

# PART ONE

---

## The Country Report

---

Juree Vichit-Vadakan, Ph.D  
Center for Philanthropy and Civil Society  
National Institute of Development Administration



# 1 | Introduction

As the role of civil society organizations becomes increasingly recognized as crucial to development, good governance, quality of life, justice and human rights in any given society but especially in a developing country like Thailand, the issue of funding for sustainability of civil society organizations becomes critical and warrants serious investigation.

This multicountry project, *Investing in Ourselves: Giving and Fund Raising in Asia*, provides a good opportunity for the Thai team to study issues relating to resource mobilization, in particular fund raising and giving in the Thai context. Although the scope of the study is limited by time and budgetary constraints, among other limitations, the survey study and the research and writing of the cases have provided significant insights into the funding methods of CSOs in Thailand. The survey study has also given us new insights into how Thai people perceive philanthropy, their behavior in giving, and their motivations for giving. Results from the survey have dispelled some common-sense beliefs about giving. It has also confirmed some assumptions on the behavior and motivation of giving.

Hopefully, the findings from this study will not only shed light on the subject of giving and fund raising in Thailand but will also provide lessons and perhaps even inspirations for CSOs, CSROs, grant makers, philanthropic individuals, and interested and concerned individuals. Ultimately, we aim for the sustainability of CSOs by becoming efficient and effective fund raisers and resource mobilizers.

As our case studies will show, energy, vitality, innovation and change, experimentation and learnings are crucial to effective fund raising. The choice of profiling different types of CSOs at various stages of development, management skills and fund raising ability was conscious and intentional. It was done for the purpose of reflecting a wide spectrum of CSOs with differential experience and ability in fund raising and in adapting to changing social

conditions and requirements. Hence, we hope to learn from successful cases as well as from failed ones.

As for giving, the study will serve not only to explain about giving in Thai society but hopefully it will help to inspire more people to give generously to philanthropy. ▶

## 2 | Context for Resource Mobilization

### Historical and Sociocultural Context

Since the Sukhothai period about 700 years ago when Buddhism flourished and impacted strongly on Thai society and culture, there has been continuity of belief and practices in Thai society where giving is concerned.

Buddhist precepts espouse the transience and impermanence of life where all statuses, conditions or situations whether material or non-material are but a “temporary stage” in an endless cycle of “birth” and “rebirth” before ultimate enlightenment can be attained. As such, one needs to gain “merits” by “giving” as much as one can to elevate one’s merit-status. “Giving” can be concrete like donating money, goods, buildings and other tangible resources. It can also be non-material, as when one gives service, or shows kindness, or shares time—even the sharing of merits, as when one remembers and includes others when one makes merit.

One of the most convenient systems of resource mobilization and resource disbursement has been temple/religion-oriented. To mobilize resources from one’s closest relations for religious merit-making provides one with satisfaction both social and psychological. Traditionally, the dominant pattern of resource mobilization has tended to fall under this category. As a result, we find a proliferation of temples and *stupas* in Thailand and Burma where kings, royalties, nobles, the elite and wealthy members of society would take the lead in resource mobilization for temple construction by often assuming the largest portions of the required fund themselves.

Hence, “giving” both to religion for accumulation of personal religious merits and to charitable causes to help the poor have been well ingrained into the Thai cultural belief and Thai behavioral practice, and are like two sides of the same coin. Giving or making merit for religious purposes, *Thambun*, represents one side of the coin, and is the weightier of the two actions. But giving to others who are in need, *Thamtaan* (alms giving), the

other side of the coin, may carry less importance, but is certainly central to the belief and practice.

*Thambun* and *Thamtaan* are the bases upon which the Thai charitable tradition is founded. Through these principles, generations are taught and socialized to be generous, charitable, caring and concerned about those who are in need and less situated than oneself. When natural crises or calamities occur, there is never a shortage of donations for those who have suffered a misfortune. Or when the plight of individuals are made known through the media, donors often come forward to assist them.

Kindness and especially compassion for the less fortunate are also ingrained through religious teachings. Acts of kindness and compassion for others are lauded socially.

### Kingship and royalty

Given the continuity of the monarchy in Thailand the close bond between the Thai monarch and the Thai people remains unchanged by time and despite transformations in other institutions. Although absolute monarchy gave way to constitutional monarchy in 1932, love for and devotion to the King has not lessened, especially when the current King has consistently and continually exhibited his selflessness and commitment to development causes and to improving the lives of the poor and marginalized members of society. The public looks up to the philanthropic causes of His Majesty and other members of the royal household have followed the King's pursuits. The public has been mobilized to assist in these causes. Resource mobilization for royal charities and royal sponsored causes have become a strong feature in resource mobilization in Thai society.

### Patron-client system

Unlike in contemporary Western societies, the patron-client system continues to play an important role in Thai society. The patron-client relationship is a vertical affiliation where persons of unequal status enter into a formal or informal social relationship. This mutually beneficial form of relationship is the mechanism that links higher status persons to the many tiers of lower status persons in society. The patron-client relationship is a principle of social organization in traditional Thai society, but it has also served to weaken and erode the horizontal linkages in society. With the exception of kinship and village-based units, the pattern of social affiliation

is built on tiers of patron-client relationships where personalism is the dominant determinant of the continuity, strength and viability of the relationship. (Vichit-Vadakan, 1999: 2)

This patron-client structure has had an impact on resource mobilization in Thai society in that it parallels the vertical, patron-based system. In other words, the bigger the aura of power and respectability of the leader at the apex, the more resources can be mobilized through the tiers and tiers of clients linked to the apex by vertical linkages. The larger the stature of the leader, the more people will assist in fund mobilization. On the other hand, resource mobilization based on horizontal linkages, although resorted to, are less successful than the vertically organized system. As a result, the board members of non-profit, philanthropic organizations tend to be lined with persons with social status and position because they will lend the organization respectability and credibility, especially for resource mobilization purposes.

### Family and kinship in resource mobilization

As the family is the most critical social unit in Thai society and kinship as an institution has great importance and a critical role in Thai society, we also need to examine their relationship to resource mobilization in Thai society.

Family, be it nuclear or extended, plays a central role in most Thai people's lives. One's social activities are inevitably intertwined with family and kin. What one does in life is first and foremost approved or disapproved, validated or invalidated, supported or not supported by one's family and kin. A Thai person's primary social/external world is his/her family and kinfolds. Beyond these two groups lie other social relations, such as colleagues/co-workers.

Customarily, when a person partakes in merit-making, his /her family and kinfolds are invited to participate as co-merit makers. One wishes for the merits to extend to one's loved ones. When friends and co-workers are asked to do merits with one, it is often rationalized as, "I value our relationship so much that our joint merit-making will bind us together in our future existence."

It is common that those who engage in resource mobilization for charitable activities/philanthropy tend to solicit from family members first before other sources. Perhaps this is a legacy from temple building as a family and kin affair. But possibly, it is because it is easier to convince family mem-

bers than others. Family members soliciting from each other is a way of life, even among the poor.

Philanthropic foundations or funds to honor family members, especially deceased parents, are common. Ultimately, family members and kin-folks are perceived to be close and intimate. Therefore one could interact with them with less concern for “face-saving,” and other considerations. If they could help, fine. If not, they could refuse with little damaging social effects. To be spurned or rejected by friends, co-workers and other social relations may leave a scar on the smooth relationship.

## Economic Development Context

In addition to the sociocultural context, the economic development of the country also has a strong relation to the issue of giving and fund raising in Thailand. The GDP per capita of the country has grown from 39,104 baht in 1990 to 75,857 baht in 1999. Thailand’s economy has grown rapidly over four decades of planned development since 1961. The overall growth rate of the GDP during the 1960s to 1980s was about 7.9 percent a year. Until 1990, economic growth dramatically increased at 11.2 percent and fluctuated between 8.1 percent and 8.9 percent from 1991 to 1995. However, when the country began to suffer from economic problems in 1996, the growth rate began to fall to 5.9 percent and to shrink to -10.2 percent in 1998. The growth rate slightly improved to 4.2 percent in 1999.

The distribution of income worsened during the 1980s and 1990s, although the two-decade period was ironically a time of high economic growth. Clearly, the overconcentration of wealth among a few is a social problem that is yet unresolved. The share of income of the poorest quintile (20 percent) dropped

table 1.1

GDP Growth rate GDP per capita of Thailand		
Years	GDP per capita (baht)	GDP growth rate (percent)
1990	39,104	11.2
1991	44,307	8.6
1992	49,410	8.1
1993	54,650	8.4
1994	61,903	9.0
1995	70,464	8.9
1996	76,804	5.9
1997	78,006	-1.7
1998	75,749	-10.2
1999	75,857	4.2

from 5.4 percent in 1981 to 3.9 percent in 1999, while that of the richest quintile increased from 51.5 percent to 58.5 percent during the same period (NESDB, 2000). As the economy expanded, more resources became available for charitable causes. Development-related CSOs in general did not capitalize on the internal economic resources during that period. As they were well funded by external donors, not enough plans and strategies were devised to mobilize internal resources. Elite-based CSOs in the form of charitable organizations have mobilized from internal sources. So have royal charities.

When external donors declared Thailand well on its way to development and many decided to retreat from Thailand about six years ago, many CSOs were forced to confront the stark realities of their survival. Since then, many have devised methods and strategies to generate income like going into businesses (community-based or membership-based). Other CSOs have taken on training and consultancy to help their organizations survive.

By and large, the planned and growth-led economic development which Thailand had subscribed to had created wealth, infrastructures, modern comforts, higher standards of living for Thai society. But it had also brought about unanticipated social problems and social dislocations which the state and its agencies have found difficult to address. CSOs have taken up the challenge to fill the gap in assisting “special” groups and in addressing related social problems.

## Legal and Regulatory Framework

In 1942, the National Cultural Commission (NCC) of the Ministry of Education promulgated the National Cultural Act. It made the National Cultural Commission responsible for examining the objectives and monitoring the activities of foundations and associations.

As the Thai government adopted a capitalist development policy and anti-communist ideology, the Trade Association and Chamber of Commerce Act was issued in 1966. Under the act, all trade associations including organizations with no profit sharing objectives, were required to register with the government.

In 1974, the military government promulgated the Cremation Welfare Act. The act gave to the Department of Public Welfare (DPW) authority to oversee the activities of cremation associations which are voluntary, non-

profit organizations.

Organizations are required to register. The Registrar, however, can give an order to take the name of any association off the registry when any of the following conditions are found to exist:

- 1) Any objective of the organization that appears to be contrary to law or public morals, or is likely to endanger public peace or national security;
- 2) The organization fails to act on the order of the Registrar to rectify the objection (Section 102 of the Civil Code). The court may, on application from the Registrar, the Public Prosecutor or any interested person, order a foundation to be dissolved in the above mentioned cases (Section 131).

In 1980, after the Communist Party of Thailand (CPT) was dissolved, the Thai government showed a more liberal attitude towards the non-profit sector in general. However grassroots organizations and advocacy groups could not register with the government, as they were required to have an endowment fund to be registered as a foundation and have a large membership. There are as many organizations that are legally registered as foundations or associations as there are unregistered third sector organizations.

Three different government departments register third sector organizations based on the proposed organization's forms and declared activity areas. Associations and foundations, commercial associations, and cremation associations must register with the NCC, the Department of Internal Trade (DIT), and the DPW respectively, while political parties must register with the Department of Local Administration (see Table 1.2).

The registration process may take a few months to a year to complete. The newly formed foundations are required to have at least 500,000 baht (US\$12,500) in endowments (cash or kind). However, the foundations with public welfare objectives like the promotion of social welfare, education and sports development, religious activities, disaster relief, or supporting research (for example, AIDS research) need to have only 200,000 baht in endowment. The would-be directors of the foundation "must have status or conduct suitable for implementing the objectives of the foundation" (Section 115).

Relevant Agencies and Laws		
Type	Registering Agencies	Law
Foundation	Ministry of Interior, The National Cultural Commission	Civil and Commercial Code 1925 National Cultural Act 1942
Association	The National Police Office Bureau The National Cultural Commission	Civil and Commercial Code 1952 National Cultural Act 1942
Trade Association	Ministry of Trade	Commercial and Association Act 1966
Cremation Association	Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare	Cremation Welfare Act 1974
Labor Union	Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare	Labor Relations Act 1975
Political Party	Ministry of Interior	Political Parties Act 1955

## Taxation

The Ministry of Finance grants tax exemption to third sector organizations. To qualify for tax exempt status, an organization must be registered with the appropriate government organization for at least three years, and have its accounting books endorsed by a certified accountant before they are qualified to submit an application. Furthermore, in order to obtain exemption from taxes (e.g. VAT, land tax, custom duties), the CSO must show that it had spent no more than 25 percent of its budget on overhead during the two years prior to its application for tax exemption. It must also show that part of its proceeds went towards expenditure for public cause. Only 300 CSOs have full tax exemption.

Donations given by corporations to tax-exempt third sector organizations are tax deductible. This deduction is up to two percent of the corporations' profits before taxes. In addition, individuals are allowed to deduct up to 10 percent of their taxable income for contributions made to tax-exempt foundations and associations.

Since only 300 or so non-profit organizations enjoy tax exemption, donors in Thailand do not focus on tax deduction as a major criterion for giving to a particular organization. In a study done by Dr. Wit Satayarakwit from NIDA in 1995 on the companies registered with the Stock Exchange of Thailand, it was found that most companies did not take advantage of the allowable two percent of profits before tax deduction for philanthropy. In other words, companies did not give much to philanthropy. (Cited from <http://www.asianphilanthropy.org>)

## Institutional Resources

Because the Thai government and its operating agencies have assumed development tasks in the past few decades, when they took on development and service delivery activities, CSOs were funded by external sources. The activities of non-profit organizations have been perceived as supplementary to the state's activities. Consequently, the state and the CSOs in the past did not partner or cooperate with each other in a significant manner. Resources from the state may filter to non-profit organizations but not enough for them to subsist comfortably without seeking other sources of income.

In the past few years, some CSOs have begun to seek ways to qualify for public funds for their programs and projects. Justifying that their role in development and service delivery helps or even substitutes for the state, non-profit organizations feel they are entitled to public funds, especially when, the CSOs are quick to point out, they are cost efficient and cost effective.

There are untapped resources within the non-profit sector itself. One such source is the unspent amount of money in the multitude of dormant accounts of inactive or even dead non-profit organizations. There are the accounts of people who put away money to honor their departed relatives, but the remainder of which have not been made use of. If a law could be passed to consolidate these accounts, a large fund could be created to help support the current active and worthy non-profit organizations.

## Gift Markets (Sources and Size)

An empirical study focusing on this aspect will need to be conducted to provide a true picture of the gift markets. In the survey conducted for this project we found out that the size of the market (from a sample of those whose monthly income was 20,000 baht and greater) could be computed from the average amount given by individuals in this group. It could be inferred that 1.04 percent of the total population give an estimated 30,964 baht per year.

In another study quoted by Dr.Wit and Dr. Surasit, it was estimated that with the 16,428,400 households in Thailand giving an average sum of 742 baht to religion each year, the total would be 12,190 million baht a year.

External sources of giving will require research to determine its total

size. Although the Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation (DTEC) supervises foreign assistance to Thai organizations external funds given to public institutions ranging from public hospitals, to universities/ colleges and other government institutions are not under the jurisdiction of the DTEC. Hence, it will take a study to determine the likely size of the external gift markets. ▶



## 3 | Key Findings on Survey

This survey has provided a number of interesting findings that are useful for understanding “giving” in Thailand.

Since a detailed report of this survey component is included at the end of the country report, we will only highlight certain interesting points that emerged from this survey study.

- 1) Respondents’ perception on giving which probably represents how they felt they should give does not correspond directly with the actual pattern of giving.

25 percent believed that giving to relatives is most important.

21 percent indicated that giving to religion is important.

20 percent stated that giving to philanthropic organizations is important.

8 percent indicated that giving to the royal family is important.

The pattern of actual giving however shows the following interesting points:

99.54 percent of our subjects gave money for “social tax,” which is giving for life cycle rituals and activities like wedding, funeral, ordination into monkhood, house blessing, and so on. This kind of giving is a form of merit-making but is also a form of obligatory giving which brings a person merits, and also proper social acceptance because social reciprocity is considered a mark of civility, social graces and proper social behavior.

Although only 21 percent stated that they believed that giving to religion was important, we found that in actual practice, 94.5 percent made “religious contributions.” To do good deeds or to make merits is an essential part of a Thai person’s socialization. It is a behavior that is

well ingrained from childhood, almost as a prerequisite for conducting a good life.

Giving to individuals was carried out by 91.06 percent of the sample. This relates to the Buddhist precept of almsgiving. Given the current economic crisis and recession in Thailand, a larger number of people in Thai society have become unemployed, underemployed and even impoverished.

84.20% of our respondents gave to philanthropic organizations.

In other words, in reality people gave more to religion and religious organizations than to philanthropic organizations (93 percent and 81 percent respectively).

- 2) When one examines the amount of giving, we find that more money was given to individuals than to organizations or institutions:
- |   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| – Giving to individuals                               | 13,137 Baht (326 US\$) |
| – Giving to “social tax”                              | 8,551 Baht (212 US\$)  |
| – Giving to philanthropic organizations               | 5,713 Baht (142 US\$)  |
| – Giving to temples and other religious organizations | 3,593 Baht (89 US\$)   |

A possible explanation is that donors feel compelled to provide larger sums of money to those who are in distress, particularly to relatives and associates.

“Social tax” as a category ranks number two which probably means that maintenance of social relationship is crucial to Thai people. Gestures of reciprocity and good will are inherently and symbolically important. Social reciprocity requires giving to those who had given to one or one’s relations in the past. Social decorum also requires obligating others for their future return of favors. Social relations are central and primary to one’s life. Giving too small a sum may signify a loss of face for the giver and a possible insult to the receiver. Hence, the amount is high.

Although people gave to philanthropic organizations and to temples/religious organizations (81 percent and 93 percent respectively), these were individual giving that was not monitored or overseen by others.

Perhaps greater freedom is found in these two types of giving, which are not done as a social favor or to reciprocate one. Therefore, givers feel comfortable to give less than the socially oriented type of giving mentioned earlier.

<b>Amount of Money Given Classified by Level of Income</b>		
Income/month	Amount donated	% of income
20,000-30,000	18,036	6,012
30,001-40,000	32,279	7,685
40,001-50,000	46,187	8,553
50,000 and greater	63,034	10,505

table 1.3

- 3) When people's income increases, the amount of donation per capita also goes up.

This is a particularly much appreciated finding because it indicates that if the Thai economy improves and people do better economically, the future of philanthropy is promising for Thailand.

- 4) The amount of giving by the group we studied is quite high, indicating that indigenous philanthropy has potential in Thai Society.
- 5) Men and women exhibit basic differences in giving. Men tend to give more in monetary terms and are less willing to refuse request for donation than women. Perhaps men need to act generous to gain respect from others or do it for their egos. Women, however, are in charge of daily expenses and perhaps are more realistic on where to spend money and how much they can actually afford to give without cutting into the welfare/well-being of the family.
- 6) Although women tend to refuse requests for giving more than men and women give less than men to philanthropic causes, we also found that women give more to relatives in need. Groomed as nurturers and caregivers from childhood, women probably feel responsible for or are empathetic with other family members in distress.
- 7) Metropolitan Bangkok residents give less than their counterparts in the provinces. The probable explanations are that Bangkok is more urbanized, less traditional and less family/kin/society-oriented than those in the provinces. Or the cost of living is higher here than in the provinces, therefore the same amount of income may go further in the provinces than in Bangkok, therefore the person in the province may have more spare money left to allow him/her to give more to worthy causes.

- 8) Giving/donating tends to be done non-systematically. Although people give on religious holy days, majority of people give when they are requested to give. Individual donors appear to be receptive to requests but not proactive in seeking causes or avenues to donate.

## Lessons Learned from the Survey

We learn that the field of indigenous philanthropy is out there, untapped and waiting to be cultivated, nurtured and developed. That Thai people are generous givers, particularly when giving relates to social reasons. That communicating the cause for philanthropy is needed to gain public monetary support. ▶

# 4 | Key Findings on Case Studies

## An Overview and Lessons Learned from Case Studies

In choosing our cases, we made an effort to incorporate different types of CSOs with the hope that they would reflect the differences and complexities of CSOs and the problems or successes that they have encountered with funding.

The 15 organizations which comprise our case studies are not only different in size, age and focus of activity, they are also different in terms of maturity in organizational and management capacity.

The 15 organizations studied came from an initial selection of 18 organizations. As anticipated from the beginning of the project, not every case that we studied could come to a completion. Our researchers have made effort to cover the 18 cases; midway and three quarters of the way into the study, three cases had to be dropped because the representatives of the organizations were not forthcoming with financial figures. There seemed to be too much secrecy and lack of transparency in answering queries. One CEO of an organization got angry with other staff members for being cooperative with our researchers and forbade them to talk to our researchers. She proclaimed that the “only voice” of the organization should be hers. In another case, our researchers were frustrated and stressed out with endless evasive answers. Lack of clarity and avoidance of direct answers were evident throughout the many encounters and attempts to understand the organization. In general, our subjects were friendly. They had agreed to be studied but in some cases not enough adequate information was made available. It was more difficult than pulling teeth.

The 15 completed cases differed in

- 1) Size :            2 large organizations

7 medium organizations

6 small organizations

- 2) Age: 4 to 10 years = 4 organizations  
11 and upward = 11 organizations

The oldest in the group is now 97 years old, the youngest is about 5 years old.

- 3) According to the classification system set by the project, our cases would fall under these categories:

Culture and recreation	2
Education and research	2
Health	1
Social service	4
Environment and housing	3
International	1 (already indigenized)
Religion	1
Total	15

What have we learned from the 15 organizations' fund raising activities?

- 1) Organizational mission and vision need to be clarified before fund raising.
- 2) Organizational performance affects fund raising and the use of funds.
- 3) Management procedures and systems are essential for long-term sustainability.
- 4) Charismatic leaders could enhance fund raising. They are critical and crucial to "special events" type of fund raising but long-term system of resource mobilization needs to be put in place.
- 5) Income generating activities must be done by people with financial and business skills and know-how.
- 6) Media involvement and assistance are important.
- 7) Fund raising methods and approaches could be different depending on each organization's audience, strengths, needs, talents and assets.

## Case #1 The Siam Society

The Siam Society is an elite-based organization with close to a hundred years of history. It has a strong board and a large, paid staff to implement the board's policies. When its board focuses on financial issues and fund raising, its constituency and staff members respond positively. Unlike most CSOs and foundations in Thailand, the Siam Society has participation, co-operation and assistance from the foreign community which includes both temporary residents and expatriates. In this context, it could also mobilize resources effectively from the multinational companies, foreign embassies and foreign businesses.

The board tends to include high status Thai persons. Within the last decade, the Siam Society has turned around financially through a new budgeting system. Most importantly, it has taken on a much more entrepreneurial style and approach towards everything it does. Study tours are now income earners and not losers. The Siam Society compound and facilities are for rent. It has expanded its membership base, especially adding corporate membership with high fees.

The most important lesson in this case is that good management and a good business approach towards potential income earning activities will bring in a steady source of income for the organization.

## Case #2 Population and Development Association

The key to its success are:

- 1) A charismatic leader with creativity, innovations and excellent ability to convince and persuade others.
- 2) A professional staff to undertake its activities.
- 3) The ability to change, innovate, adapt to new conditions and requirements. The PDA started work on family planning and reproductive health. It added integrated rural development and combating HIV-AIDS later. In its last major emphasis, it has rural business and industry initiatives for the rural poor.
- 4) It has added business ventures like restaurants, gift shops and of late a resort hotel as profit making establishments whose proceeds will contribute to the non-profit PDA for its development work.

### Case #3 The Raks Thai Foundation

We learn from this case that when a non-profit organization wishes to learn how to be financially sustainable in the long term, it can proceed systematically and methodically. A development manager was hired to focus on fund raising. The experiences of Khun Sukit, the development manager, provided hands-on lessons on experimenting with different fund raising methods. The most valuable lesson learned from this experience is that development/fund raising is not easy. Even with a person handling it as a single focus, there are still problems. But these mistakes and failures should not discourage one from trying other methods.

An understanding and tolerant board is essential. The board should guide and support while being patient and yet firm on expectations for some results.

A supportive CEO is important because the development manager needs understanding and support through the ups and downs of the trial period.

To fundraise, an organization must be prepared and able to set aside some resources (money, staff, technology, connections and networks) for this effort. Immediate results may not be readily apparent, a longer term perspective/approach is needed, as in donor relationship building.

### Case #4 Foundation for the Blind

Its success in part is based on a strong board with members from the Thai elite and upper class. It has a professional staff but leadership, particularly in fund raising, comes from the board. Having a long history and recognized as a respectable charitable organization, it attracts individual donors' support. The foundation keeps a donors list with whom it communicates. The board also knows how to utilize its members' respective networks. We found out that it is easier to solicit money for the blind because blindness is frightening to those who are not blind. And many people in Thailand believe that to give to the blind is like helping to prolong one's good eyesight, and this helps to promote fund raising for the foundation.

### Case #5 Foundation for Women Development

This case tells us what one should not do in fund raising. This organization operated with no long term plan nor strategies for its financial sustainability or viability. From its inception, it was dependent on a single

donor. Subsequently, few other donors helped out. Everything was carried out on an ad-hoc basis. When its intended objectives were not achieved, it could not change and adapt itself. Since the board was not very active and it did not have a staff let alone a professional manager, the organization existed in a nonproductive and ineffective manner.

### Case #6 Amateur Sports Association

This case tells us that the purportedly non-profit sector like in the field of sports, there is a subculture of how things are done which is different from other non-profit organizations. In a sports association, the chairperson is unavoidably a top level bureaucrat, a politician or a military top brass. This seems to be a sector reserved specially for them. Because sporting goods and other commercial items like sportswear are lucrative business, these companies are inevitably drawn into sponsorship for sports associations.

At times, the line between non-profit activities in the promotion of sports and for profit business ventures is unclear. The association needs to sell tickets, promote the sport, accept advertising while holding matches. These fund raising strategies may seem like regular business practices. But sports associations in Thailand not only promote particular sports, they also provide an avenue for upward social mobility for the poorer youngsters in the country.

### Case #7 Rung Arun School

From this case, we learn that investment in education for children is an area much neglected by Thai society. When an innovative school like Rung Arun came into existence as a non-profit entity, parents of the children were more than willing to help out in different ways. It represents a case of civil society in its formative and nascent stage. The use of school bonds was an innovative way of raising funds for the school in a time of economic crisis. As the school evolves, there will be more need to expand its operation. Given the mutually beneficial relationship between the school and its constituency (the parents and students), more innovative fund raising will be inevitable.

### Case #8 Suan Kaew Temple Foundation

This case shows us that religious leaders need not be detached from worldly activities. The temple's charismatic abbot not only fundraises but

creates jobs and opportunities for the poor and marginalized people in society. By actively engaging society to participate in temple projects, Phra Phayom's constituency base is quite large. He is successful not only in mobilizing resources, but also in utilizing volunteers to help him.

### Case #9 Bodin Decha Parents and Teachers Foundation

This case tells us that stake holders are the best donors. The PTA survives and thrives because it has successfully communicated its role in helping to foster a good education for its students. Also, the PTA has very effectively engaged the parents of current students, alumni of the school and ex-teachers as well as parents of alumni to become its constituency. The sense of being fellow stake holders for the same cause has made fund raising easy and effective.

### Case #10 Thai Holistic Health Foundation

From this case, we learn that to effectively raise funds, we must have a clear message. Alternative health/holistic health as opposed to western medicine is the message and mission of this foundation. Revival of folk medicine and indigenous curative/preventive medicine and medical practices struck a chord among its supporters. As proponents of organic agriculture, the foundation has a lot of potential in diversifying its products and market.

### Case #11 Thai Rural Reconstruction Movement Foundation

From this case, we learn that longevity does not necessarily mean vibrancy and good health. Although it started out with the best ideals and was a model organization to engage in rural development, the organization has gone through periods of difficulty due to political scrutiny as well as lack of leadership and good management. In terms of funding, the foundation is not poverty-stricken. It continues to receive income from services provided. To revitalize it, financial status and management need to be strengthened. More importantly, its long-term goal and mission may need to be reassessed in order to give the organization a specialized niche with competitive advantage.

## Case #12 Foundation for Slum Children

From this case, we find that not only is leadership at the board level critical to fund raising but close monitoring and supervision by the board are crucial to the success of the foundation. Fund raising is made easier by Princess Galayani's royal patronage. When she graces the foundation's fund raising events, individual donors, business corporations and other organizations are willing to help. This reflects the cultural realities of Thai society where adoration and admiration for royalties are strong. The royal presence and endorsement provide instant status and satisfaction to those who are involved.

The organization and management of its programs and activities as well as the follow-up of donors appear to be steps in the right direction for this organization which help to further its effectiveness.

## Case #13 Satee Foundation

This case tells us that holding "special events" as a fund raising method may be useful and effective. But in the long run, an organization must look for a stream of regular income. It is difficult to live from "feast" to "famine" because some special events may not yield tangible income. Hence, it is much safer to have regular income, regular savings as well as sound financial management and planning.

## Case #14 Friends of Elephants Foundation

We learn from this case that the media is a most effective tool for evoking public sentiments for a philanthropic cause. The elephants' plight as portrayed by the media and reinforced by the organization's charismatic leader who has excellent communication skills contribute to the success of its fund raising efforts.

## Case #15 Foundation for Children

From this case, we learn that a good cause needs to be packaged and presented well to the audience. This foundation has quite successfully carved a name for itself in the field of children's education and rights. Again, communication skills are crucial which the leadership could provide. Media support is also important which the foundation could solicit and manage.

Creative and innovative fund raising activities have been carried out. There is also a healthy mix between external and internal funding.

## Concluding Remarks

The cases have shown that the success and failure of CSOs are dependent on a host of factors such as leadership, the charisma of leaders, strong and committed chairperson/board members, innovative and creative ideas, staff and volunteer support, good relations with business or media, and management of a constituency, involvement of stake holders, effective public relations activities, good relations with donors, planning ahead, organizing capability, management skills, and so on.

However, the success of any one organization need not depend on all these factors. A combination of just a few factors may prove essential. A CSO that lacks good management skills may succeed fairly well with close supervision and hands-on support and assistance by the chair or members of the board in the short term, for instance. Ultimately, the cases have unveiled the possibility of raising fund in so many ways. For sustainability of an organization, sound financial planning and management are critical. ▶

## 5 | Conclusion and Recommendations

In this project, we have learned about giving behavior and fund raising behavior. Both activities are two rhymes to a verse or two sides of a coin. While giving was studied by quantitative survey research methods to learn about the perception, motivation and actual behavior of giving in Thailand, fund raising was studied through the eyes of the fund raisers. What did they have to do to merit donations? What did they need to do to solicit and receive funding support? Because both giving and soliciting for funds involve many individuals with divergent interests and background characteristics, this study also tells us many things about Thai society and Thai behavior. Some of the points from this project that we have learned are:

- 1) Thai society may exhibit outward appearances of modernity but Thai people still adhere to traditional values like showing kindness and sympathy to those in need, a solid basis to engender philanthropy.
- 2) Family and kinship are viable institutions in Thai society. Their members feel compelled to help one another in times of crises.
- 3) The patron-client structure continues to have its influence on social behavior. Hence, people in higher positions feel compelled to help their subordinates as good patrons should. Similarly, in fund raising, persons with power and authority are seen as logical fund mobilizers as they have extensive networks who will help them.
- 4) There is great potential and promise for CSOs to raise funds locally. What is needed is education, awareness raising and the right public relations strategies to give to social causes.
- 5) CSOs in Thailand will need to work on the issue of financial needs and sustainable funding in a systematic manner. As seen from some of our case studies, strategic planning and long-term planning among CSOs appear lacking. Also, each CSO needs to appraise its strengths and weaknesses as well as its core mission and activities. An organization's direc-

tion and plans of action should be supplemented by financial planning.

- 6) Relations with the public needs to be cultivated and nurtured. Good deeds that are unknown to the public cannot be appreciated by the public. CSOs must learn to improve their PR skills. They must work with their constituencies with a long-term view.
- 7) Since there is enough potential resources to be mobilized, CSOs can try to build their own constituencies for their specialized activities. In giving, one finds that although fewer persons give to education, environment, or culture, the amount given by the converted is high. Hence, niche donors should be cultivated.
- 8) As diverse and digervent as the CSOs are, funding methods should be diverse and innovative as well. There are no limits to creativity and ingenuity in fund raising methods. A CSO should try different methods and see which methods would work for it.

Finally, there are no set formulas for fund raising; each organization must explore what methods are best suited to its own conditions. The biggest mistake a CSO could make is to be passive and inactive. Trying to raise funds, even unsuccessfully, may provide valuable lessons to the organization which will help strengthen its quest in the future. ►