporate philanthropy was often found to be marginal. In a typical example, a long-list of ten charities drawn up by a senior manager was presented to the staff group; from this they could vote to select the shortlist of five charities who were then invited to pitch to a committee of senior managers who made the final choice. In this scenario, the lower-rung employees have no real say over who is under consideration or who is ultimately successful. The lack of meaningful involvement in decision-making probably explains why many staff in workplaces that ostensibly ask their opinion were unaware of how causes were selected, as this quote shows:

*'I'm not fully aware of the process for selecting the charity of the year, it's just announced and then we fundraise for it. I think this year's choice is for reasons around 2012 [the London Olympics], the sponsorship that we're doing as a company.'*

### **4 Staff do not always take up the offer of participation**

Credible data on levels of participation in staff votes were not readily available, but where numbers were provided, it appears turnout rates in voting procedures are around 20% or lower. This was not perceived by senior management as being necessarily problematic, given the 'means over ends' approach described in the previous finding and exemplified again in this quote:

*'Even when people don't take up the offer to help choose charities, they feel good about the fact that it's on offer.'*

But shopfloor staff described their reluctance to cast a vote as being related to timing, priorities and confidence, as this exchange illustrates:

Hari: *'[The email about choosing charities] comes round on a Friday when we've just got too much to do, there's no time to sit down and think about it properly.'*

Researcher: *'So if you can't do it properly you don't do it?'*

Iris: *'Yeah, it's better not to fill the survey in, if you don't know enough to make good choices.'*

Researcher: *'So you'd rather not make a choice at all than make the 'wrong' choice?'*

Hari: *'Yeah. It's an important decision and you can't rush it.'*

Iris: *'I'd rather someone picked who knew more about it.'*

## **5 Decision-making by shop floor staff reflects personal experiences and preferences**

Previous CGAP research has shown that philanthropic decision-making by individuals is driven largely by donor tastes, preferences and experiences (Breeze 2010). The present study finds that the same drivers exist in the workplace, such that shop floor staff prefer to fundraise for causes to which they are naturally sympathetic and have prior experience:

*'It's a really difficult question to answer, how we pick which charities get help. It all depends on the individual's circumstances. If someone has got, say, cancer in their family they have an affinity with that. Children's charities are always popular – people always want to do things for children.'*

*'One of our colleagues unfortunately died in one of the hospices, so the X hospice is very close to us. And I've banged the drum for Y hospice because my father died there. So there is a personal feel for the hospices that we're trying to raise funds for.'*

## **6 The spread of more democratic procedures favours more established charities and 'safer' causes**

Both managers and shop floor staff recognised that widening employee participation in the selection of charitable beneficiaries creates an in-built advantage for those charities with the best name recognition and the most widespread support:

*'It's usually the big boys [of the charity sector], to be quite honest.'*

Quotes from charity staff attending a large corporate-charity partnership event demonstrate how this in-built advantage for certain types of charities and causes is perceived by those working within the charity sector:

*'They're not very fair, the same few charities win them all.'*

*'If you're one of the charities that everyone loves and are popular with staff then Charity of the Year is worth it.'*

## **7 Despite selecting serious causes, shop floor staff expect that the process of supporting a charity will be fun and will enliven their working lives**

Once a cause that is universally considered 'worthy' and relevant to the lives of most employees has been chosen, talk amongst staff turns to the pleasure and joy they get from being involved in fundraising activities:

*'Ultimately it's about having fun.'*

*'X charity was fantastic – they had people abseiling down walls and all sorts of things [big smile]. It was great fun.'*

The following exchange between three members of staff recalled the enjoyment of a recent fundraising activity at work:

Jane: *'We did a sponsored bike ride where we just had to keep two exercise bikes going in the banking hall all day.'*

Keith: *'It was really good, cos we got a load of the soldiers up from the barracks, didn't we?'* [laughter]

Laura: *'But they wanted a go, everyone wanted a go. It was good fun.'*

The idea of 'fun' was dominant in all the workplaces discussions that were observed, and articulated most vividly in these comments from a woman working in a supermarket:

*'You've got to make it fun, cos you don't get many fun days down there, believe me. Down there on the shopfloor, it's hard work. People are working constantly. They come in and do a long shift, lugging boxes, putting things on the shelves, bringing things out of the chillers, and they do work hard. So it's nice to have a bit of fun, you know?'*

## **8 As well as opportunities for light-hearted fun, employee fundraising also creates temporary opportunities to challenge corporate hierarchies**

Employee fundraising is often organised and led by shopfloor staff and involves managers engaging in activities that can be embarrassing and even painful.

For example:

*'Last year we had all of our section leaders and half our managers having their legs waxed and chests waxed. [More animated voice] Yeah! It was cool. We were meant to have a waxer come in, but she let me down at the last minute so we let the colleagues come and do it [lots of laughter]. Yeahh! [more laughter]. Some of them had their chests done, some of them had their backs done, some of them had their legs done.'*

In another workplace, shopfloor colleagues reminisced about a fundraising activity:

Natalie: *'We were at [a local shopping mall], do you remember? We were running round with a trolley?'*

Olive: *'Oh my god yeah, going though [the shopping mall] with a trolley, and we had our branch manager at the time, we was dressed up as pirates, wasn't we?'*

Multiple voices: *'Yeah.'*

Pam: *'Dressed up as a pirate, in the trolley, and we basically had a bucket ... bless him. He'll do anything for charity that bloke, he really will. Once he waxed his legs in the banking hall.'*

Multiple voices: [lots of noises of agreement and approval, eg 'yeah']

There is also a sense in which senior managers loosen their grip in order to achieve the desired objectives of raising morale and building teams:

*'We did a charity bike ride. Instead of being a boss and their team, all of a sudden we were just ten guys on bikes, riding along, enjoying each others' company.'*

When hierarchies are temporarily suspended in pursuit of a fundraising goal, wider business benefits can be achieved in terms of building relationships and trust between different tiers of a company:

*'I found myself climbing a mountain with a member of our executive committee – the most senior woman in our company! And there was also a new graduate there too. On the trip it didn't matter if they earn ten times more than you, if they climbed slower then you had to all slow down and go at their speed.'*

## Discussion

The findings highlight distinct motivations related to positions in the workplace hierarchy for engaging with corporate philanthropy. While the management appears driven primarily by pursuit of business benefits, their employees on the shopfloor are driven more by personal preference for causes and the hope for some light relief from their day job, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1 Determinants of corporate philanthropy on the board and on the shopfloor**

	<i>Rationale for charity choices</i>	<i>Driver for involvement</i>
<b>Managers</b>	<p>Appropriate brand alignment (a 'good fit') between the charity and the company.</p> <p>A respectable partner with the right image, a proven track record and a professional approach to working with the private sector.</p> <p>A strategic partnership offering continuity and potential for a long-term relationship.</p> <p>Value for money relative to alternative charities and relative to gaining benefits such as staff development opportunities.</p>	<p>Improving the reputation and credibility of the company.</p> <p>Marketing opportunities to attract and retain customers.</p> <p>Access to HR benefits (staff recruitment, retention and development).</p> <p>Publicity and public relations opportunities.</p> <p>Other tangible benefits – eg access to celebrities and entertainment opportunities for the board and directors.</p>
<b>Shopfloor staff</b>	<p>Similar to charity choices made in personal life.</p> <p>Based on personal taste and experiences of charities and causes.</p> <p>Causes that are easily understood, have widespread appeal and are believed to make good use of donations.</p> <p>Preference for well-known charity brands and local charitable organisations.</p>	<p>To support causes they personally care about.</p> <p>To 'have a laugh', fun and carnival.</p> <p>To relieve the monotony of working day.</p> <p>To subvert normal workplace hierarchies by temporarily asserting shopfloor dominance over managers.</p>

The research also finds distinct motivations for involving staff in charitable decision-making. Managers take an instrumental/incidental approach to involving staff:

involvement is either viewed as a means of achieving greater 'buy-in' and therefore more enthusiastic fundraising and support for the initiative, or it is viewed as an engagement device where the means matters more than the ends, and only minimal funds are allocated. Employees, however, take a more personal/emotional approach, following a similar decision-making process to that used in their private giving. The added factor is that charitable decision-making in the workplace is 'on display' to work colleagues who may not be aware of each others' personal stories, which makes expressing a charitable opinion in the workplace a potentially revealing act. Low levels of participation in staff votes may be due to an appreciation of the instrumental/incidental nature of the ballot, or it may be due to a preference to avoid bringing personal concerns into the workplace.

Previous research has identified three strategies for recipients to get a positive response from donors (Ostrander and Schervish 1990, p86):

- 1 Needs-based strategy – presenting needs that can be met by donors.
- 2 Opportunity-based strategy – presenting social/political benefit to donors.
- 3 Agenda-based strategy – presenting beneficiary needs as part of donor's overall interests.

The findings indicate that all three strategies are present within corporate philanthropy decision-making, but they receive different degrees of emphasis from different parts of the company. While shopfloor staff follow a combination of needs-based strategies (seeking to meet needs they care about) and opportunity-based strategies (seeking the social benefits of fun and relief from the monotony of their job), managers largely pursue agenda-based strategies, pursuing business interests through the medium of charitable activity.

## Conclusions

This paper began by noting the shift in corporate philanthropy decision-making from the historic model of 'chairman's choice' (which prioritised the philanthropic preferences of business owners and leaders) to 'dual agenda giving' (where corporate philanthropic activity strives to deliver both business and social benefits). The findings presented in this paper indicate the existence of a potential third model, in which corporate philanthropy meets the diverse needs of charities, business leaders and their staff.

If this model is found to be robust and increasingly prevalent, then it has implications for both sides of corporate-charity partnerships. Companies need to better understand how to involve staff in a way that secures greater meaningful participation while maintaining the desired business benefits, and charities need to better understand the more varied motivations for involvement across the company and the implications of more diffuse decision-making for their efforts to seek and maintain corporate support.

Just as efforts to attract income from other sources (individuals, major donors and trusts and foundations) have increased in recent years in response to both public sector cuts and as a realisation that much untapped philanthropic potential exists across the UK, so too corporate philanthropy has been the target of various hopes and expectations within the charity sector.

Corporate philanthropy may seem increasingly unattainable in the current difficult financial climate, yet *'companies are still keen to engage with charities, but the terms of that engagement are complex and changing'* (Ribeiro 2011). The complexity and costs of investing in efforts to attract and maintain corporate support is substantial, and should be approached with caution by charities because:

*'[Corporate philanthropy] is a highly complex form of relationship fundraising that will not suit either the needs or capabilities of every organization.'* (Sargeant and Jay 2004, p216).

Whereas the starting point for charities seeking corporate support has traditionally been the board, the latest phase within corporate philanthropy involves opening up decision-making to a wider staff group, meaning the chairman's endorsement is no longer the only – or best – route to success for charities seeking support from the private sector. Charities can be self-limiting if they focus solely on the owners and senior management (Elischer 1999b, p23). This paper shows that if their cause can inspire employees and offer enjoyable opportunities then the shopfloor may well decide to support them.

Big brands have traditionally benefited from the 'dual agenda' model, as they have usually been best placed to offer and deliver the greatest business benefits when defined from the perspective of business leaders. But giving a wider group of employees a greater voice in corporate charity choices could open the door for different types of causes to secure corporate support, as democratic decision-making reflects personal rather than professional imperatives, leading – for example – to more local charities attracting support.

This paper reinforces the well-known point that philanthropy as a concern has to dovetail with personal concerns. This is true whether charitable decision-making occurs in the private sphere of home or in public spheres such as the workplace. Shopfloor philanthropists are not wealthy, yet they also demonstrate similar concerns to rich donors (documented in a growing body of literature such as Odendahl 1990, Ostrower 1995, Lloyd 2004 and Schervish 2008) in that they need more fulfillment than their daily life and work can offer, and they turn to philanthropy as one means for seeking that greater fulfillment.

We already knew from previous research (eg C&E 2011) that companies and charities have distinct motivations and gain different benefits from engaging in corporate philanthropy. But this paper casts a light on the internal variation within companies, highlighting the difference in the charity choices, drivers for involvement and experiences of engaging with charity for those at the top and the bottom of workplace hierarchies.

In conclusion, this paper finds that there is a distinctive 'shopfloor perspective' on corporate philanthropy as a result of the experience of social solidarity between colleagues and the licensed temporary challenge to corporate hierarchy or other rigid norms and conventions, all wrapped up in the British tradition of carnival within giving.

## References

- Breeze B (2010) *How Donors Choose Charities* Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy, London.
- Burlingame D and Young D (1996) *Corporate Philanthropy at the Crossroads* Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- C&E (2011) *Corporate-NGO Partnerships Barometer* Cause and Effect Advisory Services, London.
- CaritasData (2011) *Charity Market Monitor 2011* London: Cass Business School/Centre for Giving and Philanthropy.
- DSC (2011) *The Guide to UK Company Giving* Directory for Social Change, London.
- DSC (2010) *The Guide to the Major Trusts* Directory for Social Change, London.
- Elischer T (1999a) 'Historical context and current environment' in V Morton (ed) *Corporate Fundraising* Directory for Social Change, London.
- Elischer T (1999b) 'The company as a resource' in V Morton (ed) *Corporate Fundraising* Directory for Social Change, London.
- Mourdoukoutas P (2011) 'How to turn every corporate member into a philanthropist' *Forbes magazine* 12/22/11.
- NCVO (2012) *The UK Civil Society Almanac 2012* National Council for Voluntary Organisations/ Civil Society Media, London.
- Odendahl T (1990) *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest Among the Philanthropic Elite* Basic Books, New York.
- Office for National Statistics (2012) *Estimating Differences in Public and Private Sector Pay – 2012* ONS, London.
- Ostrower F (1995) *Why the Wealthy Give: The culture of elite philanthropy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Sargeant A and Jay E (2004) *Fundraising Management: Analysis, planning and practice* Routledge, London.
- Schervish P (2008) 'Why the wealthy give: factors which mobilise philanthropy amongst high net-worth individuals' in A Sargeant and W Wymer (eds) (2008) *The Routledge Companion to Nonprofit Marketing* Routledge, London.
- Turner V (1969) *The Ritual Process: Structure and anti-structure* Transaction Publishers, New Jersey.
- Van Gennep A (1909) *The Rites of Passage* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Walker C, Pharoah C, Marmolejo M and Lillya D (2012) *UK Corporate Citizenship in the 21st Century* Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy Briefing Note 9.

## About the author

Dr Beth Breeze is a researcher within the ESRC Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy. She is based at the University of Kent where she co-founded and now directs the Centre for Philanthropy, which conducts a range of research projects and offers undergraduate and postgraduate courses on philanthropy, fundraising and volunteering. Contact [b.breeze@kent.ac.uk](mailto:b.breeze@kent.ac.uk)

## About CGAP

The ESRC Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy (CGAP) is the first academic centre in the UK dedicated to research on charitable giving and philanthropy. Three main research strands focus on individual and business giving, social redistribution and charitable activity, and the institutions of giving. CGAP is a consortium comprising Cass Business School, University of Edinburgh Business School, University of Kent, University of Southampton, University of Strathclyde Business School and NCVO. CGAP's coordinating 'hub' is based at Cass Business School. CGAP is funded by the ESRC, the Office for Civil Society, the Scottish Government and Carnegie UK Trust. The views in CGAP papers are entirely the author's own.

**For further information on CGAP, visit [www.cgap.org.uk](http://www.cgap.org.uk)**

# More publications from CGAP




## **User views of fundraising** *Beth Breeze and Jon Dean*

The use of visually striking images in fundraising materials can raise large sums of money for charities, yet has also led to accusations of exploitative 'poverty porn'. This report explores the tension between discomfort at the use of images that could be seen as emotionally manipulative and the resulting success of fundraising appeals. Based on focus

groups with homeless young people, it is the first research to explore the opinions of those represented in charity campaigns.

Charitable beneficiaries are largely supportive of methods that maximise income, yet would prefer fundraising imagery that elicits empathy and 'tells stories' about how people find themselves in need of charitable assistance, rather than pictures that provoke pity and depict beneficiaries at their lowest ebb.




## **Philanthropy and a better society**

Every aspiring reforming government needs a big idea, and for the Conservatives in 2010 it was the Big Society. Not everyone greeted this big idea with equal enthusiasm, but it is playing a part in the new debate under the Coalition about the right balance of state, private and voluntary sector in the future provision of welfare. What role does philanthropy have in our society and how can it be enhanced? Does a better society

depend on better philanthropy? Or do the limitations of philanthropy mean that, far from redressing inequalities, it often only reflects existing ones?

Such questions are explored in the 13 chapters of this report written by researchers in the ESRC Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy. The report highlights the implications of CGAP's research findings for philanthropy in our society today, for the needs and ideals of the Big Society, and for future policy and practice.



## **How donors choose charities** *Beth Breeze*

There are tens of thousands of charities in the UK, and even the most generous donors can support only a tiny fraction of these good causes. This paper examines how donors go about choosing which organisations to give their money to. Based on interviews with 60 committed donors, it explores

how people define charity, what they think about charitable beneficiaries, and the rationale behind their giving decisions.

Despite widespread assumptions that need is the primary driver of charitable donations, this study finds that giving decisions are also based on other factors, notably donors' tastes, personal experiences, perceptions of charities' competence and a desire for personal impact.