



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Harrow, J., Donnelly-Cox, G., Healy, J. & Wijkström, F. (2021). The management and organization of philanthropy: New directions and contested undercurrents. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23(3), pp. 303-311. doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12273

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/26960/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12273>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

The management and organization of philanthropy: New directions and contested undercurrents

Jenny Harrow¹ | Gemma Donnelly-Cox² | John Healy³ | Filip Wijkström⁴

¹ Bayes Business School (formerly Cass), City, University of London, London EC1Y 8TZ, UK

² Trinity Business School, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland

³ Genio and Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland

⁴ Department of Management and Organization, Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm 113 50, Sweden

Correspondence

Jenny Harrow, Bayes Business School (formerly Cass), City, University of London, 106 Bunhill Row, London EC1Y 8TZ, UK.
Email: j.harrow@city.ac.uk

The case for theoretical scrutiny of philanthropy's achievements and problems, in the institutional settings in which it operates, has never been stronger. In this introduction to *IJMR's* special issue on philanthropy, we examine the developing levels and directions of institutional philanthropy scholarship, together with the consensual and contradictory themes they exemplify and the theoretical leads to which they give rise. Modern philanthropic theory is still largely based on archetypes developed in the early 20th century that accord a central role to foundations in addressing social challenges, yet the complex health, education and social service fields within which philanthropy operates have changed dramatically. We argue for the elevation of, and deepening directions for, theoretical study of institutional philanthropy. At present, institutional philanthropy has a modest theoretical literature, at the same time as we can notice an extensive and growing grey literature in the philanthropic community, often grounded in traditional strategic management. We reflect on the grey literature's potential development into theoretical scholarship, drawing on and fusing with a broader range of academic disciplines and organizational theories, and the linked study of the field as a discourse community. Here, the challenges of visibility and transparency in relation to privacy are significant, whether for accountability or research access.

INTRODUCTION

In this introduction to the special issue on philanthropy, we examine the developing levels and directions of institutional philanthropy scholarship, together with the consensual and contradictory themes they exemplify, and the theoretical leads to which they give rise. We define philanthropy as 'the use of private resources—time, treasure and talent—for public purposes' (Phillips & Jung, 2016, p. 7) and emphasize the importance of seeing 'the problems (of philanthropy) in the light of the institutional settings in which philanthropy functions' (Sacks, 1960, p. 516). We

revisit notions of 'golden ages' of philanthropy, aspects of the influence and relevance of business literatures to philanthropic institutions' roles and behaviours (notably concerning strategic management thinking) and consider the limits to and opportunities for theorizing from organization and management perspectives. Voices from this field's vibrant community of practice, though captured in its grey literature, are often absent in theory development. We therefore reflect on the implications of that particular literature's exclusion from or possible inclusion in literature reviews. We see potentially mutual benefit for both sides in increasing bridges and meeting rooms between the

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2021 The Authors. *International Journal of Management Reviews* published by British Academy of Management and John Wiley & Sons Ltd

practice and the study of philanthropy, and hope this special issue can provide one such opportunity. We go on to consider current scholarly perspectives on institutional philanthropy, including its visibility, and present the contributions of the six papers which comprise this special issue and the research agendas to which they point. Finally, the time elapsing between this special issue call and its publication has seen a grievous worldwide pandemic, with its immense pan-institutional challenges. We therefore consider briefly possible implications for philanthropic institutions' management and organization, including possible re-theorizing of their relations with beneficiaries and donors, but also governments. These implications seem likely to go far beyond considerations of any of the noble causes or 'grand challenges' which many foundations and philanthropists alike have until now chosen to address.

Setting the scene: philanthropic institutions in an earlier 'golden age'

The burgeoning study of philanthropic institutions offers a maturing field of research. No longer relegated as a supplementary subset of non-profit or third-sector scholarship, scrutiny extends in breadth and depth to examination of areas such as organization legitimation, transnational and globalizing presence, and public policy and governmental relations (Boodoo et al., 2021; Hammack & Heydemann 2009; Kumar & Brooks, 2021; Rey-Garcia, 2020; Toepler & Abramson, 2021; Youde, 2019). Notwithstanding the third sector's own potential for being 'unruly' (Corry, 2010, p. 11), philanthropy's institutional expressions are now central to considerations of whether its contemporary forms and extent represent a 'new golden age' of philanthropic endeavour (Ferris, 2016; Hay & Muller, 2014) or, more ambiguously, 'a new gilded age' (Callahan, 2017); even whether, through that gold or gilding, philanthropy 'will save us all' (Fuentenebro, 2020).

In its expressions, deliberations, structures, operations and outcomes, philanthropy is as much a creature of distinct managerial and organizational choices and actions as it is of wider social and community concerns. This makes the rise, fall and rise again of waves of 'business' thinking and 'management speak' (Rombach & Zapata, 2010) within philanthropy particularly interesting. Philanthropy in the early 20th century is often referred to as the 'golden era' of modern philanthropy. One of the key innovations of portal figures such as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller was 'to conceive of philanthropy as yet another financial investment' (Zunz, 2012, p. 2). Among the main departures from previous charitable efforts were the focus on root causes and also the addressing of wide-ranging,

ambitious agendas, from disease eradication to national education reforms (Cunningham, 2016). Referencing back to an idealistic, apparent golden age period, when philanthropy was a central strategic actor in society and its institutions (notably philanthropic foundations) dominated the social and public stage, has continued to also influence how modern philanthropy has conceptualized its own role in society, for example in seeking projection of its own institutional logics (Hammack & Heydemann, 2009). This is expressed too in contemporary philanthropic institutions' focus on generating and demonstrating 'social impact', increasingly sought through foundation grant-making reconfigured as 'social investment' (Nicholls & Teasdale, 2021). Institutional expressions of philanthropy contain a wide range of non-governmental, quasi-governmental and quasi-business organizations. Some are in hybrid, bridging forms, such as intermediary structures, with commercial and/or charitable aims (Hazenbury et al., 2015). Others are in singular forms, such as foundations and trusts, historically modelled on structures including the Islamic institutions of the waqfs (Singer, 2016), mediaeval charitable endowments (Cunningham, 2016) and the United States' 'versatile' foundation (Hammack & Anheier, 2013). Nevertheless, it is the institution of the foundation, albeit in different types (Jung et al., 2018), which continues to be especially prominent in the 'philanthroscape' (Osella et al., 2015, p. 39); a prominence reflected in the contributions to this special issue.

As the size and role of the welfare state grew in the United States and Europe, and with inflation diminishing spending power—especially of the large US foundations, the relative importance of these institutions in fields such as health, education and international development has however lessened. 'The moment when American foundations could reshape entire fields had largely ended by the 1930s. Foundations' interventions in medicine, science, research universities, public schools, and public libraries had by then done much to create new self-sustaining enterprises and professions that could now set their own course, without regard to foundation preferences' (Hammack & Anheier, 2013, p. 76). This is true not only for the large US foundations, but also for foundations, with variations, in all modern developed welfare states, whether for example in Sweden, where foundations occupy 'a carefully negotiated state of existence' (Wijkström & Einarsson, 2018, p. 1889), or in the Norwegian case, displaying 'a much larger segment of operating foundations' (Wijkström & Einarsson, 2018, p. 1889). Currently, the annual spending of the entire philanthropic community in a country (however immense it appears to us as citizens and individuals) is but pocket change in comparison to the annual spending of our governments.

The prominence of strategic management thinking and the persistence of the 'golden age' idea

Since the 1990s, business thinking and managerial practices have re-emerged in the non-profit sector generally, organizations increasingly becoming more business-like and influenced by managerialism (Hvenmark, 2013; Maier & Meyer, 2011; Maier et al., 2016), leading them to focus objectives on specific strategic targets (Thompson, 2018, p. 51). Popular modern philanthropic practice concepts—such as strategic philanthropy (Frumkin, 2006), venture philanthropy (LaFrance & Latham, 2008) and collective impact (Kania & Kramer, 2011), embraced widely by foundations and their donors—are derived from the broader business-focused strategic management literature, whereby foundations are understood to play key roles, enhancing the impact of a field by agreeing objectives and measures of success, and aligning available charitable, public and private resources to tackle social challenges. Using functionalist (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) theories, based on the tenets of strategic management, has enabled these institutions to make sense of how philanthropy can target specific causes, drawing particularly on the positioning school in strategic management, whereby organizational choices are narrowed from limited positions, taken from a generic strategic management framework (e.g. Porter & Kramer, 1999). This move away from broad missions to more specific objectives has not, however, diminished perceptions of the role of the foundation as the central actor in practice contexts, but may have enhanced them, where influential commentators heralded a new philanthropic golden age (e.g. Bishop & Green, 2008).

Whilst this emphasis on, and inspiration from, strategic management has influenced the planning, management and linear evaluation processes used by foundations, there has also been critical questioning of whether these processes do improve and enlighten foundations' activities (Patrizi & Thompson, 2010). Meanwhile, a lack of theorizing concerning the role and complex challenges for the management of philanthropic institutions appears to have led to an over-reliance in practice on broad, often rather simple strategic management notions and to the development of tacit knowledge in the field about how to engage in philanthropy that has not been explicated. If the managerial mode of the prominent foundation is as fixed in the early 20th century as we suggest, then this raises theoretical questions about organization structures' validity and capability in the turbulent non-linear conditions in which foundations currently find themselves and their societies. Some foundations thrive in these circumstances and enter new public arenas well beyond those concerned with the provision of resources (see Harman, 2016); others may not.

To advance our understanding of how and why different institutions of philanthropy intervene in complex social systems, there is then a particular need to build on and move beyond the functionalist frame of strategic management, and to draw on other bodies of organizational theory (e.g. governance theory; Donnelly-Cox et al., 2020). Institutional theory also has the potential to illuminate why ingrained beliefs and practices in organizational fields can be highly resistant to change. Thus, studies of foundations projecting their institutional logics globally (e.g. Swidler, 2009) are already suggesting that institutional logics are far more durable and less plastic than the functional strategic management literatures suggest.

The institutional and donor-institutional sets of relationships with business and with business models also require further exploration. Boulding's classic statement (Boulding, 1962, p. 63) that 'a foundation must make choices much as a firm does' reminds us of a much later but similar quest, where Young (2011, p. 573) asks whether non-profit governance could 'be redesigned to resemble the ownership model'. Boulding's consideration of whether we could have a theory of the foundation in the sense in which we have a theory of the firm remains to be explored. His suggestion that there is 'a certain analogue of the market in the mutual competition of foundations for grantees and of potential grantees for foundation support' (Boulding, 1962, p. 64) remains apposite in the light of current emphasis on achieving philanthropic impact (Harrow & Jung, 2015; Kah & Akenroye, 2020; Liket & Maas, 2016), and implicitly on foundations and their donors' ability to 'pick winners'. Yet theorizing competition among philanthropic institutions is not yet evident. (Somewhere there may be the foundation turning down the 'impactful' grant-seeker—equivalent to the firm rejecting a recording contract for the Beatles; see Nieme, 2000.)

The practice literature: also a ground for theorizing?

Our account of developments in philanthropy's influential practice field returns us to consideration of that field vis-à-vis theory development. Is institutional philanthropy's practice literature itself providing a (missed) ground for theorizing? Philanthropy and third-sector scholars will generally be aware of the extent to which narrative reviews of the literature, as opposed to systematic reviews for their field, are able to incorporate material from the grey literature, presenting and reflecting on aspects of lived experience that lie outside the frame of theoretically or empirically focused peer-reviewed work but unable, mostly, to be drawn into theory building. This poses a conundrum for us as scholars, editors and ourselves members of and

contributors to philanthropic practice. In what ways, if any, can and should the extensive grey literature on philanthropic institutions be acknowledged—even integrated—into the theory building and development for the field? What role should the manifestation of the tacit knowledge of philanthropic institutions' communities of practice, through books and other presentation forms, play in the continued search for understanding of the field? That literature is a strong feature of philanthropic life, and our own field experience and observation tells us of its relative influence, alongside some of the more seductive elements of strategic management thinking, discussed above. Currently, it very much remains an isolated island of knowledge.

We are clear that narrative literature reviews are especially capable of telling the stories that the reviewer wants told. However, the narrative literature process, 'iterative, non-structured and multi-layered', has value too, since it is also 'embedded in a social context' (Juntunen & Lehenkari, 2021, p. 330). There is a wider debate to be had concerning the risks and rewards of attempting to incorporate grey literature materials into systematic studies, to ensure capture of the fine-grained organization and management detail they provide, so progressing their value as a basis for theorizing. However, it remains a challenge for philanthropic institutions studies—especially given that many foundations and some individual donors play a role in commissioning, funding to publication and/or endorsing examples of that grey literature and potentially, through that route, enabling innovation (Jaskyte et al., 2018) (see e.g. the report *Time, Treasure, Talent, and Testimony: Giving by Women of Color in Chicago*, 'made possible thanks to the generous support of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation'; BECOME, 2020).

A relevant route therefore might be to consider theorizing staff, board and management in philanthropic foundations as a 'discourse community' (Swales, 2016). Swales (2016, p. 8) describes a discourse community as 'a group of people who share a set of discourses, understood as basic values and assumptions, and ways of communicating about their goals', a definition offering opportunity to explore both these institutions' values and communication mechanisms, as enshrined in grey literatures, and to consider how those discourses, real and rhetorical, affect their managerial and organization activities, choices and overall behaviours. Further, Swales' scrutiny of criteria for discourse community identification includes its possession of a 'threshold of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discursal expertise' (Swales, 2016, p. 18)—a criterion relevant both for institutions and for the major, often elite, donors who fund them or have funded them. It is a fact that an extensive grey literature on philanthropic institutions both exists and is important for how the actors in the field behave, so is deserving of special, scholarly,

theoretical attention, as well as empirical acknowledgement and some narrative review citation.

The papers for this special issue: new scholarly directions and institutional philanthropy's global visibility

The six papers in this special issue provide insights which challenge and reframe, create, develop and advance our theoretical understanding of philanthropic institutions. They demonstrate the breadth and depth of management and organization literatures in the service of philanthropy's conceptualizations and theorization, suggesting new frameworks for further, especially explanatory, research. Each of them also has a range of resonances for institutional practice. They are presented as follows.

In **What lies beneath? Spectrality as a focal phenomenon and a focal theory for strengthening engagement with philanthropic foundations** (Jung & Orr, 2021), the authors build on the common reference to foundations as 'a donor's dead hand', for exerting social, political, economic and cultural influence from beyond the grave. They offer spectrality as a theoretical lens to address known shortcomings in the literature, combining literature 'prospecting' and 'mining'. Prospecting establishes the relevance of spectrality as a strategic platform from which theorizing on foundations can proceed. They then 'mine' the literature on spectrality to synthesize insights and identify specific contributions to aid understanding of foundations; the spectrality lens allows a critical approach to examining foundations' role and context, and the 'legacy of a foundation's origins, as well as its present and future paths'.

Though very different in purpose and orientation, **Elite philanthropy in the United States and United Kingdom in the new age of inequalities** (Maclean et al., 2021) also offers a critical stance, using the tool of literature prospecting, to understand 'how, why and with what consequences do wealthy elite families engage in philanthropy in the US and UK'. The authors observe the lack of integration of philanthropy into elite studies, the paucity of research on discourses of elite philanthropy and the strategic management of large-scale philanthropic assets. They emphasize that these 'lacunae' hold considerable potential for further research and make the case for further integration of philanthropy into management and organization studies.

An explicitly critical approach is again employed in **"You've Been Framed": A critical review of academic discourse on philanthrocapitalism** (Haydon et al., 2021). This places the critical lens on limited and fragmented conceptualizations of philanthrocapitalism (the

strategic application of market methods and motives for philanthropic purposes) in the context of its growing prominence in national and international policy design. The authors' systematic review yields a comprehensive analysis of key debates and issues, producing conceptual clarity and nuance, deriving their own definition of philanthrocapitalism and indicating a future research agenda.

Another lacuna surfaces in **Place and corporate philanthropy: A systematic review** (Mei & Wang, 2021), where the authors note the curious 'lack of attention to how philanthropy can be linked with place' in corporate philanthropy contexts. The authors address this by looking at the corporate philanthropy literature and at how place is variously presented, including as geographic units, critical events and virtual platforms. With these appearances associated with firms' experience of place as social enclosures, political constellations and peer communities, three primary roles for place affecting corporate philanthropy are shown: socializing, rationalizing and learning.

Place is again important in **Exploring the accountability and organizational identity of public philanthropic foundations** (Williamson & Luke, 2021). Here, the authors work to develop a conceptual typology of public foundations, focusing on a foundation form with a particular development trajectory in Australia. The authors employ organizational identity theory in understanding accountability of philanthropic foundations, finding that it 'facilitates deeper engagement with issues and questions of accountability in these proverbially opaque organizations'. The typological development makes clear why public foundations, as in the Australian case, should not be treated as homogenous or as a kind of community or fundraising foundation.

The focus moves from specific place to whole systems in **Strategic philanthropy's investment in public systems—a framework for intervention** (Shaw et al., 2021), with focus on influencing systems already raised in **Elite philanthropy**. Here, the authors explore the nature of philanthropic interventions in 'the infrastructure for service and policy development'. While not employing the critical management studies lens of the other work, they point to the term 'instrumental philanthropy' for this type of foundation giving, developing a framework for understanding strategic engagement in public systems that identifies areas of intervention where foundations have the greatest capacity for effectiveness, based on their role identification in policy engagement, social innovation or con-venorship.

Taking the papers collectively, it is striking that they raise, albeit differently, the current research question of philanthropic institutional (including individual) visibility, on global as well as local stages. In their call for 'pushing the boundaries of philanthropy research as a global and

contested practice', Von Schurbein et al. (2021, p. 185) stress the importance of philanthropy's 'global societal visibility', yet other relevant institutional scholarship is also emphasizing developments in which straightforward structural or personal visibility becomes a marked challenge. Gehringer (2021), for example, examines the development of corporate foundations as hybrid organizations; and Benjamin's (2021) case for placing the beneficiary more centrally in non-profits implies the requirement for some stakeholders to step back, as others step forward.

Scholarly research into philanthropy's 'supply side' has always had to reckon with the situation that foundations especially, and many major donors, are very predominantly private organizations or individuals, while operating in public domains. Thus, global visibility is either planned and chosen by them, or viewed through a variety of external lenses rather than through the internal lenses of the choices and challenges faced by foundation boards and professional staffs. As assessed by Bushouse and Mosley (2018, p. 289), in relation to public policy processes, 'the role of philanthropic foundations in the policy process is largely hidden and thus significantly under conceptualized'. This situation is obvious, not least when we observe the close proximity and interaction between philanthropy, think-tanks and research-near policy institutes in many contemporary policy fields. Paradoxically, much-advocated collaborations between philanthropic institutions, and notably between foundations and public management and governmental bodies (Healy & Donnelly-Cox, 2016; Phillips, 2018; Toepler, 2018), may make philanthropic activity less visible, as will membership of specified-purpose coalitions. In the latter case, foundations' preferences may lean towards intermediary and not membership roles in coalition building, providing for limited visibility, as has been noticed, for example, in the field of education and the movement for school choice reforms in the United States (Henrekson et al., 2020).

Lack of visibility, and preferences and privileges of institutional privacy, mean that researching foundations is not easy, other than through (often invitational) case-study strategies, making those grey literatures which 'open up' especially valuable. Here, Anthony et al.'s (2017) argument, that the implications of privacy extend beyond individual-level concerns to broader social structural impacts, is especially relevant. So, however, is Adloff's (2015, p. 2002) characterization of foundations (in Germany and the United States) as embodying 'the principle of charismatically charged exclusivity'. If this characterization holds, and is applicable to other foundations, foundations as institutions retain a kind of unassailable strength and influence in societies, on policies as well as on people, which not only acculturates their management and organizational systems, structures and reputations, but also affects

research access at many levels. Thus, it still remains challenging from management and organization perspectives to be fully capable of ‘seeing like a philanthropist’ (Horvath & Powell, 2020, p. 81). Nevertheless, this challenge is taken up in each of the papers presented in this special issue.

Final reflections: foundations and the pandemic and post-pandemic world

The experiences of us all during late 2019 to date can be framed in terms of philanthropy itself—that is, demonstrating simultaneously the best of us and the worst of us. The shifting of government roles, beginning to tilt foundations away from their pivotal public and community resource roles, beyond the early 20th century to which we allude has now been magnified almost beyond comprehension. By contrast to governments’ spending worldwide and at national levels, we are reminded forcibly how relatively small philanthropy’s global contributions are. This is not to detract from the pro-active and effortful responses, organizational and managerial, from across the range of foundation types; their experiences and responses being published in the scholarly and grey literatures (Hemel, 2020; Cairns et al., 2020), notably regarding their heightened levels of spend (Finchum-Mason et al., 2020) and organizational awareness (Cairns et al., 2020a).

Moreover, the very importance of the philanthropic institutional context, whether and how it affects individuals’ propensity for and levels of charitable giving, is newly explored in a 19-country study by Wiepking et al. (2021). For these authors, ‘while formal and informal institutionalization of philanthropy is continuously being shaped’ (Wiepking et al., 2021, p. 25), institutions shape individuals’ behaviour and individuals in turn shape institutions; a critical perspective in the post-pandemic philanthroscapes. That inter-relationship is also evident in the other side of the binary line within philanthropy—giving time and talent through volunteering. Though unexamined in this special issue, volunteering has also figured strongly, pointing to a need for developing its theorization from organization and management perspectives; for example, where levels and forms of volunteer community activism made for co-production, in contrast to hospital-managed care (Cepiku et al., 2021).

Nevertheless, criticism and critique of foundations and major donors remain. For example, Finchum-Mason et al.’s (2020) study is reported as responsive to the context of recognition that the Covid-19 crisis brought the charges of (foundation) plutocracy in the United States into sharp focus, being ‘more interested in protecting their power and privilege than in contributing to the public good’ (p. 1129). Seibert (2019) identifies the ‘new wave’ of

scrutiny facing philanthropy, in light of the severe criticism of foundations and donors promising to fund Notre-Dame Cathedral’s rebuilding, both in terms of funding sources and community priorities. The institutional visibility challenges of collaborative working, discussed above, have never been more evident than in the case of the Global Vaccine Alliance (GAVI) and its COVAX delivery arm, where philanthropy, governments and quasi-government organizations are together both hidden and in plain sight (Eccleston-Turner & Upton, 2021).¹

Fuentenebro (2020), in challenging the idea that philanthropy can in fact ‘save us’, points instead to the wave of collective solidarity, channelled through mutual aid groups and organizations during the pandemic; arguably a further testament to volunteer activity, that aligns with social movement thinking, with its own management and organizational challenges. An interesting scenario, advancing this perspective, if retrospectively, comes from Reid and Broadhurst (2020): ‘(now) we had a game changing opportunity for foundations to step aside from the limelight, with grace, and put all their energies into supporting the real protagonists, those who tirelessly served the most vulnerable communities, where the COVID-19 pandemic had exposed widespread inequality and disadvantage from the cradle to the grave’. That this power-shared approach is feasible is, nevertheless, posited by Estwick (2021), suggesting ‘that the COVID-19 pandemic has opened an opportunity for philanthropy to embrace marginalised people within their power structures, to tame the worse impacts of health inequalities, and to promote health equity’.

Any one of these insights might suggest yet another ‘golden age’ in the making, as institutions and their donors embark on more, creative and responsive spending in the midst and in the wake of global and local need. Alternatively, those insights may undermine for the foreseeable future the chances of these institutions being regarded in any way as ‘golden’ (except perhaps as privileged) and usher in increasing prominence for other philanthropic institutions, resulting from external pressures. Either way, however, classical scholars tell us that the element of ‘gold’ in current considerations of a ‘golden age’ is misplaced. For Baldry (1952), for whom the idea of a different and happier existence is a traditional belief going back beyond any extant classical literature, ‘the key element of the traditional picture was not wealth but simplicity, not accumulated riches but the bounty of nature’ (Baldry, 1952, p. 87). Gold, far from having a place in the traditional picture, was seen as one of the causes of degeneration from that happy state, making gold ‘not of itself a part of the ideal past’ (Baldry, 1952, p. 87). It seems unlikely though that popular commentators will refrain entirely from characterizing philanthropic action, past and perhaps future, in this way,

while even the downgrade to a ‘gilded age’ (a veneer of gold, even gold paint) may still sound like praise, rather than the uncertainty and dubiousness that classical and pre-classical literary usage suggests.

Whether or not scholars and practitioners should persist or desist from using or acknowledging this phraseology, taken together, the ‘gold’ which philanthropic foundations now hold—their financial, social, intellectual, political and community capital—remains central to their management and organization. The opportunities for theorizing and deepening nuanced understanding of their own managerial and organizational risks and rewards are exemplified by the papers in this special issue. Those opportunities are important as never before as the scale of foundation work is being re-examined—whether or not re-purposed in our current pandemic-focused era—and as collaborative work with public bodies appears less of an option and more of an imperative, if foundations’ credible and worthy goals are to be met, and their promises kept.

STOP PRESS

Our stress on the separation of philanthropy’s grey literature from the canon of scholarship, and highlighting of foundations’ willingness to take on board only the broadest, most basic (challengeable) tenets of strategic management thinking, may be taken as a mutual critique: ‘they don’t read our work’ and ‘we only skim theirs’. Already this is challenged by the facts. The online publication by *IJMR* in advance of publication of this issue’s paper, ‘Elite philanthropy in the United States and United Kingdom in the new age of inequalities’, prompted an email in early April 2021 from a senior practitioner member of a philanthropy network in Sweden to co-editor Filip Wijkström, telling him and others in the network about the paper. Roughly translated, the message read:

‘There is a lot to consider in this (although it is also a bit provocative) and what is said certainly does not only apply to the US and the UK...’²

We could not have hoped for better.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge and express our thanks to everyone who submitted papers to this special issue, and our gratitude for the incisive responses and encouragement of our reviewers. The rigorous, reflective and timely guidance of Dr Marian Iszatt-White, from *IJMR*’s senior Editorial Team, working alongside us as Guest Editors, has been invaluable. The authors are indebted too for the

support and patience of *IJMR*’s Managing Editor, Emma Missen.

NOTES

¹ COVAX is co-led by the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI), GAVI and the World Health Organization (WHO), alongside key delivery partner UNICEF. GAVI coordinates the COVAX facility, a global risk mechanism for pooled procurement and equitable distribution of Covid-19 vaccines. GAVI’s founding members are the WHO, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the World Bank.

² In the original: ‘Det finns en hel del tänkvärt i denna (även om också lite provokativt) och det sagda gäller säkert inte bara för US och UK...’

REFERENCES

- Adloff, F. (2015) Foundations and the charisma of giving: A historical sociology of philanthropy in Germany and the United States. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26, pp. 2002–2022.
- Anthony, D., Camos-Castillo, C. & Horne, C. (2017) Toward a sociology of privacy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 43, pp. 249–269.
- Baldry, H.C. (1952) Who invented the golden age? *The Classical Quarterly*, 2, pp. 83–92.
- BECOME (2020) *Time, Treasure, Talent, & Testimony: Giving by Women of Color in Chicago*. Center for Community Engagement and Social Change in collaboration with Chicago Foundation for Women Report, Chicago, IL.
- Benjamin, L.M. (2021) Bringing beneficiaries more centrally into nonprofit management education and research. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 50, pp. 5–26.
- Binder, A. (2007) For love and money: Organizations’ creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society*, 36, pp. 547–571.
- Bishop, M. & Green, M. (2008) *Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Change the World*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.
- Boodoo, M.U., Henriques, I. & Husted, B.W. (2021) Putting the ‘love of humanity’ back in corporate philanthropy: The case of health grants by corporate foundations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32, pp. 185–193.
- Boulding, K.E. (1962) Notes on a theory of philanthropy. In: Dickinson, F.G. (Ed.) *Philanthropy and Public Policy*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, pp. 57–72.
- Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979) *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bushouse, B.K. & Mosley, J.E. (2018) The intermediary roles of foundations in the policy process: Building coalitions of interest. *Interest Groups and Advocacy*, 7, pp. 289–311.
- Cairns, B., Dyson, E. & Firth, M. (2020), *Moving out of the initial shock, Briefing 2 for trusts and foundations on the challenges faced by VCSE leaders during the Covid-19 Crisis*. London: Institute for Voluntary Action Research.
- Cairns, B., Dyson, E. & Lewis, M. (2020a) *Covid-19: The Story Told by 72 Emergency Funding Applications*. London: Institute for Voluntary Action Research.
- Callahan, D. (2017) *The Givers: Wealth, Power and Philanthropy in a New Gilded Age*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

- Cepiku, D., Giordano, F. & Bovaird, T. (2021) Managing the Covid-19 pandemic – from a hospital-centred model of care to a community co-production approach. *Public Money & Management*, 41, pp. 77–80.
- Corry, O. (2010) Defining and theorizing the third sector. In: Taylor, R. (Ed.) *Third Sector Research*. New York: Springer, pp. 11–20.
- Cunningham, H. (2016) The multi-layered history of western philanthropy. In: Jung, T., Phillips, S.D. & Harrow, J. (Eds) *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 42–55.
- Donnelly-Cox, G., Meyer, M. & Wijkström, F. (2020) Nonprofit governance. In: Anheier, H. & Baums, T. (Eds), *Advances in Corporate Governance – Comparative Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 142–179.
- Eccleston-Turner, M. & Upton, H. (2021) International collaboration to ensure equitable access to vaccines for COVID-19: The ACT accelerator and the COVAX facility. *The Millbank Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12503>
- Estwick, R. (2021) Delivering impact: Why now is the time for philanthropy to lead on health equity in cities. *Cities and Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23748834.2021.1910002>
- Ferris, J.M. (2016) Is this a new golden age of philanthropy? An assessment of the changing landscape. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 7, pp. 315–324.
- Finchum-Mason, E., Husted, K. & Suárez, D. (2020). Philanthropic foundation responses to COVID-19. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 49, pp. 1129–1141.
- Frumkin, P. (2006) *Strategic Philanthropy: The Art and Science of Giving*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fuentenebro, P. (2020) Will philanthropy save us all? Rethinking urban philanthropy in a time of crisis. *Geoforum*, 117, pp. 304–307.
- Gehring, T. (2021) Corporate foundations as hybrid organizations: A systematic review of literature. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32, pp. 257–275.
- Hammack, D.C. & Anheier, H.K. (2013) *A Versatile American Institution: The Changing Ideals and Realities of Philanthropic Foundations*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Hammack, D.C. & Heydemann, S. (Eds) (2009) *Globalization, Philanthropy, and Civil Society: Projecting Institutional Logics Abroad*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Harman, S. (2016) The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and legitimacy in global health governance. *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 22, pp. 349–368.
- Harrow, J. & Jung, T. (2015) Debate: Thou shalt have impact, total impact – government involvement in philanthropic foundations’ decision-making. *Public Money and Management*, 35, pp. 176–178.
- Hay, I. & Muller, S. (2014) Questioning generosity in the golden age of philanthropy: Towards critical geographies of super-philanthropy. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38, pp. 635–653.
- Haydon, S., Jung, T. & Russell, S. (2021) ‘You’ve Been Framed’: A critical review of academic discourse on philanthrocapitalism. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, pp. 353–375.
- Hazenbergh, R., Seddon, F. & Denny, S. (2015). Intermediary perceptions of investment readiness in the UK social investment market. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26, pp. 846–871.
- Healy, J. & Donnelly-Cox, G. (2016) The evolving state. In: Jung, T., Phillips, S.D. & Harrow, J. (Eds) *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. London: Routledge, pp. 200–212.
- Hemel, D. (2020) What some foundations are doing differently because of the coronavirus pandemic: 4 questions answered. <https://theconversation.com/what-some-foundations-are-doing-differently-because-of-the-coronavirus-pandemic-4-questions-answered-140693>
- Henrekson, E., Andersson, F.O., Wijkström, F. & Ford, M.R. (2020) Civil society regimes and school choice reforms: Evidence from Sweden and Milwaukee. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2019-0042>
- Heydemann, S. & Hammack, D. (2009) Philanthropic projections: Sending institutional logics abroad. In: D. Hammack & Heydemann, S. (Eds) *Globalization, Philanthropy and Civil Society: Projecting Institutional Logics Abroad*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, pp. 3–31.
- Horvath, A. & Powell, W.W. (2020) Seeing like a philanthropist: From the business of benevolence to the benevolence of business. In: Powell, W.W. & Bromley, P. (Eds) *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 81–122.
- Hvenmark, J. (2013) Business as usual? *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 35, pp. 223–247.
- Jaskyte, K., Amato, O. & Sperber, R. (2018) Foundations and innovation in the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 29, pp. 47–64.
- Jung, T., Harrow, J. & Leat, D. (2018) Mapping philanthropic foundations’ characteristics: Towards an international integrative framework of foundation types. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47, pp. 893–917.
- Jung, T. & Orr, K. (2021) What lies beneath? Spectrality as a focal phenomenon and a focal theory for strengthening engagement with philanthropic foundations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, pp. 312–329.
- Juntunen, M. & Lehenkari, M. (2021) A narrative literature review process for an academic business research thesis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46, pp. 330–342.
- Kah, S. & Akenroye, T. (2020) Evaluation of social impact measurement tools and techniques: A systematic review of the literature. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 16, pp. 381–482.
- Kania, J. & Kramer, M. (2011) Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter, pp. 36–41.
- Kumar, A. & Brooks, S. (2021) Bridges, platforms and satellites: Theorizing the power of global philanthropy in international development. *Economy and Society*, 50, pp. 322–345.
- LaFrance, S. & Latham, N. (2008) Taking stock of venture philanthropy. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer, pp. 60–65.
- Liket, K. & Maas, K. (2016) Strategic philanthropy: Corporate measurement of philanthropic impacts as a requirement for a ‘happy marriage’ of business and society. *Business and Society*, 55, pp. 889–921.
- Maclean, M., Harvey, C., Yang, R. & Mueller, F. (2021) Elite philanthropy in the United States and United Kingdom in the new age of inequalities. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, pp. 330–352.
- Maier, F. & Meyer, M. (2011) Managerialism and beyond: Discourses of civil society organizations and their governance implications. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 22, pp. 731–756.
- Maier, F., Meyer, M. & Steinbereithner, M. (2016) Nonprofit organizations becoming business-like: A systematic review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45, pp. 64–86.

- Mei, M.Q. & Wang, T. (2021) Place and corporate philanthropy: A systematic review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, pp. 376–393.
- Nicholls, A. & Teasdale, S. (2021) Dynamic persistence in UK policy making: The evolution of social investment ideas and policy instruments. *Public Management Review*, 23, pp. 812–817.
- Nieme, S. (2000) *Band on the record*. Beatles Studies 2. Department of Music, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Osella, F., Stirrat, R. & Widger, T. (2015) Charity, philanthropy and development in Colombo, Sri Lanka. In: Morvaridi, M. (Ed.) *New Philanthropy and Social Justice, Debating the Conceptual and Policy Discourse*, pp. 137–156. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Patrizi, P. & Thompson, E.H. (2010) Beyond the veneer of strategic philanthropy. *The Foundation Review*, 2, pp. 52–60.
- Phillips, S. (2018) Dancing with giraffes: Why philanthropy matters for public management. *Canadian Public Administration*, 61, pp. 151–183.
- Phillips, S.D. & Jung, T. (2016) A new ‘new’ philanthropy: From impetus to impact. In: Jung, T., Phillips, S.D. & Harrow, J. (Eds) *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 5–34.
- Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. (1999) Philanthropy’s new agenda: Creating value. *Harvard Business Review*, 77, pp. 121–130.
- Reid, R.J. & Broadhurst, C. (2020) Looking back on philanthropy in a pandemic foundation: Colleagues share common perspectives from across the pond. *International Journal of Community Well-Being*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42413-021-00115-9>
- Rey-Garcia, M. (2020) Why foundations flourish: A comparative policy framework to understand policy support for foundations across countries. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis, Research and Practice*, 22, pp. 6–29.
- Rombach, B. & Zapata, P. (Eds) (2010) *The Rise of Management-Speak*. Stockholm: Santérus Academic Press.
- Sacks, A.M. (1960) The role of philanthropy: An institutional view. *Virginia Law Review*, 46, pp. 516–538.
- Seibert, K. (2019) Giving under the microscope: Philanthropy, legitimacy and a new era of scrutiny. *Third Sector Review*, 25, pp. 123–141.
- Shaw, A.M., Canavan, J. & Dolan, P. (2021) Strategic philanthropy’s investment in public systems: A framework for intervention. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, pp. 411–425.
- Singer, A. (2016) Waqfs: Faith-based Islamic institutions before modern NGOs. In: Nejema, S. (Ed.) *NGOs in the Muslim World: Faith and Social Services*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 17–28.
- Swales, J. (2016) Reflections on the concept of discourse community. *ASp: la revue du GERAS*, 69, pp. 7–19.
- Swidler, A. (2009) Dialectics of patronage: Logics of accountability at the African–NGO interface. In: Hammack, D. & Heydemann, S. (Eds) *Globalization, Philanthropy and Civil Society: Projecting Institutional Logics Abroad*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, pp. 192–222.
- Toepler, S. (2018) Public philanthropic partnerships: The changing nature of government/foundation relationships in the US. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41, pp. 657–669.
- Thompson, C. (2018) Philanthrocapitalism: Rendering the public domain obsolete? *Third World Quarterly*, 39, pp. 51–67.
- Toepler, S. & Abramson, A. (2021) Government/foundation relations: A conceptual framework and evidence from the U.S. federal government’s partnership effort. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32, pp. 220–233.
- Von Schurbein, G., Rey-Garcia, M. & Neumayr, M. (2021) Contemporary philanthropy in the spotlight: Pushing the boundaries of research on a global and contested social practice. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32, pp. 185–193.
- Weller, A. (2020). Exploring practitioners’ meaning of “ethics,” “compliance,” and “corporate social responsibility” practices: A communities of practice perspective. *Business & Society*, 59, pp. 518–544.
- Wiepking, P. et al. (2021) Global philanthropy: Does institutional context matter for charitable giving? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764021989444>
- Wijkström, F. & Einarsson, S. (2018) Swedish foundations in comparison: A carefully negotiated space of existence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 32, pp. 1889–1918.
- Williamson, A. & Luke, B. (2021) Exploring the accountability and organizational identity of public philanthropic foundations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, pp. 394–410.
- Youde, J. (2019) The role of philanthropy in international relations. *Review of International Studies*, 45, pp. 39–56.
- Young, D.R. (2011) The prospective role of economic stakeholders in the governance of nonprofit organizations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 22, pp. 566–586.
- Zunz, O. (2012) *Philanthropy in America: A History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

How to cite this article: Harrow J, Donnelly-Cox G, Healy J, Wijkström F The management and organization of philanthropy: New directions and contested undercurrents. *Int J Manag Rev*. 2021;23:303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12273>