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Abstract

This study identified and described the role and practice of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) from a perspective of Presbyterian Church of East Africa (PCEA), an organization in the Not for Profit (NfP) sector. Communication channels, strategies and tactics used by PCEA institutions to communicate CSR activities to the church’s publics were studied using the systems theory. The study had four objectives: 1) to identify the CSR programs and activities in PCEA, 2) to find out the practice of CSR by PCEA, 3) to find out how PCEA communicates CSR activities to internal and external publics, and 4) to investigate the role of CSR in PCEA. The respondents were 68 senior leaders in PCEA of whom 61 answered the self-administered questionnaires. The remaining 7 comprising past and current General Assembly officials were interviewed. Their responses corroborated responses from the questionnaires. Respondents indicated that the use of public relation firms and mass media for publicity were avoided due to cost factors. Further, PCEA favored inexpensive and swift channels such as letters, telephone and public announcements over any other channel. Nevertheless, the latter channels were less effective in communicating CSR information to external publics.

However, majority of the respondents had the opinion that communication strategies and tactics such as media relations (83.33%), lobbying and advocacy (83.6%) and advertising and marketing (67.21%) could be very effective in informing external publics about CSR programs in PCEA. Further, 98.36% felt that public relations were an effective strategy. Thus, PCEA can promote its corporate image and its reputation by partnering with media houses and public relation firms in CSR publicity. Likewise, such opportunity would also profit other organizations in the NfP sector.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction

In recent years, there has been significant interest in social responsibility by various corporate groups (Hamann & Acutt, 2003). Across the world, the UN Global Compact is a major force promoting corporate social responsibility (CSR) (McKinsey & Company, 2004). In the local scene, CSR initiatives in Kenya have grown tremendously especially during the last 10 years. This has partly been as a result of the upsurge of yearly awards such as the Company of the Year Award (COYA) and the Financial Reporting (FiRe) Awards. These awards have CSR as a factor. Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Kenya (ICPAK), Capital Markets Authority (CMA) and Nairobi Stock Exchange (NSE) are co-sponsors for the FiRe Awards. The awards offer recognition to the best companies in different sectors such as Banks: Industrial, Commercial and Services; Insurance; and Not for Profit (NfP) categories (ICPAK, CMA & NSE, 2009). In addition, the recent widening of the democratic space has also encouraged the society to hold corporate bodies accountable for their actions (CEDMAC et al., 2001).

Despite that the motivation for practicing CSR may be as diverse as the groups involved, of great concern are the intensity and the enthusiasm with which churches and other NfP organizations have embraced this concept. For instance, the Presbyterian Church of East Africa (PCEA) has a history of practicing CSR that spans over a century. This is especially in the area of health and education (PCEA, 2008). In recent times, the church has also ventured in other sectors. For instance, the church recently assisted in the
construction of the Bombi Bridge in Malindi district. So far, this is the longest suspension bridge in Africa. While opening the 112 meter long Bombi suspension bridge, the General Assembly Moderator, Rt. Rev. David Gathanju, said that PCEA was touched by the plight of pupils and other residents. The bridge brought joy and relief to local residents who had previously been terrorized by crocodiles and hippos for decades as they crossed river Galana. PCEA and project partners spent twenty million Kenya shillings to complete the bridge (Nyassy, 2010, March 24).

Pacione (1989) argues that the institutional church occupies the key position in the ecclesiastical community of interest. It has the overarching moral philosophy and an established organizational structure. For example, PCEA has a philosophy and an organizational structure that is conducive to the practice of CSR. Hence, it is able to coordinate social actions while pursuing its own spiritual and secular activity (PCEA, 1998). Pacione (1989) adds the following:

A central characteristic of the ecclesiastical community of interest is the fusion of the spatial and the spiritual, the sense of place and the sense of justice. The latter is enshrined in the shared belief in the principle of social justice and compassion, and the former is the parish-based hierarchical form of organization. (p.94)

Thus, in CSR, the interests of an organization are assured while those of the society and environment are enhanced. The organization in partnership with its publics leaves the society a better place than it found it. Rev Gathanju also commented that PCEA has planned to construct two similar suspension bridges at Hawe Wanje and Peta Liguo in partnership with GORTA International, AIG and Bridging the Gap. These projects are in addition to the ongoing assistance in health, education and agriculture offered to Malindi residents (Nyassy, 2010, March 24). All this is an indication of the
paradigm shift from the traditional CSR activities to embrace infrastructural development for the benefit of the needy.

Corporate Social Responsibility

The phrase CSR refers to an organization’s initiative to meet its legal, ethical, economic and philanthropic duty (Carroll, 1991). Lantos classes CSR into three types, namely ethical, altruistic and strategic CSR (Lantos, 2002). Ethical CSR is the morally and mandatory fulfillment of an organization’s economic, legal and ethical responsibilities. The altruistic CSR goes beyond ethical CSR to help alleviate community welfare deficiencies through philanthropy. This is regardless of whether or not such philanthropy is of any benefit to the organization itself. The strategic CSR is the fulfillment of “philanthropic responsibilities which will benefit the organization through positive publicity and goodwill” (Lantos, 2001, p. 2).

Thus, CSR is a broad and multi-dimensional concept that has economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic facets (Smith & Langford, 2009). Nowadays, CSR concept goes by many names: such as corporate citizenship, social responsibility, social action, community service, charitable services, environmental stewardship, sustainable development, corporate virtue, and triple bottom line (PCEA, 1998; Alsop, 2004; Mirvis & Googins, 2006). All these diverse corporate social engagements are critical for organizational development and success. Hence, “corporate responsibility is not just social, it is integral to practice and strategies; it is unavoidable and is the building block on which the company’s reputation for citizenship is built” (Waddock, 2003, pp. 5 - 6).
Further, CSR "is now one of the key elements of reputation equation. It is not a choice anymore but it is part of the cost of doing business in the new millennium" (Alsop, 2004, p. 70). Through CSR an organization gives back to the community while enhancing teamwork among its workforce. In the process, the organization itself benefits through enhanced reputation, employee loyalty and corporate image. Also, it is through CSR that an organization maintains cordial and beneficial relations with key publics (Waddock, 2003; Alsop, 2004; Dainton & Zelly, 2005). Thus, due to its importance, many businesses and NfP organizations have incorporated CSR in their business practice and strategies.

Importance of CSR in Business Organizations

Business organizations are expected to operate as legal, ethical, economic and philanthropic entities. As legal entities, they have rights, privileges and responsibilities just like their natural counterparts. These are legitimately enshrined in their corporate charter, memorandum of association and articles of association (Carroll, 1991). In addition, organizations are expected to be ethical in their economic pursuits. Further, responsible corporate citizenship demands that organizations be philanthropic by giving back to the community and being mindful of needy in the community. Thus, CSR is equally important to the business organization as it is to the hosting communities and beneficiaries of philanthropy.

Further, CSR is a function of corporate communication. Organizations are increasingly utilizing CSR to open up communication lines with strategic publics (PCEA, 2008). Consequently, the corporate social initiatives are increasingly becoming central to
organizational communication strategy (Argenti, 2002). Hence, CSR and corporate ethics are now in the centre-stage of corporate and business strategy (Carroll, 1991; Cravens & Piercy, 2009). The corporate communication departments are mandated to communicate CSR programs to relevant publics so as improve on image, reputation and relations. Cravens and Piercy (2009) say that "the goal is to establish CSR not simply as corporate altruism, but as a source of opportunity, innovation, and competitive advantage" (p. 22). This is due to the fact that CSR programs create new products, services and strong relationships (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Outlined below are four ways in which CSR is useful to organizations.

**CSR enhances corporate reputation.** CSR enhances organizational reputation and establishes organization's long-term effectiveness. Many business organizations have recognized the importance of maintaining media relations through their corporate communication department so as to position their corporate brand, product and services appropriately. Alsop (2004) has expressed a similar view that if the media coverage of CSR and philanthropy is well planned then it can provide the most credible publicity. "It is usually safe to let the beneficiary do the talking to the media and work in a plug for the company. Best of all is making your projects so interesting that they are a natural for media publicity" (Alsop, 2004, p. 83). Waddock aptly says that CSR is “an integral part of developing productive and constructive ongoing relationships with key stakeholders” (Waddock, 2003, p. 7). Thus, CSR programs are a natural part and an effective way of corporate communication. Any organization intending to maintain a competitive edge must capitalize on every moment to communicate to its publics.
According to Heath and Ni (2009), the advocates for corporate social responsibility believe that CSR enhances the reputation of an organization. They assume that organizations with good reputations have an edge over those with bad or inadequate reputations. "This stronger reputation can lead to profits and defend the organization in times of crisis and during public policy issue battles" (Heath & Ni, 2009, p. 1). Therefore, the advantages of being perceived to have achieved corporate responsibility is a stronger reputation and acceptance (Wilson, 2000). Nielsen (2009) says that there is the need to use a credible measure while measuring CSR:

CSR professionals have the opportunity to take the initiative to integrate the importance of trust across the business. A way to do this is to understand that citizenship activities build trust - and improve reputation - with stakeholders from across the business. At Reputation Institute we measure reputation as fundamentally being a level of trust, admiration, good feeling and overall esteem that stakeholders have towards a company. We know citizenship activities are a key driver of this trust and a company’s reputation. (p. 1)

Nielsen expresses the view that a good reputation is observed by the level of trust and good will that publics have towards an organization (2009). Since CSR activities build trust, it is important that they should be integrated with organization core business and strategies for optimum results.

*CSR enhances corporate image.* Wilson (2000) says that "the corporations must strive to achieve greater perceived fairness in the distribution of economic wealth and in its treatment of all stakeholder interests" (p. 71). Wilson (2000) adds that "equity, or fairness, is fast becoming a key social issue…” (p. 72). Stakeholders are now aggressively demanding their rights and calling corporations to be accountable for their actions. This phenomenon is partly as a result of the imbalances arising from "recent
economic restructurings, and in part to a continuing rise in democratic populism" (Wilson, 2000, p. 72). Hence, through CSR, a corporate can enhance fairness in the system by creating economic opportunity for marginalized internal and external publics. This creates goodwill (Carroll, 1991; Wilson, 2000).

*CSR enhances organizations' mutual relationships.* Scholars in communication studies agree that corporate citizenship entails enhancing organizations' mutual relationships with their publics. Such publics are both internal and external to the organization and may comprise employees, customers, communities, suppliers, governments and investors. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) are also relevant publics who in many instances represent the interests of third parties who are vulnerable (Waddock, 2003; Alsop, 2004; Heath & Ni, 2009).

*CSR improves the quality of offerings by the mass media.* CSR in media organizations entails the injection of the truth in advertising. This makes “the mass media responsible for the quality of their offerings, print or broadcast” (Black & Bryant, 1995, p. 493). This concept of social responsibility in the mass media was first spelt out in the 1940s by the commission on freedom of the press. It aimed at injecting the truth in advertising in the interest of the public as part of CSR by the media. As a result, the mass media was urged to develop and enforce ethical practices (Black & Bryant, 1995). The current practice of media self-regulation all over the world is a commitment to its responsibility to the society.
CSR in the Not for Profit (NfP) Sector

A NfP organization is one whose objective is to engage in activities of public or private interest without any profit motive (Aras & Crowther, 2010). CSR in the NfP organizations is undertaken for a variety of reasons. However, the essential reason for the existence of such organization is the provision of services. The money and other resources used to provide such “services normally do not come from the recipient of those services. Moreover, the need for those services frequently outstrips the ability of the organization to satisfy those needs and it is forever operating under a situation of resource constrain” (Aras & Crowther, 2010, p. 31). This type of social responsibility has assisted in the growth of these organizations.

Gertrude's Children’s Hospital was honored for its performance in CSR with the 2010 FiRe Award in the NfP category. This annual Award is aimed at recognizing and promoting excellence in financial reporting. However, according to ICPAK, CMA and NSE (2009), “the NfP making sector is extremely lagging behind in substantive CSR reporting, though for majority of them, CSR is impliedly their major objective” (p. 45).

Among some non-Christian religious communities, CSR publicity is better in comparison to their Christian counterpart. For instance, the Aga Khan Foundation by the Shia Ismaili Muslim community and the Lottery Foundation advertise their CSR activities in the media. This publicity has contributed towards enhancing their reputation and image as key players in health, education and infrastructural development.

Scope of CSR in Christian Organizations

CSR in Christian organizations is largely for social-economic transformation as a response to the inequalities, socio-economic challenges and environmental degradation in
the world. Majority of the world’s population is faced with starvation and lack of basic necessities of life. The worst affected resides in Africa, Latin American and the Caribbean countries (Visser, Middleton & McIntosh, 2005; UNCTAD, 2008). In order to overcome these challenges, global Christian organizations such as C3, Action Aid, and World Vision source donations from well-wishers. They in turn channel these funds through partner local churches in order to improve the lives of local communities.

In addition, some churches have established organizations to deal with some aspects of social responsibility as sign of caring for the community. For instance, the Methodist Church in Ireland has the Council of Social Responsibility to deal with needy cases (2005). PCEA has the Board of Social Responsibility and Presbyterian Foundation. Also protestant churches such as the Colonial Presbyterian Church in USA have initiated 'The Colonial Global Orphan Project' with the aim of rescuing orphaned and abandoned children in Kenya and Malawi (Jim West, personal correspondence, 2009, July 28). Other clear cases of church and individual CSR efforts include the service of the renowned Catholic nun, Mother Theresa in Calcutta.

Other churches have widened the scope of CSR to entail a dialogue with business communities. For instance, CSR at the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) entails an engagement with local business community. The ELCA CSR program involves creating dialogue on the social, environmental, and financial implications of company practices. Businesses are challenged to bear the wider social and environmental costs of their operations and hire without discrimination (ELCA, 2009).

In addition, ELCA support legislation, ordinances, and resolutions that guarantees equality to all persons. It also requests financial institutions to be mindful of the
vulnerable persons in their pursuit of economic efficiency and profit (ELCA, 2009). ELCA CSR policy is based on the conviction that God's business involves corporate and individual stewardship of all of God’s creations. Hence the need to practice good stewardship, pursue justice and peace (Genesis 1:26; Amos 5:24; Matthew 25:40; Luke 19:41-42) (ELCA, 2009).

Visser, Middleton and McIntosh (2005) say that “corporate citizenship is enmeshed in the debate about Africa's future” (p. 18). Africa is an emerging market for goods and services originating from developed and developing parts of the world. This globalization of businesses and markets has resulted in lack of a uniform approach to CSR in Africa. However, CSR programs covered by most organizations in Africa generally fall under the following: building of hospitals and schools, empowerment and support of orphans and vulnerable groups, paying of school fees, digging of boreholes, construction of bridges, initiation of micro-credit schemes and funding project proposals (The International HIV/AIDS Alliance, 2002).

Among some churches in Kenya, social responsibility is integrated with the church’s mission in areas of service, fellowship, proclamation and witness (Cf. Hebrews 10: 24 - 25). For instance, Anglican Church of Kenya (ACK) and Methodist Church in Kenya (MCK) combine the preaching ministry with community development in a holistic approach (ACK website, 2010; Methodist Church in Kenya, 1996). This is a new paradigm entailing planned CSR programs that are targeted to enrich host communities and also benefit the sponsoring churches.

Wilcox is of the view that the basic purpose of CSR is to create awareness and maintain symbiotic, mutual relationships (2005). In PCEA, CSR programs help the
community to understand the church, its vision and mission (PCEA, 2008). Thus, these programs meaningfully and holistically promote society’s progress. In addition, they promote the church’s reputation. Among key programs initiated by churches, most relate to development, rehabilitation, welfare, education and empowerment (PCEA, 2006a; Methodist Church in Kenya, 1996).

It is worth noting that despite that the church does a lot of CSR, it has reaped little of the benefits of CSR. This is unlike other corporate groups in the business world. Most large business organizations are located in commercial centers and are keen to take advantage of any CSR activity to market its product and services. On the other hand, most churches are generally located in the grassroots contexts. The majority of them are established with the blessings of the local people. Hence, many of them almost have permanent social license to operate. As a result, they do not see the need to publicize their CSR activities for reputation and image building. However, their social responsibility in these contexts is yet to be studied and documented.

Importance of CSR in Christian Organizations

In line with the church’s calling and its legal foundations, some churches combine preaching of good news with CSR-based community development programmes (PCEA, 1998). “The essence of the work of the church, as stated in Luke 4:18, Mark 16: 16 - 18 and Matthew 28:18 - 20, is to bear witness to the love of Christ through gospel proclamation, Christ-like living and social action” (ACK website, 2010). Therefore, CSR programs serve to supplement the church's mission by establishing and maintaining mutually beneficial relationships with the host community. These relationships work as a
bridge into a targeted community where the church wants to establish her mission. Consequently, the integration of CSR program activities into the Christian faith therefore contributes to the overall mission of the church by enhancing credibility of the church. The church is trusted as a good neighbor and a caring institution by the community (PCEA, 2008). Thus, the following are the two main facets of social responsibility in Christian organizations.

The first aspect of social responsibility is anchored on the belief that the church is a body of Christ. Prior to the time of reformation, “the church was considered the institutional church of the Roman catholic system” (Vlach, 2011, p. 1). The subsequent reformed theologians viewed the church as a legal institution and an invisible mystical body of Christ. The twentieth century scholars held the view that the church exists through missions (Bosch, 1991). “There is a church because there is a mission, not vice versa” (Bosch, 1991, p. 390). The bible strongly supports this latter view in Matthew 28:18 - 20 and Mark 16:15 by highlighting that the core business of the church is to make disciples of every nation through preaching and teaching the word of God. According to this view, the church conducts its social responsibility as part and parcel of its divine mission and calling to help the poor and set the captives free (Luke 4:18 - 19).

Secondly, social responsibility is based on the idea of the church as a corporate body. The ultimate goal of such CSR programs is to bring socio-economic transformation in the society. In order to achieve such transformation, organizations align their organizational strategies with their core business values while addressing the broader expectations of host society (Mirvis & Googins, 2006). Likewise, Christian churches practicing CSR integrate social responsibility into their preaching work; the latter being
the core business of the Church. For instance, “the terms and conditions set forth in the Certificate of Incorporation of the registered trustees of the Presbyterian Church of East Africa” (PCEA, 1998, p. 221) is foundational in guiding the operation of the church in regard to its involvement in social responsibility and community service. As such, it is expected to operate as a legal, ethical, economic and philanthropic entity. In addition, it has rights, privileges, and responsibilities just like any other legal or natural counterpart. Thus, PCEA has endeavored to serve the society beyond the task of preaching and evangelization. As a result, the church has endeared itself to many of its publics by creating diverse economic opportunities (PCEA, 2010b).

Social Responsibility in PCEA

PCEA has over the last 100 years related positively to the spiritual, economic, political and socio-cultural issues of the day. The Church of Scotland missionaries, precursor to the PCEA, began and championed church medical services in 1908 at Thogoto (Macpherson, 1970). In addition, all their mission stations were predominantly marked by the installation of a school, hospital and a church building. They also educated and evangelized the Africans. For instance, outstanding people like Eliud Mathu and Mzee Jomo Kenyatta received their education at PCEA Thogoto mission. The former was the first African to join legislative council while the latter was the first president of Kenya (PCEA, 2008).

On the cultural front, the Church of Scotland advocated the rights of women especially in denouncing the female circumcision in 1929 (Macpherson, 1970). It also promoted the education of the girl child. This became the foundation of women
empathyt in Kenya (PCEA Woman’s Guild, 2010). This work which is an example of altruistic CSR has continued to date through PCEA institutions such as the Woman’s Guild (PCEA Woman’s Guild, 2010).

According to Arthur, evangelism is the core of the missionary work. Arthur was a pioneer missionary and medical doctor and argues that it is only Jesus Christ who can transform lives of heathen nations. “Such being the aim of the whole, it is also the aim of each several part, and therefore comes to be the aim of medical work” (Arthur in PCEA, 2008, p. 7). Thus, medical work practiced as part of strategic CSR is instrumental to the growth of the church. Arthur believes that the influence of the hospital often reached further than any other mission agency. He says the following regarding the influence of medical work:

Supposing for instance, a man comes in from some distance to hospital, he has to stay in, and the average time he could remain in would probably be not less than fourteen days. During that time, he would receive so much education. He would see how the patients are looked after and cared for, how quickly their pain and suffering were often treated and how frequently after a couple of days they showed marked improvement. Further, he sees men of his own race undertaking work that is naturally reprehensible to them. He listens day by day to the definite teaching given at the hospital service. Such a man when he leaves the hospital goes back to his home and immediately becomes the interest centre of a circle of enquirers, who learns from his life the story of all that he has seen and heard. He thus comes to be at once a missionary, especially to those who, like himself, are sick in body. They make enquiries, and the result is that others in the same neighborhood come to the hospital for treatment. Each, as he comes and goes learns so much that is new, and carries it back to his own village, and becomes a second and a third missionary in that one district. Thus opposition is broken down, and a feeling of friendship is felt at least for the staff and a way is opened for a hearing of the message when the doctor happens to visit that direction. (pp. 5 - 6)

Thus, after over a century of CSR practice, PCEA has been connected to the life of the society. Its various CSR programs bridge the gap between the church and its host
community. This has gradually enhanced the reputation and image of the church. It has also provided an opportunity to serve God and humanity (PCEA, 2008).

In order to serve effectively, PCEA has instituted three categories of social responsibility programs. The first category is run through the Board of Social Responsibility (BSR). Some of these programs under BSR include provision of water, food, clothing, school supplies and relief, drilling of boreholes, socio-economic empowerment programs, micro-enterprises and promotion of agriculture. Majority of these initiatives amount to only assistance to needy communities and do not have any financial benefit to the church (PCEA, 1998; PCEA, 2010).

As a commitment to social responsibility, PCEA initiated BSR in 1979. It was mandated to promote and develop church projects. It was also to be proactive in solving "all problems of social nature that affect human beings, both inside as well as outside the church" (PCEA, 1998, p. 303). It was bestowed with the responsibility of conducting research on community needs and the church's contribution to meeting these needs. It was also responsible for general publicity through media on project activities. It was charged with the responsibility of evaluating the contribution of projects to the changing needs of the community (PCEA, 1998).

In addition, the BSR was allocated the function of creating the "awareness of the development in the remote areas, to improve the standards of living and to advise the community on programmes concerning social and material needs" (PCEA, 2007, p. 12). BSR has had notable successes. For instance, the BSR bee keeping project in Tum, Maralal has brought about social and economic transformation among the Samburu people. Its impact was felt even in families as it led to reduced drunkenness among
Samburu men and increased household incomes (Cowan, personal interview, November 3, 2010). The BSR report to eighteenth General Assembly shows that PCEA had prioritized programs meant for sustainable development, rehabilitation and education of destitute and street children and empowerment projects. These CSR activities had an impact of effectively promoting church's reputation and are an engine of society's progress and development (PCEA, 2006a).

Further, BSR provides relief and empower people through organized community initiatives. Such initiatives are micro-credit schemes and trainings on micro-enterprising among other activities. This makes the people to be “self reliant and to lead a quality life, to the glory of God (PCEA, 2007, p. 18). The impact from BSR has percolated down through the PCEA organizational structure. Its impact has been felt in presbyteries, parishes and grassroots congregations. Consequently, there are myriads of projects in these organizational units.

A fitting example is PCEA Zimmerman church which has integrated CSR programs in its strategic plan. It has harmonized CSR projects with the core business of the church. Through strategic planning, the church holistically tackles societal ills such as poverty, ignorance, unemployment, injustice, diseases, substance and drug misuse among other things (PCEA Zimmerman Church, 2009). The bible encourages believers to practice that kind of responsibility. “… Blessed is he who is kind to the needy” (Proverbs 14:21, NIV). The bible also encourages planning and forethought (Proverbs 20:18; 21:5).

The second category of CSR programs is made up of social and sustainable programs. These are income generating ventures whose main aim is to serve the needy community and not to make profit. Any surplus funds that may be realized is ploughed
back to expand and improve the services offered to the community. PCEA hospitals, health centers, clinics and educational institutions fall under this category. They charge subsidized fees. To a large extent, they rely on donations from church organs and other partners for their operation. For instance, PCEA has set aside one Sunday every year when all offering goes towards supporting hospitals and health work. On the other hand, the hospitals maintain a ‘poor patients’ fund’ to assist her needy clients (PCEA, 2006a, p. D15.36). Other institutions also in this category include the four main PCEA community centers namely; PCEA Bahati Community Centre, PCEA Dandora Community Centre, PCEA Eastleigh Community Centre and PCEA Kibwezi Community Centre.

The third category of CSR programs are run by Presbyterian Foundation. The Presbyterian Foundation is registered under The Companies Act (Chapter 486, Laws of Kenya) as a company limited by guarantee and not having a share capital. It is the investment arm of PCEA (PCEA, 1998). It is “the legal body mandated to take care of all the properties owned by the Presbyterian Church of East Africa as well as to act as trustee of the church” (PCEA, 2006a, p. D 14.1). Hence, it has income generating projects such as real estates, a beach hotel and guest houses (PCEA, 2010). According to The Practice and Procedure Manual, all the income of the Presbyterian Foundation is applied “wholly and exclusively for charitable purposes of the church in the Republics of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania” (PCEA, 1998, p. 194).

The income of the Foundation (as determined by generally accepted accounting principles) shall be applied wholly and exclusively for charitable purposes in accordance with the provision of the Articles of Association. No portion of the income of the Foundation shall be paid or transferred directly or indirectly, by way of dividend, gift, divisions, bonus or otherwise howsoever by way of profit to the members of the Foundation. (PCEA, 1998, p. 190)
Thus, the objects and activities of The Presbyterian Foundation is part and parcel of the entire PCEA CSR efforts, philanthropy and charitable work.

**CSR and Corporate Communication Strategies**

Corporate communicators use strategies and tactics to communicate CSR activity to the intended public. Some of these tactics include the development of specific communication vehicles such as public service announcements, logos, brochures, training materials, special events and positive emotional appeal (Austin & Pinkleton, 2006). The corporate manager tailors his/her communications messages with an aim of raising a public need, concern and an interest in the organization, its products and services. In addition, the participatory process during the formulation and implementation of CSR programs also creates a prolonged point of interaction between the organization and its publics. The whole process helps in endearing the publics to the organization especially if CSR programs are packaged as credible solutions to society’s needs and problems (Wilcox, 2005). Thus, CSR as practiced cannot be divorced from organizational and communication strategies.

In addition, for CSR programs to be relevant to their intended beneficiary, the project activities must be a reflection of the expectation of those publics (Wilson, 2000). Thus, effective communication strategies and tactics in CSR program formulation and implementation emphasis on the “social” aspects of program. As a result, many corporate social responsibility initiatives are targeted at alleviating social problems such as environmental degradation, poverty, ignorance and disease. For instance, according to ICPAK, CMA and NSE (2009), in the year 2009, most companies in Kenya supported
communities mainly in the areas of “… donations, health, sports, education, water and children …” (p. 43). Hence, they expressed care and solidarity with the society at the latter’s point of need. At the same time, through relevant communications, the organization encourages the society to develop an ownership of company goals (The McKinsey & Company, 2006).

Considering the above, communicating CSR activity to the intended public is not an easy task to corporate communicators. Indeed, it is a communication challenge. It deals on how well a corporate relates and communicates with its relevant publics in its execution of its CSR programs. This study attempts to look at critical issues that concern the role, strategies, tactics and practice of CSR in PCEA. Effective communication strategies and tactics employed in CSR programs focus on positive relations that result from organizations planned benevolence.

This study is enlightened by December 2005 McKinsey quarterly survey of 4,238 global business executives. The survey was on the CEOs’ perception on the effectiveness of current tactics that were used by organizations to manage their socio-political issues. It was found that 49% of corporations’ CEOs felt that organizations most frequently used media and public relations tactics to manage socio-political issues. In addition, 35% of CEOs also felt that media and public relations is the most effective tactic for managing socio-political issues. On the other hand, 48% of CEOs felt that lobbying regulators was the most frequently used tactic. In addition, 25% of CEOs felt that lobbying regulators was the most effective tactic. On advertising and marketing, 22% of CEOs thought that it was the most frequently used tactic; while 12% of them thought it was the most effective tactic. On philanthropy, 14% of CEOs said it was the most frequently used tactic.
Only 11% of CEOs felt that philanthropy was the most effective tactic (in Googins, nd). The question was framed as follows: “When large companies in your industry try to manage socio-political issues which 3 tactics do they rely on most frequently and which 3 do you believe are most effective” (in Googins, nd). Figure 1 graphically illustrates the findings.

Use and Effectiveness of Communication Tactics
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Figure 1: December 2005 McKinsey Quarterly Survey of 4,238 global business executives. Source: Googins (nd).

From this McKinsey survey, media and public relations emerged as the most effective tactic in managing socio-political issues. Thus, based on the above results, it is clear that church organizations can also manage their social-political issues such as social responsibility by use of media and public relations as the most proven tactic. As a consequence, their public image and perception as key providers of CSR will be enhanced among their publics.
Problem Statement

The lack of sustained publicity of PCEA sponsored CSR activities in the mass media has led to a misunderstanding of the role and practice of CSR in the church. BSR report to 2010 General Administrative Committee (GAC) highlighted that its mandate is not well understood within the church. “Many continue to view the department as an income generating department rather than a relief and development arm of the church” (PCEA, 2010). Further, the BSR strategic plan for 2007 - 2011, listed “making sure that BSR’s mandate is understood by all stakeholders” as one of key areas of focus.

On the other hand, the Presbyterian Foundation which is the investment arm of PCEA reported to GAC in 2010 and also in 2011 that they planned “to ensure that activities of the foundation realizes a remarkable contribution to the mission work of the church as initially anticipated” (PCEA, 2011; PCEA, 2010). Thus, to avoid such misunderstanding, there is need to identify and describe the role and practice of CSR in PCEA. Therefore, this study set out to assist in understanding the role and practice of CSR in PCEA as a Not for Profit organization. This was accomplished through a survey of CSR from the perspective of senior leaders involved in decision making, policy formulation and implementation in purposively selected PCEA institutions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to identify and describe the role and practice of CSR in PCEA.
Research Objectives

i) To identify CSR programs and activities in PCEA.

ii) To find out the practice of CSR by PCEA.

iii) To find out how PCEA communicated CSR activities to internal and external publics.

iv) To investigate the role of CSR in PCEA.

Research Questions

i) What were the CSR programs and activities that were found in PCEA?

ii) How were CSR programs practiced in PCEA?

iii) How were CSR activities communicated to internal and external publics?

iv) What was the role of CSR in PCEA?

Significance of the Study

The research findings would be of great importance because they would benefit the following:

i) The Kenyan religious sector and society in general. The study and documentation of CSR in PCEA would present new information and insights on CSR that could transform corporate communications among the churches in Kenya.

ii) The present and future generations of policy makers and planners in NfP sector as it would provide highlights to some of the hindrances to attaining desired CSR goals.
iii) CSR program implementers. The study would help them develop a better understanding of CSR programs and its impact on organizations and beneficiaries.

iv) In addition, future researchers of a similar or a related subject would benefit from the findings of this study. They would use this study as a basis of their research undertakings as they seek to add knowledge to this relatively new field.

Scope of the Study

The study’s focus was on the role and practice of CSR from the perspective of internal publics. Thus, external publics were not examined. The internal publics that were subject for examination were sixty-eight (68) senior church leaders spread across PCEA organizational structure. These comprised of sixty-one (61) respondents that represented PCEA institutions and an additional seven (7) respondents that consisted of some current and past officers of the General Assembly. They were very resourceful in this study since they have been in senior leadership in PCEA for many years and were involved in decision making, policy formulation and implementation.

The researcher’s aim was to study CSR in purposively selected PCEA institutions. Those institutions were; three (3) community centers, forty-eight (48) Presbyteries and ten (10) departments. A complete listing is found in appendix C. These institutions were selected because they have numerous CSR activities.
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The following are limitations that were encountered and their delimitations that ensured the success of the study.

i) The researcher’s area of study had earlier not been researched on. Most of literature dealt on CSR from a purely profit-making perspective compared to literature dealing on CSR in the NfP sector. Further, very little scholarly work was documented on CSR activities by churches. Hence, there was scarcity of literature for review. As delimitation, the researcher keenly selected literature that was relevant to this study. Also, the researcher used trained research assistants to collect primary data from PCEA leaders. They worked under his supervision and guidance so as to ensure accountability, accuracy and objectivity. The researcher also conducted quality checks at every stage of the project. Also, he ensured that operational terms and concepts used in this survey were clearly defined. In addition, the researcher did not generalize the findings of the study beyond PCEA.

ii) There was fear from some respondents that they were exposing confidential church data. The researcher dealt with this challenge by assuring respondents that their responses would be kept confidential. In addition, respondents were briefed on the purpose and their role in the study.

iii) Some respondents were slower in responding than the researcher had expected. As delimitation, the researcher kept calling and reminding them to fill in the questionnaires.
Assumptions

The study assumed that the church leadership would cooperate in what could be seen as self evaluation. Further, the researcher would be granted permission to carry out the study by PCEA leadership.

Definition of Terms and Concepts

*Corporate social responsibility (CSR)*: The term CSR refers to an organization’s initiative to meet its legal, ethical, economic and philanthropic duty (Carroll, 1991). Lantos classes CSR into three types namely, ethical, altruistic and strategic CSR (Lantos, 2002). Thus, CSR is a broad and multi-dimensional concept that has economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic facets (Smith & Langford, 2009).

In this study, the term corporate social responsibility (CSR) refers to socio-economic affirmative and empowerment programs initiated and sponsored by an organization for the benefit of the society in which it works in and other publics (PCEA, 1998; PCEA, 2009). That is, in this study, the church CSR refers to any non-preaching activities such as education, agriculture, health, donations, sponsorship, sinking of boreholes, road rehabilitation and construction of bridges and any other project activities aimed at empowering hosting community as well as church members. It involves investing resources in the interest of church publics.

*Philanthropy*: The term philanthropy refers to voluntary contributions to the society such as giving money and other resource for society’s good (Carroll, 1991). In this study, philanthropy is used to imply benevolence towards individuals or a section of a human society so as to alleviate community welfare deficiencies without expectation of
any form of benefit to the organization. This involves giving assistance in form of cash and kind such as foodstuff, clothing or any other form of relief.

_Presbytery_: In PCEA, the word presbytery is a corporate expression having two meanings; first geographical area consisting of parishes and secondly, “it is the church court responsible for oversight of sessions, congregations, ministers, projects and church agents within those bounds” (PCEA, 1998, p. 214). In this study, the researcher will apply the second meaning of this term.

_Church group_: Means a grouping or a wing of the church. However, for the purpose of this research the term church group will be used to imply a certain specific and identifiable set of church members who function as a unit of interest with the overall goal of church development (PCEA, 1998).

_Community centre_: The phrase community centre refers to a building or a group of buildings for a community’s educational and recreational activities (Merriam-Webster Dictionary). In this study, the term Community Centre stand for PCEA institutions that have social, educational, technical, empowerment and affirmative programs targeting the needy members of the host society.

_Department_: A department is a division or a branch in an organization. In PCEA, the word department refers to PCEA institutions formed under acts constituting standing committee of the church (PCEA, 1998). In this study, the word department will denote PCEA institutions formed under acts constituting standing committee of the church.

_Organization_: An organization is an establishment, a company, an institution, corporation or a system. Thus, in this study, the term organization will be used
interchangeably with corporate or corporation and it implies a registered legal establishment of any nature that has specific mission, vision and goals.

**Institution:** An institution is an established or organized society, foundation or corporation. Hence, in this study an institution will refer to an establishment serving the public or affecting a community through philanthropy such as a charitable institution.

**Missions:** In this study, the term missions refer to the spreading of Christian faith though teaching and preaching of the word of God.

**Church courts:** It is the policy making sub-structure of PCEA which includes Kirk Session, Presbytery and General Assembly. In this study, church courts will have a similar meaning.

**Summary**

This chapter provides a brief introduction and historical background to CSR practice. Largely, the importance of CSR across sectors is discussed. In addition, there is a discussion of the problem under study. The role and practice of CSR in profit and NfP sectors have been discussed with reference to Carroll pyramid of social responsibility and Lantos three types of CSR, namely ethical, altruistic and strategic CSR (Carroll, 1991; Lantos, 2001). Further, the researcher has outlined the objectives of the study and explained its importance. Also highlighted are limitations the researcher experienced while conducting the study and their delimitations. In addition, the researcher has provided meanings of key terms and concepts used in the study and their operational definitions. In the next chapter, the researcher has reviewed literature that is pertinent to this study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter delves into the subject of CSR with a view to gaining better understanding of the NfP perspective of CSR. The study has analyzed the foundations of CSR in business and church organization with reference to Carroll’s pyramid of social responsibility and Lantos three types of CSR namely, ethical, altruistic and strategic CSR (Carroll, 1991; Lantos, 2001). Further it has examined PCEA as an organization that can be analyzed using systems theory as the theoretical framework.

Concept and Practice of CSR

Many companies around the world are increasingly getting attracted to the CSR concept (Hamann & Acutt, 2003; McKinsey & Company, 2004). The taking care of the society is increasingly becoming a primary concern for every organization. Lantos says that ethical CSR is the moral and mandatory fulfillment of organization’s economic, legal and ethical responsibilities. He has also talked of the altruistic CSR that goes beyond ethical CSR to help alleviate community welfare deficiencies through philanthropy (2001). This corresponds to what Hamann and Acutt have referred to as "the need for business to fill the gap left by governments…” (2003, p. 63). This latter practice of CSR happens regardless of whether or not such philanthropy is of any benefit to the organization itself. Most NfP organizations practice the altruistic CSR. Thus, they do not see the need to advertise their philanthropy for self-benefit.
Lantos has also put forward the idea of strategic CSR. According to Lantos (2001), the strategic CSR is the fulfillment of “philanthropic responsibilities which will benefit the organization through positive publicity and goodwill” (p. 2). Thus, through strategic CSR these organizations elevate their status and reputations. They stand out as generous and virtuous organizations who love and care for others in need (Waddock, 2003). Also worth to note is that most CSR activities are for commendable causes. They empower communities and have great potential for benefiting sponsoring organizations. Such enormous opportunities are not without challenges as the discussion in the next section on opportunities and challenges of CSR presents.

Opportunities and Challenges in CSR

Corporate social responsibility is an opportunity for organizations to actualize their mission. At the same time, they improve their public perception and standing while taking care of the society’s needs (ICPAC, CMA & NSE, 2009). However, formulating and implementing CSR programs is a great challenge to many organizations as noted below.

Challenge in the Corporate Citizenship Debate

The first critical challenge is finding a common language to facilitate dialogue between the different sectors in the corporate citizenship debate. Observation shows that finding a common language is a significant challenge. According to Hamann and Acutt (2003), “… different approaches make use of different keywords …” (p. 72). For instance, the variation of use of key words such as ‘surplus income’ and ‘profits’ in accounting reports by different sectors. The NfP use the term ‘surplus income’ while
business organizations use the term ‘profits’ to describe incomes that are way above their costs of operation. In addition, the debate becomes complicated when the same words are often used in different sectors to mean different things. Concerning this, Hamann and Acutt (2003) write the following words:

… the same words were often used in different ways: for the business body, ‘accountability’ was interpreted as an obligation voluntarily demonstrated primarily through reporting, whereas for critical NGOs ‘accountability’ required duties on human rights and labor standards, liability and regulation (p. 72).

Inconsistent Corporate Behavior

Positive CSR information, attitude and practice are quite productive. They are a source of opportunity for the best-run and most profitable companies (Savitz, 2006). Hence, there is the “need to match the CSR initiatives disclosure statements with an equal dose of evidence for those initiatives” (ICPAC, CMA & NSE, 2009, p. 45). However, reports of inconsistent organization behavior are also counterproductive. Such reports can potentially lead to negative backlash from consumers of products and services. Hence, the firms’ attitude and practice of CSR needs to be harmonized and integrated (Wagner, Lutz, & Weitz, 2009).

Despite the existence of well documented facts on the importance of CSR, some organizations are yet to take advantage of it. Inconsistent corporate behavior especially from corporate leadership is a serious challenge to CSR programs implementation. This is worsened by the lack of ‘deliberate measures to mainstream the CSR culture among their workforce’ (ICPAC, CMA & NSE, 2009, p. 45). Such behavior and attitudes
hampers the tapping of benefits of CSR as a new social technique for boosting reputation and corporate brand equity. Craig Bennett argues that hundreds of companies ‘greenwash’, and while many more are not interested with CSR (Hamann & Acutt, 2003). To some, incorporating citizenship on the corporate agenda is a challenge. Others face the challenge of understanding of stakeholders, their needs and concerns. While still others have problems in taking sensible initial steps to effectively implement citizenship activities (Mirvis & Googins, 2006). Hence, CSR is not solely a panacea for corporate reputation.

*Monitoring and Evaluation*

Monitoring and evaluation is a vital element in formulation and implementation of CSR programs. Monitoring and evaluation ensures cost-effectiveness, institutional learning, transparency, accountability and sustainability of programs (World Bank, 1994). However, according to ICPAC, CMA and NSE (2009), only “few companies mentioned that they undertake monitoring of their CSR activities. It was therefore difficult to assess the impact of their support. This is an area that requires further investment” (p. 43).

*Foundations of CSR in Business Organizations*

CSR in business is entrenched on economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic foundations. Hence, it is part and parcel of an organization strategy and operations that is concerned with sustainable development of an organization (Waddock, 2003). Scholars like Alsop (2004) believe that organizations committed to CSR are in pursuit of the ‘triple bottom line’ (TBL) (p. 71). TBL is an approach that aims at integrating and
balancing economic, environmental and social performance. According to Savitz (2006), "people, planet and profit" (p. 41) describes the triple bottom line. He argues that TBL is the goal of sustainability since it is the place where corporate and societal interests intersect.

According to the European Commission (CSR Europe, 2009), CSR is: "A concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis" (p. 1). Carroll’s pyramid of social responsibility gives more emphasis to economic viability. An organization must be profitable for shareholders. It must also provide economic benefits to its stakeholders. Some publics may be internal such as employees who should be well remunerated. Others may be clients who deserve good quality and fairly-priced products and services (1991). Thus, the core business is integrated with social and environmental concerns to ensure organizational and environmental sustainability (CSR Europe, 2009).

CSR also creates voluntary interaction of internal and external publics. It caters for different entities in different ways. The organization gets improved image and enhanced reputation way above its profits. Further, the organization’s employees experience bonding and team building. The community is also a beneficiary of the benevolence (Lantos, 2001; Alsop, 2004). Thus, in order to cater for these varied publics, organizations operate CSR from four levels of responsibilities which are the foundation of CSR in business. These are outlined in figure 2 which portrays that CSR is a broad and multi-dimensional concept that has economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic facets (Smith & Langford, 2009).
Economic Foundation

Carroll (1991) argues that economic responsibilities are the foundation upon which all other levels rest. He adds that successful organizations are those that are consistently profitable. All organizations must therefore strive to be profitable and justify their existence by maximizing their earnings per share. In order to remain consistently profitable, the organization must maintain a strong competitive position and a high level of operational efficiency (Carroll, 1991).

Further, there must be real economic benefit to the host society. The society hosting an organization must not be exploited. Instead, according to sustainability framework, they should enjoy real economic benefit. This is the *profit* aspect of the TBL. Hence, Steele holds that as the societal and environmental initiatives are synchronized
with the organizational core business there will be real economic impact (2010). For instance, Microsoft participates in the development and the management of communities through its effective and innovative technologies (Microsoft, 2008). The company is also committed to serving the public good through partnerships and programs that contribute to economic and social opportunity (Microsoft, 2009). Thus, Steele argues that TBL assists in ethically realizing business profits while protecting the rights of communities and the natural environment (Steele, 2010).

Legal Foundation

Carroll (1991) maintains that organizations have legal responsibilities. Successful organizations fulfill their legal obligations such as obeying the governing laws, statutes, regulations and guidelines. They comply with various national and international laws as a legal requirement and corporate responsibility. They also provide goods and services that meet the legal standards.

Further, an organization must garner legitimacy to operate in the community by ensuring resource sustainability and protecting the environment. A sustainable environmental practice keeps the planet clean and safe. Thus, a TBL organization manages its energy use, treats its waste and finally disposes it safely in accordance to the laws of the land (Steele, 2010). Wilson says that such legitimacy rests on “adherence to a moral purpose rather than to an amoral need” (2000, p. 139).

Ethical Foundation

Carroll (1991) argues that good corporate citizenship is being morally and ethically correct as par society standards. Hence, CSR best practice displays ethical practices. It avoids harm and practices what is just and fair. In its pursuit of corporate
goals, it maintains integrity and virtue. Through boundary spanning, it recognizes evolving ethical norms in the society and complies for its good and that of its publics (Austin & Pinkleton, 2006). Thus, corporate integrity and ethical behavior are more than legal compliance (Carroll, 1991).

Good ethics entails treating employees and other publics with decorum. Wilson says that organizations must “… elevate and monitor the level of ethical performance in all its operations in order to build the trust” (Wilson, 2000, p. 137). Trust is foundational to cordial relations with strategic publics. Thus, a TBL organization must of necessity take good care of the people.

By providing goods and services that are demanded by the community, an organization acquires social license to operate in that community. This social purpose makes them legitimate members of the society (Carroll, 1991). The organization henceforth is accepted as part and parcel of the community. Its products, services and processes are also accepted as authentic (Wilson, 2000). These mutual beneficial relationships create synergy as the organization and the community contributes to each other’s welfare.

**Philanthropic Foundation**

On the philanthropic level, Carroll (1991) maintains that a good corporate citizen improves the quality of life of societal members. It contributes its charity in accordance with philanthropic traditions of the recipients. For instance, the donation of puppies’ food toward starving children in Kenya was rejected by intended beneficiaries (Schwab & Perry, 2008). An inclusive process that integrates the organizational leadership, employees and beneficiaries is necessary for the success of charitable programs.
Thus, philanthropy and TBL accounting aims at continuously improving the economic, environmental and social conditions of the organization and that of its host community. In CSR practice, an organization plays an affirmative role to society (people) and environment (planet). Such other philanthropic opportunities include assistance to educational institutions and an affirmative action towards fine and performing arts (Carroll, 1991). For instance, Wyeth Pharmaceuticals corporate citizenship includes “community outreach; diversity programs; environment, health and safety initiatives; and patient education” (Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, 2006, p. 19). The affirmative role is made possible through good corporate governance and human resource management practices where human rights are observed (OECD, 2010). Local examples of charitable trust in the profit sector that have benefited from good corporate practices are Equity Group Foundation, Safaricom Foundation and KCB Foundation which are the philanthropic arms of Equity Bank, Safaricom and KCB respectively.

Finally, the understanding and application of the concept of social responsibility differs from one organization to another since CSR is a broad and a multi-faceted concept (Smith & Langford, 2009). Despite that fact, the Carroll’s and Lantos’ types of CSR are an important framework for understanding the organizational social responsibilities (Carroll, 1991; Lantos, 2001). The following analysis of foundations of CSR in church organizations is a fitting example of the use of Carroll’s and Lantos’ framework.
Foundations of CSR in Church Organizations

**Legal Foundation**

For the church to legitimately operate in Kenya, it must either be registered under societies act or incorporated as a "tax-exempt non-profit religious corporation." Its operation is then pegged on the adherence to the governing laws of the land. Thus, legally, such a corporation is "a creature of the State" and the State is the "sovereign" of the corporation. A number of Not-for-Profit organizations (NfPs) are registered as companies whose liability is limited by the guarantee of the members.

The Presbyterian Foundation is such a charitable trust and is an investment-cum-philanthropic arm of PCEA. It is an entity that was legally created to hold and manage assets for the benefit of the church. It is established under the Trustees (Perpetual Succession) Act. In Kenya, a legal entity can undertake any legal activity upon its establishment and registration. It can engage in socio-economic activities consistent with its constitution, articles and memorandum of association.

**Biblical Foundation**

The churches’ CSR policy is guided by the biblical conviction that God is the creator and sustainer of all life (Psalms 24:1). Thus, God's business and purpose involves all of his creation. Hence, the church as a corporate body has a responsibility to practice good stewardship of the creation (Genesis 1:26; Matthew 25:40; PCEA, 1998). It is a beacon of justice, mercy and peace (Amos 5:24; Luke 19:41-42). Successful biblical figures such as Joseph, King David and Daniel are good role models for Christian leaders ready to practice CSR. Their integrity, commitment and genuine concern for the well being of their people are a clear mark of biblical responsibility.
The church is an advocate and a watchdog. It is a voice of the voiceless (Okullu, 1974). “Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute. Speak up and judge fairly; defend the rights of the poor and needy” (Proverbs 31:8 - 9, NIV). This biblical mandate compels the church to advocate for rights of the internally displaced persons (IDPs). Other areas that the church has advocated for are: zero tolerance to corruption, debt relief, decolonization of Africa and promotion of the millennium development goals (MDGs). In the 1990s, the constitution making process in Kenya was spearheaded by Ufungamano Initiative which was a Kenya Church initiative.

The church counsels and cares for those affected and infected by HIV/ AIDS as demonstration of biblical love and compassion. They are embraced, provided with medical care, relief supplies and other forms of assistance (FHI & AIDSCAP, 1996; Garland & Blyth, 2005). Such CSR programs preserve life and promote human dignity. Waddock (2003) opines that a good corporate citizen treats its publics with dignity and respect for mutual benefits.

In line with biblical mandate, the Anglican Church of Kenya, PCEA, Roman Catholic Church (RCC) and National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCCK) have established CSR projects to assist orphans and the aged. These are signs of a caring community (PCEA, 2009). The bible commands humanity to take care of each other and empower the oppressed (Leviticus 23: 22; Luke 4: 18). This requirement is highlighted by provision of legislation such as in Leviticus 19:1 – 10; 23:22; Deuteronomy 14:27 – 29; 16:11). “When you reap the harvest of your land, do not reap to the very edges of your field or gather the gleanings of your harvest. Leave them for the poor and the alien. I
am the Lord your God” (Leviticus 23:22, NIV). Moral, spiritual and social responsibility entails caring for the spiritual and material well-being of humanity.

In obedience to God, the church therefore helps alleviate poverty by fighting injustices and inequality in the political, economic and social affairs (Kinoti, 1994). “If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him something to drink. In doing this, you will heap burning coals on his head” (Rom12:20, NIV). Kinoti (1994) asserts that “African Christians must act expeditiously to replace human degradation with human dignity, poverty and hunger with prosperity, disease with health, oppression with freedom, injustice with justice, and above all conflict with peace” (p. 67).

Philanthropic Foundation

According to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), poverty is a state of being deprived of essentials of well-being such as adequate housing, food, sufficient income, employment, access to required social services and social status. Poverty is usually manifested as a socio-political problem and is reflected in low per capita income. The majority of African nations are classified as poor since they suffer hunger, illiteracy, disease and injustices (UNDP, 2010).

In rural areas, about 55 – 56 % of populations are living below poverty line. In urban areas, a recent phenomenon of urban poverty is emerging especially in unplanned settlements and slums (Oxfam, 2009; Baker & Schuler, 2004). The general poverty and hunger is caused by low incomes. Absolute poverty is measured not only by low income but also by malnutrition, poor health, clothing, shelter, and lack of education (World Bank, 2011; Jhingan, 1988). Over the last three decades millions of Africans have been
victims of chronic hunger. The vicious circle of poverty perpetuates and accelerates impoverishment and hunger.

In such dehumanizing conditions, philanthropic responsibilities entail giving back to these communities (Carroll, 1991; Lantos, 2001). The CSR educational programs by churches are a way of giving back with an aim of alleviating illiteracy, ignorance and disease. The UNDP survey indicates that educational backwardness and widespread poverty perpetuates political patronage and inferiority complex among the people living in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific countries. This is worsened by digital divide which is responsible for continued backwardness (UNDP, 2010). Preventable diseases such as malaria, typhoid, worm and jigger infections are causing havoc in rural and informal settlements. This is due to poor living conditions. The poor state of Kenya’s health is indicated by low life expectancy which is currently at 40 years for men and 42 years for women. Hence, the initiation of health programs by PCEA to tackle such health problems (PCEA, 2008).

The church in Kenya has in the past collaborated with UNICEF to promote health and vitality for the Kenyan children. They raised enormous funds through radiothons and telethons. These funds assisted ante-natal and post-natal mothers, and children below the age of 5 years. Thus, the program helped to solve malnutrition in children and its debilitating effects on infants such as mental retardation, disease, disability or eventual death. This researcher had once participated in such CSR program.

The church has initiated CSR programs targeted at uplifting the standards of farming and agriculture. Agriculture is the main occupation for the majority of the people in Kenya. Most are subsistence farmers who are in abject poverty. They use old and
obsolete methods of farming. A number of CSR activities by PCEA are now uplifting the standards of farming and agriculture (Nyassy, 2010, March 24). The church is encouraging the use of exotic breeds and new methods of farming (Melkote & Steeves, 2001; PCEA, 2009). Further, these programs are also targeted at addressing the root causes of Africa’s high poverty levels such as over reliance on subsistence economy, balance of trade deficit and external debt (Melkote & Steeves, 2001; Kiwanuka, 2005; PCEA, 2010).

**Ethical Foundation**

In reference to black Africa, Kinoti (1994) attempts to answer the question: “Is there really hope for Africa?” The author recognizes that Africa suffers a myriad of problems caused by internal and external factors. He argues that every Christian has a moral responsibility to do their very best to correct this situation (Kinoti, 1994). They can create social harmony and cohesion by taking up social and political responsibilities. Gathaka and Bururia (2005) write the following concerning social responsibilities:

> General social responsibilities are the responsibilities that are performed by almost all the people in a society for the welfare of the whole society while special social responsibilities are those that are performed by certain groups of people for the welfare of some special people in the society. (pp. 6 - 7)

Waddock (2003) underlines the importance of assisting the vulnerable in the community. He says that “The health of communities and engagement with the governments where companies operate do matter to corporate success” (Waddock, 2003, p. 5). He argues that corporate responsibility is *integral* to organizational practice and strategies. He adds that social responsibility “is the building block on which the
company’s reputation for citizenship is built (Waddock, 2003, p. 6). This view coincides with Lantos (2001) as it relates to strategic CSR. Similarly, the CSR initiatives by churches though unpublicized communicate a lot in regard to their commitment to create a positive impact in the society.

Ethical practice demands promotion of equality and non-discriminatory policy. In the CSR, churches engage business community in a dialogue. The latter's investment policy is challenged in the light of the best corporate practice and environmental stewardship. Churches lobby for enactment of legislation supporting equality and non-discriminatory policy. They advocate for enjoyment of human rights by all persons. Organizations are also asked to cater for the most vulnerable in the community as they pursue economic efficiency and profit (ELCA, 2009).

The Christian responsibility and response to social-economic and political problems is based on the golden rule that states that ‘you do to others what you would like them to do to you’. This golden rule is based on Christ’s command to his disciples: “A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another” (John 13: 34 - 35, NIV). Jesus also gave emphasis to the need to help vulnerable persons in the parable of the good Samaritan. “Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind” and, “Love your neighbor as yourself” (Luke 10: 27, NIV). This is the way to live so as to inherit eternal life.

CSR in the church is in line with the five themes proposed by the World Bank. The themes include human rights, worker rights, environmental impact, community
involvement, and supplier relations and monitoring (IFC/the World Bank, 2009). Gross inequalities, starvation and environmental degradation affecting poor countries have awakened churches to establish organizations to deal with social responsibility. Such a standard concurs with the IBRD idea that organizations are integrating social, environmental and economic concerns into their organizational cultural values, decision-making, and strategic operations (IFC/the World Bank, 2009). It is partially through CSR, that corporate bodies such as PCEA develop symbiotic and beneficial relationships with their publics. This is an interactive and trusting relationship ensuring corporate success while meeting the needs of the vulnerable groups (PCEA, 1998).

Economic Foundation

NfP sector initiates social and sustainable programs that are income generating. For instance, PCEA has numerous profitable income generating programs. All the surplus funds after tax are re-invested in CSR and other charitable activities. Program managers must justify the continued existence of such projects by ensuring that they are financially self-sustaining. This is a good practice that creates jobs, quality products and services. Lantos (2001, p. 2) says that organizations must “also provide good jobs for employees, produce quality products for customers” as part of their economic and social responsibility.

CSR programs are also meant to improve the quality of life (PCEA, 2011). Over the last century, many African nations have typically been at the bottom of any list measuring economic activity. Despite possessing ample wealth of natural resources, the per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has been low. The bottom 25 spots of the United Nations (UN) quality of life index are regularly filled by African nations. In 2006,
34 of the 50 nations on the United Nations (UN) list of least developed countries (LDC) were in Africa (UNCTAD, 2008). In the majority of these nations, the per capita annual income is often less than $200 U.S.A per year, with the vast majority of the population living on much less. Reports from World Bank (IBRD) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) indicate that nearly half of these populations are in abject poverty and live on less than one USA dollar per day (World Bank, 2010). Therefore, there is need to improve the quality of life for these people through social responsibility programs.

Comparison of CSR in Business and Church Organizations

*Affirmative role.* In CSR, both business and church organizations play an affirmative role to society (*people*) and environment (*planet*) as part of their social responsibility. They aim at continuously improving the economic, environmental and social conditions for their own benefit as well as for their hosting community. They provide the community with goods and services. In return, they acquire the social license to operate in that particular community in the form of acceptance and recognition as part and parcel of the community (Carroll, 1991; Wilson, 2000). Wilson (2000) aptly says that such “legitimacy rests … on adherence to a moral purpose rather than to an amoral need” (p. 139). These mutual relationships and acceptance create synergy and ownership of mission and goals of the corporation and the community.

*Sustainability.* Savitz says that CSR deals with sustainability where “profits go side-by-side with environmental and social performance” (Savitz, 2006, p. 77). Craig Bennett (cited in Hamann & Acutt, 2003) says that the CSR concept is new to some organizations. He adds that for every organization that honestly implements its CSR
policies, "there are hundreds who greenwash, and for each of these there are hundreds more who don’t even bother with that” (p. 63). However, Savitz (2006) writes that CSR “is a spot that the best-run and most profitable companies have already found” (p. 77).

*Societal expectation:* On the other hand, the society is increasingly becoming more interested in CSR. The educational empowerment has awakened society members to demand their rights and privileges from all forms of organization. As societies consume corporate products and services, they also demand fair play from every organization in their community. Thus, true CSR is not discretionary as it entails more than charitable acts directed at a society (Alsop, 2004; Waddock, 2003). Hence, it is imperative in the sense that it is more than "an attempt to deflect attention away from negative news" (Alsop, 2004, p. 80).

**Is PCEA a System?**

PCEA is an open and structured system with porous boundaries. As a result, it interacts with its environments. It exchanges feedback both within and without itself. Consequently, it evolves and adjusts while focusing on its mission and goals. This guarantees the continuity of the church as an establishment. Like any other system, PCEA is structured in interrelated parts and sub-parts as shown in figure 3. The latter are subsystems within the church - each having unique features and boundaries. Dainton and Zelly (2005) argue that the more integrated they are the better they are in achieving corporate mission, goals and objectives. The following information highlights some aspects of PCEA organizational structure that demonstrates clearly that the church is indeed a system per-excellence.
Hierarchical Order

In totality, sub-systems make up the entire organization. In majority of organizations, such subsystems include planning, administrative, marketing, corporate communication and management functions. For instance, figure 3 illustrates that PCEA as an organizational system is made up of many subsystems that comprise institutions such as departments, 48 presbyteries, hundreds of parishes and other units. These in turn are made up of thousands of local churches, each with its church groups, standing committees and work teams. Structurally, some are co-working while others are assisting and subordinate (PCEA, 1998; PCEA, 2010). These systems and subsystems are arranged in hierarchical order for self regulation and control. According to Dainton and Zelly (2005), “… systems are embedded in a hierarchy, with systems existing within other systems” (p. 52).
Feedback

In order to create mutual understanding, systems and their respective subsystems respond to feedback. Such feedback usually determines and regulates their communicational relationships. von Bertalanffy (1969) argues that a system detects any stress in its environment and structurally adjusts itself for self propagation. “Concepts and models of equilibrium, homeostasis, adjustments, etc are suitable for maintenance of systems …” (von Bertalanffy, 1969, p. 23). Homeostasis “is the tendency for a given system to maintain stability in the face of change” (Dainton & Zelly, 2005, p. 53).

Wholeness and Interdependence

A common feature of a system is that it changes due to any change occurring in any of its strategic subsystem. A system maintains a functioning relationship among
inputs, processes and outputs. Each affects and is affected by the other’s feedback (von Bertalanffy, 1969). Further, various subsystems must function together for the whole system to work effectively. This implies that for one component of a system to function optimally, it has to rely on other components of the system. Thus, if one component within a system fails then other parts of the system either fail completely or they function dismally (Dainton & Zelly, 2005). Consequently, PCEA considers the interest and needs of internal subsystems while conducting any CSR project. For instance, the practice and procedure which is the policy document of the church, guides and regulates financial operations, recruitment and development of personnel (PCEA, 1998).

Besides that, PCEA also considers the interest and needs of the following publics while conducting her CSR projects: other denominations, Para-church organizations, suppliers, rural population, urban population, hospitals and other health care institutions, church sponsored educational institutions, and, other public and private educational institutions. PCEA serves rural and urban populations. Just like any other system, PCEA is surrounded by dynamic environments. Hence, it changes in order to adapt and respond to this dynamism (Littlejohn, 2002). As an international organization, it relates with worldwide and local ecumenical bodies. The church has founded institutions that are leading in providing health and education services (PCEA, 2010b).

Open System

Open systems are highly complex and interdependent. As an open system, PCEA gives and receives information. It uses information to interact dynamically with its environment so as to survive and prosper. According to Farace, Monge and Russell (1977), systems are characterized by input-throughput-output process. Thus,
organizations are "viewed as processors of energy, materials and information" (Farace, Monge & Russell, 1977, p. 8). They are characterized by uncertainty, internal and external change (Miller, 2003).

Open systems receive feedback from their internal and external environments. They analyze that feedback and consequently adjust internal systems so as to achieve their goals. “One important characteristic of biological systems is circumscribed by terms like ‘purposiveness, finality, goal seeking …’” (von Bertalanffy, 1969, p. 131). They also send out necessary information to the environment. Hence, open systems have porous boundaries with varying degrees of permeability. On the other hand, organizations that have closed boundaries are not only unhealthy but also will eventually degenerate (Dainton & Zelly, 2005). Permeability allows information and materials to flow in and out of the organization so as to promote dialogue and interactive communication between organization, groups and individuals.

*External Environment*

All systems exist in an environment. The organization can affect its surrounding either positively or negatively. On the same breath, it can also be affected positively or negatively by its environment (Dainton & Zelly, 2005). Such external influences can be political, economic, ecological, societal or technological in nature. Through boundary spanning, market research, survey and evaluations, a system can understand its environments (Austin & Pinkleton, 2006). Systems can also influence their external environment by maintaining good media relations, CSR activities, public relations, advertising and promotions, lobbying and advocacy, and educating its publics (Wilcox, 2005; Argenti, 2002).
Core Values

Some scholars (von Bertalanffy, 1969; Schoderbek, Schoderbek & Kefalas, 1990) agree that every system has attributes that describe the qualities of the system and its objects. Some of those attributes include core values and organizational culture. Precisely, like other organizations, PCEA also has core values. For instance, PCEA is responsible for establishing, developing, and managing corporate reputation by living her values and ethics. “To enhance your corporate reputation, values must become an entrenched part of culture. Ethics are corporate DNA, not just the fashion of the day, for companies with outstanding reputations” (Alsop, 2004, p. 59).

Theoretical Framework: Systems Theory

Systems theory is the most ideal in this study due to the fact that PCEA is in itself a system, consisting of sub-systems and functioning within a larger encircling supra-system. Thus, in this part, the researcher will look at the origin of systems theory, its usefulness, its application and its relevance to this study.

Origin of Systems Theory

The idea of a system originated from studies in biology and engineering. It was developed further by theoretical biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy in his study of “living systems” in 1940’s. He emphasized in his study that a real system is a complex of interacting elements (von Bertalanffy, 1968). It is a hierarchy of open systems that maintains itself in a continual state (von Bertalanffy, 1969; Dainton & Zelly, 2005). As open systems, they evolve and acquire qualitatively new properties by interacting with
their environments. This causes growth and development of an organism or an organization (Schoderbek, Schoderbek & Kefalas, 1990).

**Usefulness of Systems Theory**

Systems theory is vital in the study of an entire organization because it does not reduce an entity to properties of its parts. Instead, it focuses on the arrangement of parts and their relationship with other parts which connect them into a whole (Dainton & Zelly, 2005). These connections among various elements fit together into a whole. “… the whole is greater than the sum of its parts” (Dainton & Zelly, 2005, p. 52). Thus, a system is independent of the concrete substance of its elements.

The theory is also appropriate for the study of an organization since it is based on a two-way symmetrical model of communication. The major focus of a two-way symmetrical model is the creation of mutually beneficial relationships and understanding. This makes an organization more responsible to its publics while at the same time achieving its mission (Hunt & Grunig, 1994). In addition, a two-way symmetrical model promotes ethical responsibilities since it is premised on a win-win situation. For instance, it allows free flow of correct information to enable managers make informed decisions. Thus, the model is congruent with fundamental truths that form the principle tenets of PCEA (PCEA, 1998).

**Application of Systems Theory**

Systems theory is based on the idea that all occurrences can be viewed as a web of relationships among elements of a system (von Bertalanffy, 1969). Secondly, all systems have common patterns, behaviors, and properties. Thirdly, just like biological systems which are complete with cells and organs, system components are also interdependent.
They sustain each other through exchange of resources and feedback (Miller, 2002). 

Fourthly, scholars such as Baxter and Babbie agree that the theory is important in discovering functions that are performed by many elements of a communication system for the whole system (Baxter & Babbie, 2004). These facts helped the researcher to gain real insights into behaviors and values of PCEA institutions. This was vital especially when studying system components as they related to their various internal and external publics.

*Relevance of Systems Theory in this Study*

The focus of this study is on open systems. This theory helped the researcher to understand the connection between the theory and practice of CSR in PCEA. It highlighted concepts of exchange, feedback and interdependence which are crucial in the practice of CSR (Severin & Tankard, 1988). This helped the researcher to understand strategies and tactics used to communicate CSR activities to PCEA publics. The theory’s strength lies on the fact that it is generally applicable in real life. It is based on wholeness and interdependence of complex systems. This is an important feature as the church is made up of complex parts and sub-parts (PCEA, 1998; Dainton & Zelly, 2005).

Also, the theory emphasizes the complexity of organizations and interrelatedness of system components. In addition, it considers the importance of mutual beneficial relationships between an organizational system and its environment. This is important since PCEA organizational systems are increasingly becoming more complex with the establishment of new presbyteries, parishes and congregations. Therefore, this theory was the most ideal means of analyzing and understanding of these interrelated components. Each of these components has a CSR component. "The research agenda is that of
discovering how the parts function together to sustain the system” (Baxter & Babbie, 2004, p. 58). Thus, systems theory made it easier to analyze this complex system and its subsystems with their CSR activities. This was especially due to the fact that the church as a system is surrounded by a supra-system within which it operates (Dainton & Zelly, 2005).

Further, in this study, this theory highlights and explains how communication and the transfer of information bind together key components of the church (Severin & Tankard, 1988). The theory therefore helped the researcher to navigate through complex church systems especially during data collection and interviews with senior PCEA leaders.

Summary

In the preceding discussion, the researcher has looked at CSR as an opportunity for profit and NfP organizations to enhance their public perception and standing. Special attention was given to churches since they have enormous capacity to transform societies through CSR programs. These programs benefit the needy and provide churches with an opportunity to care. In addition, CSR lessens human suffering, poverty and injustices. As the voice of the voiceless, churches courageously advocate the cause of the poor as part of their responsibility.

CSR also creates mutual benefits by maintaining cordial relationships. Carroll’s pyramid of social responsibility and Lantos three types of CSR, applied to the different aspects of the systems theory served as the theoretical framework guiding the study. It emerged that many companies around the world are increasingly getting attracted to the
CSR concept. Thus, there is need for regulatory agencies to support voluntary CSR initiatives by organizations. They can put measures to protect workers’ and communities’ rights. Some may be basic rights such access to clean and healthy environment. The government should also provide for independent monitors to report any exploitation of CSR beneficiaries by corporate groups (Savitz, 2006).
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was conducted in order to identify and describe the role and practice of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in PCEA. It focused on PCEA institutions practicing CSR. PCEA has diverse CSR programs targeted at empowering host communities irrespective of their faith affiliations. Some of these programs are income generating while others fall under social, health and educational categories. In describing the practice of CSR, the researcher studied strategies and tactics used by PCEA to communicate CSR based programs to relevant publics.

In order to attain the objectives of this study, the researcher describes the population, sample and sampling methods. Other areas included in this chapter are method of data collection, tools of collecting information, pre-testing of data collection instruments. Finally, the chapter presents the process of data processing, analysis, presentation and ethical considerations.

Research Methods

The researcher used a survey method to gather data. The approach is supported by Mugenda and Mugenda who argue that survey method is useful in collecting original information on people's attitudes, perceptions, behavior and values where the population is too large to observe directly (2003). Further, Kombo and Tromp (2006) say that the survey design is used when “the questions raised in the study require collecting information by interviewing or questionnaires” (p. 73). The researcher employed an
interview guide and a questionnaire as data collection instruments (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

The self-administered questionnaire encouraged respondents to give responses and promoted confidentiality. The researcher administered the questionnaire to key church leaders who represented PCEA institutions. These leaders were purposively selected since they were in-charge of policy implementation in their respective institutions. In addition, some past and current officials of the General Assembly were interviewed since they are responsible of interpreting church policy documents.

The researcher also conducted document content analysis. He analyzed church documents such as strategic plans, resolutions, policy documents, and various proceedings of GA and GAC meetings in the last 7 years. The researcher used both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The approaches supplemented each other, and thus ensured valid and reliable results (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

Population

Gupta and Gupta (2009) define a population as "the totality of cases (items) in an investigation" (p. 27). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), the target population is the universe to which the researcher "wants to generalize the results" (p. 9). Considering this definition, the target population in this study comprised 530 persons representing PCEA institutions such as community centers, presbyteries and departments. This also formed the accessible population.
Sample and Sampling Methods

In order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in data collection, the researcher purposively picked a sample made up of “a smaller group obtained from the accessible population” (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003, p. 10). According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), purposive sampling is important while targeting “a group of people believed to be reliable for the study” (p. 82). Through purposive sampling, the researcher was able to select subjects that were rich in information for the interview. Consequently, the researcher selected one (1) respondent from each of the 48 presbyteries who was in-charge of social responsibility programs. An additional 13 respondents who comprised 10 heads of departments and 3 community centre directors were also selected. The remaining seven (7) respondents were made up of current and some of the past officers of General Assembly who had served during the last seven years. These officials of the General Assembly were incorporated into the sample since they are in-charge of interpreting church policy. The sample had relevant characteristics that were representative of the population. All these respondents were chosen on the basis of their involvement in CSR policy formulation, interpretation or its implementation. And, thus the information they gave was considered reliable.

The communication director was included in the sample since the officer is in-charge of CSR reporting and corporate branding; and hence was a vital subject for examination. Hence, there were 61 participants who responded to the questionnaire and 7 persons who were interviewed as listed in appendix C. In total, the sample was made up of 68 respondents from an estimated accessible population of 530 persons i.e. 12.8 % of accessible population. This sample size is adequate according to Mugenda and Mugenda
(2003) who recommend that a good sample should be approximately 10% of the accessible population.

Tools and Method of Data Collection

The data collection instruments comprised a questionnaire and an interview guide as presented in appendix A and appendix B respectively. These instruments were used to collect primary data. Each of these instruments had open-ended and closed-ended questions that helped the researcher to gain deeper understanding of the problem at hand.

The questionnaires were distributed to all respondents in the sample except the officers of the General Assembly. The respondents were given four days to fill in the questionnaire and return it. Lastly, the selected past and current officers of the General Assembly were interviewed by the researcher and their responses recorded. In addition, secondary data was obtained through document content analysis on topics related to the study. This was to ensure objectivity, representativeness and accuracy.

Pre-testing Data Collection Instruments

The researcher conducted a pre-test of the questionnaire with a sample of ten (10) church leaders who were purposively selected from PCEA Bahati community centre. This institution has social, educational, technical and empowerment cum income generating projects. The centre was used for pilot study only. Thus, it was not made part of the actual study. The pre-test ensured that concepts and wording of the research instruments were accurate and understandable (Kombo & Tromp, 2006).
Data Processing, Analysis and Presentation

The process of data processing and analysis was a multi-stage process. It involved organizing data systematically (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). The researcher sorted the qualitative data into themes and then conducted a thematic analysis (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Kombo & Tromp, 2006). According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), the themes refer to "topics or major subjects that come up in discussions" (p. 119). Through this method of analysis, all relevant and homogeneous materials were placed under an identified major theme.

The quantitative data was analyzed by use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. The findings were finally presented in tables, figures and narrative form in chapter four. Further, the researcher analyzed church documents such as strategic plans, resolutions, policy documents, and various proceedings of GA and GAC meetings that were accessed from PCEA head office. These are important data whose authenticity can be counterchecked for further clarification. The researcher also cross tabulated the findings.

Ethical Consideration

This study aimed at contributing to the body of knowledge in NfP sector. Hence, it involved the gathering of data, organizing it, analyzing it, and finally writing a report. Data sources were cited appropriately and accurately.

The researcher also promoted trust and confidence among respondents by getting their consent before interviews and distribution of questionnaires. Only willing respondents participated in the survey. To compensate for a few who were not willing to
participate, the researcher interviewed available subjects who had similar characteristics. For confidentiality, respondents were requested not to write their names in the questionnaires. This whole process ensured the integrity of the report.

Summary

This chapter on methodology is a highlight of the process the researcher underwent during this study on CSR in PCEA. In describing the practice of CSR, the researcher studied strategies and tactics used by PCEA to communicate CSR based programs to publics. The researcher used a survey method to gather data.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the role and practice of CSR in PCEA. The researcher aimed at looking at CSR programs and activities that were practiced at PCEA. Further, in order to understand the practice of CSR, the researcher looked at communication channels, strategies and tactics used to confer CSR information to both internal and external publics. Important areas that were studied comprise factors such the quantity of information communicated by each channel, effectiveness, frequency of use and awareness of information channels. A comparison was also made on CSR in the church with that in business organizations.

The research results are reported in this chapter which consists of presentations, analysis and interpretation of the findings of the study. The numerical data obtained from quantitative approach are presented in form of tables and figures. On the other hand, the qualitative data emanating from interviews, observations, document content analysis and personal accounts of respondents have been presented in a narrative form. The researcher employed quantitative and qualitative approaches in order to overcome limitations of any of the two approaches if used alone.

In order to corroborate the questionnaires’ findings, the researcher interviewed 7 senior church leaders in PCEA. The decision to interview them was purposive since they are decision makers as far as the choice and implementation of CSR programs is concerned. In addition, these leaders have been in church leadership for many years after having risen up through the ranks. Thus, they are all well versed with the church publics,
the role of CSR and communication strategies used in the practice of CSR by the church in its relationship to her various publics.

Findings

Demographic Data

The researcher analyzed demographic information whose purpose is given as follows:

_Name of your institution._ The purpose of this question was to identify the geographical area where respondents were working in and their position in PCEA organizational structure.

_The time respondent joined this institution._ The purpose of this question was to identify the duration the respondent had worked in that particular geographical area believing that respondents who had worked for longer periods in a particular area or station would be well versed in CSR program activities.

Other personal information that was requested included the sex and the marital status. The purpose of knowing the sex status of the respondent was meant to identify the gender representation of respondents. Of all respondents, fifteen (24.59 %) were females while the rest forty-six (75.41 %) were males. This observation shows that men in leadership positions are three times more than women. This is an important observation especially considering that PCEA has more women in its membership than men. Also, most CSR projects run by PCEA mainly target women and children as beneficiaries as opposed to men.
The question on marital status was to identify whether respondents were single, married or other status. Of all respondents, nine (14.75%) were single while the rest fifty-two (85.25%) were married. This observation shows that most respondents were married. This important observation is expected especially considering that most church institutions have a bias of entrusting more responsibility to married persons as opposed to singles.

Figure 4: Gender distribution of respondents
The following is a thematic classification of the study findings as par each objective of the study.

Objective (i): To identify CSR programs and activities in PCEA.

The findings were as detailed below:

**CSR Programs and Activities Undertaken at PCEA**

Study findings show that all institutions surveyed practiced CSR in one form or another. The programs undertaken largely depend on needs of local beneficiaries since the church mostly practices altruistic CSR. In a nutshell, the following CSR programs and activities were identified as being undertaken at PCEA: Education programs, health programs, environmental conservation programs, child sponsorship programs, partnership programs, feeding programs, street children rescue programs, home for aged, children and handicapped programs, water projects, construction of bridges and roads rehabilitation programs, ROPES and agriculture. There are diversity of CSR programs
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*Figure 5: Marital status of respondents*
each geared to meet a particular function. The information gathered shows that PCEA is meeting economic, social, ethical and philanthropic obligations by its involvement and sponsorship of social responsibility programs in its institutions. These are illustrated in table 1.

Another important finding is that all institutions had education programs. This is an indicator that PCEA attach a lot of importance on education. In addition, findings show that other important programs practiced by a majority of PCEA institutions are health, sponsorship and ROPES programs. Sponsorship programs have varied activities such as school sponsorship and sponsorship of specific needy cases especially orphans and vulnerable children.

Further, the findings indicated that infrastructural development and home for the aged comprised the least number of programs practiced. Infrastructure was 4.9% while home for the aged accounted for 4.9%. This is an indication that these last two programs were accorded less priority in comparison with the rest.
Table 1: CSR programs currently going on in PCEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Presbyteries</th>
<th>Community Centers</th>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conservation</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship programs</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street children Rescue</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for aged</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for children</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural development</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rites of Passage</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation (Roads, Bridges etc)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee empowerment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership programs</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective (ii): To find out the practice of CSR by PCEA.

The findings are presented below:

Use of Strategic Plan

The findings show that the integration of CSR programs into strategic plan is an effective way of enhancing strategic CSR (Lantos, 2011). Some PCEA institutions (1.6 %) have fully integrated CSR into strategic plan. Others comprising 32.79 % (20) of respondents said that their institution had a strategic plan. The rest who comprised 67.21 % (41) said that they did not have one. This is shown in figure 6. The church strategic plan outlines what the church hopes to accomplish in different critical areas and sectors through God’s guidance. It is the church’s vision for her future.
Thus, findings show that 32.79 % (20) of PCEA institutions have a strategic plan. As shown in figure 7, of those who have a strategic plan, 80 % (16) said that they have integrated CSR into their strategic plan. The rest 20 % (4) have not integrated CSR into their strategic plans.

Figure 6: PCEA institutions that have strategic plan

Figure 7: Extent of integration of CSR into strategic plan by PCEA institutions
However, as figure 8 shows, only 5% (1) of those who have strategic plan said they have fully integrated their CSR into their strategic plan. For others, their opinions were as follows: 20% (4) not integrated; 10% (2) integrated; 50% (10) more integrated; 15% (3) most integrated.

![Level of Integration of CSR into Strategic Plan by PCEA Institutions]

*Figure 8: Level of integration of CSR into strategic plan by PCEA institutions*

In addition, in order to enhance the understanding of the practice of strategic CSR in PCEA, it was vital to analyze the awareness, use and effectiveness of communication channels, strategies and tactics used in conveying CSR information.

*Awareness of General Public of PCEA CSR Programs and Activities*

As shown in figure 9, all respondents indicated that the general public was aware of PCEA CSR programs and activities. However, they differed in their opinion on the level of awareness as follows: only 1.64% (1) said that the general public was most aware, 29.51% (18) said that the general public was more aware, and 44.26% (27) thought that the general public was aware. The rest 24.59% (15) said that the general public was less aware. This information corroborated responses from personal interviews.
with other church leaders. The latter felt that the church’s presence in the community that spans over 100 years has positively impacted the past and current generations in East Africa. Consequently, majority of the general public understands the church as a provider of quality health and educational services. This scenario is illustrated in Figure 9 which is a pie- chart showing to which extent the general public was aware of PCEA CSR programs and activities.

![Pie chart showing extent of general public awareness of PCEA CSR programs and activities]

*Figure 9: Extent of general public awareness of PCEA CSR programs and activities*

PCEA also practiced ethical CSR. Ethical CSR fulfils moral and mandatory requirement of being economically viable, legally compliant and ethical. Thus, any surplus funds are re-invested wholly and exclusively for charitable purposes as required by the law. As at the time of research, PCEA was also an equal opportunity employer. As a policy, it does not discriminate on the basis of gender or race. Also, CSR programs in PCEA were social and economically self-sustaining. This justified their continued operation.
**PCEA Use of Services of Public Relations Firms to Communicate CSR Activities**

Public relations firms assist in promotion of public image and institutional reputation. Findings revealed that majority of respondents had never used services of public relations firms to manage and promote CSR programs. These are tabulated as follows: Those who had never used services of PR firms were 78.69 % (48); those who used their services very rarely were 9.84 % (6); those who used their services rarely were 6.56 % (4); those who used their services often were 1.64 % (1); those who used their services very often were 3.28 % (2); and those who used their services all the time were (0). Figure 10, pie- chart, is a graphical illustration of these findings. It shows that PCEA very rarely used services of public relation firms to communicate CSR activities to its target audience. The failure to make use of such professionals partly explains why most CSR activities within PCEA were rarely known beyond the locality of these programs. The hiring of such services were deemed as being expensive and thus not within the church budgets. In addition, there was apathy on the importance of public relation firms and their role in church establishments.

This scenario in part explains why BSR and Presbyterian Foundation mandate were not well understood by internal and external publics. Further, this scenario reinforces the perception that PCEA did not practice CSR despite its sponsorship of CSR programs that dates colonial era. Responses from interviews and questionnaires expressed that public relations firms were important in raising awareness and understanding of the organizational mission, vision and goals. Public relations firms employ experts in mass communication who assists in the shaping of opinions of publics in favor of their clients. They assist their clients to attain goodwill and maintain healthy
relationships with their strategic publics. However, despite that, the church is yet to utilize such vital services.

![Pie chart showing PCEA use of Services of Public Relations Firms to Communicate CSR Activities](image)

**Figure 10: PCEA use of services of Public Relations firms to communicate CSR activities to its target audience**

**Use of communication strategies and tactics**

*Frequency of use of communication strategies and tactics.* Table 2 shows opinions of PCEA leaders on how frequently communication strategies and tactics were used. It depicts how often PCEA institutions used communication strategies and tactics to inform the general public about their CSR programs. Table 2 shows that majority of PCEA institutions never used media relations (91.9%) and public relations (96.8%). Based on these results, it is clear that PCEA institutions rarely used proven tactics such as
media and public relations. However, most of them used a little of marketing and advertising with only 3.2% of respondents indicating that they never used this strategy. Others used lobbying and advocacy (77%); though on a smaller scale and less frequently. As a consequence, PCEA CSR work was not fully understood by external publics. As a result, the church was perceived as not being involved in CSR by some sections of external publics. This is unlike their counterparts in the profit sector who advertise their philanthropy as a way of positioning their corporate brand, products and services. Although PCEA social responsibility activities have traditionally been concentrated in areas of health, education, agriculture and relief, very little has been done to advertise these services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategy/Tactics</th>
<th>Never %</th>
<th>Very Rarely %</th>
<th>Rarely %</th>
<th>Often %</th>
<th>Very Often %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying and Advocacy</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Marketing</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of CSR programs

Effectiveness of CSR programs in evangelization of the community. The literature review displayed mixed reactions on the relationship between CSR and evangelization. Some critics of CSR felt that CSR in the church was a non-core business and thus the practice should be avoided entirely. Others who comprised CSR practitioners felt that it was useful for evangelization. The research findings support the latter view with
education (98.4 %), health (96.7 %) and feeding (83.6 %) programs being considered as very effective in promoting evangelism. Table 3 below shows the effectiveness of a number of CSR programs in reaching out to local communities with the word of God. Table 3 shows that respondents considered CSR programs as being effective tools for evangelism to local communities. Among the worst rated programs in the area of evangelism were infrastructural development (14.8 %), street children rescue program (8.2 %) and home for aged and children (6.6 %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Not Effective %</th>
<th>Effective %</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conservation</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sponsorship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding program</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street children rescue program</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for aged and children</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural development</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>60.66</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness of CSR programs in building of image and reputation.** Table 4 shows the effectiveness of CSR programs in helping the community appreciate the presence and the work of the church in the community. This was by way of image and reputation. Programs considered as very effective according to respondents are health (91.8 %), feeding (80.3 %), school sponsorship (72.1 %), home for the aged (64 %) and infrastructural development (60.7 %) programs. None of respondents said that education,
health and school sponsorship programs were not effective. This data corroborate the interview responses. Those interviewed said that the church was trusted and appreciated because of its contribution to the community. By creating economic opportunities for the marginalized, PCEA has attained goodwill from its publics. This concurs with the views by Kaplan and Norton that CSR creates strong relationships (2004).

Table 4: Effectiveness of CSR programs in building of image and reputation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conservation</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sponsorship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding program</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street children rescue program</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for aged and children</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural development</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of communication strategies and tactics in PCEA. Table 5 shows how effective communication strategies and tactics would be if they were used to inform the general public about CSR programs in PCEA according to the opinion of PCEA leaders. A majority of respondents had the opinion that communication strategies and tactics such as media relations (83.6 %), lobbying and advocacy (83.6 %) and advertising and marketing (67.2 %) could be very effective in informing the general public about CSR programs in PCEA. Only 21.3 % felt that public relations were very effective strategy while 77.1 % thought it was just an effective strategy. This task of promoting
reputation and image is possible through the use of communication strategies and tactics such as media and public relations.

Thus, there is need for churches to communicate information on their CSR to their publics through such appropriate methods. Such strategies if adopted by PCEA will help improve its reputation and image. In addition, it will assist in creating a perception that PCEA is an effective provider of CSR based empowerment and affirmative programs. Thus, there is need for PCEA institutions to establish, maintain and develop their reputations as caring communities and peacemakers by use of media and public relations.

Table 5: Effectiveness of communication strategies and tactics in informing the general public about CSR programs in PCEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategy/Tactics</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying and Advocacy</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Marketing</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows opinions of respondents on the effectiveness communication strategies and tactics in informing the general public about CSR programs in other organizations. The respondents had a general view that the following strategies and tactics were very effective in communicating CSR information to the general public by organizations: advertising and marketing (96.7 %), media relations (95.1 %), public relations firms (93.4 %), and lobbying and advocacy (88.5 %). These findings agree with Waddock that CSR is critical for organizational development and success. He mentions that research conducted in the last three decades has highlighted the importance of CSR (Waddock,
Alsop (2004) is of the view that CSR is an integral element to the building up of the company’s reputation. Hence, the need for both profit and NfP organizations to develop appropriate communication strategies and tactics that ensures CSR activities are communicated effectively to targeted beneficiaries and other publics. These will in-turn enhance organizations' mutual relationships with their relevant internal and external publics, and; as a result, their long-term effectiveness (Ferrell, Fraedrich & Ferrell, 2008; Alsop, 2004; Waddock, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategy/Tactics</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying and Advocacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Marketing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective (iii): To find out how PCEA communicates CSR activities to internal and external publics.

The findings from the objective are as follows:

*Information Channels*

Information channels are vital components of CSR programs management and administration. The channels of communication used within PCEA are depicted in table 7.

*Channels used and frequency of use.* Findings on table 7 portray that the most used channels while communicating with internal publics were public announcements...
(98.4 %), letters (100 %), face to face interactions (100 %), telephone (100 %), notice boards (100 %), meetings (100 %), and memos (98.4 %). The least used channels were public relations firms (1.6 %), internet (3.3 %) and radio (8.2 %). The channels not used were daily newspaper (0), TV (0), and grapevine (0). Other important channels that were used were e-mail (67.2 %) and bulletins (54.1 %).

Table 7: Information channels used by PCEA to communicate information on CSR programs to PCEA members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Presbyteries</th>
<th>Community Centers</th>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Firms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcements</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, findings in table 8 show that the most used channels while communicating with external publics were letters (100 %), telephone (100 %) and meetings (96.7 %). The least used channels were radio (32.79 %), public announcements (16.4 %), bulletins (13.1%), notice boards (9.8 %), face to face interactions (6.5 %),
public relations firms (3.3 %), internet (3.3 %), e-mail (4.9 %), daily newspaper (1.6 %) and TV (1.6 %). The channels not used at all were memos (0), and grapevine (0).

In addition, radio was used especially to inform the general public on Rites of Passage programs. Radio was also used by Board of Social Responsibility to publicize relief and other emergency assistance to IDPs and other persons in famine stricken areas. Face to face interaction was used by community centre employees such as social workers as they were assessing community needs and communicating available opportunities for assistance to CSR beneficiaries.

On the other hand, responses also displayed inadequate use of some modern communication technologies and practices. Only 3.3% indicated that they used the internet to communicate CSR programs to PCEA members and other publics. Interestingly, 67.2 % of respondents used e-mail to communicate to other PCEA members while only 4.9 % used the same media to communicate with their local communities.

In addition, as tables 7 and 8 indicate, modern communication practices such as use of public relations firms were largely avoided. From the questionnaires, it was found that only Youth and Woman’s Guild departments had ever employed services of public relations firms to communicate to external publics. This information was corroborated by findings from interviews of General Assembly officers who cited the cost of hiring such services as one of the deterrent factors. Therefore, PCEA lacked sustained publicity of its CSR activities through public relations firms as well as through the mass media.
Table 8: Information channels used by PCEA to communicate information on church’s CSR programs to the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Presbyteries %</th>
<th>Community Centers %</th>
<th>Departments %</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Firms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcements</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rare use of public relations firms and media. PCEA did not have a public relations department. Also, it did not have a media liaisons department. In addition, the church rarely outsourced these services. Hence, the mandate of PCEA institutions and their CSR operations were less known to some publics. Responses show that internal publics did not use public relations firms for inter-institutional communications. Table 9 shows that public relations firms did not play any role in sending of information within PCEA. This finding was corroborated by responses from the interview with the 19th General Assembly moderator who emphasized that the church organizational structure and polity favored letters, telephone and public announcements over any other channel of
internal communication. They were best suited for internal communication as they were inexpensive and swift.

*Quantity of CSR information.* Table 9 shows the amount of CSR information received by PCEA institutions from internal publics such as employees, members and other organs of the church. Findings indicate that public announcements, telephone, letters, notice boards and meetings were main channels of information from internal publics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Firms</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/ Mobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, table 10 shows the amount of information that the church sent to its external publics. From responses, it is evident that telephone, letters and meetings were the main channels through which PCEA sent a lot of information on CSR to its publics. Table 10 shows that public relations firms played an insignificant role in sending out information to external publics. Further, tables 9 and 10 show that with exception of radio, the rest of mass media was used on a very small proportion. No one indicated using grapevine to send CSR information. This implies that no one can use grapevine deliberately. In addition, memos and in-house publications were never used to communicate to external publics. However, as table 7 shows, 98.4% and 49.2% of respondents had used memos and in-house publications respectively for internal communication. This indicates that some channels may be suited for particular publics and unsuitable for some others.
Table 10: Amount of information on CSR programs sent out by PCEA to external publics on a scale of 1 – 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Firms</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcement</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of information channels

For internal communication use. Table 11 illustrates the opinion of respondents on the effectiveness of information channels when used to communicate social responsibility activities to other PCEA institutions. Public announcements, telephone and letters were considered as the most effective with 95.1 %, 91.8 % and 86.9 % of respondents respectively saying that they were very effective. None of respondents thought that public announcements, telephone and radio were not effective channels. Only 1.6 % felt that letters were not effective.
In addition, table 11 shows that 45.9% thought that radio was very effective. This indicates an appreciation of this vibrant media technology. This response corroborates information from personal interviews which revealed that radio was very effective since the church used different local languages to reach those at grassroots levels. Also, 32.8%, 31.1% and 19.7% considered newspapers, e-mail and TV respectively as very effective. Only 1.6%, 1.6% and 3.3% thought that newspapers, e-mail and TV were not effective. On the internet, only 9.8% thought it was very effective channel while 21.3% said it was not effective. Only 3.3% said that public relations firms were not effective as a significant number (16.4%) thought that it was a very effective channel.

Table 11: Opinions on the effectiveness of information channels in communicating social responsibility activities to other PCEA institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>1. Not effective</th>
<th>2. Effective</th>
<th>3. Very effective</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Firms</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For external communication use. Table 12 shows the opinion of respondents on the effectiveness of information channels if they were used to communicate information on PCEA social responsibility programs to external publics such as partners, community, government and others. A large number of respondents portrayed through their opinions that new technologies could be very effective channels in communicating CSR activities to external publics. These were as follows in the order of preference; radio (96.7 %), daily newspapers (91.8 %), telephone (88.5 %), Television (86.9 %), e-mail (70.4 %).

On the effectiveness of information channels, 93.44 % of respondents said that letters were very effective. Findings also portrayed that only a few of respondents felt that new technologies were not effective. These were as follows: daily newspapers (3.3 %), telephone (3.3 %), Television (4.9 %), and e-mail (6.6 %). Only 1.64% thought that letters were not effective. No one felt that radio was not an effective information channel.
Table 12: Opinions on the effectiveness of information channels in communicating social responsibility programs to various PCEA external publics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>% Not effective</th>
<th>% Effective</th>
<th>% Very effective</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Firms</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcements</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>93.44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noteworthy from table 11 and table 12, that letters were considered by a large number of respondents as very effective channel of sending information to both internal and external publics. Typically, these letters were read in meetings and formed the basis of agenda for most deliberations in PCEA.

One unique finding was on the use and effectiveness of communication strategies and tactics such as public relations firms, media and lobbying and advocacy. Findings revealed that their effectiveness did not correspond to their use in PCEA. Respondents said that they believed that these strategies and tactics were very effective in CSR communication management. However, they did not sufficiently use them in CSR.
practice. Instead, there was extremely limited use of public relations firms as an opportunity and as a strategy to appropriately communicate CSR to publics.

Objective (iv): To investigate the role of CSR in PCEA.

The findings from the objective are as follows:

Findings show that PCEA practices altruistic CSR. This corporate altruism is a philanthropy that provides the church with an opportunity to serve God and humanity through offering assistance to local communities. Thus, it helps to meet economic and development needs of host communities. It aims at poverty reduction, healing the sick, improving education and literacy levels and prevention of drug abuse. Hence, such philanthropy fills the gaps left by government agencies.

In PCEA, some CSR activities are also a source of opportunity and competitive advantage. Such forms of CSR are strategic since they assist the church in its core business of preaching the word of God and evangelism. Thus, they fit in the church’s strategy of reaching out to external publics by enhancing relationships, creating ownership and trust. Consequently, the church’s philanthropy and generosity speaks well for its mission. Therefore it “… acts as a bridge, it creates commonality, and is a point of contact” (Rt. Rev. David Gathanju, Interview, November 5, 2010).

Programs such as health and education are centers of attraction and publicize the church’s presence, mission and activities. In the mission areas, the gospel seems foreign to locals. Hence, “CSR is a factor in gospel communication as it creates ownership and trust” (Rt. Rev. David Gathanju, interview, November 5, 2010). It creates goodwill, enhances the image of the church and thus brings the local community closer to the
church. For instance, responses from interviews showed that the construction of the Bombi suspension bridge made the residents of Malindi district to open up to the church. Eventually, beneficiaries of this project invited the church leaders into their homes. Thus, CSR has been instrumental in the church strategy of reaching out to its external publics by enhancing relationships. Consequently, the church is recognized as a provider of education and health services. This improves on goodwill, image and attractiveness of the church.

Study findings show that CSR programs are important to PCEA and local communities as was indicated in various responses. Such programs can be used to inform the general public about PCEA through strategic use of media and media technologies. To maximize their potential, it is vital to deal with challenges facing CSR programs in PCEA. This will assist the church to reap all benefits that accrue from sponsoring such social responsibility programs just like their business counterparts.

Why CSR is practiced at PCEA

The study also investigated the factors that prompted PCEA to initiate and establish social responsibility programs. This information assisted the researcher to understand the role of CSR in PCEA. Most respondents expressed that CSR in PCEA was geared to benefit members of communities. For instance, PCEA Zimmerman church has integrated CSR in its strategic plan with an aim of reducing poverty, ignorance and unemployment, injustices, diseases, substance and drug misuse in the community.

CSR programs are effective tools of publicizing the church mission, its activities and its presence in local communities. In addition, responses indicated that social responsibility enhances church’s reputation among local communities. However,
responses indicate that such acts of generosity are little known beyond the precincts of the program area by church publics since the church rarely engages the mass media in its CSR publicity. Alsop (2004) expresses the view that media coverage of CSR and philanthropy if well planned can provide the most credible publicity. This view concurs with that of Cravens and Piercy (2009) who say that "the goal is to establish CSR not simply as corporate altruism, but as a source of opportunity, innovation, and competitive advantage" (p. 22). In addition, Kaplan and Norton (2004) note that CSR programs create new products, services and strong relationships. Thus, for PCEA to maintain her relevance and innovativeness within the supra-system, it must communicate to all its publics through various appropriate means.

Findings also revealed that social-economic programs such as micro-enterprises enhance fairness by assisting in the redistribution of wealth in the country. They create economic opportunities for internal and external publics. According to some respondents, the church’ social-economic programs such as education programs and PCEA Jitegemea credit scheme assists in redistribution of incomes.

Thus, these affirmative and empowerment programs involving caring and giving back to the community creates trust and goodwill for PCEA. “… The concept of social responsibility entails giving back to community as a good will for support received" (PCEA, 2009, p. D6.6). These views concur with those of Carroll (1991) and Wilson (2000) who hold the view that most organizations are using CSR for the purpose of creating goodwill. By managing communication, organizations build relationships with strategic publics that can enhance or constrain their ability to pursue their mission and
goals (Hunt & Grunig, 1994). CSR is a sign of caring for the community. The church is trusted as a good neighbor and a caring institution by the community (PCEA, 2008).

Further, PCEA also has income generating projects such as real estates, hotels and rental houses (PCEA, 2010). These generate incomes for use in CSR activities. The income from these projects is “wholly and exclusively for charitable purposes …” (PCEA, 1998, p. 194). Such projects are registered under the Presbyterian foundation.

According to The Practice and Procedure Manual, all incomes of the Presbyterian Foundation is applied “wholly and exclusively for charitable purposes of the church in the Republics of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania” (PCEA, 1998, p. 194). Accordingly, the objects and activities of The Presbyterian Foundation are part and parcel of the entire PCEA CSR efforts, philanthropy and charitable work. Thus, PCEA provides stewardship of God’s resources through CSR. Hence, income generating projects are important in providing the needed financial resources for the running of CSR oriented programs.

PCEA understanding of CSR

The document content analysis showed that PCEA social responsibility is understood from two fronts. Firstly, from a perspective of PCEA as a registered corporate body limited by guarantee, and secondly from a perspective of PCEA existing as part of the universal body of Jesus Christ. These perspectives are important to the understanding of the church CSR since PCEA is both legally and spiritually instituted. Legally, it is a creation of the state where the latter is sovereign. Spiritually, it is a spiritual organism with Christ as its head.
From the first standpoint, PCEA was registered as a corporate body limited by guarantee under the Land Perpetual Succession African Act of Kenya on 18th September, 1946. It has Board of Trustees made up members of PCEA who are experienced in administration and of known probity (PCEA, 1998). This is “based on terms and conditions set forth in the Certificate of Incorporation of the Registered Trustees of the Presbyterian Church of East Africa” (PCEA, 1998, p. 221). PCEA St Andrews Church was issued with a separate certificate of incorporation on 8th June, 1961 which was under the Land (Perpetual, Succession) Ordinance (Chapter 163). In both cases, the registrar general is notified immediately of any change of trustee by the secretary of the board so as to effect that change in the Certificate of Incorporation (PCEA, 1998). As a corporate body, PCEA thus undertakes corporate responsibility.

According to ‘the Practice and Procedure Manual’, which is the current PCEA constitution and policy document, the social responsibility is meant to meet the economic and development needs of the community. The church is committed to “building institutions such as schools, hospitals and training centers for equal opportunity and community service” (PCEA, 1998, p. 150). To this end, it promotes community effort and participates in public programmes. As an organism, it engages its various organs such as “Presbyterian Foundation at all levels, in trade and business, to raise resources for its own ministry and for community service… but never for personal or individual interest or profit” (PCEA, 1998, p. 150).

From the second viewpoint, social responsibility in PCEA is understood from the perspective of the church existing as part of the universal body of Jesus Christ. “The church is committed to helping people identify and meet their economic needs, and fulfill
their right to development, by promoting education, health and training in all its areas of mission and evangelism, as part and parcel of the gospel of Jesus Christ” (PCEA, 1998, p. 150). Thus, this aspect of responsibility is a spiritual responsibility to preach, heal, educate and evangelize. “The [PCEA] church as the body of Christ must live and be seen to live as a functioning body, alive in every way for the glory of its Head, Jesus, the crucified and risen Lord” (PCEA, 1998, p. 150). This is a principle on which the universal church of Jesus Christ has practiced her social responsibility. The idea is found on the premise that the church is a functional and an organic community carrying out God's mission on earth. It is through the church that God liberates the captives and heal the sick (Luke 4:18 - 19). This gives meaning to the existence of the universal church of Jesus Christ in a community (PCEA, 2008).

Jesus Christ manifested the kingdom of God in his missionary activities during his life, death and resurrection. Likewise, contemporary Christians manifest the kingdom of God through their preaching, lifestyle and witness. The church is made up of witnesses in a witnessing community. Thus, mission is the raison d'être of the church (Lutheran World Federation, 2004; PCEA, 2010).

Thus, CSR policy in PCEA incorporates legal and spiritual perspectives. It is guided by the conviction that God's business entails all aspects of his creation. God calls the church both corporately as a legal entity, and individually as part of the universal body of Christ to practice good stewardship. This is by its proper use of its resources to care for all of God’s creation (Genesis 1:26; Matthew 25:40), while pursuing justice (Amos 5:24), and promoting peace (Luke 19:41-42) (PCEA, 1998; ELCA, 2009; PCEA, 2010). Hence, as agents sent into the world by God, churches engage in social actions
through the establishment and practice of CSR programs and activities. These activities comprise acts of mercy such as providing food and water for the hungry and thirsty, helping the sick, construction of bridges and sustaining widows and orphans. Through these, the church as an institution remains relevant and contextual to the changing state of affairs. Other avenue of service includes providing quality pastoral care programs for those infected and affected with HIV/AIDS epidemic (Garland & Blyth, 2005; PCEA, 2010).

Communication of CSR Reports

Findings show that PCEA organizational structure provides the best opportunity for horizontal and vertical communication for internal publics. For external publics, communication and information flow is sustained through feedback processes among organizations and publics within the supra-system. This is due to the fact that PCEA is an open system having porous boundaries.

In PCEA, there are various formal channels of communication that are employed to disseminate CSR information to internal and external publics. Such channels include public announcements, letters, and bulletins, notice boards, telephone, face to face interactions, e-mail, internet, meetings and mass media. Findings show that the mass media which includes television, radio, newspapers and internet is rarely used due to cost factors. Instead, the church utilizes its existing organizational structure to disseminate its information.

According to the moderator of the 19th GA, PCEA organizational structure provides the best setting for communication of CSR programs reports. The structure provides the opportunity for horizontal and vertical communication. CSR information is
disseminated with speed and accuracy horizontally in different channels such as meetings, telephone conversations, face to face interactions, discussions and shared reports among peers of the same rank.

The vertical communication involves both upward and downward communication. This two way traffic provides constant communication and maintains feedback processes. The upward communication entails vital information from subordinate policy and administrative units such as courts and committees to superior courts and departmental units playing supervisory role. Such information is channeled through letters, periodical reports, and meetings. The contents of this information mainly comprise of work progress in CSR programs and projects. According to Secretary General of the 19th GA Rev. Festus Gitonga, other information disseminated includes pleas for intervention from subordinate institutions to the General Assembly office. The latter is especially when project implementers are experiencing problems and difficulties while dealing with external publics such as the government and other legal entities.

On the other hand, the downward communication entails the dissemination of information from superior courts and departmental units to their subordinates. The content of such communications mainly entail dissemination of GA/GAC/business committee resolutions, policies, procedures and other important instructions. Such communications encourages uniformity of goals, practices and procedures. Further, it assists in participatory decision making process as information is shared across decision making units. In addition, the shared information is also a source of encouragement and motivation to internal publics to pursue common mission, vision and goals.
In addition to formal communications, there is also informal communication system in PCEA. This information travels very fast and takes place mainly through face to face interactions, telephone and SMS channels. Some of its contents entail information on the geographical and upward mobility of personnel manning CSR programs and other pertinent church issues.

Summary

The success of CSR programs in PCEA has re-ignited the enthusiasm in the church to initiate and establish even more social responsibility programs to assist her members and communities (PCEA, 2010). Since PCEA is an open and a structured system, feedback processes has been instrumental in keeping this fire burning. Despite lack of documented policies guiding public relations, findings from interviews reveal that mutually beneficial relationships exist between PCEA and her publics which in turn help the organization to achieve its mission and goals (Hunt & Grunig, 1994; Kaplan & Norton, 2004; PCEA, 2010; PCEA, 2011).

However, as findings reveals, PCEA has not positioned itself appropriately in its management of CSR communications. Austin and Pinkleton underline the importance of an organization positioning its corporate brand, product and services by strategic use of media strategies and tactics such as public relations, lobbying, advertising and marketing (2006). Thus, an organization can capitalize on its managing social responsibility issues to achieve publicity, recognition, image and reputation. Such strategic use of media and public relations strategies and tactics can also help an organization to achieve its mission, program sustainability and organizational development (Austin & Pinkleton, 2006).
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to identify and describe the role and practice of CSR in PCEA. A description of the status of CSR activities and strategies, methods and tactics used in communicating CSR activities was a major thrust of the study. The problem statement was that the lack of sustained publicity of PCEA sponsored CSR activities in the mass media has led to a misunderstanding of the role and practice of CSR in the church. Thus, to avoid such misunderstanding, there is need to identify and describe the role and practice of CSR in PCEA.

In this study, corporate social responsibility referred to any non-preaching activity such as education, agriculture, health, construction of bridges, road rehabilitation and any other projects aimed at empowering communities as well as church members. Respondents were kindly requested to provide their views about CSR activities that are carried out by PCEA in their institutions. The respondents were senior church leaders. They provided important information on CSR in PCEA. Their views were treated with absolute confidentiality.

The objectives of the research were as follows:

i) To identify CSR programs and activities in PCEA.

ii) To find out the practice of CSR by PCEA.

iii) To find out how PCEA communicated CSR activities to internal and external publics.

iv) To investigate the role of CSR in PCEA.
Discussion of Key Findings

CSR Practice and Activities in PCEA

Responses received showed that CSR is widely practiced in PCEA. All institutions that were represented in the survey practiced CSR in one form or another. However, due to the fact that PCEA institutions are located in different geographical areas, programs initiated differed depending on the needs of the local beneficiaries. The study also revealed that most common CSR activity in the church was education with 100% of respondents stating that they took part in educational programs. Other common programs were school sponsorship (90.16%), health (86.89%), ROPES (80.33%) and feeding (90.2%).

In order to understand the practice of CSR, it involved identification of information channels, their use and effectiveness. This is important since information channels are vital components of CSR programs management and administration. The most used channels in PCEA were public announcements, telephone, letters, face to face interaction, and meetings. This leaves out the use of mass media and public relations despite their proved effectiveness in modern best CSR practices. Such services are avoided as they eat into the already constrained church budget. In addition, a lot of CSR information is easily communicated through the established church structure which is cheap and swift (Rev. Samuel Murigu, Interview, April 12, 2011). However, unlike mass media such method is only suitable for communicating to internal publics. Also, the quality and quantity of information communicated through mass media is high and its impact is equally great.
The integration of CSR programs into strategic plans is an effective way of ensuring strategic use of CSR (Lantos, 2001). However, only 1.64% (1) of all respondents said that they had fully integrated CSR into their strategic plan. This limits the church from reaping from advantages of strategic CSR. The latter is aimed at improving organization’s image, reputation and standing among its publics. Some of the programs that were considered as very effective in strategic CSR are education (98.4%), health (91.8%), school sponsorship (72.13%), feeding (80.33%), home for the aged (63.93%) and infrastructural development (60.66%) programs.

Worth noting from research findings is effectiveness of CSR programs in evangelization of the community. This is an important fact especially taking into consideration that preaching and evangelization is the core business of the church. Education (98.36%), health (96.72%) and feeding programs (83.61%) were considered very effective programs in promoting evangelization. However, some critics of CSR in the church disapprove the use of church money to fund education and industries such as agricultural development and buildings. They argue that such non-core business activities should be avoided as they consume funds that could have been used in preaching. According to Hetherwick, the “… emphasis on industries and education was not a proper function of a Christian mission and therefore a waste of resources which could otherwise have gone towards a more widespread preaching of the Christian gospel” (in Macpherson, 1970, p. 34).

However, if CSR is properly communicated then the awareness of general public of PCEA programs and activities would increase. The personal interviews with church leaders revealed that the presence of PCEA in the community for over 100 years had a
positive impact in East Africa. In addition, PCEA is acknowledged as a provider of quality health and educational services. Further, many have been evangelized through such programs.

The practice of CSR in PCEA cannot be complete without the analysis of the use of public relations firms. Public relations firms have experts who are skilled in the promotion of public image and institutional reputation. They raise awareness of the organizational mission, vision and goals thus shaping of opinions of publics and creating goodwill toward the organization. Thus, there is need to create awareness on the importance of PR and its role in church establishments.

Another important factor in CSR practice is the use and effectiveness of the communication strategies and tactics. Such are media relations, public relations, advertising and marketing and; lobbying and advocacy. In PCEA, the effectiveness of such strategies did not correspond with their use. Respondents held that media relations (83.33%), lobbying and advocacy (83.6%) and advertising and marketing (67.21%) were very effective tactics. However, except advertising and marketing, PCEA used the rest on a very small scale. This is unlike in the profit organizations where these tactics are used intensively and extensively.

CSR Practice in PCEA as Compared to the Practice in Business Organizations

All respondents were of the view that CSR practice within PCEA is different from that of business organizations due to the following reasons. First, the packaging of CSR in business is different from that in the church because each targets different publics. The business community main targets are clients and shareholders. On the other hand, PCEA
mainly targets CSR beneficiaries with a core purpose of alleviating poverty by meeting their needs. For instance, the core business and bottom line of PCEA community centers is poverty reduction. Thus, PCEA always conducts needs assessment prior to project initiation.

On the other hand, the core business of profit making organizations is creation of positive image, good reputation and generation of profits for shareholders. Profit making businesses look at areas they will win most in reputation and image building. Thus, CSR in profit making organization fits in as long as it assists the organization in its primary objective of profit making. Thus, they use their CSR events to strategically advertise and promote their product, services and corporate brand (Ferrell, Fraedrich & Ferrell, 2008).

However, CSR in the church is holistic. It also aims at preaching the gospel besides other forms of social and economic empowerment. Thus, targeting at the whole person (Rev. Murigu, Interview, April 12, 2011). Further, the church is also guided by virtues reflected in the bible. CSR as practiced by PCEA is a service to the community with no strings attached. It is a God centered approach. The aim is to glorify God by serving the community. Consequently, PCEA encourages participation by locals and program beneficiaries in formulation and management of programs. Conversely, business organizations generally limit participation of locals and other supposedly less strategic publics. In addition, such businesses may not be guided by Christian virtues as they may not necessarily be founded on biblical principles.

Moreover, the information concerning many of PCEA CSR programs and activities are not communicated professionally. Further, PCEA rarely publicizes its CSR in the mass media. This is due to the fact that the church mainly relies on volunteer
service from members. These serve on short-term rotational basis and may not necessarily be communication and media professionals. On the other hand, many profit making organizations have a corporate communication department that coordinate information management, dissemination and campaigns besides hiring public relations firms. Thus, they are very good at advertising and using such publicity in their favor.

Challenges Facing CSR Practice in PCEA

All respondents agreed that there are challenges facing the practice of CSR in PCEA. The following are some of challenges that were mentioned.

There is extremely limited use of public relations firms as an opportunity and as a strategy to appropriately communicate CSR to publics. The church does not have a public relations department. Also, the church has only hired these services on very rare and limited occasions. This is due to the fact that public relations firms charge high prices to organize and publicize events. According to research findings such charges are way beyond what the church can afford.

Moreover, there is lack of media coverage. The media houses report where CSR events will make big news. Other times they turn down the church invitation if in the opinion of the media houses, the CSR event is not ‘worth’ covering. Sometimes there is also information delay due to lack of corporate communication experts to carry out communication and news dissemination. As a result, CSR information sometimes does not reach its targeted audience and beneficiaries in good time.

There is also general ignorance and a lack of well trained personnel to implement CSR programs. Research findings show that there is lack of knowledge regarding some
CSR programs. For instance, in many presbyteries, some aspects of the Christian education programs are not well understood. Consequently, the Christian education department is not properly supported in carrying out its activities in such areas. In addition, there is also the problem of leadership where some of those elected in education committees seem not to be wholly committed. Such lack of seriousness in CSR work is a major setback in program implementation.

Additionally, there are financial constraints. Financing CSR programs is a challenge since the church lacks enough finances. In addition, the presence of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in some areas has made the church to divert long-term program development funds to short term relief programs. The former is self sustaining while the latter are unsustainable in the long run. This challenging scenario comes at a time when financial partners are suffering from donor fatigue. Other serious challenges that were mentioned by respondents include general insecurity in the country, lack of supportive policies, environmental degradation and poor infrastructure.

How PCEA is Addressing its CSR Challenges

PCEA is addressing the challenges facing the practice of CSR in the following ways:

PCEA is establishing liaisons with media houses. For instance, some church institutions such as Woman’s Guild are creating rapport with media houses such as K24, Kameme and Coro to publicize their events. In addition, the church hopes to start an FM station as well as strengthen communication department and Board of Social Responsibility function.
The Church through the Christian education department is rolling out a plan to educate church leaders and general membership on the role of Christian education programs. There are plans for in-house trainings. PCEA is also keenly mobilizing and educating its stakeholders on the need to embrace and participate in the programs. The church is also motivating its staff and volunteers through offering rewards, certificates of appreciation and recognition of best performers.

PCEA has established income generating ventures through the Presbyterian Foundation. Any surplus fund generated through these projects is wholly and exclusively reinvested to meet the church social responsibility function in CSR programs. The church is also fundraising for programs budgets from local and foreign partners. Furthermore, PCEA is mobilizing community owned resources for the benefit of those at the grassroots. Other measures being taken comprise of accountability reporting; and the community policing where the church is engaging local residents and their resources in the maintenance of security, law and order for the common good.

Role of CSR in PCEA

Survey findings show that CSR plays a vital role in PCEA and among its publics. Internal publics such as employees, staff and church members are able to develop themselves as a united team with a mission, vision and goals. In addition, PCEA and local communities enjoys numerous benefits as highlighted below.

*Importance of CSR programs in PCEA.* Research findings show that church members have benefited from this holistic development. Further, PCEA as an entity has also benefited from CSR programs in the following ways. Firstly, there is increased
church attendance. Many people have liked and joined the church since the latter is seen as caring and practical. Secondly, there is increased good will. The church has gained respect, trust and acceptance from the local community. Hence, the church is able to get reliable feedback from the community. As a result of the goodwill from the community, the church has grown rapidly.

Through CSR, the church has carried out its missionary task. The integration of CSR programs with the church core business of preaching has strengthened PCEA arm of evangelism and missions. This has effectively enhanced the fulfillment of the Great Commission. In turn, it has increased PCEA membership in the grassroots communities.

Further, the church has also received positive publicity. As a result, it has gained a reputation of being mindful of the needs of the society. Some of the church institutions practicing CSR such as hospitals and schools have been known far and wide beyond their locality. In addition, the church presence in the local community is felt in a positive way. For instance, the church is a good steward of God’s resources especially through environmental and resource management. It is also gaining recognition as a centre of education excellence and as a provider of cheap reliable health services.

Finally, through CSR programs, the church has also been able to establish local and international networks. This has helped to create dialogue among partners and program beneficiaries. Also, more partnerships have been formed as the church has secured partners in CSR programs.

*Importance of PCEA CSR programs to local communities.* Through PCEA sponsorship of CSR programs the local communities have achieved holistic development. For instance, many families have benefited through the education of their children. Needy
children from poor backgrounds, orphans and vulnerable persons have been educated and are now contributing to community growth and national development.

Secondly, there have been development and improvement of local communities. Their basic needs such as health, water and sanitation have been meet. Health services, educational facilities and other services have also come closer to the people. The HIV/AIDS programs have lead to greater awareness of the disease and reduction of stigma associated with it. The environmental programs such as tree planting, garbage collection, sanitation has protected environment from degradation. This has uplifted community wellbeing and standard of living. Thus, all these have improved the lifestyle of people in communities.

Thirdly, CSR has promoted harmonious and mutually beneficial relationships among key publics such as community leaders, partners, church members and program beneficiaries. As a consequence, some key publics have been attracted into participating in church oriented activities. In addition, PCEA has created employment for local persons working in CSR programs.

CSR has been an avenue for the empowerment of needy groups in community such as orphan and vulnerable children (OVC) and poor families. The financial support to poor families through church initiated saving and credit scheme such as PCEA Jitegemea Credit Scheme has gone far to uplift their standard of living. This has lead to growth of small and medium scale businesses and increased household incomes. There has also been continuous learning and growth.

The community has also gained from the integration of the church CSR programs in district planning in remote areas such as Kibwezi. In Kibwezi, the church participates
in district development forums. This has enhanced the effectiveness in the implementation of programs. There has also been more appreciation of local communities through participatory development of CSR programs. The local communities have also understood more on practical witness. There has also been enhanced evangelization and preaching of the gospel in local communities.

Conclusions

Dainton and Zelly say that “… systems are embedded in a hierarchy…” (2005, p. 52). Dainton and Zelly add that such systems exist in such manner for self regulation and control. As a system, PCEA is made up of systems and sub-systems that are structured in a hierarchical order. In its totality, the church exists within the supra system. According to study findings, this organizational structure has been instrumental in communicating CSR information both horizontally and vertically among internal publics. Those interviewed hailed use of church structure as very significant as it is swift and inexpensive.

As an open system, PCEA exists within the supra system. It influence and is influenced by the surrounding environment through feedback processes. It gives and receives information. This permeability has assisted the church to communicate to its publics through radio, meetings, letters, face to face interactions and internet. It has also helped the church to obtain important CSR data through various channels as partners and other publics sends information to PCEA. It is through these exchanges of information that PCEA is able to position itself as reputable and respectable organization that meets communities’ needs.
Open systems also exhibit the characteristic of wholeness and interdependence. The organization is bound to change as institutions constituting it changes. Further, it also changes as the supra system goes through dynamic change processes. This calls the organization to move alongside with other systems within the supra system. Hence, PCEA should embrace modern information and communication technology and other strategies so that it can communicate its mission and be at par with its publics. Findings show that PCEA has over years lagged behind in its use of mass media, public relations firms and internet technology. This has negatively affected its positioning within the supra system. That is, despite its practice of CSR in its varied forms, its CSR work is yet to be well known by the general public.

Study findings also show that the foundations for CSR in PCEA include economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities as proposed by Carroll (1991). However, the study revealed that there are other important responsibilities that guide CSR in PCEA. Such bases include and are not limited to biblical responsibility (MacPherson, 1970; PCEA, 1998).

Research conducted in the last three decades has highlighted the importance of CSR. CSR is critical for organizational development and success (Waddock, 2003). It is an integral element to the building up of the company’s reputation (Alsop, 2004). Hence, the need for both the profit and not for profit organizations to develop appropriate communication strategies and tactics that will ensure it is communicated effectively to targeted beneficiaries. These will in-turn enhance organizations' mutual relationships with their relevant internal and external publics, and; as a result, their long-term effectiveness (Alsop, 2004; Waddock, 2003).
CSR as practiced in PCEA is different from that in profit making organizations because factors that influence the formulation, implementation and management of CSR program and activities are different. The study showed that most PCEA institutions were mainly interested in contributing positively to the society. However, some expressed that they also aimed at maintaining goodwill as a secondary factor.

Therefore, PCEA has through social responsibility programs contributed to the growth and development of the church and the community. Consequently, this success has prompted the church to initiate and establish more social responsibility programs in order to assist her members and more communities (PCEA, 2010). Nevertheless, much of this success has not been fully understood and acknowledged beyond local communities hosting CSR projects. This is due to lack of appropriate and significant use of the mass media, new media technologies and modern communication strategies to publicize CSR work at PCEA.

The need to transform local communities and promote the cause of the gospel prompted PCEA to initiate and establish social responsibility programs. The key factor in the choice of a suitable project is the relevance and suitability of the programs to its intended beneficiaries. Therefore, a need assessment is conducted to establish which program is relevant and suitable for beneficiaries. This participatory process in program identification and management is guided by the organizational structure and church polity. The practice and procedure manual offer the guidelines and policy framework for initiation and implementation of these social programs. Thus, social responsibility programs within PCEA are generally implemented through various PCEA institutions such as community centers, presbyteries and departments.
Various information channels and communication strategies are used to disseminate CSR information to internal and external publics. However, research findings show that PCEA very rarely employs the services of public relations firms and rarely uses media to communicate and publicize its social responsibility programs. Study findings reveal that the high cost of hiring public relations and media services has been a major deterrent factor to their use. Given the critical role that CSR programs play, it is imperative that PCEA reviews its financial base to support CSR communications and activities.

Recommendations

1. To PCEA:

*How CSR programs in PCEA can best be used to inform the general public about church.*

*Partnership with media houses.* CSR programs in PCEA can best be used to inform the general public about the church by use of the following methods; first, the church can partner with media houses to publicize her CSR events. The church should ensure that its CSR events are well publicized in the media. In addition, the church can prepare documentaries on CSR programs which can be aired on TV, radio and published in the print media.

*Use of public relations.* PCEA should establish a public relations section under the communication department. The church can also use public relations firms to advertise its CSR events. This would assist in promotion of corporate brand image and reputation. It can also help in the publicity of particular CSR programs and activities by use of appropriate media and communication technologies. There should be appropriate and
consistent use of reliable information channels such as e-mail, internet, websites, and print and broadcast media. Thus, PCEA can use new information and communication technologies to supplement their traditional channels of communication.

*Integration of CSR programs with PCEA core business.* PCEA should carefully integrate CSR programs with her core business of preaching God’s word. When people come for education, health services or any other social activity, there should be an opportunity to talk about the Word of God and inform them about the church’s endeavor to assist in raising their standard of living. Moreover, the church can send its representatives to various key publics to talk about PCEA CSR work.

*Strengthening of Board of Social Responsibility (BSR).* The BSR should be strengthened so that it can be more proactive through research, CSR policy development and advocacy. Further, BSR should coordinate different interventions the church is involved in. The BSR through the communication department should also be involved in media liaisons, marketing and publicity of various CSR activities. It should advocate the rights of OVC, aged and other needy persons.

*Allocation of sufficient financial resources.* The adoption of new media technology and communication strategies requires ample investment in finances. As a result, PCEA should budget and allocate sufficient financial resources to incorporate these new inventions and technologies. This will ensure that the church always have enough resources to run and publicize its CSR work.

*Use of participatory process.* Participatory process should be used in needs assessment, program formulation, implementation and management. The project team should be representative of key stakeholders. Part of the team should be drawn from the
community, the beneficiaries and other key publics. Since PCEA is an open and ordered system with porous boundaries, it can exchange feedback within and without itself for organizational success. Such feedback processes can aid in program identification and management through a participatory process. Feedback determines and regulates communicational relationships for self propagation.

2. To other organizations in the Not for Profit sector

*Lessons that NfP organizations can learn from the findings of this study*

*Use of mass media.* The NfP organizations can influence their external environment as well as their internal circumstances by maintaining good media relations. Their CSR work can effectively be integrated with core business. CSR can then be promoted through advertising, lobbying and advocacy through the mass media channels.

*Use of PR.* Players in the NfP sector should develop mutually beneficial relationships with both internal and external publics. Through such relationships and understanding, such organization can promote their image, reputation and success. In addition, they can acquire social license to operate with community recognition and acceptance.

*Use of modern communication technologies.* The organizations in the NfP sector can also engage in income generating programs activities. Any surplus funds they generate can then be appropriately re-invested in corporate social responsibilities. In addition, such surplus funds can be invested in the promotion of CSR programs and activities by use of modern communication technologies.
Recommendations for Future Studies

1. Findings from the study revealed that radio is the most used form of information channel within PCEA especially in publicizing the Rites of Passage (ROPES) program. Thus, researcher recommends that any future research to look at the effectiveness of Radio as an information channel in communicating the Rites of Passage (ROPES) program.

2. Under this particular study, several PCEA institutions were studied. The researcher recommends that future research should concentrate on any one of these institutions.
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Appendix A: A Questionnaire
The following is a sample questionnaire that was used in the collection of data on corporate social responsibility (CSR) in this study.

**A Questionnaire for Senior PCEA Leaders**

*(Ministers in Presbyteries, Department and Community Directors)*

**Introduction**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I greet you in the Name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. My name is Rev. Zachary Gioko, an M. A. communication student at Daystar University. I am conducting a study on corporate social responsibility (CSR) in PCEA. *(N/B: In this survey, **CSR** refers to any **non-preaching** programs such as education, agriculture, health, construction of bridges, road rehabilitation and any other project activities aimed at empowering your local communities as well as PCEA members).*

I therefore kindly request you to provide your views on CSR activities that are carried out by your institution. Your views will be treated with absolute confidentiality. Please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire and return it within four days. Your views will be very useful in this research exercise. Please **do not write** your name. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. God bless you.

Yours faithfully,

Rev. Zachary Gioko.
A Questionnaire for Senior PCEA Leaders

(Ministers in Presbyteries, Department and Community Directors)

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO FILL THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please DO NOT write your name.
For questions with multiple choices, kindly put a tick in the box provided i.e. [    ]
For any other questions, write your answers in the spaces provided.

Personal Details

1) What is the name of your institution? _____ _________________________

2) When did you join this institution? _______________________________

3) Sex: [    ] male [    ] female (Tick one)

4) Marital status: [    ] married [    ] single [    ] separated
   [    ] divorced [    ] widow(er) [    ] other. Specify___________

CSR Information

5) Which of the following CSR programs are currently going on in your institution?
   (Tick whichever is applicable)
   [    ] Educational program, (specify which program) _____________________
   [    ] Health program, (specify which program) _______________________
   [    ] Environmental Program
   [    ] Sponsorship program, (specify which one) ______________________
   [    ] Partnership program, (specify which one) ______________________
   [    ] Feeding program
   [    ] Street children rescue program
   [    ] Home (e.g. for aged, children) program, (specify which one) __________
   [    ] Rehabilitation program, (specify which one) ______________________
   [    ] any other: ___________________________________ (Specify which ones)

6) Which of the following information channels do you use to communicate information
   on CSR programs to PCEA members? (Tick whichever is applicable)
   [    ] Public Relations Firms [    ] Public Announcements
   [    ] Grapevine [    ] Internet [    ] E-mail [    ] Telephone/Mobile [    ] Letters
   [    ] Face to face interaction [    ] In-house publications [    ] Memos
   [    ] Notice Boards [    ] Meetings [    ] Bulletins [    ] Daily Newspapers
   [    ] Television [    ] Radio
7) On a scale of 1 – 5, how much information on social responsibility programs do you receive through the following information channels from other PCEA institutions? (1 represents least information and 5 represent most information).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public relations Firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Which of the following information channels do you use to communicate information on church’s CSR programs to the community? (Tick whichever is applicable)

[ ] Public relations Firms  [ ] Public Announcement/intimations
[ ] Grapevine              [ ] Internet  [ ] E-mail  [ ] Telephone/Mobile  [ ] Letters
[ ] Face to face interaction [ ] In-house publications  [ ] Memos
[ ] Notice Boards          [ ] Meetings  [ ] Bulletins  [ ] Daily Newspapers
[ ] Television            [ ] Radio
9) On a scale of 1 - 5, how much information on CSR programs in the church do you send to your stakeholders using the following information channels? (1 represents least information whereas 5 represent most information).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public relations Firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) In your opinion, how effective would the following information channels be if used to communicate your social responsibility activities to other PCEA institutions? (Use the scale 1 to 3 where 1 represents the least effective and 3 represent the Very effective channel).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>1. Not effective</th>
<th>2. Effective</th>
<th>3. Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public relations Firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11) In your opinion, how effective would the following information channels be if used to communicate information on your social responsibility programs to various PCEA external stakeholders? E.g. to partners, community, government etc. (Use the scale 1 to 3 where 1 represents the least effective and 3 represent the Very effective channel).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>1. Not effective</th>
<th>2. Effective</th>
<th>3. Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public relations Firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) a. Does your institution operate through a strategic plan? [ ] Yes [ ] No (Tick one)

    b. If your answer in (10 a) is Yes, then please indicate to which extent your institution has integrated the CSR programs into its strategic plan.

    [ ] Not integrated [ ] Integrated [ ] More integrated [ ] Most integrated [ ] Fully integrated
13) a. How effective are the following CSR programs in reaching out to your local community with the word of God?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street children rescue program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for aged and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How effective are the following CSR programs in helping the community appreciate the presence and the work of the church in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street children rescue program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for aged and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Please indicate to which extent the general public is aware of PCEA CSR programs and activities. (Use a scale of 1 – 5, where 1 represents Not aware and 5 represent Most aware).

____1 Not aware ____2 Less aware ____3 Aware ____4 More aware ____5 Most aware

14) a. Please list three ways in which PCEA has benefited from the CSR programs.

i. ____________________________________________

ii. ____________________________________________

iii. ____________________________________________
b. Please list three things that your local community has achieved through your sponsorship of CSR programs.
   i. ______________________________________________
   ii. _____________________________________________
   iii. ____________________________________________

15) How can the church CSR programs best be used to inform the general public about PCEA?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

16) a. Are there challenges facing CSR programs in your institution?
    [   ] Yes              [   ] No              (Tick one)

   b. Please explain your answer.
    __________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________

   c. How is PCEA addressing these challenges in your institution?
    __________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________

17) a. Is the way you practice CSR in your institution different from the way it is practiced in business organizations?
    [   ] Yes              [   ] No              (Tick one)

   b. Please give reasons for your answer)
    __________________________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________________________

18) How often does your institution use the services of Public Relation firms to communicate CSR activities to your target audience? (TICK ONE OPTION ONLY).
    [   ] Never      [   ] Very rarely     [   ] Rarely     [   ] Often    [   ] Very often [   ] All the time
19) a. In your opinion, how often does your institution use the following communication strategies and tactics to inform the general public about PCEA CSR programs in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategy/Tactics</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying and Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. In your opinion, how effective would the following communication strategies and tactics be when used to inform the general public about CSR programs in PCEA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategy/Tactics</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying and Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20). In your opinion, how effective are the following communication strategies and tactics in informing the general public about CSR programs in other organizations apart from PCEA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategy/Tactics</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying and Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thank you for your time and your willingness to answer all the questions*
Appendix B: Interview Guide

An Interview Guide for Officers of the General Assembly

i. Introduction

My name is Rev. Zachary Gioko, an M. A. communication student at Daystar University. I am conducting a study on the role and practice of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in PCEA. In this study, CSR refers to any non-preaching activities such as education, agriculture, health, construction of bridges, road rehabilitation and any other project activities aimed at empowering local communities as well as members of PCEA.

I consider you to be very resourceful in this study since you have been in senior leadership in this church for many years. I therefore kindly request you to provide your views about corporate social responsibility activities. I believe that your views which will be treated with absolute confidentiality will be very useful in this research. Please kindly allow me to interview you for 45 minutes and where necessary to audio record you. Thanks and God bless you.

ii. Questions for Officers of General Assembly Only

1) In your opinion, what prompted the church to initiate and establish social responsibility programs? How relevant are social responsibility programs to intended beneficiaries?

2) What is PCEA understanding of CSR? How has this understanding affected the management of CSR issues and programs?

3) How was (is) social responsibility programs implemented during your time in office?
4) How does the office of the General Assembly communicate information on social responsibility programs to the following?

   a. church members   b. the nation   c. any other stakeholders (please mention these groups).

5) In your opinion, is such communication effective? Give reasons for your answer.

6) In communicating information on social responsibility programs to the general public, has PCEA ever made use of the following; a. media? b. public relations firms?

   If answer is Yes, then how often and how effective were they?

   If answer is No, Why has the church not made use of media/ public relation firms?

7) How can CSR activities be effectively used to inform the general public about PCEA?

   iii. Closing Remarks

Thank you for your time, kindness and willingness to answer these questions.
Appendix C: List of Respondents (Sample)

i. Past and Current Officers of General Assembly
   2. Rev. Festus Kaburu Gitonga – Secretary General, 19th General Assembly.
   3. Rev. Francis Ndung’u Njoroge – Deputy Secretary General, 19th General Assembly.
   4. Mr. Johnson Njatha Wathiri – Honorary Treasurer, 19th General Assembly.
   5. The Very Rev. Dr David Muhia Githii – Moderator, 17th and 18th General Assembly.
   6. Rev. Samuel Murigu Njoroge, Secretary General, 17th - 18th General Assembly.
   7. Rev. Peter Kenyanjui, Deputy Secretary General, 16th - 17th General Assembly.

ii. Heads of Departments
   8. Rev. Dr Charles Kibicho, Director, PCMF (also former Deputy Secretary General, 15th - 16th General Assembly)
   9. Rev. Dr Sicily M. Muriithi, Director, Church School
   10. Rev Nahashon G Mwaura, Director, Christian Education
   11. Rev Simon Githiora, Director, Youth
   12. Rev. Gibson Gichuki, Director, Board of Social Responsibility
   13. Rev. F. N. Njoroge, Secretary, Health Services Board
   14. Mr. Peter Kamuthu, ag Director, Communication
   15. Mr. Wilson Wahome, Secretary, Presbyterian Foundation
   16. Rev. Wilson Macharia, Director, Boys and Girls Brigade
   17. Mrs. Veronica Njoki Muchiri, Director, Woman’s Guild

iii. Community Centre Directors
   18. Mr. Ehud Mukuha Gachugu - Director, PCEA Eastleigh Community Centre
   19. Rev. Samuel Muritu - Director, PCEA Dandora Community Centre
   20. Mr. Samuel Mote Mungai - Director, PCEA Kibwezi Community Centre.

iv. Ministers; one minister from each of the following Presbytery:

   Eastern Region
   21. Imenti Central Presbytery
   22. Imenti North Presbytery
23. Imenti South Presbytery
24. Magumoni Presbytery
25. Chogoria Central Presbytery
26. Chogoria South Presbytery
27. Chogoria North Presbytery
28. Chuka Presbytery

Central Region
29. Murang’a Presbytery
30. Githunguri Presbytery
31. Kihumbu-ini Presbytery
32. Thika Presbytery
33. Gatundu Presbytery
34. Thiririka Presbytery
35. Kambui Presbytery
36. Kiamathare Presbytery
37. Komothai Presbytery
38. Kikuyu Presbytery
39. Muguga Presbytery
40. Rungiri Presbytery
41. Limuru Presbytery

Nairobi Region
42. Milimani
43. Ngong Hills Presbytery
44. Nairobi Central Presbytery
45. Nairobi North Presbytery
46. Nairobi East Presbytery
47. Pwani Presbytery
48. Tanzania Mission Presbytery

Mt. Kenya Region
49. Kirimara West Presbytery
50. Kirimara East Presbytery
51. Tumutumu Presbytery
52. Kiganjo Presbytery
53. Nanyuki Presbytery
54. Nyeri Presbytery
55. Othaya Presbytery
56. Kieni West Presbytery
57. Nyeri Hill Presbytery
58. Mukurwe-ini Presbytery

Rift Valley Region
59. Nakuru Presbytery
60. Nyandarua Presbytery
61. Aberdare Presbytery
62. Elburgon Presbytery
63. Njoro Presbytery
64. Laikipia Presbytery
65. Iria-ini Presbytery
66. Western Presbytery
67. Eldoret Presbytery
68. Ndaragwa Presbytery
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