

A Study on the Sources of Resources and Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization: Case of Private Chartered Universities in Nakuru Town, Kenya

Simon Kibet Kipchumba

*Higher Educational Institute, Nanjing Agricultural University
Egerton University, Nakuru, Kenya,*

Liu Zhimin

Higher Educational Institute, Nanjing Agricultural University

Robert Chelagat

Kabarak University, Kenya

The purpose of this study was to review and analyze the resources needs and sources of resources and level of training and capacity building in resource mobilization in Kenyan private chartered universities. The study employed a descriptive survey research design. Purposeful sampling technique was used to select 63 respondents (staff) from three private universities within Nakuru town. Data was collected by use of questionnaires, coded and analyzed descriptively by use of Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) computer program. Study findings showed that: training and capacity-building efforts on resource mobilization are yet to have a significant impact on resource mobilization efforts; students were the main source of resources for the private universities and tuition fees formed the bulk of the resources mobilized by private universities; regular awareness, training and capacity-building in resource mobilization among the staff; empowerment of university campuses in order to mobilize as many resources.

Key words; Resource Mobilization, Resources, Fundraising, Capacity Building, Training, Financial Resources.

In the recent past, many private universities have been established in order to meet the huge demand for university education, which the Public Universities have been unable to adequately meet. Hence most private universities find themselves in an increasingly competitive scenario of many institutions competing for scarce resources. In a rapidly changing world, securing sufficient resources to sustain non-profit organizations is not an easy task. Yet every organization needs money to survive – to meet project costs and develop programs for the future, to pay the wages and salaries of its staff as well as all the necessary

organizational overheads. There are many other needs to be met and if the required money is not raised somehow, an organization may come to a standstill (Simiyu, 2004). If an institution cannot raise adequate resources, it means that it cannot fulfill its mission, and it is up to the leadership to ensure that in some way or other, those resources are available (Kiiru, 2010).

Private Universities, despite their significance to the society, do not receive direct government funding and with the rising demand for education coupled with economic pressures and scarcity of resources, it calls for the need to raise adequate resources in order to enhance

growth and sustainability. Most private Universities rely heavily on student tuition fees to meet both recurrent and capital expenditure, finance scholarships and work study programs to the needy and other deserving students based on the Universities' education policy. These rising demands call for more resources which is a real challenge. Resource mobilization is giving people the opportunity to give. It is not an end in itself but rather the process whereby resources are transferred from those who are able to give to those who have the need to receive. Resource Mobilization facilitates this process. It is the enabler of the activity that not only satisfies the need, but also satisfies the giver that the resources have been wisely and effectively used. Resource mobilization is all about building relationships with donors – whether individuals or major corporations. The purpose of the study was to review and analyze the resources needs and sources of resources and level of training and capacity building in resource mobilization in Kenyan private universities. The study focused on public universities. Besides, the study sought to achieve the following specific objectives: To establish the level of awareness of resource mobilization among staff in private universities, to determine the level of training and capacity building in resource mobilization in private universities and to analyze the resource needs and sources of resources for the private universities.

Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following questions.

- i. What is the level of training and capacity building in resource mobilization in private universities?
- ii. What are the resource needs and sources of resources for the private universities?

Literature Review

Historical Perspective of Resource Mobilization- An African Context

Traditionally, Africans are renowned for their generosity. Yet, how ironic that, amidst

numerous resources and outstanding generosity, there are still so many Christian institutions which are lagging behind and in dire need of financial support. Almost akin to the infamous and chronic water shortages in Kisumu or Mombasa amidst the surrounding lakes, oceans and seas of plenty. Why are Africans in general and the church in particular, languishing in poverty? (Kiiru, 2010). “Is it because Africans are economically poor and lack resources? God has blessed the churches with many resources, including money, and highly qualified and gifted leaders. Some of their members own farms in rural areas, houses in urban areas, and motor vehicles. Yet, these same people, while their churches struggle with a bank overdraft, only drop a few coins in the collection plate – while at the same time laying out lots of money for gifts at wedding receptions. Wealth and poverty seem to have very little to do with breaking dependency and experiencing self-reliance. But more with a mentality of dependence that came along with the preaching of the gospel by western missionaries in Africa (Glenn, 1993). Having served for many years in Africa as a missionary, Schwartz observes that from his experience, the problem of dependency is more than simply a financial matter; it is also a problem of attitude (Schwartz, 2005). Schwartz continues to argue that many churches and related institutions in Africa have continued to remain “poor” because of the dependency syndrome and the expectation that funds will continue to flow from Europe and America. “Through the years, believers in Africa found that it was not necessary to put paper money into the offering plate. They knew that if they sat back and waited long enough, funds would eventually come from an unseen source. Sooner or later the church and its program would be rescued. Indeed those who created the programs could not afford to let them fail.” Kiiru became the first African director of World Vision in Kenya (Kiiru, 1976). During his tenure, World Vision blazed many trails and became the role model for world vision work in Africa. In his book, ‘Mobilizing and Managing Resources,’ he makes the following perceptive observation: “The greatest challenge that I faced as the Director of World Vision in Kenya was to convince the local churches and communities

that they have the resources around them that remain untapped. It was not easy to convince them to stop looking up to the organization for everything that they needed and to instead, identify locally available resources within the community to bankroll their programs.”

In spite of all this, however, there are encouraging signs for church leaders in Africa (Kiiru, 2010). There are an increasing number of churches and their related institutions which have successfully completed projects and programs, including schools, colleges and hospitals, wholly by Africans from local sources. The Jitegemee concept initiated by the PCEA (Presbyterian Church in East Africa) is a classic case in point. The posh Milele Resort Hotel, situated in the up-market Milimani area of Nakuru is a landmark PCEA-sponsored project worthy of note, in this regard. The Lutheran Church of Tanzania and the Seventh Day Adventist Church in Zambia have also discovered that dependency on foreign funding can be overcome. In fact, many institutions which were never dependent on foreign funding in the first place are in fact better off than those which have been heavily dependent on subsidies from abroad (Kiiru,2010). However, as Kiiru cautions, mobilizing resources for local institutions need not be an either/or proposition, that is, local versus foreign resources. In as much as we need to major on mobilizing resources locally, we still live in a global village and our collective destinies are intertwined with those of people from other nations and it would be foolhardy to completely close the door to all potential and prospective foreign donors. With the right people and right attitude, foreigners can benefit from interacting and sharing, complementing and supplementing their resources with local people. After all, all believers from all over the world are members of one body, and the same universal church. In the final analysis, however, it is important for people to take charge of their own situation and destiny and not to think there are others out there who will take care of them, including foreigners (Kiiru, 2010)

Resource Mobilization in Christian sponsored Institutions

There is a spiritual dimension that must be addressed in our efforts to mobilize resources for Christian ministries and institutions. Properly understood, the Biblical concept of Stewardship is God’s way of providing resources for the church and church-related institutions. It is critically important for us, more so as children of God to understand that all resources belong to God and we are simply stewards. “The earth belongs to the Lord and everything in it, the world and all who live in it” Psalms 24: 1(NIV).One of the major premises of this thesis is that Christian institutions of higher learning, such as Kabarak University are part and parcel of God’s work. That being the case, God surely has resources for His work. And as the great missionary Hudson Taylor once put it: “God’s work done in God’s way will never lack His resources.”(Kiiru, 2010). Divine sovereignty and human responsibility are two sides of the same coin. God is sovereign and can do whatever He wills, including supplying all our needs without any effort on our part. But human beings are also responsible. As we learn from one of the most practical books of the Bible, Faith in God and works go together. Faith without works is dead (James 2: 26). “It is God’s will to provide for His work but we have the responsibility, like in all other fields to develop strategies for mobilizing resources for Christian ministries” (Kiiru, 2010).

Importance of Communication in Resource Mobilization

The importance of communication in fundraising cannot be over-emphasized. Communication in this context is basically about informing people the organization’s *raison d’etre*: the reasons why the organization exists or is considered to be important in the lives of the stakeholders and all those concerned. It is extremely important to build strong relationships with potential supporters for this is the very basis for continued and consistent support for the organization concerned (Thompson, 2000). Again, in the end it is all about personal relationships, which wisely cultivated, in some cases over a period of many years, can bring millions of dollars to the service of a personal and institutional mission. According to Kiiru

(2010), ability in establishing and enhancing personal and individual relationships, will in the end determine your success in mobilizing resources and raising funds for your projects. Fundraising is not simply about generating the resources you need to survive from one year to the next, and planning for any expansion and development but it is also about creating a strong and viable organization that is able to sustain itself into the future.

Resource Mobilization Strategies

Identifying some close friends who have ties with institutions, both locally and overseas, encouraging sale of services and products which meet the needs of the congregations and the local community are some strategies that can be explored (Kiiru, 2011). In this respect, the proposed establishment of a University Teaching Hospital at Kabarak is a welcome step in that direction. Resource mobilization strategies also extend to establishing income generating activities and viable investment projects. Giving through Wills or Legacy fundraising is another long-term fundraising strategy, worth considering. Michael Downes, an Australian fundraising consultant reveals that in his country, legacy fundraising is the number one income generator for nonprofit organizations (Dhillon, 1993). A small measure of success has been achieved in African countries, but it is still an untapped potential as many Africans die interstate (without a will). Traditionally, most Africans are averse to writing of wills, which in the minds of many is tantamount to the speeding up of one's death (Kiiru, 2010). Moreover, there is much ignorance in this area. Though slowly but steadily, the younger generation, more so the elite are becoming open to the writing of wills. In the West, it is common for committed Christians to include Christian ministries and institutions among the beneficiaries of their wills. With proper education, the will could be a good strategy of raising resources for the church and Christian ministries and institutions. The church has a critical role to play in this education process by preaching the need to leave behind a legacy for the work of God and the benefit of future generations.

The future of Resource Mobilization

In thinking about the future of resource mobilization, there is need to stop thinking about giving as an act and think of it as an attitude, a frame of mind. It is more than just giving funds. It is the giving of ourselves to a cause (Cuthbert, 2011). Giving is at its best when it is part of an attitude of gratitude. This attitude is important if we are to get out of the trap where both sides of the gift think in terms of power imbalance, those that are privileged, powerful givers on the one side the one side and the needy weak recipients on the other.

According to Youth in Philanthropy Program (2010), every now and then, we hear about self-made men and women, particularly millionaires or billionaires. However, strictly speaking no one can be said to be self-made. Virtually all of us have benefited from the assistance of other individuals or institutions, which enabled us to grow into independent people. Such a realization should fill the donor with a sense of gratitude and should be coupled with respect and dignity for those whom the donor seeks to help. The expression "giving back to society" is gaining increasing currency in our country. That is, those who are now in a financially privileged position through the assistance of others, have a duty to reciprocate out of a sense of gratitude. The role of youth in resource mobilization has been largely overlooked or underrated (Youth in Philanthropy Program, 2010). By and large, the youth have been viewed as a vulnerable group that is at the receiving end of financial support. However, if fundraising trends in the recent past are anything to go by, the role of youth cannot be underestimated. The youth are increasingly being recognized as resources and active social participants who have the ability to contribute to their own development and that of their communities and the society at large. Hence there is a great potential and future for Youth engagement in resource mobilization. Over the last decade, youth involvement in philanthropic giving has spread in the USA, Canada, Britain, the Czech Republic and New Zealand (Tice, 2002). The programs range from small, locally based initiatives to state and national level ones, designed to reach thousands of young people

(<http://youth.foundationcenter.org>). For example The Youth in Philanthropy program has been initiated in the West and often begins with students in primary school up to the age of 35 years. The youth get involved at different levels from fundraising activities to sitting on fundraising boards. Moreover, educating the youth on the importance of various aspects of philanthropy such as volunteerism is also emphasized (Norton, 1996).

According to Norton (1996), the role of volunteers in resource mobilization is also proving to be critical. A volunteer is someone who undertakes a job for no monetary gain, and out of his or her own free will. Generally, volunteers are driven by a desire to help others and find personal fulfillment in the constructive use of free time. Volunteers not only bring much needed expertise to the organization but also save money which would have been used to pay members of staff to do the same thing. Volunteers can be used to raise money as well as a wide range of related tasks including working in fundraising committees; administrative tasks; publicity; research and marketing.

The noted management guru, Peter Drucker, has this to say on the value of volunteers: “increasingly volunteers are taking over the professional and executive work in non-profit organizations (Norton, 1996). The 1800 local branches of the American Heart Association, for instance, are managed and run by volunteers. A growing number of volunteers are professional men and women. The number of active volunteers working for non-profits is growing fast. A lot of older people, retired or semi-retired have found volunteer work to be satisfying and a way to put a lifetime of experience to work.” Although no survey has been carried out so far, on the scope and value of volunteerism in Kenya, it is nevertheless evident that volunteers have been instrumental in the development of welfare services in Kenya. Concerned people have over the years, initiated and developed services to meet the needs of communities, serving as board and committee members and fundraisers (Kiiru, 2010). There is a growing trend in resource mobilization that calls for collaboration and cooperation between nonprofit organizations (Buechler, 1993). Donors are increasingly concerned about duplication and the

resultant waste of resources. One big and nagging question in the minds of most donors is: Why should we fund you, whereas there are another or other organizations, pursuing the same goals and objectives as yours? Why should we channel our resources to your organization when there are others who are excelling in the very same field as yours? The demand for nonprofits to pull together financial and human resources, time and effort so as to benefit from the power of synergy may soon be shaping and changing the face of funding available and accessible, especially from foundations and trusts. Furthermore, emerging trend in resource mobilization that is worthy of attention is the Mutual commitment model, that has been strongly advocated by Roost and Fairbanks (2005). In this model, there are no superior and inferior partners. Rather, all the parties involved in the fund development effort are not only on an equal footing but are also mutually accountable to each other. The Apostle Paul in 2 Corinthians 8: 13 – 15(GNB), puts it this way: “Our desire is not that others might be relieved, while you are hard pressed, but that there might be equality. At the present time, your plenty will supply what they need, so that in turn, their plenty will supply what you need” Unfortunately, our whole system of giving has been based on a concept of charity that elevates the donor and downgrades the recipient. The giver is the gracious benefactor, and the receiver is the unfortunate victim of circumstances. That is not the Christian way of looking at stewardship. Biblical principles are diametrically opposed to such an attitude (Dillon, 1993, p. 21). Indeed, stewardship is one crucial component of the mutual commitment model, a steward being anyone who manages resources that belong to another person. This person (the owner), entrusts his resources into the hands of a trusted manager, in this case the steward.

Perhaps the best biblical parable on stewardship is Matthew 25, p. 15-29. It is the story of a well-endowed man who before going on a long journey, calls together all his servants and entrusts to everyone of them bags of silver in varying amounts. Upon returning from his long journey he calls all of them together again and asks each of them to give an account of how they have used the money entrusted to them.

Those who invest the money entrusted to them wisely are commended. The one who failed to invest the talents entrusted to him is severely punished. The essence of this parable in the words of Jesus is: “To those who use well what has been given to them, even more will be given. But from those who do nothing, even the little they have will be taken away” (Matthew, 25, p. 29). According to the Bible, the bags of silver represent any kind of resource we are given (The Life Application Study Bible). God gives each of us time, gifts, and other resources according to our abilities, and he expects us to invest them wisely until he returns. We are responsible to use well what God has given us. The issue is not how much we have but how well we use what we have. In the first place, our time, abilities and money are not ours. We are merely caretakers or stewards, for that matter. Someday, a report must be given to God, the ultimate owner of all resources concerning how the resources entrusted to us have been used. In the mutual commitment model, the donor is much more than a source of funds. He along and equally with the recipient is also a steward. The donor becomes a partner, not just an “absentee landlord of economic potential.

Another important component is relationship. The relationship between the donor and the recipient is not defined by or limited to, as has often been the case, to the mechanics of financial transfers. Both parties respect and honor one another as members of the same family of God, as they mutually share their various gifts and talents. People give to people they know and trust and care for. This principle can be summed up in one word: Relationships (Dillon, 1993, p. 65). Unlike in the predominant, prevalent and traditional models of resource mobilization, in this new model, both the giver and receiver are mutually accountable to one another, for the purpose of building relationship and trust. In any relationship where giving and receiving is involved, there is an inherent danger of developing unhealthy dependency, which drains initiative from the receiver. When someone “out there” is financially responsible, personal creativity, drive and energy soon, it creates a one-sided relationship that encourages the unfortunate syndrome of the “haves and have nots” (Cuthbert, 2011). The development of

local home-grown resource mobilization programs would go a long way in counteracting unhealthy dependency. Moreover, as local institutions succeed in their resource mobilization efforts, their belief in their potential and abilities to initiate and accomplish bigger programs will be further enhanced, for the benefit of all concerned as well as our society at large.

Theories of Resource Mobilization

Resource Mobilization Theory and New Social Movements

Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT) attempts to explain social movements by viewing individuals as rational actors that are engaged in instrumental actions that use formal organizations to secure resources and foster mobilization (McCarthy and Zald, 1987). RMT can be broken down into two parts. First, RMT attempts to explain people joining social movements with rational actor theory. Secondly, RMT attempts to explain the actions of the social movement organizations (SMOs) that are formed by these rational actors by viewing the SMOs as an organization which functions for self preservation and to market its products.

Rational actor theory states that people will join social movements when the benefit of joining these groups outweighs the cost to that individual. This benefit cannot just be the possibility of achieving the social movement's purported goal (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). The goal a social movement is to achieve some collective good. Because the benefit is collective, few individuals will on their own bear the costs of working to obtain them. It does not benefit individuals to work towards the common good because they can free-ride and allow someone else to act for them while taking in the benefits. According to RMT, the possibility of free-riding means that we must explain why individuals join social movements by looking at incentives, cost-reducing mechanisms, and career benefits of such behavior (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). Individuals must join social movements for a resource gain other than that promised by the social movement's end goal.

Individual participation in social movements is explained only by a cost/benefit analysis of resources, cultural things such as grievances and mechanisms for social cohesion of groups are not the deciding factors for when social movements will arise. Grievances are considered to be a background factor (Beuchler, 1993). Because they are always present in a society they have no explaining power for predicting social movements. In fact, grievances and discontent may be created and manipulated by issue entrepreneurs trying to form SMOs for personal resource gain (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). These social movements arise when an elite class has the resources available to mobilize a group. People do not become involved in these groups because they have a cause, they become involved to incur personal resource. The purpose of these groups is to aggregate resources for themselves (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). RMT presumes that such aggregation of resources requires some organization, and so it focuses on understanding the SMOs that are formed.

The success and failure of SMOs is determined by external factors affecting resource flow to and from the organization (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). A supply and demand model can be used to describe resources in and resources out. Each SMO is part of a social movement industry and produces a product, just like any other industry (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). This product is the purported target goal of the SMO. The resource flow into the SMO is dependent on individuals 'purchasing' the product of that SMO (i.e. giving resources to that SMO to help it achieve its goal). The products of different SMOs within a social movement differ depending on the extremity of the solution, the means, and the efficiency of the organization (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). Adherents to a particular social movement purchase the target goal product based on a conception of product quality (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). The perceived quality of the product depends on how successful the SMO is perceived to be and is heavily dependent on the media.

The SMO must use some resources to pursue its goal or adherents will not purchase the target goal product, but an SMO does not solely concentrate on achieving its goal. The first priority of an SMO is self-preservation. The

purpose of an SMO is not to clash with authorities in an effort to create social change, but to maintain or increase membership and resource flow (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). The SMO divides its resources between recruiting new people, maintaining its constituents, and directing activity towards its stated goal (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). The way that the SMO divides its resources depends on its resource base and its constituents, as well as the cultural setting (McCarthy & Zald, 1987). The actions of an SMO can be explained by looking at what the SMO has to do to survive.

Resource Mobilization Theory works very effectively to explain social movements because it explains the actions of individuals by just looking at selfish behavior and does not some sort of deviant, unexplained mechanism to force individuals to behave altruistically. However there are a few problems with RMT when it is applied to certain social movements. One problem is that RMT focuses almost solely on social movement organizations. Many New Social Movements (NSMs) do not have any traditional organization. Instead they have what could be better called a social movement community (Beuchler, 1993). The social movement is decentralized and cannot be fit into the SMO framework provided by RMT. RMT also discounts the necessity of the formation of a collective identity. For a SMO to form and be effective, the individuals within it need to form some sort of collective identity so that they can act with some degree of social cohesion (Beuchler, 1993). This collective identity is not always formed; therefore it is necessary to look at collective identity formation to determine when SMOs will arise. The collective identity of an SMO also affects the methods that it will use, and so it is necessary to look at the collective identity of an SMO to understand its actions (Beuchler, 1993). In NSMs, the collective identity formed often dictates very specifically what sorts of actions can be taken.

Owing to the fact that RMT focus on a centralized organization and its lack of consideration of the role of the collective identities that are formed it has difficulty explaining the activities of many NSMs. These factors could possibly be accounted for if RMT was expanded to take the role of collective

identities and decentralized organizations in to consideration. But RMT also has difficulty explaining why individuals become involved in NSMs. Rational actor theory just doesn't always work. Often there doesn't seem to be any resource gain on the part of individuals who join NSMs (Beuchler, 1993). It would appear that individuals are not resource utilitarians. They are not acting in the manner that gives them the highest resource gain.

New Social Movement Theories (NSM)

A body of New Social Movement Theories has been developed to explain individual participation in NSMs using social constructionism. NSM Theory states that NSMs are not different than other social movements. The modernization of post-industrial revolution society produces conflicts around democratization, self-determination, and individualism. NSMs are seen as a reaction to these colonizing intrusions of state and markets into modern society (Buechler, 1995). Because of the differences between NSMs and traditional social movements, NSMs cannot be adequately explained without using social constructionism.

NSMs are different from traditional labor based movements. Traditional Marxian movements tended to be focused on a struggle for political power. These movements were worker-class based and did not seek to challenge the goal structure of Western society, but rather to simply redistribute the resources. This differs from the goals of NSMs, which are generally to create a new social paradigm that challenges the dominant goal structure of Western societies by advocating post-materialist, anti-growth, libertarian, and populist themes (Buechler, 1995). To achieve these goals, NSM tend to emphasize symbolic action, self determination, post materialist values, collective identities, grievance articulation, and self referential organization instead of the direct political confrontation traditional worker-based social movements used to maximize influence and power (Buechler, 1995). NSM theory would also maintain that NSMs are different than traditional romantic or utopian movements because they strive for the expansion of the structural differentiation of society into a post-materialist

society instead of a dedifferentiation and regression of society (Buechler, 1995). NSMs tend to draw from a constituent base that is not particularly class focused. Constituents tend to not be bonded by a common class, but rather by a common ideology (Buechler, 1995). Most members of NSMs are from the middle-class which is an undefined, residual class between the poles of capital and labor (Buechler, 1995). These constituents do not tend to be individuals bonded together by common grievances in their immediate life (Buechler, 1995). In fact, they can often be characterized as spoilt rich white kids getting together to protest.

There is variation within NSMs but they are bonded by common ideological and political styles. They tend to be more cultural than political, struggling for progressive social change (Buechler, 1995). They consciously avoid or reject institutionalized politics, which makes them hard to co-opt but also means that they can lack an effective strategy for confronting state power (Buechler, 1995). Instead of using institutionalized politics NSMs may use apolitical introspection, emphasizing politically correct lifestyles and substituting personal transformation for political activity (Buechler, 1995).

Social constructionism looks at framing processes and identity formation. A 'frame' is an interpretive schema that an individual uses to interpret reality by selectively omitting and emphasizing various aspects of the world (Hunt *et al.*, 1994). Framing processes can link individuals ideologically and by forming and supporting collaborative identities (Hunt *et al.*, 1994). Actions of the NSM also help to form collaborative identities of participants (Hunt *et al.*, 1994). NSM theory conceptualizes changes in identity formation as manifestations of macro social changes in industrial societies (Hunt *et al.*, 1994). These changes in identity formation and framing processes result in NSMs, and so the framing processes and identity formations are given prime consideration in determining when individuals will join NSMs. Grievances are closely linked with the frame and identity of the individual (Johnston *et al.*, 1997), and so NSM Theory also considers grievances to be important.

The framing processes place values on certain aspects of individual identity and change is noted or encouraged (Hunt *et al.*, 1994). Various frame alignment processes reconcile individual identities of NSM members to enable the formation of collective identities. By finding commonalities in personal identities and stressing them, creating new personal identities, and attempting to minimize conflicts (possibly by stressing the commonality of diversity), collective identities are created and maintained (Hunt *et al.*, 1994). Antagonist identity fields also serve to strengthen the collective identity. Boundary frames identify 'us' and 'them' and serve to bind the group together (Hunt *et al.*, 1994). Particular lines of collective action arise not because of objective conditions, but because of how the actors perceive the objective conditions which is a result of framing processes and collective identities (Hunt *et al.*, 1994).

If a social movement addresses global concerns that are far removed from everyday life, movement cohesion requires the selective incentives of a strong collective identity (Johnston *et al.*, 1997). This does not just apply to NSMs. Other social movements, such as neofascist and nationalist movements, use collective identities for group cohesion as well (Johnston *et al.*, 1997). But because of the unique characteristics of NSMs, collective identity formation seem essential for group cohesion and motivation of individuals to join the group. Although NSM Theory provides a framework to explain individual participation in NSMs when rational actor theory fails, NSM Theory doesn't even attempt to explain anything about when NSMs will form, how they will form, when they will grow or shrink, or what their outcome will be (Buechler, 1995). RMT attempted to explain the organization and strategy of social movements, when they would form, and whether they could succeed. RMT is a theory to explain the formation and activities of social movements, while NSM simply tries to explain the motivation behind participants in a select group of social movements.

NSM Theory is not adequate as an explanation of social movements. Its applicability is too narrow. RMT needs to be modified to explain NSMs. RMT explains individual participation in social movements

from a behaviorist viewpoint. Individuals will do something if they are rewarded for doing it. But RMT only allows for this reward to be the acquisition of resources. This tends to work in the western cultural context that RMT has been applied in because in that cultural context resource gain coincides with the accepted reward system. But NSMs defy this with their anti-materialist, anti-growth, non-consumerist ideology. NSMs therefore require a reward system other than resource gain (Buechler, 1995).

Humans are social animals, and NSMs play on our innate social cohesion mechanisms to recruit constituents. The resource gain of actors in NSMs could be looked at in terms of the dopamine reward that the individual gets for participating in a collective identity. RMT just needs to consider the reward of being part of a collective identity, of gaining social prestige, or just of having fun as being a resource gain on the part of the actor. This would incorporate NSM Theory into RMT by allowing RMT to consider the formation of collective identities when predicting participation in social movements (Buechler, 1995).

Critics point out that resource mobilization theory fails to explain social movement communities, which are large networks of individuals and other groups surrounding social movement organizations, and providing them with various services (McCarthy and Mayer, 2001). Critics also argue that it fails to explain how groups with limited resources can succeed in bringing social change and that it does not assign sufficient weight to grievances, identity and culture as well as many macro-sociological issues (McCarthy and Mayer, 2001).

Summary of Literature and Research Gaps to be Filled by the Study

The literature review has established that past studies have extensively demonstrated the rising demands for more resources especially in non-profit organizations as a real challenge. Private institutions despite their significance to the society do not receive direct government funding and with the rising demand for education coupled with economic pressures and scarcity of resources, it calls for the need to raise

adequate resources in order to enhance growth and sustainability. Attempts to bridge the gap through such efforts as; seeking for both short and long term loans, reduction on the number of scholarship beneficiaries as well as in value has been explored. Other bridging alternatives include; start of income generating units e.g. - farming and lease of catering and accommodation facilities during the holidays.

Methodology

Research Design

A descriptive survey design was used in this study. The design was appropriate because it is useful in establishing the nature of existing situation and current conditions and also in analyzing such situations and conditions. It enabled the researcher to secure evidence

Population and Sampling Procedure

The total population for survey comprised all the management staff of the private chartered universities within Nakuru town. Purposeful sampling technique was used to select 63 management staff respondents (staff), owing to their ability to understand issues of resource mobilization. There were total of 30 management staff in University (I), 23 in University (II) and 10 in University (III).

Data Collection Procedures

The study employed the use of a structured questionnaire to collect primary data from the study respondents. The questionnaire was administered to the selected study respondents (management staff). The researcher proceeded to collect data from the selected respondents after obtaining permission from the University, and other relevant authorities and applied the drop and pick system. Secondary data was collected from documented information including government offices and libraries (books, journals, periodicals, and other publications) to supplement the primary data. After data collection, "data cleaning" was done to ensure that questionnaires were accurately completed. The questionnaires were pilot-tested in order to

check their reliability and validity. Borg and Gall (1996) recommends pre-testing of research instruments before use in research. In this study a reliability co-efficient (Cronbach alpha value) was found 0.7 and above was acceptable for this study.

Data Analysis

The survey data was analyzed descriptively to facilitate answering of the research objectives and questions. The data was coded, organized and analyzed, with the aid of SPSS computer program. The study employed descriptive analysis to analyze the nature of resource needs for private universities in the study area and results presented in terms of frequencies and percentages. Similarly, the study employed descriptive analysis to analyze the various resource mobilization strategies (awareness, training and capacity-building, strategy policy) used in private universities in the study area and results presented in terms of frequencies and percentages. Secondary data and information was used to explain the empirical findings of the study.

Results

Training and Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization:

The study sought to establish the level of training and capacity building in resource mobilization among private universities. In this regard, the study sought information on respondents' participation in resource mobilization training; Frequency of training and impact of training on resource mobilization among private universities. The results of data analysis and discussions are as follows:

Participation in Training on Resource Mobilization

According to study findings (Table1), only 16.1% of the respondents had participated in capacity-building training on resource mobilization while 83.9% did not. These findings suggest that majority of the study

respondents had not attended capacity-building training on resource mobilization in their respective private universities.

Table 1: Participation in Training in Relation to Resource Mobilization

Response	University			Total
	University I	University II	University III	
Yes	2 11.1%	0 .0%	7 25.9%	9 16.1%
No	16 88.9%	11 100.0%	20 74.1%	47 83.9%
Total	18(100.0%)	11(100.0%)	27(100.0%)	56(100.0%)

Source; Research data, 2012

Frequency of Attendance of Training Seminars/Workshops by Staff

The study respondents who had attended at least a capacity-building training were then asked about the number of times that they had attended training on resource mobilization and responses summarized in (Table 2). It was

established that 8.9% of respondents had attended the training once, 5.4% had attended twice, 3.6% had attended more than three times. These findings imply that majority of respondents had not attended the capacity-building sufficiently enough even if conducted by their institutions.

Table 2: Frequency of Attendance of Training Seminars/Workshops

Response	University			Total
	University I	University II	University III	
Once	1 5.6%	0 .0%	4 14.8%	5 8.9%
Twice	0 .0%	0 .0%	3 11.1%	3 5.4%
> 3 times	1 5.6%	0 .0%	1 3.7%	2 3.6%
N/A	16 88.9%	11 100.0%	19 70.4%	46 82.1%
Total	18(100.0%)	11(100.0%)	27(100.0%)	56(100.0%)

Source; Research data, 2012

Frequency of the Training/Awareness Conducted

The study respondents were then asked about the number of times the awareness trainings were conducted by their respective institutions. On the basis of study findings

(Table.3), it was established that 3.6% of respondents reported annually, 8.9% reported half-yearly, 3.6% reported quarterly while 10.7% reported monthly. These findings imply that a significant proportion of the private universities conducted awareness on resource mobilization at least monthly or did not at all.

Table 3: Frequency of the Training/Awareness Conducted

Responses	University			Total
	University I	University II	University III	
Annually	1 5.6%	1 9.1%	0 .0%	2 3.6%
Half-yearly	0 .0%	0 .0%	5 18.5%	5 8.9%
Quarterly	0 .0%	0 .0%	2 7.4%	2 3.6%
Monthly	1 5.6%	0 .0%	5 18.5%	6 10.7%
N/A	16 88.9%	10 90.9%	15 55.6%	41 73.2%
Total	18(100.0%)	11(100.0%)	27(100.0%)	56(100.0%)

Impact of Training and Capacity-building on Resource Mobilization

The study also investigated whether the training had any significant impact on resource mobilization among private universities. According to study findings (Table .4), 92.9% of respondents reported that training on resource mobilization did not have significant impact on resource mobilization while 7.1% were not sure. The findings show that generally, the training on resource mobilization is yet to have a significant impact on resource mobilization efforts among private universities in the study area.

Table 4: Impact of Training on Resource Mobilization

Response	University			Total
	University I	University II	University III	
No	15 83.3%	10 90.9%	27 100.0%	52 92.9%
Not sure	3 16.7%	1 9.1%	0 .0%	4 7.1%
Total	18(100.0%)	11(100.0%)	27(100.0%)	56(100.0%)

Source: Research data, 2012

Nature of Resources Needs among Private Chartered Universities:

The study sought to establish the resource needs and sources resources for the private universities. In order to achieve this, the study sought information on the main sources of resources; forms/nature of resources; participation of university campuses in resources mobilization and institutions' income base to finance its programmes. The results of data analysis and discussions are as follows:

Main Sources of Resources for Private Chartered Universities

According to study findings (Table 5), the main sources for the institutions in order of

magnitude were as follows: students (78.6%), Income generating Units (16.1%), NGOs (10.6%), Religious organizations (8.9%), International organizations (7.1%) and Government (7.1%). This suggests that students were the main source of resources for the private universities. This implies that other potential sources of resources are yet to be fully exploited for resources mobilization.

Table 5: Main Sources of Resources for Private Universities

Source	University						Total	
	University I		University II		University III		Yes	No
Student	16(89.9%)	2(11.1%)	8(72.7%)	3(27.3%)	20(74.1%)	7(25.9%)	44(78.6%)	12(21.4%)
NGOs	3(16.7%)	15(83.3%)	0(0.0%)	11(100%)	3(11.1%)	24(88.9%)	6(10.7%)	50(89.3%)
Religious organizations	3(16.7%)	15(83.3%)	1(9.1%)	10(90.9%)	1(3.7%)	26(96.3%)	5(8.9%)	51(91.1%)
International organizations	4(22.2%)	14(77.8%)	0(0.0%)	11(100%)	0(0.0%)	27(100%)	4(7.1%)	52(92.9%)
Government	3(16.7%)	15(83.3%)	0(0.0%)	11(100%)	1(3.7%)	26(96.3%)	4(7.1%)	52(92.9%)
Income generating Units (IGUs)	4(22.2%)	14(77.8%)	1(9.1%)	11(90.9%)	4(14.8%)	23(85.2%)	9(16.1%)	47(83.9%)
All the above	0(0.0%)	18(100%)	0(0.0%)	11(100%)	0(0.0%)	27(100%)	0(0.0%)	56(100%)

Forms of Resources Mobilized by Private Universities

On the basis of study findings (Table 6), the various forms of resources mobilized by private universities in order of magnitude were as follows: Tuition fees (71.4%), Donations in-kind (21.4%), all the above resources (21.4%), Human resources (16.1%) and Grants (8.9%).

These findings imply that tuition fees formed the bulk of the resources mobilized by private universities with other resources mobilized on a limited scale.

Table 6: Forms of Resources Mobilized by Private Universities

Type	University						Total	
	University I		University II		University III		Yes	No
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Tuition Fees	14(77.8%)	4(22.2%)	9(81.8%)	2(18.2%)	17(63.0%)	10(71.4%)	40(71.4%)	16(28.6%)
Grants	3(16.7%)	15(83.3%)	0(0.0%)	11(100%)	2(7.4%)	25(92.6%)	5(8.9%)	51(91.1%)
Donations in-kind	10(55.6%)	8(44.4%)	2(18.2%)	9(81.8%)	0(0.0%)	27(100%)	12(21.4%)	44(78.6%)
Human resource	5(27.8%)	13(72.2%)	1(9.1%)	10(90.9%)	3(11.1%)	24(88.9%)	9(16.1%)	47(83.9%)
All the above	3(16.7%)	15(83.3%)	2(18.2%)	9(81.8%)	7(25.9%)	20(74.1%)	12(21.4%)	44(78.6%)

Source: Research data, 2012

Whether Resource Mobilization is Biblical

The respondents were asked whether, resource mobilization was biblical and responses summarized in Table 7. The findings showed 78.6% of respondents agreed that resource

mobilization was biblical, 1.8% disagreed whereas 19.6% were not sure. A closer look at the findings reveals that religious-based institutions had majority of respondents agreeing that resource mobilization is biblical.

Table 7. Whether Resource Mobilization is Biblical

Response	University			Total
	University I	University II	University III	
Yes	17 94.4%	8 72.7%	19 70.4%	44 78.6%
No	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 3.7%	1 1.8%
Not sure	1 5.6%	3 27.3%	7 25.9%	11 19.6%
Total	18(100.0%)	11(100.0%)	27(100.0%)	56(100.0%)

Source; Research data, 2012

Resources Mobilized by University Centre/Campus

The study also investigated the resources mobilized by private university campuses. According to study findings (Table 8), 28.6% of the respondents reported that their campus were able to mobilize tuition fees, 23.2% (grants),

23.2% (Donations in-kind), 33.9% (Human resource), and 21.4% (all above resources) while 10.7% would not mobilize any of the resources. These findings generally imply that despite their potential, majority of campuses of the private universities were not able to mobilize as many resources as possible.

Table 8: Resources Mobilized By University Centre/Campus

Type	University						Total	
	University I		University II		University III		Yes	No
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Tuition Fees	3(16.7%)	15(83.3%)	5(45.5%)	6(54.5%)	8(29.6%)	19(70.4%)	16(28.6%)	40(71.4%)
Grants	5(27.8%)	13(72.2%)	4(36.4%)	7(63.6%)	4(14.8%)	23(85.2%)	13(23.2%)	43(76.8%)
Donations in-kind	4(22.5%)	14(77.8%)	2(18.2%)	9(81.8%)	7(25.9%)	20(74.1%)	13(23.2%)	43(76.8%)
Human resource	8(44.4%)	10(55.6%)	4(36.4%)	7(63.6%)	7(25.9%)	20(74.1%)	19(33.9%)	37(66.1%)
All the above	4(22.2%)	14(77.8%)	0(0.0%)	11(100%)	8(29.6%)	19(70.4%)	12(21.4%)	44(78.6%)
None	3(16.7%)	15(83.3%)	2(18.2%)	9(81.8%)	1(3.7%)	26(96.3%)	6(10.7%)	50(89.3%)

Source: Research data, 2012

Strength of Universities' Income Base to Finance their Activities

The respondents were asked whether their universities had strong income base to finance their activities. Table 9 illustrates that 44.6% of

the respondents agreed, 32.1% disagreed whereas 23.2% were not sure. This implies that a significant proportion of private universities did not have strong income to finance their activities.

Table 9: Whether the University has Strong Income Base to Finance its Activities

Response	University			Total
	University I	University II	University III	
Yes	3	5	17	25
	16.7%	45.5%	63.0%	44.6%
No	10	4	4	18
	55.6%	36.4%	14.8%	32.1%
Not sure	5	2	6	13
	27.8%	18.2%	22.2%	23.2%
Total	18(100.0%)	11(100.0%)	27(100.0%)	56(100.0%)

Source: Research data, 2012

Limitations of the Study

There are many private universities in Kenya. Nevertheless, this study was confined to the chartered private universities located within Nakuru town. In order to get information for generation of knowledge on issues that were raised in the study, the study targeted randomly and purposively selected senior level staff within the institutions. The study is mainly a cross-sectional survey; It focuses on the private

universities located within Nakuru town and does not cover other private universities in the country.

Findings, Implications, and Recommendations

This study sought to examine the resources needs and sources of resources and level of training and capacity building in resource mobilization in private universities. The study

provides valuable insight to awareness, training and capacity-building, resource needs and resources. Based on the study objectives and the research methodology, the summary findings were as follows:

Training and Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization

According to study findings, (83.9%) of respondents had not attended capacity-building training on resource mobilization in their respective private universities. Furthermore, majority of respondents (82.1%) had not attended the capacity-building sufficiently enough even if conducted by their institutions. Also, a larger proportion of the private universities (83.9%) conducted awareness on resource mobilization at least monthly or did not at all. In general, the training and capacity-building efforts on resource mobilization are yet to have a significant impact on resource mobilization efforts in 92.9% of private universities.

Nature of Resources Needs among Private Universities

Study findings indicated that students were the main source of resources for 78.6% of private universities and therefore other potential sources of resources are yet to be fully exploited for resources mobilization. In addition, tuition fees formed the bulk of the resources mobilized by 71.4% of the private universities with other resources mobilized on a limited scale. Despite their potential, majority of campuses (67.8%) of the private universities were not able to mobilize as many resources as possible. In general, significant proportion of private universities (67.6%) did not have strong income to finance their activities.

Conclusion

This study has examined the training and capacity-building on resource mobilization undertaken by the private chartered universities. In addition, the study has also evaluated the resource needs and nature of resources mobilized by private universities. The study

findings are useful in providing clear understanding of the resource mobilization efforts in the private universities in the study area and in other parts of the country. On the basis of the survey findings, the study arrived at several conclusions:

The study established that the study respondents' (staff) knowledge and awareness of the resource mobilization was quite high across the sampled institutions. This implies that majority of the staff who should be part of resource mobilization were adequately aware. Furthermore, it was also evident that private institutions needed to mobilize resources to achieve their objectives. Nevertheless, it was apparent from the study that most of the institutions did not have officers or officers or committees in charge of resource mobilization. In addition, in most of the institutions, the staffs were not adequately involved in resource mobilization efforts. The study also concludes that majority of the study respondents (staff) either did not attend capacity-building training on resource mobilization or did not attend the capacity-building sufficiently enough even if conducted by their institutions. Furthermore, a significant proportion of the private universities rarely conducted awareness on resource mobilization. Moreover, the training and capacity-building efforts on resource mobilization are yet to have a significant impact on resource mobilization efforts in majority of private universities. With regard to resource needs and nature of resources mobilized, the study concluded that a significant proportion of private universities did not have strong income to finance their activities. Furthermore, the study established that students were the main source of resources for the private universities and tuition fees formed the bulk of the resources mobilized by private universities. The study also concluded that apart from tuition fees, other potential sources of resources are either yet to be fully exploited or mobilized on a limited scale. It was also noted that despite their potential, majority of centers/campuses of the private universities were not able to mobilize as many resources as possible.

Recommendations

In view of the study findings and conclusions, resource mobilization is critical among private universities in order to effectively and efficiently meet their objectives. Nevertheless, resource mobilization among private universities has not been satisfactory. This has been attributed to various factors identified by the study. It is therefore imperative for elaborate and specific policy recommendations to be formulated that can address the challenges of resource mobilization. It is evident from the study findings that the training and capacity-building efforts on resource mobilization are yet to achieve a significant impact on resource mobilization efforts in majority of private universities. This study recommends the need to organize regular awareness, training and capacity-building in resource mobilization among the staff in private universities. The study also established that apart from tuition fees, other potential sources of resources are either yet to be fully exploited or are mobilized on a limited scale. It was also noted that despite their potential, majority of campuses of the private universities were not able to mobilize as many resources as possible. Consequently, this study recommends effective empowerment of university campuses in order to mobilize as many resources as possible. In addition, private universities should diversify their resource mobilization efforts to include other forms of resources from a variety of sources. This study provided relevant qualitative information on the factors influencing resource mobilization in private universities. It is important that further research is carried out to assess the quantitative aspects of the resource mobilization so as to determine quantitatively the resources mobilized by universities.

Author Biographies

- **Professor Liu Zhimin;** Is a Professor of Educational Economics and Management at Nanjing Agricultural University. Professor Zhimin is currently the Associate Dean and Director of Humanities and Social sciences Division, Academy of sciences Head of Higher Education Institute, Nanjing Agricultural University.

Professor Zhimin has widely published in the area of higher education economics and management; he is a member of so many academic boards both locally and internationally

- **Mr. Simon Kibet Kipchumba;** Simon is a Ph.D. student in higher educational economics and management at Nanjing Agricultural University; he works at Egerton University, Kenya as a Lecturer of Management. Prior to this, Simon worked at Kabarak University as a senior administrator. He is an holder of Masters in Business Administration MBA
- **Mr. Robert Chelagat;** Robert is a holder of MBA –strategic management; he is currently working at Kabarak University, Kenya, as a Resource Mobilization Manager. Mr. Chelagat has a wealth of experience in Non Governmental Organizations, he has worked in World Vision and Arid and Semi Arid Lands Programs.

References

- Buechler S. M. (1999). *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism*, Oxford University Press.
- Beuchler, S. M. (1993). *Beyond resource mobilization? Emerging trends in Social Movement Theory*. In: *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*. Ed. S. M. Buechler and F. K. Cylke. 1997. *Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, California. pp 193 - 210*.
- Buechler, S. M. (1995). *New social movement theories*. In: *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*. Ed. S. M. Buechler and F. K. Cylke. 1997. *Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, California. pp. 295 - 319*.
- Cuthbert, D. (2011): *Successful Fundraising: A strategic and Practical Guide*, Evangel Publishing House,

- Dillon W. (1993): *People Raising: A Practical Guide to Raising Support*, Moody Press, Chicago.
- Cole, G. (2002): *Personnel and Human Resource Management (5th Edition)*, Biddles Ltd International HIV/AIDS work (A total kit support NGO's & CBO's) – (2002)
- Janwel T. H. (1992). *Fundraising For Academic Library: Emeralds Group Publishing Ltd.*
- Jenkins, J. C. (1983). Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 527–553.
- Johnston, H., E. Larana, and J. R. Gusfield. (1997). Identities, Grievances, And New Social Movements. In: *Social Movements: Perspectives And Issues*. Ed. S. M. Buechler and F. K. Cylke. 1997. *Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, California. pp 274 - 295.*
- Joyce K. (2006): *Introduction to Management Research*, Jomo Kenyatta Foundation
- Kendall, D. (2005). *Sociology in Our Times*, Thomson Wadsworth.
- Kiiru, M. (2010): *Mobilizing And Managing Resources: Foundations, Principles & Strategies*, Evangel Publishing House, Nairobi.
- Kiiru, M. (2011): *Successful Fundraising: A strategic and Practical Guide*, Evangel Publishing House, Nairobi.
- Khawaja, M. (1994). Resource Mobilization, Hardship, and Popular Collective Action in the West Bank. *Social Forces*, 73(1), 191–220.
- Lester A. (1997): *Strategic Management, Concepts, Processes and Decisions (4th Edition)*, Dame Publications.
- Hunt, S. A., R. D. Benford, and D. A. Snow (1994). In: *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Ed. E. Larana, H. Johnston, and J. R. Gusfield. 1994. *Temple University Press, Philadelphia. pp 185 - 208.*
- McCarthy, J. D. and Mayer N. Z., (2001). The Enduring Vitality of the Resource Mobilization Theory of Social Movements in Jonathan H. Turner (ed.), *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, p.533-65.
- Buechler, S. M. (1993). Beyond Resource Mobilization? Emerging Trends In Social Movement Theory. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(2), 217–235.
- McCarthy, J. D., and M. N. Zald. (1987). Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. In: *Social Movements: Perspectives And Issues*. Ed. S. M. Buechler and F. K. Cylke. 1997. *Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, California. pp. 149 - 172.*
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1,212–1,241.
- Mugenda, O. & A. Mugenda. (2003): *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Norton, M. (1996): *The world wide fundraiser's Workbook*.
- Schwartz, G. (April, 1993): It is Time to Get Serious about Breaking the Cycle of Dependence In Africa, *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, 29(2)
- Simiyu, M. (2004): *Role of Income Generating Activities in Universities, A Case Study of Egerton University, Nakuru.*
- Tice, K. (2002): *Engaging Youth in Philanthropy. New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 38 (Winter): 5 – 18)
- The life Application Study Bible (2006), New Living Translation, Tyndale House Publishers
- Thompson, W. (2000): *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Grant Writing: Alpha. Managing library finances volume 10 issue No.3 9199*),
- Youth in Philanthropy Program (2010). An initiative of The Central Susquehanna Community Foundation, U.S. www.csgiving.org.