



Towards a Generosity Measurement Instrument (GMI)

Dr. John N. Kamau¹ Stephen Muchami² Mary M. Njau³ Nicholas Mwaura⁴
Christopher Ngugi Kariuki⁵

¹School of Business, Africa Nazarene University

²Pan African Christian University

³School of Business, Africa Nazarene University

⁴Pan African Christian University

⁵Thika Road Christian School

Corresponding author: Dr. John N. Kamau

ABSTRACT : Generosity is a widely desired practice among many groups of people. It is virtue that involves sharing of material things, skills and knowledge among others. Various instrument for measuring generosity already exist. The purpose of this study was to develop a more universal Generosity Measurement Instrument (GMI). Data was collected from a sample of 187 respondent cutting across different sectors of economy and age groups. The study employed principal components analysis (PCA) methods to determine the underlying components that constitute generosity. The method extracted eleven factors that accounted for 64% variance. The study recommends testing of the instrument in different context to ascertain its universal applicability.

KEY WORDS: Generosity, helpfulness, sacrifice, Good Samaritan, hospitality

Received 10 May 2019; Accepted 27 May, 2019 © the Author(S) 2019.

Published With Open Access At www.Questjournals.Org

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Generosity is one of outstanding virtues practiced by humanity from time immemorial. It is a value esteemed in all African communities and tribes. Batson (1991) noted that helping people who are in need is a practice encouraged in all religions. In Kenya, generosity is considered to be one of the national values others being entrepreneurial, resilience and respectfulness. Kenyans pride themselves in their giving nature, kindness and hospitality which is a common practice among different cultures and tribes. Kenyan generosity is also accorded visitors across the country whether in business or tourism (Brand Kenya Board, 2012). Kenyans will always come together to donate food, clothes and building materials especially in times of disasters. They are also known to donate land, vehicles and as good blood donors. The willingness to help and offer support to those in need coupled with the desire to improve livelihood of the poor are a common practice in the land. Among different communities in Kenya, generosity may be defined differently leading us to the question: What is generosity?

Bendor, Kramer, &Swistak, (1996) as quoted by Somerfield (2008) describes generosity as the extent to which individuals share their money and other assets. On the other hand, Van Lange, Ouwerkerk, and Tazelaar (2002) held the view that generosity is manifested in social interactions characterized by a conflict between self-interest and the interests of others. Collett J.L & Morrissey C.A (2007), view generosity as disposition of freely giving ones' time, talents, and treasure to others. These definitions show generosity as comprising a practice of sharing physical valuables, relationships as well as talent skills and, time.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature has demonstrated that a number of tools have been developed to measure generosity. Smith and Hill (2009) in a study entitled "Toward the Measurement of Interpersonal Generosity (IG): An IG Scale Conceptualized, Tested, and Validated developed an instrument that captured six components of generosity. The components include attention, compassion, openhandedness, self-extension, courage, and verbal expression. This study recommended that the instrument should be refined by incorporating other measures and also by testing in different contexts. The study further recommended use of confirmatory factor analysis to identify the other underlying components of generosity. This study will add value to the instrument by testing it in different

context (developing country, Kenya) and also apply confirmatory factor analysis. In his work entitled “The Subjective Experience of Generosity”, Somerfield (2008) identified four components of generosity that include emotional cost and burden, prosocial orientation, Narcissistic gratification and Guilt and self-accusation. The components identified through factor analysis accounted for 49.1% variance implying that a more reliable instrument was needed. The study further recommended replication of the same in different cultures and the need for generalization hence this study.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Developing a concept measurement tool requires one to understand the underlying components of the concept of interest. Factor analysis is an appropriate tool for determining underlying components within a construct. This study collected data from 187 respondents working in different sectors of Kenyan economy which also included university students and faculty. The data collection tool was an online questionnaire administered over a period of one month. Prior to data collection the instrument was discussed by a panel of experts and pretested to ascertain its validity.

IV. STUDY FINDINGS

The objective of this study was to develop an improved generosity measurement tool from the already existing tools. To achieve this, the study identified factor analysis as the most appropriate method for identifying the underlying dimensions of generosity. The study took into consideration the requirement for using factor analysis that include use of appropriate sample size, deriving variables from past research, measuring variables at interval or ratio scale, testing on correlation of the variables as well testing appropriateness of factor analysis model.

The variables included in the study were based on past research especially from previous studies on generosity measurement tools and were measured on a 5-point interval scale. The study used a sample of 187 respondents using a questionnaire with 44 variables which meets the requirements of at least four times the number of respondents to the number of variables required for reliable interpretation (Malhotra 2010). To determine the reliability of the data collected, Cronbach alpha test which is a measure of internal consistency was used. Cronbach coefficient which ranges from 0 to 1 considers a value less or equal to 0.6 as indicating unsatisfactory internal consistency reliability while higher value indicate reliability. The Cronbach’alpha value obtained from the collected data was 0.946 indicating a high level of reliability of the instrument (Table 1). Bartlet test of Sphericity results were approximate chi-square was 3683.831, df 946 and significance of 0.000 implying the variables are uncorrelated. The study further used Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy where values greater than 0.5 favor the appropriateness of factor analysis model with the value obtained in this study being 0.887 (Table 2). Upon the successful preliminary tests the study performed factor analysis using principal component analysis and varimax rotation and results are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.946	44

Table 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	Approx. Chi-Square	.887
	df	3683.831
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Sig.	.000

Table 3: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% Variance	of Cumulative %	Total	% Variance	of Cumulative %	Total	% Variance	of Cumulative %
1	13.196	29.991	29.991	13.196	29.991	29.991	5.690	12.931	12.931
2	2.478	5.633	35.624	2.478	5.633	35.624	4.105	9.331	22.262
3	2.152	4.891	40.515	2.152	4.891	40.515	3.018	6.860	29.122
4	1.658	3.767	44.283	1.658	3.767	44.283	2.661	6.048	35.170
5	1.530	3.478	47.760	1.530	3.478	47.760	2.151	4.889	40.059
6	1.361	3.092	50.853	1.361	3.092	50.853	2.142	4.867	44.926
7	1.302	2.959	53.811	1.302	2.959	53.811	2.074	4.713	49.639
8	1.268	2.881	56.693	1.268	2.881	56.693	1.887	4.288	53.927
9	1.098	2.494	59.187	1.098	2.494	59.187	1.829	4.158	58.084

10	1.066	2.422	61.609	1.066	2.422	61.609	1.437	3.265	61.349
11	1.004	2.282	63.891	1.004	2.282	63.891	1.118	2.542	63.891

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

It was the concern of this study to identify the underlying dimensions of generosity. Principal component analysis was used to determine the minimum number of factors that account for maximum variance. The 44 study variables were reduced to 11 factors whose eigenvalue was greater than 1 accounting for 63.891(64%) total variance. This value is above the recommended value of 60% and that of Somerfield (2008) which had obtained a total variance of 49.1%. This implies that the tool developed in this study achieves a greater improvement of the previous reviewed tools. Factors obtained were further subjected to rotation in order to redistribute the variance explained by the individual factors. To enhance interpretability of the factors, varimax rotation was used where factors with loading coefficients of 0.5 were used. The results presented in table 4.

Table 4: Extracted factors

	Factor Loading	Factor components	Factor name
1.	.741	Helping friends and family gives me great joy.	Helpfulness
	.728	I believe that sharing with those in need will attract a blessing	
	.623	For me, giving help to the poor is the right thing to do.	
	.618	I admire generous people	
	.590	I assist people in need irrespective of where they come from	
	.535	I reach out to help others who may not be aware of the assistance I can provide	
	.516	I enjoy helping others who are in need.	
	.499	Volunteering to help someone is very rewarding.	
	.499	I help sick people whenever an opportunity arises.	
	.487	Doing volunteer work makes me feel happy.	
	.466	I have good intentions any time I offer help.	
.463	I derive satisfaction from helping others		
2.	.689	I reach out to help others who may not be aware of it	Sacrifice
	.686	I give priority to people in need over my wants	
	.665	I go an "extra mile" to take care of those in need.	
	.549	I give to those in need, things that are of value to me	
	.528	I enjoy making sacrifice for others	
.497	I empathize with people issues		
3.	.790	I don't feel exploited when I give to others	Kindness
	.742	I don't hesitate to offer assistance when called upon	
	.711	My giving is not based on the appreciation of the recipient	
	.627	I don't get tired of offering the same support to someone	
4.	.742	I offer to others what I consider to be of value to them	Compassionate
	.572	I make effort to improve my ability to offer help	
	.492	I often put special effort on my part to help someone in need.	
5.	.752	I help strangers whenever they need my assistance	Good Samaritan
	.635	I give directions to strangers who are lost	
6.	.619	My immediate family attest to my generosity	Hospitality
	.598	People acknowledge that I reach out to others	
	.526	I spare time for my loved ones who are in need	
7.	.709	I take it as my responsibility to help the elderly	Charitable
	.595	I always give my time to charity work	
8.	.734	I feel uncomfortable when my help does not resolve the problem	altruism
	.566	I give to enhance a more equitable society.	
	.452	I feel good assisting someone in trouble.	
9.	.674	I don't hang onto grudges when someone I care about does something that hurts me.	Kind hearted
	.471	I encourage children to help others.	
10.	.656	I contribute to social and medical programs not necessarily to benefit me	Selflessness
11.	.480	I consider it better to give than to receive help	Magnanimous

V. DISCUSSION

The result from factor analysis produced 11 underlying components of generosity; helpfulness, sacrifice, kindness, extra effort, good Samaritan, hospitality, charitable, altruism, kind hearted, selflessness and bountiful. Each of the factors is discussed

Helping others was identified as the strongest factor underlying generosity accounting for approximately 13%. Practices of helping others derive joy and satisfaction to the giver and admiration from

others. A generous person seizes opportunity to share and reach out to those in need irrespective of who they are or where they come from. A generous person believes that helping others is the right thing to do and does it with good intentions whatever other people may think. To generous person, the act of helping goes beyond the family members to even those who may not be aware of the assistance offered. This act is self-rewarding, brings a feeling of happiness and is believed to attract a blessing. In assessing generosity, the instrument must put the greatest weight on the component of helping.

Sacrifice was the second strongest underlying factor of generosity accounting for 9.3% variance. Sacrifice is explained by practices such as reaching out to those in need as well as prioritizing their needs over my own. Sacrifice also considers the issue of going an extra mile to support other people. It also involves giving out things of great value and ability to empathize with people situations. This study therefore holds the view that a generous person makes sacrifice to address issues of others.

Another strong underlying factor is kindness as it accounted for 6.8% variance. A generous person demonstrates readiness and consistency in helping others without a feeling of being exploited. In practicing generosity the person does not necessarily expect praise in return from those supported or any other people. Generosity is a practice that calls for extra effort towards offering support to others, a factor that explained 6% variance. A generous person normally evaluates the impact the assistance will have on the needy person and continuously makes effort to improve the quality of giving.

Another aspect of generosity is the act of the Good Samaritan. A generous person naturally is able to reach out to even those he may not know. The person helps strangers and is willing to listen to them with a desire to assist. The study further revealed that generosity practices hospitality. People close to generous person attest and appreciate this virtue as it is demonstrated in their day to day life. Generous people do not only give material things but also offer their time and skills willingly.

Generosity goes beyond helping individuals to offering support to groups and organizations. Generous people offer charitable donations to organizations, elderly people and the underprivileged in the society. Altruism was also identified as a significant factor of generosity. Altruism is demonstrated when one act to promote others welfare, even at a risk or cost to himself. It is an internal feeling reflected through acts of kindness and care. A generous person expresses strong discontentment with inequality in the society and is ready to deprive himself of some things to bring fairness among people. The person is dissatisfied when there is a need and he is not in a position to offer help but derives joy in relieving people of their problem.

A generous person is kindhearted. The person is not easily offended, is willing not only to forgive but also to resolve issues with others and encourages others including children to develop the virtue. Among other factor of generosity are selflessness and magnanimous with a strong belief that it is better to give than to receive.

The study concludes that generosity is a strong virtue with many underlying factors. The instrument developed captured eleven factors of generosity which explain 64% variance. It is so far the strongest instrument and can easily be administered to assess the level of generosity among individuals. The study recommends that the instrument be tested to assess its effectiveness in measuring generosity among groups of people and organizations.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Batson, C. (1991). *The altruism question: towards a social-psychological answer*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [2]. Brand Kenya Board, 2012 available at: [http://brandkenya.go.ke/brand-kenya/files/Annual%20Reports/Annual_Report_2009-2012\(1\).pdf](http://brandkenya.go.ke/brand-kenya/files/Annual%20Reports/Annual_Report_2009-2012(1).pdf)
- [3]. Smith C. & Hill J.P (2009). Toward the Measurement of Interpersonal Generosity (IG): An IG Scale Conceptualized, Tested, and Validated. <https://generosityresearch.nd.edu/assets/13798/ig>
- [4]. Van Lange, P. A. M., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Tazelaar, M. J. A. (2002). How to overcome the detrimental effects of noise in social interaction: The benefits of generosity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 768-780.
- [5]. Bendor, J., Kramer, R. M., & Swistak, P. (1996). Cooperation under uncertainty: What is new, what is true, and what is important. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 333-338.
- [6]. Collett J.L & Morrissey C.A (2007). *The social psychology of generosity: The state of current Interdisciplinary research*. Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame
- [7]. Sommerfeld E. (2008) *The Subjective Experience of Generosity*: available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.498.1513&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [8]. Smith C. & Hill J.P (2009). Toward the Measurement of Interpersonal Generosity (IG): An IG Scale Conceptualized, Tested, and Validated. <https://generosityresearch.nd.edu/assets/13798/ig>
- [9]. Sommerfeld E. (2008) *The Subjective Experience of Generosity* : available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.498.1513&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [10]. Havens J.J & Schervish, P.G (2005) *Geography and Generosity: Boston and Beyond*, The Boston Foundation

Dr. John N. Kamau" Towards a Generosity Measurement Instrument (GMI)" *Quest Journals Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 07, no. 5, 2019, pp. 31-34