



UNIVERSITÀ
CATTOLICA
del Sacro Cuore

CRC - CENTRO RICERCHE SULLA COOPERAZIONE
E SUL NONPROFIT

WORKING PAPER N. 14

**Making Grants, but to serve what purpose?
An Analysis of Trust and Foundation Support
for Women in the UK**

Siobhan Daly

VP VITA E PENSIERO

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

CRC - CENTRO RICERCHE SULLA COOPERAZIONE
E SUL NONPROFIT

WORKING PAPER N. 14

**Making Grants, but to serve what purpose?
An Analysis of Trust and Foundation Support
for Women in the UK**

Siobhan Daly

VP VITA E PENSIERO

Siobhan Daly, Department of Social Sciences and Languages, Northumbria University, United Kingdom; Siobhan.daly@northumbria.ac.uk

✉ coop.ricerche@unicatt.it

www.vitaepensiero.it

All rights reserved. Photocopies for personal use of the reader, not exceeding 15% of each volume, may be made under the payment of a copying fee to the SIAE, in accordance with the provisions of the law n. 633 of 22 april 1941 (art. 68, par. 4 and 5). Reproductions which are not intended for personal use may be only made with the written permission of CLEARedi, Centro Licenze e Autorizzazioni per le Riproduzioni Editoriali, Corso di Porta Romana 108, 20122 Milano, e-mail: autorizzazioni@clearedi.org, web site www.clearedi.org.

Le fotocopie per uso personale del lettore possono essere effettuate nei limiti del 15% di ciascun volume dietro pagamento alla SIAE del compenso previsto dall'art. 68, commi 4 e 5, della legge 22 aprile 1941 n. 633.

Le fotocopie effettuate per finalità di carattere professionale, economico o commerciale o comunque per uso diverso da quello personale possono essere effettuate a seguito di specifica autorizzazione rilasciata da CLEARedi, Centro Licenze e Autorizzazioni per le Riproduzioni Editoriali, Corso di Porta Romana 108, 20122 Milano, e-mail: autorizzazioni@clearedi.org e sito web www.clearedi.org

© 2014 Siobhan Daly
ISBN 978-88-343-2839-2

Research support was provided by a grant from the *International Research in Philanthropy Awards* (IRPAs) of Italy. IRPAs is a joint initiative of the *Centro di Ricerche sulla Cooperazione e sul Nonprofit* (CRC) of the Catholic University of Milano (Italy) and the *Dipartimento di scienze economico-sociali e matematico-statistiche* of the University of Torino (Italy).

An earlier version of this article has been presented and discussed at the Fourth Workshop on Foundations, Catholic University of Milano, October 7–8, 2013. I thank Paola Profeta for helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft. All errors are my own.

INDICE

1. Introduction	pag. 5
2. Women and Philanthropy: an Overview	9
3. Women and Philanthropy: a UK perspective	14
4. Grant Making and Foundations	21
5. Foundations and grant making in the UK	26
6. Findings	31
7. Discussion	38
8. Conclusion	42
References	45

Abstract

There are two key dimensions to women's philanthropy: (i) engagement by women in philanthropy, potentially but not exclusively for the support of other women and girls; and (ii) philanthropic support for women, including individuals and women's groups and organisations, particularly from philanthropic foundations. In the UK, despite the widespread interest and attention that philanthropy has received in recent years, there remains a substantial gap in our understanding of the relationship between women and philanthropy. In particular, this paper argues that the need to enhance our understanding of philanthropic support for women, especially from foundations, has taken on a renewed urgency in a challenging and increasingly competitive funding environment. It presents the analysis of grants made to women's groups and organisations by 26 foundations in England. In this way, the paper also seeks to address a gap in our understanding of foundation giving to particular sectors, in this case the women's voluntary and community sector in the UK.

JEL codes: *Z18 Z19*

Keywords: Women, Philanthropy, Grantmaking, Trusts and Foundations

1. Introduction

Historical studies of philanthropy are replete with prominent female philanthropic figures such as Jane Addams and accounts of a range of charitable societies and organisations founded and run by women. Philanthropic action created opportunities for women to establish and operate within ‘parallel power structures’ (McCarthy 1990; 2001). This was instrumental in shaping civil society in different countries as well as, more specifically, being instrumental in the development of nineteenth century feminism (Phillips, 2002). There are also examples of foundations supporting, if not directly influencing the development of feminism itself. For example, Mittelstadt (2008) analyses the role of the Field Foundation in funding African American women’s groups, and influencing the second wave of feminism more broadly. Johnson (1977) provides an account of the philanthropic support given by one wealthy female philanthropist, Katherine Dexter McCormick, to the development of the oral contraceptive pill. In recent years, the importance of female role models is still pertinent, though perhaps more controversial in an era of celebrity philanthropy and ‘charitainment’ (Mooney Nickel and Eikenberry, 2009). Studies of grant making, based mainly on the American experience also underline how foundations support women’s organising (Goss, 2007).

The feminisation thesis is often used to encompass a range of different ways that women have come to influence, shape and, in

terms of presence or numbers, even feature more prominently in certain areas (for example, in higher education in the UK since the 1960s, see Leathwood and Read, 2009). Similarly, this paper proposes that broadly speaking, the feminisation of philanthropy clusters around two key dimensions: (i) engagement by women in philanthropy, potentially but not exclusively for the support of other women and girls; and (ii) philanthropic support for women, including individuals and women's groups and organisations, particularly from philanthropic foundations. Both of these dimensions are inter-linked: the analysis of the latter has potentially much to tell us about women using philanthropy, especially foundations to support other women.

In the UK, there is a strong rationale for the investigation of both of these aspects of women's philanthropy. Notwithstanding some important historical studies (Prochaska, 1980) and other commentaries (Baxter, ed., 2008), there is a gap in our understanding of the relationship between women and philanthropy. This is despite the attention that philanthropy has received in policy circles. The cultivation of philanthropy has been championed by governments, including the present Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Government, notably as part of the Big Society programme (Cabinet Office, 2010a; 2010b; 2011). In addition, the promulgation of ideas and initiatives to broaden the range of people and organisations engaged in philanthropy has been led by a variety of actors from think tanks, to intermediaries to private banks (Davies and Mitchell,

2008; John et al., 2007; Heady, 2010a; 2010b; Barclays Wealth, 2009a; 2009b).

In the UK, the second dimension of the feminisation of philanthropy, philanthropic support for women, especially from foundations, has taken on a renewed urgency in the current public sector environment. The women's sector has experienced persistent funding shortages and women's issues have not received sufficient attention by policymakers (Soteri, 2001; Hodgson, 2004; Davis and Cooke, 2002, cited in WRC, 2006). In recent years, cuts in public sector funding have had a particularly negative effect on women's voluntary groups and organisations which have been compounded by a decline in charitable giving to this area of the voluntary and community sector and increased competition for grants from charitable foundations (Heady, Kall and Yeowart, 2009; Stephenson, 2011; WRC, 2011). The argument being made here is not that philanthropic foundations should step in where the government has withdrawn to address gaps in public sector funding. Rather, the point is to emphasise that in terms of the relationship between philanthropy and women, in this case, the women's voluntary sector, we know little of how foundations support and engage with women's groups and organisations in the UK. This has the potential to obfuscate important insights into the feminisation of philanthropy. Much of what is of concern here can be expressed from the perspective of resource dependence theory, which draws attention to how the social

and political environment in which an organisation operates affects its internal organisation and operation (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978, cited in Delfin and Tang, 2007, p. 2169). In relation to funding, Heimovics et al (1993, pp. 420-421) argue that non-profit organisations in the USA altered their programmes and approaches to obtaining funding in response to changes in the political funding environment. Yet, the notion of resource dependence applies as much to foundations as it does to grant recipients as the former are dependent on the latter to ensure that their philanthropic goals are accomplished (Delfin and Tang, 2007, p. 2170). Foundation policies and approaches to grant making may also be shaped by the external social and political environment.

Against this background, this paper will proceed as follows. First, it reviews the extent of our existing knowledge of women and philanthropy, focusing specifically on the UK as part of this review. Second, it examines different approaches to the analysis of grant making and their potential to inform how we examine grant giving. Having then provided an overview of foundations and grant making in the UK, the focus turns to the present study. The approach and findings, which resulted from the analysis of grants made to women's groups and organisations by 26 foundations in England is presented. The article concludes with a discussion of these findings and a consideration of what these findings have to tell us about the second dimension of the feminisation of philanthropy; how

philanthropy and philanthropic foundations specifically are supporting women (and girls).

2. Women and Philanthropy: an Overview

In recent years, the global development of women's philanthropy, particularly the creation of women's funds in different countries and the promotional activity of initiatives such as the International Network of Women's Funds (INWF) and the Women's Funding Network has popularised both the philanthropic activity of women donors and the funding which is available to support women in a variety of situations. As stated above, this paper suggests that this type of activity is illustrative of the feminisation of philanthropy, but the relationship between feminism and philanthropy remains ambiguous, if not contentious. Indeed, this perhaps reflects the ambiguous relationship between gender and civil society more broadly, where feminist scholarship does not draw upon civil society as 'a significant organising category' (Phillips, 2002, p. 72) and the relationship between gender and civil society has largely been under-theorised (Howell, 2007).

www.inwf.org is aligned to the promotion of philanthropy 'with a feminist perspective' and this is underpinned by a core mission and values which advocate an approach based on equal partnership

between network donors, grantees and advisors; a commitment to diversity in funding sources and governance, as well as flexibility, generosity and openness to new ideas and practices. Its membership comprises 46 women's funds in different stages of development located throughout the world. Some of the more well known funds, such as MamaCash have been the subject of analysis (Ploumen, 2001). The Women's Funding Network's (www.womensfundingnetwork.org) mission states that it is 'a movement for social justice' which seeks to 'accelerate women's leadership and invest in solving critical social issues from poverty to global security by bringing together the financial power, influence and voices of women's funds.' It seeks to "re-imagine" philanthropy in a similar way to INWF. In particular, underlining the commitment of women's funds to social change, the emphasis is placed on members pursuing a rounded approach to philanthropy which involves more than grant making and partnership with other stakeholders (Foundation Center/WFN, 2009, PP. 23-27).

The global context is important as it draws attention to the extent to which the organisations that sit under the umbrella of INWF and WFN belong to the social movement that forms the global women's movement (Brilliant, 2000, p. 556). This, in itself, poses a number of dilemmas and tensions, notably for the (formal) social movement organisations that have to balance their enthusiasm for the social change goals they seek to achieve with the demands of running a formal organisation, and in this case, the pursuit of funding (ibid.). In

many respects, this type of situation typifies the ‘double militancy’ of women’s movements, that is, ‘the location of activist women in two political venues, with participatory, collective identity and ideological commitments to both’ (Beckwith, 2000, p. 442). Specifically, in relation to funding, this may involve a scenario where prospects for fundraising success for feminist activities and events are heightened where feminists work in non-feminist funding organisations. This may extend to feminist groups deciding to re-organise their activities to increase their funding appeal (della Porta, 2000, cited in Beckwith, 2000, p. 445). In relation to the WFN, for example, the founders decided upon a focus on woman and diversity, over a clear espousal of a feminist ideology to avoid potential conflicts and to place their emphasis on the mobilisation of funds to empower women (and girls) (Brilliant, 2000, p. 558). However, there is also evidence of how women’s funding organisations develop strategies which allow them to challenge or at the very least ‘moderate’ dominant, hierarchical relationship patterns between funder and grantee, which is typical of philanthropy but anathema to feminist organising. In this way, their practice aligns with a more ‘feminist philanthropic practice’ (Ostrander 2004 on the Boston Women’s Fund).

Overall, much of what we know about women and philanthropy is concerned with how and why women engage in philanthropic giving and it is largely based on the American experience. Since the 1970s,

in the United States increases in women's personal wealth; their influence in the corporate world and higher levels of educational attainment are believed to correlate with an increased interest by women in philanthropic giving and in the targeting of women by fundraisers (Shaw-Hardy, 2005). Women's philanthropy in the United States is also underpinned by a strong infrastructural base that includes Women and Philanthropy; the Women's Funding Network, mentioned above, and the National Network of Women as Philanthropists. (Shaw-Hardy, 2005). This base is actively engaged in the promotion of philanthropy for and by women (for example, Shaw-Hardy and Taylor, 2010; Clift, ed., 2005; Women's Philanthropy Institute, 2009). These organisations and, more specifically, the leaders within them, in conjunction with leading academics, have produced or contributed to a number of initiatives and publications which seek to enhance our understanding of how and why women engage in philanthropy. Some of the key findings suggest that women engage in philanthropic giving in a variety of ways such as women's giving circles, women's funds, initiatives led by non-profits at a national level and donor advised funds in community foundations (Women's Philanthropy Institute, 2009). There is also some evidence that women prefer to give as part of a group or circle of donors; that they are particularly open to negotiating innovative relationships between funder and grantee and often have a preference for supporting women and girls (Moore and

Philbin, 2005; Shaw-Hardy, 2005, p. 19; Ostrander, 2004; Otis and Jankowski, 2005, pp. 166- 172).

This body of work is underpinned by a burgeoning literature on the relationship between gender and philanthropic giving. This literature is diverse and lacking in coherence (Piper and Schnepf, 2008, p. 105). However, it has provided important insights into the personal motivations, giving styles and causes preferred by female donors (for example, Gutner, 2000; Marx, 2000; Newman, 1996; Ben-Ner et al., 2003; Piper and Schnepf, 2008; Kossatz, 2004; Low et al., 2007, pp. 82-83; p. 103; p. 108; Belfield and Beney, 2000). It has also drawn attention to the particular influence women can exert over giving in different contexts, from decision makers within households to members of a corporate board (Rooney et al., 2007; Andreoni et al., 2003; Wieping and Bekkers, 2005). Williams (2003) argues that firms which have a higher number of women on their boards are likely to be more active in relation to charitable giving, particularly to community service and the arts, than those who have a lower number of female board members. Studies such as this one are likely to become more important as figures from other analyses suggest that a good proportion of new foundations (23 per cent of those which granted more than \$2.1 billion in 2004) have female chief executives or both a female chief executive and a board which also involves women in a key decision making role (Otis and Jankowski, 2005,p. 163-164). Moreover, it is estimated that women, either by themselves

or as part of a family estate, have given more than \$3bn in establishing or giving money to the new foundations that formed part of this latter study (ibid.).

3. Women and Philanthropy: a UK perspective

Historically, women have been stalwart figures in the world of philanthropy in the UK and there is a long, if sometimes controversial tradition of women being supported by philanthropic efforts (for example, Ross, 1990; Prochaska, 1980). In more recent years, the engagement of high-profile women in philanthropy, such as (the late) Anita Roddick, J.K. Rowling and Dame Stephanie Shirley has generated popular interest in philanthropic giving by women. The Sunday Times Giving List which ranks the most generous givers in Britain has recorded an increased presence for women donors. There is some evidence, presented in the form of vignettes, of women working innovatively and collaboratively to support charitable causes (many of which are focused on aiding women and girls) through giving circles, corporate-based networks and charitable funds and foundations (Baxter, ed., 2008). More formally, in response to women expressing a preference for giving as part of a group, international non-governmental organisations such as the Red Cross have sought to create opportunities for ‘women-only’ giving with the establishment of the Tiffany Circle (Youde, 2012). The first UK-wide women’s fund, ROSA was established in 2008. It

is a member of the WFN discussed above and its creation was influenced by the growth of women's funds elsewhere in the world (Table 1). Women's funds can also be found in some community foundations which serve particular areas of the United Kingdom (for example, the Community Foundation for Tyne and Wear and Northumberland). Professional networks of women also provide opportunities for women to engage in philanthropy, sometimes but not always in support of other women and girls. Significantly, some of the first women's professional associations that were founded in the UK served as vehicles for philanthropic and other civic activities, rather than being used for the professional advancement of women as such (McCarthy, 2004, pp. 31-32). Modern day networks serve both expressive and instrumental functions; acting as a source of friendship and networking, as well as career advancement (Coleman, 2008; McCarthy, 2004). Philanthropic fundraising is now an established part of some of these networks, such as 100 Women in Hedge Funds and the City Women's Network (Table 1). Women's associations also provide a platform for charitable giving. The members of the Federation of International Women's Associations in London (FIWAL), for example, illustrates how diaspora networks can generate opportunities for philanthropic engagement (Table 1). The role of women in establishing foundations appears to be mainly embedded in family philanthropy. The Association of Charitable Foundations (ACF) is the principal representative body for

foundations in the UK. Fewer than half of its member foundations have been founded by women (I estimate the number to be about 11), though there is some evidence of women acting as founding donors as part of a family foundation. This in itself may be significant as philanthropic advisors report that women are increasingly playing more prominent decision-making roles in relation to their family's philanthropy (MacKenzie, 2008). Yet, we still lack an understanding of the extent, nature and influence of women over family philanthropy in the UK, particularly regarding the establishment of foundations. Moreover, the Charity Commission does not retain information on how many foundations are established by male or female donors, nor, indeed, are all foundations members of the ACF.

Table 1 - Women's Philanthropy in the UK: an Overview

ROSA

The first UK-wide women's fund, ROSA was established in 2008. It is a member of the Women's Funding Network. In part, the rationale for setting up ROSA lay in observations about the extent to which the work of the women's sector does not get adequate recognition or funding (Baxter, 2008). The fund has a number of core priority areas and supports projects which advance equality and justice for women and girls in these areas: economic justice, health and well-being; leadership and representation, and safety. In 2011, ROSA made its

largest round of grants to date (£100,000) from its Challenge Fund. Commensurate with the broader values and philosophies espoused by the WFN, ROSA envisions a reciprocal, multi-dimensional relationship with its donors, beneficiaries and supporters, as well as aspiring towards involving a wider range of stakeholders in funding decisions. Moreover, beyond grant making, it is involved in partnerships with other stakeholders (trusts and foundations, individual philanthropists) on issues such as female genital mutilation.

City Women's Network

The City Women's Network (CWN), a network for senior professional women in the City and the UK, is an example of a professional network with a philanthropic arm in the form of its charitable committee, which is made up of a number of its members. The charity committee is tasked with the organisation of the selection of CWN's 'Charity of the Year' and fund raising events such as the Gala Dinner. The selection process is rigorous: the charity's focus must align with the ethos of CWN; the opportunity for CWN members to assist with the charity's growth is also important, in particular the identification of opportunities for CWN members to contribute in non-financial as well as financial ways. In 2013, its Charity of the Year was the Microloan Foundation.

100 Women in Hedge Funds

100 Women in Hedge Funds is a global association whose membership is comprised of professional women in alternative investments. Since 2006, London has had its own Board of Directors and Executive Committee, following the incorporation of 100 Women in Hedge Funds, Ltd. Philanthropy is a core area of activity for the global association. Similar to CFN, each year one or two charities are selected by the Board of Directors to receive support from the association. Again, charities are selected based on specific criteria and their alignment with the priority areas of women's health, mentoring and education. A series of fund raising events, including an annual gala are held throughout the year for the charity.

Federation of International Women's Associations

The Federation of International Women's Associations in London (FIWAL) has over 30 members, most of which are engaged in fund raising activities. The fund raising activities of these organisations vary according to whether the fundraising has a local, national or international focus. Although some organisations have a formal charitable arm and/or links to international charitable initiatives or organisations, it is mainly the case that fund raising activities are organised and carried out by volunteer members from the organisations themselves. A number of organisations also underline the role of their members as volunteers too.

The Tiffany Circle

The Tiffany Circle is a women's giving circle established by the Red Cross in the UK, following the success of a similar initiative in the US. Members give £5,000 annually to be part of the giving circle but they decide which Red Cross projects or initiatives receive the funding. The giving circle offers women opportunities for networking, events, and socialising, as well as being a forum for the giving of time and money.

Websites:

Tiffany Circle: <http://www.redcross.org.uk/Donate-Now/Make-a-major-donation/Tiffany-Circle>

ROSA: <http://www.rosauk.org/>

100 Women in Hedge Funds: <http://www.100womeninhedgefunds.org/pages/index.php>

City Women's Network: <http://www.citywomen.org/>

From the perspective of the feminisation of philanthropy, there are historical similarities to be drawn between the US and the UK in terms of the role of women and philanthropy shaping civil society (Scott, 1990; Ross, 1990). However, in more recent decades, the trajectories of women's philanthropy are the subject of much contrast. Most notably, the UK is lacking in the infrastructure that has been so instrumental in the US in shaping discourses around women's philanthropy, and how it relates to feminism, social justice and the global women's movement. This is underpinned by a dearth of research on women's philanthropy and, despite the emergence of some role models, champions who give a sense of vision of what women's philanthropy has the potential to achieve. In her work on women's networks, McCarthy (2004, pp. 92-94) articulates three stages to women's networks: survival, support and voice. This is the challenge facing women's philanthropy in the UK: to cement the stage of support, where the emphasis is on the development and support for women and then to evolve to the stage of voice, where the focus turns to what the network can do beyond supporting individuals to giving support to issues beyond the network. Whilst there are some innovative examples of how women are engaging in philanthropy (Table 1), it is difficult to ignore the dominant presence of foundations in the British philanthropic landscape. Thus, as the feminisation of philanthropy is about women's engagement in philanthropy and how women are supported by philanthropy, the

question arises as to how foundations as stalwarts of British philanthropy are engaged in supporting women? There is a gap in our understanding of what foundations do, and have the potential to do, to support women in the UK. This paper seeks to begin to address this gap via an analysis of the grant making activities of foundations which support women as a category of beneficiary.

4. Grant Making and Foundations

Broadly speaking, studies of grant making tend to fall into one of the following three categories. First, the influence philanthropic foundations have exerted over social movements and more specifically, civil society organisations and groups can be discerned in the body of literature on social movement philanthropy. This refers to foundation support for grassroots activities and groups, including women as well as ‘social movement projects’, which was particularly prominent in the 1950s and 1960s (Jenkins and Halcli, 1999, p. 230). The influence of social movement philanthropy has been assessed from three main perspectives. First, the roots of ‘channeling theory’ can be found in a study which showed that foundations tend to prefer to support professional social movement organisations over grassroots and protest groups (Jenkins and Eckert, 1986). From the perspective of ‘channeling theory’ (Jenkins, 1998; Jenkins and Eckert, 1986; Jenkins and Halcli, 1999), scholars posit

that foundation support tends to result in the professionalisation of grassroots groups. This has the effect, in turn, of directing (though not co-opting) the efforts of these organisations through conventional or institutionalised channels and away from other less conventional forms of social activism. It is argued that foundation support had this effect on the women's movement (Jenkins and Halcli, 1999, p. 243). Critics of foundations argue that social movement philanthropy seeks to exert and maintain a form of 'social control' over the social movement organisations that they support (Haines, 1988; McAdam, 1982; see Jenkins and Halcli, 1999, p. 243). In her critique of the liberal foundations, Roelefs argues that through their grant making and the provision of technical assistance to grassroots groups, they have been able to de-radicalise parts of civil society as they have sought to 'co-opt' the goals of their beneficiaries (Roelefs, 2004; see McCarthy, 2004, p. 253). These two perspectives represent the polarisation of debates about the broader social purposes of philanthropic foundations (Nielsen, 1972; Karl and Katz, 1981). Studies within the social relations perspective represent a middle course and have examined cases of where foundations funding grassroots groups have sought to involve grantees in key decision making roles (McCarthy, 2004; Ostrander and Schervish, 1990). These practices are viewed to be fundamental to improving the accountability of foundations to their grantees and to making

philanthropy a more open and democratic or at least, less hierarchical process.

Second, there have been studies of grants to particular areas such as the environment or women, informed by a variety of different theoretical perspectives. From the perspective of critical or elite theory mentioned above, foundation grant making tends to favour mainstream environmental NGOs who do not pursue radical agendas or challenge the position of elites, be they policymakers, industrialists or foundations (Dowie, 2001). Linked to this, grant making is viewed as a way that foundations exercise influence over or co-opt NGOs, such as environmental NGOs, to the detriment of their independence (ibid., Roelefs, 2004). Drawing upon pluralist theory and resource dependence theory, underpinned by the analysis of grants by Southern Californian foundations to environmental NGOs, Delfin and Tang (2007) challenge these assertions, finding much broader patterns of giving than that suggested by elite theory, even in a context where mainstream NGOs tend to attract higher mean grants in some areas where they have shown themselves to be particularly competent. Moreover, the dependency of NGOs on foundation grants is attributed to a range of factors that provide a more nuanced understanding of the extent and nature of resource dependency. As outlined above, co-optation is believed to be central to capturing the role of foundations in relation to the women's movement. Goss (2007) argues that through their grant making

agendas, foundations ‘helped re-orient women’s issue priorities.’ They also fostered and gave legitimacy to the range of women’s identities that became characteristic of the women’s movement.

Finally, studies use the analysis of, or reflection on grant making activity (sometimes in conjunction with the analysis of foundation missions or programme objectives) to examine wider trends or changes in foundation activity. For example, Leat (2009b, p. 67) considers how the challenges posed by the political, economic and social environment in recent years have led foundations in Anglophone countries to question existing patterns of grant making as part of a wider re-assessment of their roles in societies. However, the adoption of alternative approaches, such as a structural change approach, or ‘social change’ or ‘social justice’ grant making offers neither a clear model nor opportunities for real innovation by foundations in relation to their grant making (ibid.). Suarez (2012) considers the likelihood of foundations acting as ‘institutional entrepreneurs’ within the field of philanthropy via their adoption of a social justice discourse. As institutional entrepreneurs, foundations have the potential to challenge conventional approaches and priorities taken by foundations, including in relation to their grant making and, ultimately, to transform the whole nature of philanthropy itself. Whilst smaller, younger and public foundations, as well as those with an international and rights-based focus are likely to adopt an explicit social justice orientation in their

24

programmes, others prefer to approach this ‘quietly’, often more mindful of historical conflicts and additional environmental constraints. There is also a gendered dimension to this strand of grant making analysis. Ackerly (2009) challenges conventional ‘measurable-product oriented’ approaches to programme evaluation by grant makers in favour of drawing upon feminist theory to prompt donors to think about the ‘second order’ as well as the ‘first order’ effects of their grant making programmes. In evaluating the extent to which progress is being made towards the achievement of social change objectives, she also underlines that this cannot be assessed through the evaluation of a single organisation, but rather a portfolio of organisations. This would entail the adoption of a different approach to the evaluation of grant making:

[W]e would assess grant making to social change organisations, not on how much a donor’s grantees are able to do (which may be a measure of program design , administrative effectiveness, or difficult contexts), but rather on how good the donor is at identifying grantees with ideas that are appropriate to their problems and contexts. Standards of achievement that are determined on a case-by-case basis during normal program operations become a resource through this evaluation of grant making itself. For example, it is especially important to recognise ideas that can increase our understanding of the challenges to and opportunities for promoting global gender

justice. By analysing a portfolio, we can determine what organisations find when they analyse their problems and contexts well. The knowledge can feedback into the grant-making organisation's process (Ackerly, 2009, p. 192).

Each of these different approaches to the study of grant making provides an opportunity to consider the practice of giving grants from a different perspective, ranging from an effort to theorise the broad impact of foundation giving on civil society, to considering the role of foundations in shaping particular areas such as the environment, to prompting a fundamental reconsideration of what grant making achieves and the goals that drive it. As such, they can inform the analysis and discussion of grant making practice amongst foundations in the UK.

5. Foundations and grant making in the UK

In Britain, the term 'foundation' is popularly associated with independently endowed charitable grant-making bodies, though this term and that of the 'trust' is also popularly associated with fundraising grant makers (Leat, 2007, p. 96; Leat, 2001, p. 268). Although foundations have long existed in the UK (Leat, 2001, pp. 269-270; Leat 2007, p. 97-98), the study of foundations is a rather new phenomenon. British foundations have not been subject to the

same level of criticism or controversy as their American counterparts (for example, see Karl and Katz, 1981). Moreover, as some of those who have led the way in this area of research have noted, many foundations were at best wary and, at worst, resistant to any form of scrutiny, be it from researchers or the Charity Commission (Leat, 2007, p. 96; p. 98; Leat, 2001, p. 125; Leat, 1995, p. 318). Pressures for foundations to be more transparent and accountable and to have better standards of governance, have led to the publication of a plethora of practical guides on how foundations can meet these demands and how those seeking funding can access and target foundations. Beyond these types of publication, the study of foundations falls into three principal categories: data gathering and analysis; debate about the current and future roles of British foundations; and a dominant focus on endowed, grant-making foundations, to the near exclusion of the analysis of the variety of different types of foundations which exist in the UK.

First, our understanding of foundations in the UK has been improved by the availability of data which maps key activities, levels of giving and the size of endowments. For example, this includes the study of family foundation philanthropy (Pharoah 2009(a); 2009(b); 2008) and the activities of high net worth donors (Breeze, 2010; 2011). Second, more questions are being asked about the purposes foundations serve in modern Britain. Debates about roles and purposes foundations serve raise fundamental questions about how

foundations legitimise their presence and activities (Anheier and Daly, 2007). Anheier and Leat (2002) note that the British state has been, at the very least tolerant and, at best, welcoming of foundations but no government has sought to lead or encourage debate about their weaknesses in any great depth. By far the most common role that foundations have traditionally assumed is that of complementing the role of government and other bodies. In practice, for foundations in Britain and, indeed, their European counterparts, this has involved a mix of “doing what the state doesn’t do” and “filling gaps” in funding for services and activities (Leat, 2007; Anheier and Daly, 2007). Studies of grant making practices are rare but those that have been carried out suggest that most foundations have tended to act as ‘gift givers’ rather than as entrepreneurial leaders in particular fields (Leat, 1995, p. 321; Leat, 1992). Recently, however, more critical analysts of foundation roles have called on these institutions to demonstrate innovative and “creative” behaviour in twenty-first century Britain (Anheier and Leat, 2002; 2006). The “creative” foundation seeks to be a leader in the field; does not shy away from being a risk-taker but one which functions on the basis of a solid knowledge base and good governance. Anheier and Leat (2002) assert that foundations should be using their independence and lack of accountability to play more effective and ground-breaking roles in modern British society and, in particular to question the status quo in a variety of areas. Of course, what it means to be ‘effective’ is also

the subject of reflection (Cutler, 2009). The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust is one of a number of foundations that has served as a case study of how foundations can be more creative, for example, in bringing about policy change (Leat, 2005; Davies, 2004).

Notwithstanding this and some other exceptions to the rule, as Leat (2001) argues, foundations have been more reactive than proactive in relation to the policy environment. The scale and type of funding requested of them has been largely shaped by the evolution of the scale and nature of government funding. More specifically, cuts in government spending in certain areas combined with a broader change in the terms and conditions attached to funding from the government had an impact on the number and type of requests for funding being received by foundations (ibid., pp. 126-129; Harker and Burkemann, 2005, p. 16). Furthermore, in recent years, foundations have had to consider how to best respond to the economic downturn. Foundations report the preoccupation of their boards of trustees with the strategic (and secure) management of investments, operations and grantmaking in difficult economic times. The situation also pushes certain issues to the fore of foundations' agendas, notably how to avoid stifling innovation amongst beneficiaries/projects whilst addressing the need to be cautious in making grants and exploring a broader repertoire of approaches to investment (Leat 2009a). The nature of the funding which trusts and foundations provide is also the subject of discussion: for instance, the

extent to which they should provide more core/unrestricted/operating support for the organisations that they fund, particularly in the current environment (Institute for Philanthropy, 2009). Other research has brought to the fore, and perhaps even encouraged, some introspective analysis amongst leading foundation representatives (Harker and Burkemann, 2005). This report underlines the prevalence of three main discourses amongst those who participated in the study (a mix of those employed by foundations and independent consultants/thinkers): those who seek to encourage more giving amongst the wealthy; those who wish to see improvements made to how money is given away and, finally, those who wish to see a more pronounced focus on grant making better serving principles of social justice. The prevalence of different discourses underlines the diversity of foundations across the UK. What is more, the diverse nature of, and the different types of foundations that exist across the UK are attracting greater interest from scholars, including community foundations and limited life trusts and foundations (Daly, 2008; Institute for Philanthropy, 2010). This will help to counter the dominant focus on large endowed, grant making foundations.

In relation to foundations in the UK, there is a juxtaposition to be made between the permanence, steadiness and confidence in roles, on the one hand and the sense of uncertainty, challenge and unpredictability of the environment in recent years. In a negative sense, this has put pressures on what foundations can offer, at a time

30

when they are being called to play roles in a range of areas. In a more positive sense, the environment appears to have fostered greater introspection about how foundations can better serve society. What this actually means on a normal, “everyday” basis is important and insights into this issue can be gleaned through the analysis of grant making policies and practices.

6. Findings

Unlike the USA and the resources that the Foundation Center provides, the UK does not have a central database that records the activities of all trusts and foundations, including their grant making. For many years, the Directory of Social Change (DSC) has been a central repository for information on British trusts and foundations, producing an annual publication which provides brief synopsis of UK grant makers; their funds and assets, and the range of activities they support. The website trustfunding.org.uk, run by the DSC fulfils this function online. As a first step, the study involved an initial scoping or profiling exercise which sought to understand the scale of foundations supporting women through their grant making activities. Using the DSC resource, a search of all organisations whose beneficiaries were “women” revealed 56 organisations. The second source of information for this exercise was the Charities Register of the Charity Commission, which was used to further investigate the

profiling of these 56 organisations. The Charity Commission is the principal regulator for all charities in England and Wales. Depending on their annual income, different organisations have to comply with different reporting requirements, which have an impact on the extent and nature of the information about the organisation that is recorded about charitable organisations in the Register of Charities. Of particular note, organisations with an income of less than £10,000 complete an Annual Update form. Thirteen of the 56 organisations fell into this category and were discounted from the study due to the lack of information recorded about them.

The list of 56 organisations included some organisations which were registered in Scotland under the jurisdiction of the Scottish regulator. These were excluded from the present study. Further exclusions from the grants analysis below include trusts and foundations where further investigation showed that there was no obvious emphasis on women, either in their grant making policies or in their grant making activities, despite their inclusion in the online search results. Moreover, in some cases, despite charity commission regulations, there was still insufficient evidence to carry out a full analysis of the grant making activity of some organisations. Sometimes, this was despite a commitment to supporting women in their objectives. The study was also limited to trusts and foundations, excluding community foundations and other types of registered organisations. Taking all of these factors into account, the analysis of grants

outlined below is derived from the analysis of the annual reports (2007/8-2012/13) for 26 trusts and foundations. In the majority of cases, women feature as a category of beneficiary supported by the objectives of the trust or foundation. In other cases, women as a category of beneficiary have been identified as a focus for grant making (as part of the grant making policy), within the framework of the general charitable objectives of the trust or foundation. The profile of each trust and foundation took the following information into account:

- Name of Trust/Foundation and year of establishment.
- Categories/Beneficiaries of Interest to the Foundation
- Brief overview of most recent statement of financial status, including income, the grants and assets.
- Trustees.
- Relevant non-grantmaking programmes and activities around women in which the trust/foundation is engaged.

It is worth mentioning that it was not the intention of this present study to comment on the way in which trusts and foundations record and present their activities, but it is difficult avoid doing so given the vast discrepancies in the range, depth and nature of information that is provided by trusts and foundations. Increasingly, these annual reports are subject to more scrutiny and analysis (Morgan and

Fletcher, 2013) particularly as they are seen to be an important vehicle for ensuring the accountability of trusts and foundations. However, this analysis shows that although these reports meet the minimum requirements for the Charity Commission, most reports do not appear to consider the range of stakeholders who may use these accounts for a variety of purposes, which is integral to ensuring the accountability of trusts and foundations and their legitimacy too.

Using the annual reports submitted to the Charity Commission from the first year that such a report was submitted in line with regulatory requirements (2007/2008), I extracted the specific grants made to women's groups/organisations/individuals; the year(s) in which they were awarded; the amount and, where specified, the foundation programme theme under which they were recorded in the annual report. The grants of the trusts and foundations included in the study were categorised in accordance with the type of organisation supported. Reflecting the differences noted above in relation to the level of detail provided in annual reports, the purpose of the grant was stated in some cases, but not in others. This approach provides a picture of how trusts and foundations are supporting women's organisations in the UK. It does less to capture the very specific purposes for which the grants are awarded to these organisations. Where reports were not forthcoming about the nature of the organisations to which grants were awarded, the purposes and activities of the organisations were researched on the internet. In all,

the grants awarded by the trusts and foundations included in the study can be categorised into seven broad categories: welfare service support (including support for self-help organisations); Infrastructural support; Women's Association; Women's Rights; Advocacy and awareness raising and Research.

The analysis of the grants by purpose of the organisation also made clear that welfare service support is provided in a variety of ways from counselling and advice services to education and training. The grants in this category can also be broken down to reveal more about the areas in which the organisations supported are engaged in supporting women's welfare:

- The majority of grants were awarded to organisations engaged in providing services and support to victims of domestic violence (and, in some cases, gender-related violence). Support for Women's Aid Centres featured prominently here, but there was little evidence of an organisation receiving a grant over a number of successive or multiple years.
- The provision of services to prevent women re-offending or to support women in prison or on probation was also significant amongst the grants awarded. Whilst a number of foundations were active in supporting organisations working

in this area, it represented a key focus for other foundations' grant making.

- Advice, Education and Counselling on health related issues for women also attracted a sizeable amount of grants.
- Similarly, support for refugee and asylum seeker women featured as a priority for grant making by the foundations analysed, followed by grants to support and provide services for Black and Minority Ethnic Community (BME) women and then organisations which use education and training as the main vehicle for support.
- Less popular issues included, in order of the number of grants awarded: Breast Cancer support; Rape Crisis Centres; Sex Work and Trafficking; Use of Arts and Cultural activity to provide services and support; Homelessness and Housing Advice; pre and post natal support; Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender (LGBT) (where focus is on women only) and survivors of war.

The emphasis on the provision of welfare support means that all of the other categories represent a very minor part of the grant making activity of trusts and foundations in the UK. There is evidence of support for infrastructure organisations: the organisations which

organise and manage networks of other organisations, including in one foundation, support for those which will sub-grant on the foundation's behalf. In a very small number of cases (less than 5), trusts and foundations referred to partnership activity with another organisation, in some cases a government body and in others, a civil society organisation, for purposes that included campaigning and advocacy activity. There is some support for organisations which are broadly focused on 'Women's Rights' and the range of activities that this encompasses (research, advocacy and campaigning, training etc.). There is also a similar level of support for organisations which are first and foremost advocacy or "awareness raising" organisations about particular issues. Yet, these categories are not mutually exclusive since those organisations engaged in campaigning and advocacy tend to be essentially concerned with women's rights. The importance of association to the vibrancy of civil society does not appear to be a priority for British trusts and foundations, with women's associations (which engage women simply for the sake of association) were supported in a fairly small number of cases. Similarly, a very small number of trusts and foundations supported research into an issue that affects women (for example, ovarian cancer) or a department of a higher education institution concerned with gender or women's rights.

7. Discussion

In the UK, grant giving by foundations has been broadly categorised as exemplary of “gift giving” as opposed to entrepreneurial leadership (Leat 1995). However, thus far, we have had little understanding of foundation giving to particular sectors, such as the women’s voluntary and community sector, or women more broadly. Through their grant making, foundations are perceived to “confer” legitimacy. The credibility of organisations which receive grants is enhanced (Anheier and Hammack, 2010; Askaratova, 2003, cited in Suarez, 2012, p. 266). Indeed, Goss (2007, p. 1175) argues that foundation support, and the nature of that support, fostered and gave legitimacy to the range of identities that came to characterise the women’s movement in the United States. The limitations of the study for making sweeping generalisations or theoretically-informed propositions are evident in the number of foundations examined; the discrepancies in the information available in annual reports and the lack of voice given to both the foundations and the beneficiaries of their grants. However, the findings do provide insights into the nature of grant making by British foundations, which with further analysis could lead to a theoretical contribution. Of most significance, beyond a focus on welfare, foundations do not appear to focus their grant making on a specific set of actors, issues or causes. In fact, the range of issues supported within this category alone suggests that patterns of grant making are at worst, piecemeal, but at

38

best, illustrative of the (perhaps inadvertent) relationship between foundations and the pluralist model of giving. This combines respect for the preferences of donors with support for a range of causes, issues and organisations (Delfin and Tang, 2007, p. 2169). By and large, this description reflects the nature of grant making in support of women by the foundations included in the analysis.

Indeed, to an extent, it can be argued that the “hyperpluralism” identified by Goss (2007) in her analysis of the women’s movement in the USA, which she argued, was affected by the approach taken by foundations to their grant making, is also evident in the UK. Thinking about the potential for the future theoretical development of this area of study, the further exploration of the rationale, if any behind the grant making policies and practices of trusts and foundations, particularly where there is specific evidence of prioritising particular areas of support by individual foundations (for instance, women offenders) would shed further light on the extent to which foundations in the UK have influenced the development of the women’s voluntary and community sector in the UK. The grants analysis presented here suggests that the influence has been limited. Rather, the hyperpluralism evident in the range of issues and interests is driven by needs identified by community groups and voluntary organisations, rather than being driven by foundation priorities and programmes. Of interest, however, is a similar point made by Goss (*ibid.*) regarding how hyperpluralism has diminished

gender as a unifying, if not mobilising category of influence and support. Indeed, of the 26 organisations included in the study, only one, ROSA, had been set up to support and champion women and girls specifically. It was much more common for women and girls to feature as one of a number of categories of beneficiary supported by the foundation (where this was made explicit). Similarly, only one foundation had a women-only board. Women feature in the majority of the boards of trustees included in the study, but it is beyond the scope of the present study to surmise whether they exerted any specific influence over grant making. Certainly, the results of the study and the emerging centrality of the pluralist model would suggest that they have not, but this does require further investigation. The limited nature of the support awarded to themes such as infrastructural organisations and women's associations that is evident here compared to welfare service support may suggest that whilst there is support for "causes that support women", less importance is attached to support for women's organising per se.

Also similar to Delfin and Tang (2007), the language of resource dependence theory is relevant in helping us to understand the patterns of grant making which have emerged in this study. In many respects, the findings of the study are under-whelming in that they reveal "more of the same." By and large, trusts and foundations use their resources to make grants to organisations which provide important welfare support services in the British voluntary and

community sector. In this respect, they continue to play a prominent role in complementing the role of the government in the provision of welfare services (Leat 2007). In the small minority of cases where the purpose of the grant is specified, there is creeping evidence of trusts and foundations substituting for government. In these cases, the majority of the grants were to support the running costs of the organisation or project, including grants towards the salaries of staff. However, there was little evidence of repeat granting, that is, of an organisation being supported year on year by the same trust or foundation. All told, foundations continue to exhibit traits as ‘policy takers’ rather than ‘policy shapers’ (Leat 2001) and in the language of resource dependence theory, their activities are influenced by the policy, or specifically, the prevalent funding environment, as much as the organisations they seek to support may be too.

By the same token, notwithstanding the small number of foundations engaged in partnership activity and a few references to visiting beneficiaries, there was little evidence of grant making being based on a “meeting of needs” or, rather, the types of conversations that are implicit in the social relations approach to philanthropy and sympathetic to women’s organising. This approach has been found to work well in providing effective support for women by philanthropy in other contexts (Ostrander, 2004). Rather, if anything, the analysis of grant making by the foundations included in this study brings into stark focus the impact of the public sector cuts on the women’s

voluntary and community sector and the challenging environment in which women's voluntary and community organisations operate. Moreover, beyond what Leat has previously termed "gift giving", it is difficult to see widespread evidence of grant making being used to strategically support the women's voluntary and community sector – or, indeed, of foundations stepping up to be institutional entrepreneurs in this area (Suarez 2012). Whilst there is some suggestion that strategic giving may be the case in some foundations, there is still the point to be made that it is difficult to see evidence of foundations coming together to think and act strategically around support for women's organisations. Viewed in this way, the legitimacy conferred by grant making appears rather tokenistic and limited in its effectiveness in the medium to long term. Indeed, there remain discrepancies between the voice that areas of the women's sector give to highlighting the challenges facing the women's voluntary and community sector and the range and nature of grant making by foundations.

8. Conclusion

The feminisation of philanthropy deserves much more discussion and development to be a viable thesis that can shape our theoretical and practical understanding of women's philanthropy. However, proposed here in terms of two dimensions: (1) women's engagement

in philanthropy and (2) philanthropic support for women and girls, especially by philanthropic foundations, this allows us to begin to map and understand how it is manifested. Clearly, there is a global dimension to women's philanthropy as well as the experiences of different countries to consider. A review of the literature alone reveals the dominance and centrality of the American experience to helping us to understand the development and scope of women's philanthropy. Turning our attention to the UK, the mapping of some of the ways in which women are engaging in philanthropy reveals some innovative thinking and practice, but this remains under-supported and lacking in any sense of alignment to something greater than the sum of activities in which the group/organisation/network is engaged (Rosa's membership of the WFN suggests it is an exception in this regard). The analysis of how women are supported by philanthropy, via the analysis of the grant making of 26 foundations to women's groups and organisations also highlights that although pluralistic, rather than elitist or co-optive, foundations are providing support in response to a challenging funding environment. However, there is little evidence of a bigger role for foundations in giving greater consideration to the "big picture", that is, in re-considering how their grant making can support women, or the women's voluntary and community sector to meet its future challenges head on. The extent to which foundations do take up this challenge, if at

all, has the potential to shape the future development of the feminisation of philanthropy in the UK.

References

- Ackerly, B.A. (2009) Feminist Theory, Global Gender Justice and the Evaluation of Grant Making. *Philosophical Topics*, 37 (2), pp. 179-198.
- Andreoni, J., Brown, E. and Rischall, I. (2003) Charitable giving by married couples: Who decides and why does it matter? *The Journal of Human Resources*, 38 (1), pp. 111-133.
- Helmut K. Anheier and David Hammack (eds.) *American Foundations. Roles and Contributions*. Washington, DC.: The Brookings Institution Press, 2010.
- Anheier, H.K. and Daly, S. (eds.) (2007) *The Politics of Foundations: A Comparative Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Anheier, H.K. and Leat, D. (2006) *Creative Philanthropy: Towards a new Philanthropy for the 21st Century*. London: Routledge.
- Anheier, HK and Leat, D. (2002) *From Charity to Creativity: Philanthropic Foundations in the 21st Century*. London: Comedia.
- Barclays Wealth (2009) *Philanthropology: The Evolution of Giving. A White Paper on co-operation with Ledbury Research*. London: Barclays Wealth.
- Baxter, M. (ed.) (2008) *A celebration of women's philanthropy*. London: Philanthropy UK. Available at:

<http://www.philanthropyuk.org/Newsletter/SPECIALREPORTWomenPhilanthropy>

Beckwith, K. (2000) Beyond compare? Women's movements in comparative perspective. *European Journal of Political Research*, 37 (4), pp. 431-468.

Bekkers, R. and Wieping, P. (2007) Generosity and philanthropy: A Literature Review. Available at: http://generosityresearch.nd.edu/assets/17632/generosity_and_philanthropy_final.pdf

Belfield, C.R. and Beney, A.P. (2000) What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economics*, 8, pp. 65-80.

Ben-Ner, A., Kong, F. and Putterman, L. (2004) Share and share alike? Intelligence, socialization, personality and gender-pairing as determinants of giving. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 25, pp. 581-589.

Bishop, M. and Green, M. (2008) *Philanthrocapitalism: how the rich can save the world*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Breeze, B. (2010) *The Coutts Million Pound Dollar Report*. London: Coutts Bank (In association with the Centre for Philanthropy, Humanitarianism and Social Justice, University of Kent).

Cabinet Office (2011a) *Giving White Paper*. London: Cabinet Office.

Cabinet Office (2010a) *Giving Green Paper*. London: Cabinet Office.

- Cabinet Office (2010b) *Building the Big Society*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Clift, E. (ed.) *Women, Philanthropy and Social Change: Visions for a Just Society*. Lebanon: Tufts University Press.
- Coleman, M. (2008) Women-only (homophilous) networks supporting women leaders in education. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48 (6), pp. 769-781.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Cutler, D. (2009) *The Effective Foundation: A Literature Review*. London: Barings Foundation.
- Daly, S. (2012) Philanthropy as an Essentially Contested Concept. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit organisations*, 23 (3), pp. 535-557.
- Daly, S. (2011) Philanthropy, the Big Society and Emerging Philanthropic Relationships in the UK. *Public Management Review*, 13 (8), pp. 1077-1094.
- Daly, S. (2008) Institutional Innovation in Philanthropy: Community foundations in the UK. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit organisations*, 19 (3), pp. 219-241.
- Davies, R. and Mitchell, L. (2008) *Building Bridges: Philanthropy strengthening communities*. London: Policy Exchange.

- Davies, J. (2004) The Foundation as a Political Actor. *Political Quarterly*, 75 (3), pp. 275-284
- Delfin, FG and Tang, S-Y (2007) Elitism, pluralism or resource dependency: patterns of environmental philanthropy among private foundations in California. *Environment and Planning A*, (39), PP. 2167-2186.
- Donmoyer, R. (2009) Theories about the Role of Theory in Nonprofit and Philanthropic Studies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38, 701-713.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Goss, K.A. (2007) Foundations of Feminism: How Philanthropic Patrons Shaped Gender Politics, *Social Science Quarterly*, 88 (5), pp. 1174-1191.
- Gutner, T. (2000) Philanthropy with a Woman's Touch. *Business Week*, 3705, 200.
- Handy, C. (2006) *The new Philanthropists. The New Generosity*. London: William Heinemann.
- Harker, C. and Burkemann, S. (2005) *Stepping Up the Stairs: Increasing the Impact of progressive philanthropy in the UK*. London: The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust.
- Harrow, J. (2010) *Philanthropy*. In: Taylor, R. (ed.) *Third Sector Research*, New York: Springer.

- Heady, L. (2010a) Social Return on Investment (SROI) Position Paper. London: New Philanthropy Capital.
- Heady, L. (2010b) Social Return on Investment (SROI) for Funders. London: New Philanthropy Capital.
- Heady, L., Kall, A. and Yeoward, C. (2009) Understanding the stability and sustainability of the violence against women voluntary sector. London: Government Equalities Office.
- Heimovics, R.D., Herman, R.D. and Jurkiewicz, C.L. (1993) Executive leadership and Resource Dependence in Non-profit Organisations: A frame analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 53 (5), pp. 419-427.
- Howell, JA (2007) Gender and Civil Society: Time for Cross Border Dialogue. *Social Politics*, 14 (4), pp. 415-436.
- Institute for Philanthropy (2010) *The Power of Now. Spend Out Trusts and Foundations in the UK*. London: Institute for Philanthropy.
- Institute for Philanthropy (2009) *Supportive to the Core: Why unrestricted funding matters*. London: Institute for Philanthropy.
- Jenkins, C.J. (1998) Channelling Social Protest: Foundation Patronage of Contemporary Social Movements, In: W.W. Powell and E.S. Clemens (Eds.), *Private Action for the Public Good*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press.
- Jenkins, C.J. and Halcli, A. (1999) Grassrooting the System? The Development and Impact of Social Movement Philanthropy,

- 1953-1990, In: E. Condliffe Lagemann, (Ed.), *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Jenkins, C.J. and Ekert, C.M. (1986) *Channelling Black Insurgency – Elite Patronage and Professional Social Movement Organisation*. *American Sociological Review*, 51 (6), pp. 812-829.
- John, R., Davies, R. and Mitchell, L. (2007) *Give and Let Give: Building a Culture of Philanthropy in the financial services industry*. London: Policy Exchange.
- Johnson, R.C. (1977) *Feminism, Philanthropy and Science in the Development of the Oral Contraceptive Pill*. *Pharmacy in History*, 19 (2), pp. 63-78.
- Karl, Barry D., and Stanley N. Katz. (1981) *The American Private Philanthropic Foundation and the Public Sphere, 1890-1930*. *Minerva* 19, pp. 236-70.
- Kossatz, R. (2004) *Differences in the donor behaviour characteristics of young affluent males and females: Empirical evidence from Britain*. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organisations*, 15, pp. 181-203.
- Leat, D. (2009a) *Firm Foundations: A snapshot of how trusts and foundations are responding to the economic downturn in 2009*. London: Charity Commission.

- Leat, D. (2009b) Social Change grant-making: a failure of innovation? *Third Sector Review*, 15 (1), pp. 63-83.
- Leat, D. (2007). United Kingdom. In H.K. Anheier and S. Daly (eds.), *The Politics of Foundations: A comparative analysis*. London, Routledge.
- Leat, D. (2005). *Foundations and Policy Involvement: Creating Options*. York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Leat, D. (2001). Grant-making Foundations: Policy Shapers or Policy Takers? In M. Harris and C. Rochester (eds.), *Voluntary Organisations and Social Policy in Britain: Perspectives on Change and Choice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leat, D. (1995). British Foundations: The Organization and Management of grant-making, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organisations*, 6 (3), pp. 317-329.
- Leat, D. (1992) *Trusts in Transition: The Policy and Practice of Grant-Giving Trusts*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Leathwood, C. and Read, B. (2009) *Gender and the changing face of higher education: a feminised future?* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Low, N. Butt, S., Ellis Paine, A and Davis Smith, J et al. (2007) *Helping Out: A national survey of volunteering and charitable giving*. London: Cabinet Office.
- MacKenzie, S. (ed.) (2008) *A Guide to Giving* (3rd ed.), London: Association of Charitable Foundations.

- MacKenzie, S. (2008) How women are changing the face of British philanthropy. London: Philanthropy UK. Available at: <http://www.philanthropyuk.org/Newsletter/SPECIALREPORTWomenPhilanthropy>
- Marx, J.D. (2000) Women and Human Services Giving. *Social Work*, 45, pp. 27-38.
- McCarthy, D. (2004) Environmental Justice Grantmaking: Elites and Activists Collaborate to Transform Philanthropy. *Sociological Inquiry*, 74 (2), pp. 250-270.
- McCarthy, H. (2004) *Girlfriends in High Places*. Demos: London.
- McCarthy, K.(ed.) (2001) *Women, Philanthropy and Civil Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- McCarthy, K. (1990) Parallel Power Structures: Women and the Voluntary Sphere. In: McCarthy, K. (ed.) *Lady Bountiful Revisited. Women, Philanthropy and Power*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 1-34.
- Mittelstadt, J. (2008) Philanthropy, Feminism and Left Liberalism, 1960-1985. *Journal of Women's History*, 20 (4), pp. 105-131.
- Moore and Philbin (2005) *Women as Donors: Old Stereotypes, New Visions*, in Clift, E. (ed.) *Women, Philanthropy and Social Change: Visions for a Just Society*. Lebanon: Tufts University Press.

- Mooney-Nickel, P. and Eikenberry, A. (2009) A critique of the Discourse of Marketized Philanthropy. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 52 (7), pp. 974-989.
- Newman, R. (1996) Know your Donor: Gender Differences in Giving. *Fund Raising Management*, 27, pp. 31-34.
- Nielsen, W.A. (1972) *The Big Foundations*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- Ostrander, S. (2004) Moderating Contradictions in Feminist Philanthropy: Women's Community Organizations and the Boston Women's Fund, 1995-2000," *Gender & Society* (18, 1): 29-46.
- Ostrander, S.A.. (1999) When Grantees become Grantors. *Accountability, Democracy and Social Movement Philanthropy*. In: Lage-mann, E.C. (ed.) *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 257-269.
- Ostrander, S.A.. and Shervish, P. (1990) Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as social relation. In: J.Van Til (ed.) *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, pp. 67-98.
- Otis, K. and Joankowski, K. (2005) Women, wealth and endowed philanthropy?: Trends and innovations in foundations. *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, 50, pp. 157-172.
- Pharoah, C. (2009a) United Kingdom. In, P. Wieping, ed., *The State of Giving Research in Europe. Household Donations to Charitable Organisations in Twelve European Countries. An ERNOP*

- Publication. Amsterdam: Pallas Publications (Amsterdam University Press).
- Pharoah, C. (2009b) Family Foundation Philanthropy 2009. UK, Italy, Germany, US. London: Alliance Publishing Trust.
- Pharoah, C. (ed.) (2008) Family Foundation Philanthropy. Report on the giving of the largest charitable family foundations in the US, UK, and rest of Europe 2008. London: Centre for Charity Effectiveness, CASS Business School.
- Phillips, A. (2002) Does Feminism Need a Conception of Civil Society? In: Chambers, S and Kmylicka, W. (eds). *Alternative conceptions of civil society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Piper, G. and Schnepf, S.V. (2008) Gender Differences in Charitable Giving in Great Britain. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organisations*, 19 (2), pp. 103-124.
- Prochaska, F. (1980) *Women and Philanthropy in nineteenth century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roelefs, J. (2003) *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism*. State of University of New York Press, Albany.
- Rooney, P. and Brown, E. (2007) Who Decides in Giving to Education? A Study of Charitable Giving by Married Couples. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7 (3), pp. 229-242.

- Rooney, P., Brown, E. and Mesch, D. (2007) Who decides in giving to education? A study of charitable giving by married couples. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7 (3), pp. 229-242
- Ross, E. (1990) Good and Bad Mothers: Lady Philanthropists and London Housewives before the First World War. In: McCarthy, K. (ed.) *Lady Bountiful Revisited. Women, Philanthropy and Power*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 174-198
- Scott, A F (1990) Women's Voluntary Associations: from Charity to Reform. In: McCarthy, K. (ed.) *Lady Bountiful Revisited. Women, Philanthropy and Power*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, pp. 35-54.
- Shah, S., McGill, L. and Weisblatt, K. (2011) *Untapped Potential: European Foundation Funding for Women and Girls*. New York: Foundation Center (Foundation Center and Weisblatt & Associates (in association with the European Foundation Centre)
- Shaw-Hardy, S. and Taylor, M. (2010) *Boldly Shaping a Better World: Engaging Donors and Developing Leaders*. San Francisco, CA.: John Wiley and Sons.
- Shaw-Hardy, S. (2005) The emergence and future of the modern women's philanthropy movement. *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, 50, pp. 11-22.

- Shaw-Hardy, S. and Taylor, M. (2005) *Reinventing Fundraising: Realizing the Potential of Women's Philanthropy*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Stephenson, M. (2011) *TUC Women and the Cuts Toolkit*. London: TUC
- Suarez, D.F. (2012) Grant making as Advocacy. *The Emergence of Social Justice Philanthropy. Non-profit management and Leadership*, 22 (3), pp. 259-279.
- Williams, R. J. (2003) Women on Corporate Boards of Directors and their Influence on Corporate Philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 42, pp. 1-10.
- Women's Philanthropy Institute (2009) *Women's Philanthropy on Campus. Releasing the Energy of Women Donors and Embracing the Winds of Change*. Indianapolis, IN.: Women's Philanthropy Institute, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.
- Women's Resource Centre (2011) *Hidden Value: Demonstrating the extraordinary impact of women's voluntary and community organisations*. London: Women's Resource Centre.
- Women's Resource Centre (2007) *Why women only? The value and benefit of by women, for women services*. London: Women's Resource Centre.
- Women's Resource Centre (2006) *Why women? The women's voluntary and community sector: changing lives, changing communities, changing society*. London: Women's Resource Centre.

Youde, K. British Red Cross launches women-only funding initiative. Third Sector, 21 September. Available at: <http://www.thirdsector.net/Fundraising/article/1151237/british-red-cross-launches-women-only-fundraising-initiative/>

- 1) Emilio Colombo - Patrizio Tirelli, *Il mercato delle banane e il commercio equo e solidale*, giugno 2006.
- 2) Emilio Colombo - Patrizio Tirelli, *Il mercato del caffè e il commercio equo e solidale*, giugno 2006.
- 3) Gian Paolo Barbetta, *Il commercio equo e solidale in Italia*, giugno 2006.
- 4) Antonella Sciarrone Alibrandi (a cura di), *Quali norme per il commercio equo e solidale?*, giugno 2006.
- 5) Emilio Colombo - Patrizio Tirelli, *Il valore sociale delle attività del commercio equo e solidale: l'impatto sui produttori*, maggio 2007.
- 6) Giacomo Boesso, Fabrizio Cerbioni, Andrea Menini, Antonio Parbonetti, *Foundations' governance for strategic philanthropy*, aprile 2012.
- 7) Stefan Einarsson - Jasmine McGinnis - Hanna Schneider, *Exploring the talk-action gap: a qualitative investigation of foundation practices over three regime types*, aprile 2012.
- 8) Marco Minciullo – Matteo Pedrini, *Knowledge transfer methods between founder firms and corporate foundations: upshots on orientation to effectiveness*, maggio 2012.
- 9) Gian Paolo Barbetta – Luca Colombo – Gilberto Turati, *The impact of fiscal rules on the grant-making behavior of American foundations*, luglio 2012.

- 10) Raffaella Rametta - *Regulation and the autonomy of foundations: a comparative analysis of the Italian and U.S. Patterns*, aprile 2013
- 11) Emily Jansons - *From Gaining to Giving Wealth: The Shaping of a New Generation of Philanthropic Foundations in India*, dicembre 2013
- 12) Edoardo Gaffeo - *Using information markets in grantmaking. An assessment of the issues involved and an application to Italian banking foundations*, gennaio 2014
- 13) G. Boesso, F. Cerbioni, A. Menini, A. Parbonetti - *The Role of Board's Competences and Processes in Shaping an Effective Grant-Making Strategy*, marzo 2014

Printed by
Gi&Gi srl - Triuggio (MB)
June 2014

ISBN 978-88-343-2839-2



9 788834 328392 >