

MEASURING SOCIAL CHANGE INVESTMENTS
A Research Project of the Women's Funding Network
Deborah L. Puntenney, Ph.D.
April, 2002

LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the past 30 years, philanthropic institutions in the United States have increasingly invested their resources in ways they anticipate will lead to powerful and positive change in the lives of women and girls. The Women's Funding Movement has grown in response to a variety of social, political, and institutional injustices that leave women at a disadvantage in terms of achieving their full potential within society. Funders within this movement have supported all kinds of activities directed at ameliorating these injustices, including direct services, education, and advocacy. Worthwhile investment strategies and practices have been developed over time by individual institutions and shared among other foundations and funds with the same interests in and commitments to building a more just and equitable society. For the last several years, members of the Women's Funding Movement have been engaged in ongoing discussion about the need to systematically consolidate their knowledge and expertise in such a way that the significance of these social change investments can be demonstrated and used in planning future investment and fundraising strategies.

As part of its commitment to making certain that women's funds are recognized as the investment of choice of people with shared values, the Women's Funding Network is supporting ongoing research on *Investing for Social Change*. The research has explored how change is understood and measured in the broader universe through a review of the broad literature on social change, developed a model for understanding and measuring the impact of philanthropic investments that benefit women and girls, and will soon begin to test the model among non-profits supported by its members. Ultimately, WFN will develop tools and processes to enable its members and their grantee partners—individually and collectively—to track and understand their achievements in ways that will enable them to develop more effective future strategies and attract new donors to the movement.

The following pages present the literature review, both in terms of an annotated bibliography of some of the literature explored, and a simple listing of other relevant sources used in the project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY – ANNOTATED

1. Ackelson, Martha. (1988). Communities, Resistance, and Women's Activism: Some Implications for a Democratic Polity. In Ann Bookman & Sandra Morgen (Eds.), *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

In this article, Ackelson contends that a new paradigm for understanding democratic politics must account for the “politics of relationship.” Social struggle is nurtured and nourished by ongoing social relationships, and by discounting or not discussing the importance of these relationships, one cannot fully comprehend social change and how it occurs. Ackelson also states that usually, women don't enter the public arena as individuals, but their political networks emerge as a result of their response as community members or household members to social problems. Part of women's coming into “political consciousness” is also related to their ability to make connections between their lives and the lives of other people. Thus, they respond to problems not just as individuals, but through an understanding of their place within a network of various relationships – be they work, home, or family related. Although women have been relegated to the private sphere, their roles as nurturers tend to pull them into public spaces, as they attempt to deal with landlords, welfare officers, markets, etc. Ackelson suggests that we can only understand political action by first examining people *as they live*, in their everyday lives, and not just see political activity as something extra-curricular or related only to electoral politics. Also, we must define political activity broadly, seeing this activity as women's attempts to change or address concerns within their communities, households, or work places. In short, women are addressing issues that do not just touch them as individuals, but that affect their lives as relational beings. Taking into account the importance of relationships (friendships, family, romantic) to social movement development and maintenance is crucial in understanding how women get involved in the struggle for social change.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: The concept of social change being in part the result of struggle that is nurtured by social relationships; the interconnectedness of lives is relevant in the way women approach politics and change.

2. Bobo, Kim, Kendall, Jackie, & Max, Steve. (1991). *Organizing for Social Change: A Manual for Activists in the 1990s*. Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

Bobo, Kendall, and Max produced this volume to capture the work of the Midwest Academy, a community activist/organizer training center in Chicago. Founded by Heather Booth in 1973, the academy trained organizers in a variety of citizen movements, basing its teachings on lessons learned in the student, labor, women's, and civil rights movements. Three principles about the necessary ingredients for effective organizing guide the teaching of the academy:

1. The effort must win real improvements in people's lives.
2. The people involved must get at a sense of their own power.
3. The action must alter the relations of power.

All of its work is based on the premise that building networks across many kinds of organizations would enable organizers to learn the many techniques of organizing without being bound by a particular form. The Midwest Academy trained many leaders of the women's movement, and created a place where women felt reinforced in what had become a male-dominated field. All of its work is aimed at developing individuals so that "they can work together toward a more just society" (p. ix).

The volume is organized as a "how-to" guide to direct action organizing. It focuses on building "lasting institutions that are both self-defense organizations and avenues for citizen participation in public life" (p. 5). The authors preface the book by saying the direct action is not the only legitimate form of organizing, or the only effective form.

Part I deals with the fundamentals of direct action organizing, including the three principles of direct action, how a direct action organizing issue campaign works, the use of power in an issue campaign, a tactical guide to power, and the stages of an issue campaign. Subsequent chapters flesh out the basics, providing tools and resources for putting the steps into action. Part II deals with developing organizing skills, framed as leadership development. Part III deals with generating support for the growing organization. Part IV provides some great resources, including the words to a number of traditional and more modern organizing songs.

"Let me give you a word on the philosophy of reform. . . If there is no struggle there is no progress. . . Power concedes nothing without a demand."

Frederick Douglass
Letter to an abolitionist associate, 1849

Relevance to the Investing for Social Change project: This book is great reminder that change can happen as a result of collective action based on systematic activities that build citizen power to speak and act for themselves for specific purposes related to social justice.

3. Branch, Kristi, Hooper, Douglas A., Thompson, James, & Creighton, James. (1984). *Guide to Social Assessment: A Framework for Assessing Social Change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

This book is a guide to understanding the social effects of change, where change is modeled as the independent variable(s) and its impact on people is the dependent variable to be tested. It is organized as a reference manual for social scientists to help them “ask salient questions, obtain pertinent information, and conduct informed and rigorous analysis” as they explore communities on the issue of the impact of change (p. 3). Reasons for conducting this work are:

1. To predict the ability of a community or group to adapt to changing conditions.
2. To define the problems of clarify the issues involved in a proposed change.
3. To anticipate and assess impacts on the quality of life.
4. To illuminate the meaning and importance of anticipated change.
5. To identify mitigation opportunities or requirements.
6. To fulfill or comply with regulations and policies.

Cause and effect relationships are not simple, and this presents a major problem in trying to assess the social consequences of an action or policy. People do not submit quietly or predictably to various kinds of change and can voice their pleasure or displeasure in a variety of ways. The best that can be accomplished by social researchers is to understand the likely responses to changing conditions; absolute clarity is impossible.

Social assessment is discussed as an analytical process that can be useful at different stages of decision-making processes are implemented. As possible choices are explored, social assessment can contribute an understanding of the likely responses of the people the decisions will impact. An example would be the Women’s Funding Network’s NEWPP exploration of appropriate messages to attract new economy donors—the message development phase of the project is an example of social assessment.

The volume is organized around sections on general principles, frameworks for social assessment, and methods and techniques. One of the most interesting chapters focuses on determining the important characteristics of the existing environment via the use of the social organization model. It uses a matrix that charts various community

characteristics in comparison with the proposed project inputs (changes). The matrix allows the evaluator to track the relationship between each component, and to predict the likely outcome of each part of the planned change.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: The process described here looks at a different aspect of change than the current WFN project, i.e., it examines the impact of change and the likely impact of changes under consideration on people and communities, rather than the combined elements invested in by people in order to effect social change. In one sense, it may be useful, in that it describes how to go about gaining an understanding of the likely response to specific kinds of change. For WFN this could inform various efforts, for example, focus groups among women and girls to assess their likely response to certain activities under consideration.

4. Bruyn, Severyn T., and Rayman, Paula M. (1979). *Nonviolent Action and Social Change*. New York: Irvington Publishers.

In this edited volume, the authors compile a series of articles written by theorists, activists, academics, and artists about nonviolent social change. Although the articles are varied, several stand out as models of social change, answering questions such as: how do movements of people form and how do they actually create change in society?

In Chapter One entitled, “Theory of Nonviolent Action,” author Bruyn addresses theories on social movement formation. He states that there have been many radical nonviolent movements for social change in the 20th century, and through the study of these movements, we can identify a methodology for social change. These contemporary movements for social change connect both secular and sacred interests, as well as individual and community interests. They “marry” a spiritual or sacred view of individuals as precious beings bound in one community, with the radical idea that social action “in the world” must occur in order to overcome the domination and exploitation of the modern community.

A key principle within these moments is “self-governance.” It represents the ends and the means of a nonviolent social movement. While seeking self-governance for others, the rules and norms of the movements are expressed in these terms as well. People are encouraged and taught to be self-reliant in the movement process itself. Another key principle is the creation of group norms and symbols that can create meaning for people and guide their behavior in the face of opposition. Finally, self-control, self-sufficiency, and self-accountability are important aspects of social movement building and also for grounding nonviolent social movements in principles of social change and democracy.

In Chapter Two, George Lakey addresses “The Sociological Mechanisms of Nonviolence: How it works.” He claims that taking away people’s ability to maintain the status quo is the most important ingredient for social change. Through conversion, persuasion, and coercion, activists can attain their goals. For example, labor strikes take away an owner’s or a company’s ability to produce, thus rendering them economically impotent. Touching owners/corporations/elites where they are most vulnerable, i.e., their pocketbooks, is an important tactic in order to achieve social change. In addition, by helping non-movement groups to identify with the suffering of the group/cause in question, the movement helps to persuade individuals outside of the group to support or at least be sympathetic to its goals. Last, if a movement separates people from oppressive systems and does not blame individuals, people are more likely to support one’s cause.

Finally, in Chapter Six, Neil H. Katz and John P. Hunt discuss another formula for nonviolent civil resistance in their essay entitled, “Nonviolent Struggle in Albany, Georgia.” In this essay, they explore a peace walk initiative, called the Quebec-

Washington-Guantanamo walk, begun by the Committee for Nonviolent Action (CNVA) in 1963-1964. The CNVA was protesting the violation of civil liberties of people of color, particularly the racial segregation of the south and the United State's policies towards Cuba. Starting in May 1963, the CNVA left Quebec, and as they wound their way down the East Coast, they stopped in each town with the goal of drawing attention to the cause of racial discrimination. As they arrived in Albany, Georgia, they were met with resistance from local authorities who refused to let the marchers walk through town. As a result, the walkers defied authorities and were arrested for "parading without a permit" and "congregating on sidewalks," among other things. Many were arrested over the course of two months - some kept vigil outside the jail, others fasted. What resulted was a compromise from local officials and a release of the protesters, after national and international attention was brought to the walkers' plight.

In discussing this event, the authors state that it was successful for several reasons. First, political power disintegrates when people withdraw their obedience and support. The CNVA folks struck at the sources of power by refusing to cooperate with authorities. Their non-cooperation took several forms: walking downtown without a permit (after they were refused a permit), fasting, and drawing national and international attention to the treatment of those arrested, thus turning the repression by local authorities to the benefit of protesters. Second, symbolic actions can persuade non-movement members. For example, the refusal of many walkers to eat became their greatest public relations tool, as more and more people were alerted to this dedicated group of protesters willing to forego food for their cause. And, since authorities were unwilling to let the protesters starve (they were fed intravenously), the money spent on their care began to be an issue for some townspeople. Residents began to question whether or not the punishment was too harsh for the crime and also pointed out that the money spent to care for the protesters was drawing funds away from needed town services.

To summarize, the authors contend that economic, political, social-psychological, and strategic factors contribute to movement success and social change. The money spent to house and feed protesters (economic), the inordinate amount of repression brought to bear on protesters (political), the world-wide attention focused on the months long fast (social-psychological), and a well-organized group (using fasts, vigils, phone banks, and continued resistance) resulted in a successful campaign to raise awareness of and demonstrate against racial discrimination.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: The idea of social change being multidimensional and requiring a wide array of inputs and activities; the reminder that through withdrawal of obedience and support, people (movement participants) can cause a transformation in political power.

5. Buechler, Steven M. (1997). *New Social Movement Theories*. In Steven M. Buechler & F. Kurt Cylke, Jr. (Eds.), *Social Movements: Issues and Perspectives*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

New social movement (NSM) theories have developed as a response to resource mobilization and as a response to the inadequacies of classical Marxist theories that explained collective action. NSM challenges resource mobilization theory, which focuses on rational actors engaged in social action through formal networks that have access to resources, by instead considering the submerged, latent, and temporary networks that undergird collective action and by considering how culture, macro-level structures such as changes in the political structure, and collective identities (such as “women” and “gay/lesbian”) shape social movements. In addition, new social movements theories challenge classical Marxism on two levels: 1) Marxism’s economic reductionism presumed that all politically significant social action is derived from the fundamental economic logic of capitalist production and that all other social logics are secondary in shaping such actions; and 2) classical Marxist theory presumed that the most significant social actors are defined by class relations rooted in the process of production and that all other social identities are secondary at best in constituting collective action. New movement theorists by contrast look to other logics of action based on things such as politics, ideology, and culture as the roots of collective action. They have also looked to other sources of identity such as gender, sexuality, and ethnicity as the definers of collective identity that create solidarity and a basis for movement development. While resource mobilization theory focuses on institutions/resources and meso-level explanations for social change, NSM theories focus on structural changes in society, historical shifts, and micro-level considerations such as identity and culture.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: May provide some insight as to why and how it can become difficult to maintain a cohesive, single-track movement. Change is *change*, meaning that movements do not happen in static universes but in constantly shifting realities.

6. Capek, Mary Ellen S. (2001). *The Women's Funding Movement: Accomplishments and Challenges*. In *Women and Philanthropy: Old Stereotypes and New Challenges*. Volume three of monograph series.

<http://www.wfnet.org/getinformed/>

This review concentrates on what the author says about what has worked for women's foundations that are a part of the women's funding movement. The women's funding movement took off in the 1980s as a response to "Reagonomics" and because young, professional women were moving into careers in organized philanthropy. Also, litigation and criticism aimed at foundations that had not been addressing the needs of women and minorities resulted in increased attention to and generation of funds for women. Finally, the planning of the United Nations' Decade for Women meeting in Nairobi in 1985 also created a climate for the women's funding movement. Through interviews with foundation members and directors, the author found that there are several things that made the women's funding movement a success. First, interviewees concluded that a foundation must be persistent, must find allies, and find new ways of solving problems in order to secure better funds.

Also, the author gives several suggestions for future success in securing women's funding, which are connected again to things such as advocacy, research, public awareness, education, and public policy, areas important to social change that affects women. For example, Capek concludes that foundations need good mentoring programs to introduce new staff, particularly new directors, to the world of funding (advocacy). Also, she suggests that a massive media campaign (public awareness) would strengthen women's funding efforts. In addition, she suggests, more research and evaluation on the non-profit sector and on the work that grantees are doing would help foundations assess what area is most appropriate in which to invest their funds (research and knowledge). Finally, she encourages mainstream philanthropy groups to use their clout to move public policy agendas (public policy).

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Supports the inclusion of a number of the vectors in the Investing for Social Change model; wonderful concise mini-history of the women's funding movement.

7. Costello, Cynthia. (1988). *Women Workers and Collective Action: A Case Study from the Insurance Industry*. In Ann Bookman and Sandra Morgen (Eds.), *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

In this chapter, the author chronicles the organizing efforts and strike of a small group of office workers at a small Wisconsin insurance firm, Wisconsin Education Association Insurance Trust (The Trust) in 1979. These workers were subject to sex-discriminatory practices and attitudes, as well as a system of surveillance and control that treated workers like second class citizens. For example, clerical workers were made to enter and exit the building by special side entrances; they could not use the doors that upper management used for entry into the building. When they began to organize and see the strike through, the women risked financial hardship, upset family relations, and challenged traditional notions of appropriate feminine behavior, especially when they became more aggressive in their strike tactics. The author states that the strike at Trust shows that a militant work culture is more likely to develop when three conditions are present: 1) managerial practices provide women a clear target for their grievances; 2) working women have access to a supportive ideology as well as resources they can mobilize; 3) the threat of managerial repression is not prohibitive. With these conditions met, women might be more likely to engage in militant, collective action.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Not directory relevant, but good evidence that collective action produces results; possibly a cautionary tale/reminder about the risks of certain kinds of collective action focused on change.

8. Crowfoot, James, Chesler, Mark A., & Boulet, Jacques. (1983). *Organizing for Social Justice*. In Edward Seidman (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Intervention*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

In this chapter, the authors explore the ways in which struggles for social justice are being planned and carried out in the U.S. The concept of social justice is defined as an on-going struggle among various groups for access to certain resources: at the societal level, access to basic resources and power, which presumes participatory structures in both economic and political institutions; at the organizational level, arrangements of work, play, and daily life that serve the needs of different groups of people, those with power and wealth and those without it; and at the personal level, which involves the consciousness of one's group and interests and the freedom to act on them. Some emerging issues that organizers consider important in understanding current social movement development include: 1) understanding macro-social issues, such as the increase in size/power/global influence of major corporations, which might have to be addressed even by local groups organizing for social change; 2) taking into account the cultural context of organizing, such as the daily activities and living patterns of oppressed people, which must be considered when designing organizing strategies and can be used as a resource and a force for creating group solidarity; and 3) the diverse/multiple sites of movement, which are important to consider given that injustice and inequality are not isolated realities, but realities that touch multiple groups - in addition, some individuals might be members of multiple groups, thus making it important to link issues of race inequality with gender discrimination and class issues.

Finally, groups organizing for social justice are also under pressure to ensure that their internal practices are conducted in just and democratic ways. Internal empowerment of workers, attention to race and gender discrimination, and new forms of educational and leadership development are essential to the ongoing process of social change. Social justice groups must consider five areas in which to improve their internal practices and emulate social justice in their own organizations: 1) How should they choose which social justice issues to focus on? 2) How should they empower members? 3) How could research and education be more empowering? 4) How could they build coalitions with other organizations? 5) What resources are available to them and how could they use those resources in equitable ways? These are the areas that the authors consider important for understanding how social justice movements can develop and sustain themselves, particularly in ways that are consistent with movement values and goals.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Supports the notion that to work effectively for change that benefits women and girls, women doing this work in the United States must be aware of, and in some kind of supportive relationship with women working toward the same kinds of change elsewhere. Injustice in one place cannot be eliminated without simultaneous efforts to address it in other places as the economic and political structures that support injustice are global.

9. Gittell, Marilyn, Ortega-Bustamente, Isolda, & Steffy, Tracy. *Women Creating Social Capital and Social Change: A Study of Women-Led Community Development Organizations*.

<http://web.gc.cuny.edu/howardsamuels>

In this study, the authors examine what is different in women-led groups that are involved in community development. Even though community development groups may not be “social movements” per se, many developed out of neighborhood movements for social change, around issues such as affordable housing, economic development, racism, etc. Thus, I think their findings are relevant to understanding how social change is multi-dimensional and how it benefits/affects women.

The authors studied several community development groups all over the U.S., interviewing members and directors about their work and leadership style. One concept that emerged was the creation of “social capital,” what can be defined as “norms, trust, and networks” that are vital to developing leadership, maintaining member involvement, and creating a good working environment for community activists and neighborhood members. This social capital often sustains neighborhoods that are declining financially.

The women-led organizations were found to be committed to “process, participation, and internal democracy.” Also, the groups created social capital through leadership programs (getting people in the community involved, especially youth), community participation, and networking. The high degree of community participation translated into programs that directly corresponded to community needs. The authors found that the women-led community development groups tended to emphasize collective decision-making and promoted institutional change. The leaders of these groups rejected professional barriers, tended to live in or identify with the community, and described community groups as extension of family, or “sisterhood.” This trust consequently can engender more participation by community members in the struggle for change.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Supports the notion that community organizing is an important component of the Investing for Social Change Achievement Vector, and that the web of relationships that is central to the model is key. Might provide a useful overlay for the vector in terms of building capacity in each of its categories.

10. Howard, John R. (1974). *The Cutting Edge: Social Movements and Social Change in America*. Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott and Company.

In this book, the author compiles a series of articles on different social movements in the U.S. that were active during the 1960s and 1970s. Focusing on the civil rights movement, Black Power movement, women's movement, movement for gay and lesbian rights, the hippie and youth movement, and even right wing social movements, he touches on several aspects of movement development, organization, and demise. He discusses the socio-historical foundations of each movement, the social base of support for different movements, the social-psychological basis of personal involvement in movement organization, the structure and ideology of various movements, organizational diversity, and then finally analyzes conflicts within and between movements, and between movements and the larger society.

In his section on "The Minority Revolt," Howard describes some key events that fostered the development of the civil rights movement. For example, the race riots in Chicago in 1919 signified the Black community's attempts to stake their claim to their community, instead of fleeing white oppression, which had happened in rural areas. Instead, the Black urban community had enjoyed more freedoms than poor, rural Blacks even though discrimination was still widespread. In addition, there was an established community, a growing movement of national pride in urban communities, and a growing Black middle class that allowed a broad base of support to emerge for the civil rights movement in the north. Out of this growing professional class, emerged organizations such as the NAACP and Congress for Racial Equality.

In contrast, the women's movement in the 1960s had no organizational base, nor did local organizations such as churches or schools act as branches of a national movement, like they did in the civil rights movement. The women's movement organizational base rested a lot on what Howard calls "fictive kinship," that is, women's centers or consciousness-raising groups that tried to make women's everyday personal concerns political. Women were "sisters" and as such created a system of support for one another that could sustain the movement even though the national structure was not as developed. The women's movement was also helped by "instrumental groups:" these were groups concerned with just one issue, such as women's professional caucuses. Also, women's consciousness raising groups were anti-hierarchical; thus, there was no central national leadership, making this movement different from other social movements. However, the consciousness-raising groups gave women a space in which to voice their personal grievances and turn those grievances into political action.

Howard also addresses the failure of the hippie movement, which developed as a response to consumerism, conventional social relations, the estrangement of people from one another, and the mind-body dichotomy. Because part of the ideology of the movement promoted individualism and was anti-organizational, the movement had no

social base of support or organizational structure to help sustain it. The hippie movement did not develop and maintain itself as some of the other movements did during this time period. Howard suggests, then, that local and national organizations, as well as the opening up of political space for certain groups to engage in the political process (voting rights for Blacks, women's caucuses) are important for the development and maintenance of social movements. Without these supports and structures, movements would quickly wither and fade.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Provides evidence for the idea that while movements organized around achieving social justice share several common elements in terms of movement development, organization, and demise, every movement has a different set of discrete characteristics. Supports the idea that social change is about claiming the right to name the issue and to define the social construction of the issue. In one example, discusses how in the women's movement, certain processes distinct to the movement (e.g., consciousness raising groups) created the space in which women began to do these things.

11. Maruyama, Magoroh. (1983). Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Social and Community Change. In Edward Seidman (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Intervention*. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publishing Company.

Important points:

- I. Cultural differences in social and community change:
 - a. European epistemology is based on substance, identity, and permanence; Aristotelian logic assumes that there cannot be circular thinking or logic or arguments; this is not true for all cultures.
 - b. Sees change as unusual, something that requires explanation; other cultures see change as normal and natural.
 - c. European perspective fosters the view that if there is change, there must be an agent of change.
 - d. Other cultures, like the Mandenka of West Africa, for example, see change as the culmination of causal loop interactions among many elements; these interactions generate change, and neither causal priority nor a causal hierarchy is needed to (or can) explain social change.

- II. Other errors in European/white concepts of change:
 - a. Zero-sum game; if there is a winner, there must then be a loser; not all cultures see this as an inevitable outcome of change.
 - b. All social and biological developments follow the same path and can be rank-ordered, i.e., if a community had technology it was assumed to be more developed or “advanced” than other cultures
 - c. Important desire of social change is to bring about homogeneity and equalization; other cultures see heterogeneity as desirable; for example, the Mandenka believe that diversity enables mutually beneficial cooperation, while sameness ferments conflict and competition.
 - d. Use of unanimous consensus making in decision-making; assumes existence of one “best” solution; based on the principle of “sticking to the point;” in contrast, the Navajo and Mandenka cultures use the principle of “polyocular” vision, that is, it is taken for granted that people have different ideas or views of the same situation, and these differences, rather than being discarded, are incorporated into the understanding of the situation. In fact, there is no word

in the Japanese language for “objective,” since it is not understood that there is one “objective” or best view of a situation.

- III. Mindscales: Tool for understanding the reasoning, cognition, conceptualization, decision making, planning, and designing patterns of individuals:
- a. Type H: Homogeneous, hierarchical, classificational – Regards homogeneity as the basis for peace, heterogeneity as the basis for conflict, inconvenience, and inefficiency; world is seen as a system of categories; one’s gain is someone else’s loss.
 - b. Type I: Heterogeneous, isolationistic, random – Sees individuals as different, independent, and unrelated; does not make positive use of “differentness;” assumes that individual separation will result in higher productivity.
 - c. Type S: Heterogeneous, interactive, homeostatic – Heterogeneity is basic, indispensable and desirable; diversity is the basis for mutually beneficial cooperation; look for positive-sum combinations of outcomes for social change; oriented to stability, the idea that even change has some stable patterns.
 - d. Type G: Heterogeneous, interactive, morphogenetic - Heterogeneity is basic, indispensable and desirable; diversity is the basis for mutually beneficial cooperation; look for positive-sum combinations of outcomes for social change; oriented towards change, not stability.
 - e. Summary: Europeans and U.S. thinking tends to be oriented towards Type H and I thinking (some non-western cultures conceptualize social change in this way as well, i.e., Islamic and Korean cultures); S and G thinking tends to be utilized more often by non-western cultures.
- IV. Summary - How can one utilize these mindscales for understanding social change? The author suggests that, for example, in talking about economic productivity and its decline in the U.S., government and business circles often cite obsolescent production facilities, low scientific literacy, and adversarial relations between sectors to account for economic failures. The author suggests viewing change not as a zero-sum game, with winners and losers, but instead to see it as a mutually beneficial process between non-similar sectors. For example, instead of tax incentives and de-regulation, which are “passive” incentives for production, something along the lines of long-term, low interest loans, risk-absorbing measures, direct investment, and expenditures for technological and scientific research are active incentives based on positive-sum assumptions for more than one sector of the business and scientific community.

Criticism of article – a bit dated. The author looked at between group variation more than at within group variation, i.e., there is some question as to whether U.S. and Western European cultures are as homogeneous in their perspectives as the author suggests.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: A reminder that the western view of change as a linear process and something individual/collective action achieves is dissimilar to the view of other cultures that view change as more organic and inevitable, less the product of targeted effort.

12. McCarthy, Kathleen D., Editor. (2001). *Women, Philanthropy, and Civil Society*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

This is an edited volume of essays that focus on women's philanthropy, both cross-culturally and historically. It is a complement to other research that has discussed and analyzed women's political culture and how this political culture has influenced public policy making and institution building throughout history. Some historians have discovered that women's philanthropy tended to be more pervasive in weak states; however, the authors in this book have discovered that women's philanthropic activity was effective in both weak and strong states. In addition, women have often worked as volunteers using public funds for community service, but this service tends to be rendered invisible (because it is unpaid), and thus women's contributions to the political culture are often left unseen.

Religion has also been an influential factor in women's philanthropy. Religious service systems in some areas enabled women to remain largely independent. For example, religious orders of Catholic women were able to control their own hospitals, schools, and charitable organizations. Likewise, religion often shaped the type of charitable work women could do – for example, in the 19th century, Protestant women in the U.S. were encouraged to give time and money to charitable organizations, especially those that were “christianizing” other countries. Also, Jewish philanthropic or women's groups during this time tended to promote philanthropy and delivery of services within the Jewish community in the U.S. Thus, religion shaped and controlled many aspects of women's philanthropy.

In addition, colonialism fostered some aspects of women's philanthropy by promoting single-sex charitable organizations, where needs were expected to be met at the local and not state level. Also, feminist agendas around the world have brought to the forefront the importance of women's work and women's organizations, as seen from the Beijing Conference on Women and from the declining ability (and desire in some places) of states to meet human needs and the growing visibility of NGOs.

These essays are guided by a common set of seven hypotheses that provide a useful ground for comparing the authors' findings. These hypotheses include the following ideas: 1) Religion was the most important factor in shaping women's philanthropy in civil society; 2) Women's organizations made their impact on public policy-making through “maternalist” policies; 3) Women's organizations historically had more authority in weak, de-centralized states than in strong, highly centralized states; 4) Women's non-profit organizations were heavily dependent on public funds; 5) Participating in voluntary organizations enabled women to build alternative political power structures along-side those of men; 6) The types of strategies that women's groups adopted had a profound impact on their degree of authority or their autonomy;

and 7) - activities. In one way or another, these hypotheses are addressed in the essays. Several of these essays will be described in the following paragraphs.

In chapter two, Evelyn Diebolt discusses whether or not women's philanthropy was distinctive in France, between the 16th to 20th century. She describes the path of women's philanthropy as being one that began not as a sure route to women's emancipation, but developed as guise under which women could participate in public life. Many women participated in the "good works" of the church, and used religion as a means by which to be involved in public life.

By the 1900s, philanthropy's development in France grew in four stages. First, philanthropic groups took advantage of the right to association conferred on civil society. Then, these groups began to disconnect from the church, and consequently many became institutionalized. Finally, charitable groups have been more recently re-born in the form of volunteer groups.

The author concludes that women's philanthropic contributions shaped the economic and social development of France during these centuries. The secularization process made women's philanthropy more visible than when it was subsumed under religious activity. Women's charitable groups also developed a parallel power structure apart from the church and men's groups; however, these groups led by women could only keep their independence at the local level for short periods of time. In addition, women's charitable groups tended towards separatism and individualism; such "separatist" philanthropy allowed women to have a more public role. French society, though very patriarchal, tolerated these women's groups because they met so many societal needs. Finally, with the right to found organizations granted by law in 1901, women's philanthropy underwent a "freeing" period. Consequently, part of the impetus for women's ascent to high positions in government in the health and human welfare sectors can be traced to women's philanthropic groups that flourished in the early 1900s and provided a space for women in the public sphere.

In chapter six, Susan Chambre discusses the parallel power structures and changing nature of Jewish women's philanthropy in the U.S. She demonstrates that Jewish women's philanthropy has helped to develop Jewish communal institutions by identifying communal issues, encouraging women to engage in acts of *chesed*, or "acts of loving kindness," and raising funds for the community and community projects. Although Jewish women's philanthropy development parallels the development of women's philanthropy in the U.S., it also has its distinctions. For example, Jewish women's charitable groups emphasized building Jewish institutions both domestically and internationally. However, with the change in gender roles, Jewish women are less interested in working in women-only groups that have traditionally served as parallel power structures for women in the community. Some women now have taken over traditionally male leadership positions in Jewish organizations. Still, Jewish women's organizations have been social centers and also "incubators" for policy and program

development for the Jewish community, which continues to be important in the progress and existence of the Jewish community in the U.S.

In chapter eight, author Beth Baron explores the life of one Islamic woman activist in Egypt in the inter-war period of the early 20th century, Labiba Ahmad. Labiba was a central figure in the Muslim Brothers Movement. Although the movement was founded by Hasan al-Banna, Labiba was his close confidant and influential in furthering the Islamic revival in Egypt through her charitable works. These works included the creation of the Society of Egyptian Ladies' Awakening and the development of the journal *al-Nahda al-Nisa'iyya*. Her brand of philanthropy promoted a return to Islam and the development of an Islamic nation. She criticized western influences on Egyptian life and instead promoted a state nurtured and governed by Islamic law.

In addition to her ideas about social change and nation building, Labiba also took part in numerous educational and charitable acts. She helped start a school for poor girls; the school taught them skills such as sewing so that they could be self-sufficient. Labiba combined literary activity with philanthropy, promoting her message of looking to Islam to cure society's ills and using her journal as a medium for this message. The example of Labiba's life and work presents a different picture of Islamic women, one that centers them in Islamic ideology and practice instead of relegating them to the periphery of activism and nation building.

In chapter ten, Pushpa Sundar describes the practice of philanthropy in India, as it developed in the 20th century. Most of her chapter focuses on middle and upper class women, since they historically have been the ones with time and money to donate to causes. However, she also examines how poor women organized themselves in the 1960s into self-help organizations. Her chapter explores chronologically women's philanthropy from colonialism to post-independence, with emphasis on how religion and British rule shaped women's philanthropic activity.

Sundar describes the importance of giving and philanthropy in Hinduism that dates back as far as 1500 BC. She states that in the Vedic period, sacrifice and charity were considered important in order to merit a place in heaven. Also, sacred Hindu texts enjoined selfless service to fellow humans to realize the Divine in oneself and to experience the unity of Life. Thus, women, no less than men, were motivated by religious ideals to donate time and money in the service of the needy. However, these patriarchal religions still did not permit women to be active in the public sphere, consequently limiting their philanthropic activities.

Likewise, the British introduction of western ideas and religious practices altered the practice of philanthropy. While this change reinforced some Indian ideals of philanthropy, British ways of thinking also promoted education as a panacea for India's social ills, thus causing some Indian philanthropists to re-think their charitable giving or to what type of organizations they should donate time and money. These new

philanthropic adventures also gave some Indian merchants more prestige in the eyes of the British, thus advancing some members of India's upper class. During the reform era of the 1800s, Indian women campaigned for more education for women, property rights, and the abolition of child marriages and the immolation of wives. Women started giving time and money to organizations that tried to address these issues. However, women's work was still non-political and welfare oriented during this time period.

By the turn of the century, the Indian women's movement had emerged and women's work became more political in nature. Added to this was the entry of Mahatma Gandhi on the political scene. In his non-violent social struggle, he turned to women for support and help. He advocated women's self-education and self-help so that they could raise the next generation. The result was an unleashing of women's power and involvement in social movements for change. This resulted in a shift from individual philanthropy to a type of philanthropy that focused on collective action and emphasized social change. However, women's funds for philanthropic causes still came from private donors and were not distinguished by large endowments. Philanthropic effort was concentrated in three areas: the education of women, help for women in vulnerable positions (child brides, widows, unmarried mothers, and orphans), and the political and legal emancipation of women.

In contemporary India, women have been more involved in "maternalist" organizations, dedicated to serving women and children. It has not necessarily been through direct political participation that women have made an impact on national agendas, for example, women have not been in high positions of power in government. However, women have voted out governments that they did not like. Women in India have used multiple strategies in the absence of direct access to political power, working in women-exclusive organizations and through gender-neutral NGOs such as the Red Cross. Indeed, Indian women have also been helped by the international feminist movement, which has supported Indian women's push for self-sufficiency.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: In part, the book supports the idea that the work women do in creating social change can be less visible or salient when viewed through the lens of the dominant structure and that therefore it is important to reflect, validate, and capture women's investments, even though they may not come in packages that the larger structure recognizes.

13. Nagai, Althea K., Lerner, Robert, & Rothman, Stanley. (1994). *Giving for Social Change: Foundations, Public Policy, and the American Political Agenda*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

The book argues that philanthropic foundations ideologically and substantively contribute to the shaping of the American political agenda. The argument rests on the belief that elites in a variety of sectors, e.g., business, the federal judiciary, education, etc., help bring about social change from the top down. Philanthropic foundation elites are in the position of guiding one powerful sector. The authors note that the segment of the scholarly community concerned with public policy—economists and political scientists—tend to focus on markets and government as change agents, and have typically ignored foundations as potentially instrumental in effecting social change.

In spite of a few prominent conservative foundations, the authors suggest that a “critical mass of social-change foundations” successfully push the national agenda in a liberal direction. The book is based on a study of 225 of the largest foundations in America and more than 4,000 grants they distributed.

A philanthropic foundation is “a private organization with a large endowment and achieves its goals by making grants . . . to an individual or other private organizations that serve some public purpose” (p.2). Charity and philanthropy are quite different. Charity means helping the poor; foundations do not distribute dollars to the poor but rather to intermediary organizations. Additionally, they often award grants and invest in ways that have little to do with aiding the poor. The history of philanthropic foundations demonstrates that much American giving since early times has focused on building institutions capable of providing individuals with opportunities. Americans have traditionally preferred to use non-governmental organizations to distribute or redistribute wealth. Two early kinds of “philanthropy” characterize America’s history. The first involved giving to voluntary associations as a way of reinforcing group membership; the second involved giving surplus income for the purpose of some kind of influence—socially responsible or otherwise. The word philanthropy itself comes from the Greek *philanthropia*, or “love of mankind.” Out of the second early form of philanthropy emerged what we now call foundations. These organizations are currently run with several layers of persons and influence between the philanthropist—or donor—and his or her contribution.

The foundation world is a relatively new sector in society, resulting in great part from fortunes made during the industrial revolution. The authors argue that the officers and trustees of these foundations form a strategic elite. With the rise of the American welfare state, foundations, whose focus had always been the public good, became politicized as definitions of the public good became sharply polarized. Conservative and liberals did not agree and these disagreements paralleled arguments about how the welfare state should function. Foundation giving thus became politicized giving; the authors argue that this giving has been in a generally liberal direction (see details in

later paragraphs) and that foundation elites tend to see themselves as part of the cutting edge of social change.

Some foundations actively seek to change policy by taking on the funding of projects that may act as pilots for future government intervention. That is, by demonstrating the need for and potential success of funded activities, foundations influence agenda setting by acting as educators and trend setters for legislators and other more directly involved in the policy process. This was particularly true through the 1960s and 1970s as the welfare state expanded and liberal members of the foundation elite set the primary role of philanthropy as piloting programs for the government to take over. The conservative response to this liberal action was to push for philanthropy to substitute for government funding, i.e., devolve responsibility to the private sector, and to fund research and activities in support of conservative causes. This period set the stage for the ongoing trend of very broad scope investments by liberal foundations, and a very narrow focus for conservative foundations. In particular, after the 1960s, liberal foundations tended to focus more on social action (the largest foundations disburse one-fourth of liberal grants for research), while conservative tended to focus on empirical research (more than 55% of conservative grants go for research). The model for change cast in this period is for liberal foundations to invest broadly based on an understanding that change emerges from a variety of investments, and for conservative foundations to invest more narrowly in maintaining the status quo.

The book chapters examine the development of philanthropic foundations before and after the New Deal, and explore three models for understanding foundations:

- (a) Foundations preserve the status quo (the ruling elite model)
- (b) Foundations are pluralistic like other institutions (the pluralist model)
- (c) Foundations work with other groups to effect massive social change in a radical direction (the adversary culture model)

Other chapters compare foundation elites with other elite groups. They argue that foundation elites are the most polarized but also the most sophisticated group of U.S. elite groups; some are liberal, some conservative. The authors also explore how political ideology among foundation leaders affects their organization's ethos, concluding that political liberalism results in innovation, a preference for social change spending, and a greater likelihood of staff input into foundation decisions. Political conservatism results in more traditional views of foundation operations and higher investment in non-controversial projects. Finally, the authors examine how foundations support public policy and find that most policy grants have ideological tilts embedded in them. More grants go to support liberal causes (2000 grants vs. 600 grants) and more dollars go to support liberal causes than conservative causes. However, since there are fewer conservative recipients, much higher dollar amounts per award are typical.

The authors conclude that foundation elites are neither a ruling elite nor completely representative of an adversary culture, but a sharply polarized and non-cohesive elite. They argue that a critical component of the foundation elite are “proponents of a new polarized pluralism” that fragments U.S. political culture and results in many foundation elites being far to the left of the general public. Foundations tend to support general public interest organizations such as the ACLU and NAACP, but provide less support for organizations dealing with family and population issues such as Planned Parenthood. One paradoxical set of findings from the study is that while the majority of foundation elites are conservative or moderate, the number of liberal public policy grants is much higher than conservative grants. The reason public policy funding tends to be liberal is that conservatives favor traditional kinds of funding rather than social change spending. While liberal grants outnumber conservative ones four to one, the average conservative grant is twice the amount of the liberal ones. Thus, conservatives, when they do support change, do so in a more targeted fashion.

The authors argue in the final chapter that foundations are “distant” from their grantees and that this distance makes evaluating the impact of their investment very difficult. They suggest that many foundations rely on professional reputation and ideological labels as they decide which organizations to support. This part of the argument is contrary to other evidence that portrays how explicitly women-and-girl oriented foundations operate, or strive to operate. These seem to prefer closer relationships to grantees, and the current WFN effort to track social change is a step toward ameliorating both the distance issue and the social change evaluation issue.

Note: Interesting data on the ten most liberal and ten most conservative foundations based on number and size of politicized grant given. Also of note, authors point out that most foundations do not fund public policy projects at all, supporting some findings of the Women’s Fund of the Greater Milwaukee Foundation.

Relevance to the Investing for Social Change project: Provides an understanding of how philanthropic foundations developed and how they function as agents for change. While not looking specifically at women’s foundations, offers some insights into how women’s foundations differ, why and how conservative trends in funding may (apparently) achieve more than liberal funding, and some directions women’s fund may want to pursue.

14. Naples, Nancy. (1998). *Grassroots Warriors: Activist Mothering, Community Work, and the War on Poverty*. New York: Routledge.

The most relevant idea that connects to this paper for WFN is Naples' contention that the word "political" must be re-configured in order for us to understand the true extent of women's involvement in struggles for social change. Because most discussions of politics assumes self-interest as a motivator for political involvement and defines political work as voting or running for public office, many times we do not see the political work that women do. Many community activists do not engage in electoral politics, but are engaged in activities such as confronting state and local authorities on issues important to the community. Furthermore, many are connected to social change issues as a result of personal and collective experiences of social injustice. "Doing politics," suggests Naples, is anything that includes a struggle to gain control over definitions of self and community, to augment personal and community power, and to create alternative community institutions and processes.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Another piece of work that supports the idea that women's investment in social change can look different than what the dominant structure expect. The personal, *community*, and political are inextricably linked. Also supports the argument that social change is about the struggle over definitions.

15. Ostrander, Susan. (1995). *Money for Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

The importance of money to sustaining social movement activity is widely understood to be one of the most significant factors shaping social movement development, maintenance, and success. In this book, Ostrander addresses the central problem of movement funding: the power of funders as movement outsiders to co-opt or moderate movement activity through their ability to control or manipulate where funds are spent/given. Some social movement theorists and progressive organizations themselves have advocated for not seeking external funding in order to maintain control of the organization. When outside funders are utilized, it is possible that the group could become beholden to or controlled by the small group of donors whose money the organization needs. When social movements become dependent upon elite funders such as foundations for support, often their agendas are “de-radicalized” and they are directed towards more moderate goals.

Ostrander argues, through a case study of the Haymarket People’s fund, which does not allow donors or movement outsiders to control funding and fund allocation, that this problem is not a social movement inevitability; this is a problem that can be addressed and remedied within the social movement organization or philanthropic foundation through incorporating movement insiders such as *grantees themselves* into the decision making process by giving them control of the allocation of grants and other funds. Haymarket is a small, regional public foundation in Boston that funds organizations who are participating in progressive local/social movement organizations. The money at Haymarket goes exclusively to these types of groups.

Haymarket’s goals, both through the groups it funds and through its internal structure, is to create a democratic system based on collective ownership and control of resources, an equitable distribution of money and power, and an end to exploitation of workers and others with regard to race, class, gender, and sexuality. The Haymarket Board actively addresses issues such as racism and gender discrimination at the foundation level, making sure that diverse groups are represented on the board and that traditionally subordinated groups have representation on all committees.

Ostrander argues that Haymarket succeeds in procuring outside funding while at the same time not ceding control of movement goals to funders by having grantees themselves and activists like past/present/future Haymarket grantees make the decisions with regards to funding organizations. In addition, although Haymarket is a foundation, it does its own sort of “organizing” when it brings people from these diverse movements to work on their governing board, on committees, at annual meetings, and at other events where participants can discuss common goals, share resources, and strategize about social change. By connecting fund-raising with organizing and more donor involvement, and by asking board members to contribute some of their own money, this allows for a more democratic leadership structure and

allocation of funds. Philanthropy is a field in which wealth is given, thus it does not really challenge the status quo; wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few and those people then decide when and where the money should be given. Haymarket, in its differing funding system, tries to challenge this part of philanthropy.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: More relevant as the Achievement Vector is translated to the funder level. Articulates the dangers of funders having the ability to redirect movements as well as some processes that can limit these dangers.

16. Roth, Benita. Assistant Professor of Sociology and Women's Studies, State University of New York, Binghamton. *What are Social Movements and What is Gendered about Women's Participation in Social Movements? A Sociological Perspective.*

<http://womhist.binghamton.edu/socm/intro.htm>.

This is a brief description of how sociology (as opposed to only looking at movements through an historical lens) can be used to help illuminate questions related to women and social movements: for example, what is a social movement vs. what is a women's movement? And what's different for women in social movements? The definitions of social movements have changed over time. Some early scholars defined social movements as highly organized, but non-routine groups where people interact in order to establish new relationships around political and social life by challenging existing power structures. These groups were often seen as made up of individuals who were marginalized and "malcontent." However, as the largely middle-class movements of the 1960s developed, theorists began to connect movement development not so much with group discontent and marginalization, but with the amount and type of resources that were/are available to groups and their ability to penetrate the political structure. Hence, movement development was about mobilizing existing resources and capitalizing on openings in the political structure in order to grow and be successful.

Roth suggests that women's movements tend to be defined very broadly, which is problematic since the experience of activism is very different for women than it is for men. She also suggests that much of women's work in movements often has gone unnoticed. Thus, a movement might not be part of "the women's movement," but it certainly would not have developed were it not for the work of women.

Some women have made their own movements; others enter mixed-gender movements. Many define women's movements as movements made up of women, led by women, for women's needs. For women in mixed gender movements, they might encounter several problems. First, one problem is the fact that the public sphere is usually considered a "male sphere," while women are relegated to the private sphere. Consequently, women who transgress their place in the "proper sphere" raise the question of whether or not women should protest in public at all, which adds a burden to women's protest work that men don't have to deal with at all. Although this is not as much of a problem for women in contemporary movements, women who protested in public in the early part of the 20th century had to deal with public contempt for their politics and for the fact that they were working outside of their proper sphere.

Also, women in mixed-gender movements are often given work that replicates their gender roles in daily life. That is, they are expected to clean up after meetings, take notes, make coffee, etc., which replicates the gendered division of labor in larger society. Women are usually not the leaders or decision-makers in mixed gender movements.

Finally, compartmentalization is a problem in mixed gender movements. For example, common gender interests are considered just plain “issues,” while women’s issues are considered only relevant to women. Women’s agendas are then handed over to women to address, even though they tend to be the most economically, structurally, and politically disadvantaged in the group, the group with the fewest resources. It is assumed that women will take care of the “women’s stuff.” A familiar example is women’s studies departments at universities, that act as a symbol that an educational institution is committed to women’s issues, but these departments tend to be underfunded, understaffed, and generally ignored. It also allows other disciplines to get “off the hook” in not addressing gender in their own disciplines. Roth concludes that it is women’s work in autonomous women’s movements that threatens the status quo the most, as these groups disrupt political and gender norms.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: More evidence that nothing about working for social change is static; movements change, how people work within them changes.

17. Ryan, Barbara. (1992). *Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement Ideology and Activism*. New York: Routledge.

In this book, the author, Barbara Ryan, examines feminist group relations in the United States over the past century, focusing on the women's movement from the 1960s to the 1990s. She analyzes how and why the women's movement changed over the past fifty years. Using resources mobilization theory as her framework, she asks how the women's movement created support and interest for its goals. She focuses on what resources, such as money, media connections, power, people, and votes were used and how people got together in the first place; furthermore, she analyzes how commitment was activated. Finally, she examines how ideology and symbolism used in the women's movement impacted feminist group relations and feminist activism.

Ryan first summarizes the development of the women's movement in the 19th century. Collaborating with other social movements, for example, the abolition movement and women's temperance movement, she states that the women's movement of the 19th century was very religious and reform-based. Many Quaker and other pacifist groups connected their work in the abolition movement with the political and civil emancipation of women. However, after the Civil war, much of this work was suspended.

In the early part of the 20th century, many women focused on securing the vote for women. This narrow focus on the voting issue obscured the importance of other issues that were affecting women, namely racism, class conflicts, poverty. However, the women's movement of the early 20th century was dominated by white, educated, elite women who insisted upon one goal (the vote) and failed to develop a multi-faceted view of women and women's lives/needs. Also, by denying difference and focusing on the voting issue, groups such as the National Women's Party (NWP) and the National American Women's Suffrage Association (NAWSA), could be unified for a time, but after the suffrage victory, disbanded. They instead focused on issues closer to their ideological commitments: women's equality or issues of women's protection. Thus, multiple groups were able to come together in the short term to activate members and focus on securing the vote, but their ideological differences were too deep for them to sustain any type of real coalition building.

The wave of the women's movement that began in the 1960s tried to address some of these problems or oversights, both intentionally and unintentionally. The rise of other movements, such as the Civil Rights movement and Third World People's movement, suggested that there were multiple levels of problems that women faced, not just related to equal rights or equality of pay issues. Ryan states that one change in the women's movement developed around labels of feminist identity. Debates over "true feminism" and identity often led to fighting and self-defeat. Radical, liberal, and socialist feminists, along with more conservative feminists or feminists of color, had

different views on feminist identity, ideology, and coalition building. While this is not a bad thing, it often led to conflicts. Two results occurred: women's groups either tried to dismiss dissent in order to preserve a superficial unity or fractured into numerous coalitions. Indeed, some women left the national organization, NOW, in the early 1970s because it failed to take seriously issues of sexuality and lesbianism. Many straight feminists believed adding a "lesbian agenda" would mean that women's issues would not be taken seriously on a whole. Therefore, some women tried to distance themselves from lesbian politics because "lesbian" symbolized something too aberrant for their agenda. Likewise, women of color felt that their experiences were not being heard and addressed by mainstream feminists, who tended to be white women. Thus, there were issues related to race that divided groups and made feminist circles uncomfortable for women.

In addition, debates over the term "radical" created tensions within groups such as NOW. The term "radical" came to symbolize different things for different women, and without an agreed upon understanding of the word, membership in NOW was lost. Some used the term as a personal identification; others used it to delineate political strategies. Nonetheless, it was a loaded term that made some women wary of becoming group members.

While the ERA held a dominant place in mainstream feminist movement agendas in the 1970s and 1980s, now feminists are focusing on issues of diversity, becoming more inclusive, and developing broader definitions of feminism that allow for multiple levels of action. Labels and arguments over "true feminist identity" and civil disobedience are less pronounced, as feminist coalitions have now been fighting to maintain women's rights with the encroachment of conservative political agendas in the 1980s and 1990s. The defeat of the ERA ultimately brought many feminists together. Ryan suggests that a resource mobilization framework enables us to see how the women's movement benefited from multi-movement activation of large numbers of people. For example, the civil rights movement brought issues of racism and poverty to the attention of mainstream feminist groups. However, without ideological dialogue between coalitions, defeat of feminist agendas can ensue. The conflicts over the inclusion of lesbian rights, the debates of the use of the term "radical" and what it symbolized are themes that Ryan addresses in order to show us the importance of ideology and ideological dialogue to the social movement building process.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Illustrates how the "women's movement" is more than one movement with many components, sometimes competing for control over definitions and goals. Argues that related but unconnected movements can be more effective when working together.

18. Scarpaci, Joseph. (1993). Empowerment Strategies of Poor Urban Women Under the Chilean Dictatorship. In Meredith Turshen and Briavel Holcomb (Eds.), *Women's Lives and Public Policy: The International Experience*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

The author studied the relationships and networks formed by poor women in a Chilean shantytown near Santiago in two organizations between 1987 and 1989: a communal kitchen and sewing cooperative. Poor urban dwellers in Latin America have a history of organizing to fight oppression and pool scarce resources. These two groups that Scarpaci studied are similar to other organizations/communities in Latin America where this type of organizing is done. Women tend to be involved in this type of organizing because of their contact in the community and because they are usually in charge of seeing to day-to-day activities in their households. Ironically, the authoritarian dictatorships of many Latin American countries in the 1960s and 1970s, while de-politicizing men, actually politicized many women, as they fought to overthrow many repressive regimes. In the sewing collective that Scarpaci studied, women made decorative linen pieces, known as *arpilleras*, to sell in order to maintain the house in which the cooperative is housed and to fund a literacy program. In addition to the sewing project, the cooperative provided a space in which women could begin to be independent outside of the private sphere, through organizing the daily activities and running the organization. Finally, the cooperative held women's focus groups meetings, discussions at which women could air their grievances and figure out strategies for survival. Most importantly, in this space, women could discuss gender and exploitation. Women could also discuss their own personally oppressive situations in the context of greater social and economic change. Many connected their personal struggles with the need to overthrow the repressive government of Pinochet, as women were losing husbands, brothers, and other loved ones who were disappeared or killed if they were in opposition to the regime. Likewise, the communal kitchen that the author observed provided a real, direct service to the community by serving meals to families. Yet, while the women involved in this group did not call their work "political," they were providing for the material needs of their community. At the same time, they empowered themselves by being the creators and maintainers of this kitchen, independent of some NGO or state-run agency. Thus, women gained independence and the opportunity to move out the private sphere by being a part of this organization. Finally, Scarpaci concludes that these two organizations use strategic "gender activities" as a means to empower women. That is, the groups directly address women's subordination by allowing women to make key decisions about the nature and direction of their organization. This is different from many other NGOs or family centered state organized programs that only address women's needs as mothers, or treat women as the recipients of aid, and not as the authors of the solutions to their problems.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Also illustrates how women creatively utilize the spaces allowed them by dominant structures to define issues, create strategies, and engage in political action directed at change.

19. Seitz, Barbara J. (1992). *From Home to Street: Women and Revolution in Nicaragua*. In Jill M. Bystydzienski (Ed.), *Women Transforming Politics: Worldwide Strategies for Empowerment*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

In this article, the author examines the struggle for equality waged by Nicaraguan women during the revolution in the 1970s and 1980s. She discusses their struggle in the context of the restrictions and burdens placed upon women by their culture. Seitz states that the women's movement paralleled the revolution to overthrow Somoza in the 1960s and 70s. In fact, 30% of guerrillas were women and in 1969 the FSLN committed to upholding women's equality in their organization. While women traditionally were held to be the ones to take care of the home and had to remain outside of political institutions and the public sphere, women were very active during the revolution in demonstrations, leaf letting, fighting, and other political work. The first organization of women that was concerned with social-political work were mothers' clubs, formed by women whose children and/or partners were killed or disappeared in the war. They organized women to fight in the revolution, set up safe houses, raised money, and formed a formal network for the cause of the revolution. In 1977, with the formation of AMPRONAC, the Association of Nicaraguan Women to Confront the National Problem, this group agitated to repeal all laws that discriminated against women, pressed for equal pay for equal work, and struggled for an end to the commercialization of women. Another organization, the AMNLAE, Luisa Amanda Espinoza Association of Nicaraguan Women, was founded with the establishment of the new revolutionary government. This group helped to integrate women into society through massive public education campaigns, legislative changes, legal counseling, and consciousness-raising. Reproductive rights and family planning, as well as pushing for funding for women's health concerns, were also issues pursued by members of AMNLAE. I think these strategies - education, advocacy, public policy, and direct service - are again similar to social change models utilized by women's groups in the U.S. The author concludes that the new government's policy in the 1990s was to ban contraception and eliminate sex education. Seitz states that Nicaraguan women's ability to control their bodies and reproductive lives might well determine their continued progress for emancipation and equality.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Also illustrates how women creatively utilize the spaces allowed them by dominant structures to define issues, create strategies, and engage in political action directed at change.

20. Selle, Per (2001). *The Norwegian Voluntary Sector and Civil Society in Transition: Women as a Catalyst for Deep-Seated Change*. In Kathleen D. McCarthy (Ed.), *Women, Philanthropy, and Civil Society* (pp. 109-152). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Selle argues that in Norway, a densely organized society, the position of women in voluntary organizations reflects one measure of women's influence in civil society, and thus of their power in the larger political context. Selle suggests that to examine women's influence in shaping society through the "general marginalization or disempowerment perspective" (p. 112) that has characterized much of women's studies, often results in the conclusion that women have had far less power than they actually do. The author contends that through their involvement in civil society via voluntary, often grassroots organizations, women have been major actors in important mass social movements.

Much of the article discusses the various conceptualizations of Scandinavian societies and the proximity that exists in them between the voluntary and public sectors. Selle suggests a relational understanding in which the personal/family sphere and public and market spheres are linked is more appropriate than conceptualizing civil society as existing only to satisfy needs left unmet by the public sector or market. The U.S. is not as "state-friendly" as the Scandinavian countries, but some of Selle's arguments may have relevance for considering our own civil society and its voluntary organizational structure. In particular, it is relevant to understand women's involvement in U.S. civil society as one kind of measure of their true impact, in spite of the less direct links the organizations in which they participate may have with government in general.

One way in which Norwegian organizations assert their voices is that they tend to be both based on local initiatives and structured so that the power is carried upward through regional and national expressions of the organization. Such hierarchical structuring allows for horizontal and vertical integration of society, for a wider range of voices to be heard. These fundamentally community-based organizations are "of great importance in building local identity and civic connectedness, but have at the same time been very important nation builders through their organizational links to the national level, making them main political actors" (p. 114). In this sense, Norwegian women have a greater voice at the national level than American women may have because more of the voluntary organizations they belong to at the local level also have regional and national entities.

The study upon which this article is based demonstrates a shift over time in the kinds of voluntary organizations being started in Norway and men's and women's participation in them. Those dominated by women are on the decline, including some old forms of sex-integrated organizations which are becoming more female-dominated (suggesting women are the last to bail out of a disintegrating situation). Most social and humanitarian organizations are dominated by women. Women in general still belong

to voluntary organizations at the same rates as in the past, but women under 30 have very low rates of participation. Younger men are more active, with older men participating at much lower rates; the reverse is true for women, for whom participation increases dramatically as they age.

Several conclusions of the study are of interest. First, the number of female dominated voluntary organizations with long histories that have disappeared suggests that the mass movements that spawned these organizations are in decline. Second, smaller organizations dominated by women have a difficult time sustaining themselves and are much more likely to disappear. Third, female-dominated organizations tend to hang on through difficult periods and abruptly disappear (for example, when a key leader departs), the result of a different (and more rigorous) culture of participation and civic duty among women. Fourth, women tend to be more successful at sustaining voluntary organizations at the grassroots level than at the city, regional, or national levels. While there are far more small organizations (20 or fewer members) that are dominated by women than large ones, they are much more difficult to sustain. Women are currently joining mixed organizations at a higher rate than female-dominated organizations, and are increasingly involved in larger, more regionally-based organizations. Finally, women may be investing more time in informal organizations at the very local level than formal ones, a change that would increase the disconnect between local voluntary organizations and voluntary work, resulting in a deterioration of the political role of civil society (i.e., disconnection of the very local from the larger political).

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Describes a state environment (Norway) in which women's influence on civil society manifests itself through participation in voluntary organizations, out of which their power flows upward through ever larger iterations of local organizations into the larger political context. But, points out that women tend to be more active locally and so when intermediary structures disappear, have a more difficult time being heard.

21. Shaw, Sondra C. & Taylor, Martha A. (1995). *Reinventing Fundraising: Realizing the Potential for Women's Philanthropy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Philanthropy is a “planned, deliberate program to improve society.” Women’s involvement has unique risks, including the danger of squandering one’s money on organizations that cannot adequately manage it, the fear of money, i.e., worry about losing it and worry about not understanding it. Education can help to mitigate these dangers. Women as philanthropists represent a powerful force for social change. In the future, women’s unique reasons for giving will help remind foundation development officers why they do what they do: to have a positive impact on social change. What became a technical fundraising approach in the second half of the 20th century works less and less well with women who are looking for a more relational approach to giving. The philanthropic community must raise its sights to the actual (and very large) levels at which women will increasingly be able to give, as well as engage in education and other activities designed to capture their interests and help them visualize the impact their investments can have. The six Cs of giving for women include the desire to change, create, connect, collaborate, commit, and celebrate. Examples of women’s power include convincing politicians with their votes to keep their interests in mind (child labor laws, seat belt laws, regulation of polluters).

Chapter One, *Women as Important Prospects* outlines in detail how wealth will increasingly be in the control of women, as society ages and leaves behind women to inherit fortunes (women live longer than men), and as women earn and control more money in their own right. It also shows that younger women (college age) report higher levels of commitment to investment of both time and resources in social causes and social justice activities.

Chapter Two, *The History of Women’s Philanthropy* contends that women’s contributions to the building and improvement of the country were unremarked by historians until recently, although not at all insignificant in their importance. In spite of the restrictions on their movements in the social, political, and economic world, women nonetheless invested in their world in important ways, in particular, they expressed their vision for a better world through philanthropy. Often emerging out of the tradition of church supported missionary work abroad, women eventually decided to do their philanthropic work closer to home. Examples:

1797 Isabella Martha Graham joined with 15 other women to start the Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children in New York.

Late 1800s, Margaret Gaffney Haughery started the New Orleans Female Orphan Asylum.

1883 Rebecca Gratz started the Female Hebrew Benevolent Society in Philadelphia.

African-American women were early philanthropists, for example, in 1897 the Phyllis Wheatley Home Association was started by 24 black women to serve elderly women in Detroit.

Women philanthropists engaged in efforts in broad range of areas including the arts, education, historic preservation, conservation, in addition to economic well being and political and social rights.

At the end of the 18th century, more than 200 societies were being supported by philanthropic women. These traditions continued to grow for 200 years. By the end of the 20th century, the societies tended to be more focused on social change than on charity, and explicitly raise funds to support a much broader array of issues of interest to women.

Chapter Three: The authors interview eight significant women philanthropists, who make it clear that they believe absolutely that giving creates change. Each one articulates how she integrated personal values into her philanthropy style. The history of women's philanthropy also makes it clear that women have believed throughout their efforts over time that giving helps to create change.

Chapter Four: The authors discuss how and why women give, and present the findings of focus groups of women asked to come up with their own definition of philanthropy. While their definition reflects the traditional definition (from the Greek, love and goodwill to mankind), their experiences, perspectives, and intent were also apparent in what they had to say. Women want incremental change for the better, they want to share their own good fortune, they want to empower others. They know these desires must be translated into giving money, not just volunteer work. Women describe a holistic aspect of their philanthropy, that is, giving is about making others' lives better, which in turn benefits them, i.e., everyone must benefit. Women also express the importance of passing on the social responsibility for giving to their children, and the value of collective action expressed through combining their giving. Interestingly, women did not consider political fundraising philanthropy although they acknowledged that change requires electing the right people, which requires investment.

The women in the study indicated that what they got in return for their philanthropy was a sense of altruism, self-empowerment, and the feeling of being part of a community. "The ability to bring about change and make a difference ranks number one as a motivation for women's giving" (p88). For women, making a difference tends to mean creating change rather than preserving the status quo. The authors cite Sublett and Stone (1993) in contending that women support political candidates out of a desire to see that justice is served, to address a need, or to make a difference. They note that many women have felt the sting of injustice and inequality and as a result, want to make things better for the girls and women coming behind them. One finding is that

women tend to want fast change, as see money as a tool for immediate rather than gradual change. Some women understand the importance of targeting their money to maximize clout. The specific aspects of return on philanthropic investment for women include (the six Cs) change, create, connect, commit, collaborate, celebrate.

Chapter Five discusses overcoming the barriers to women's giving, which include traditional differences between men and women in control of finances, socialization in a male-dominated social order, internal characteristics, or even myths about women held by fundraisers. The authors present a number of myths and identify ways fundraisers can help women to move beyond any reality that my undergird the myth.

The remaining eight chapters deal with how to develop gender sensitive fundraising programs, including training staff, dealing with particular kinds of women donors, and communicating with women. Each of these chapters addresses the specific characteristics of women as donors in developing the chapter's theme. The final chapter explores the realization of the potential of women's philanthropy. The authors contend that women represent a powerful force for social change. Their interests cover a range of causes and they support organizations dedicated to social change. They argue that women are poised to change the world with their philanthropy, but that those seeking their support will be successful only if they first understand how women are unique, and how diverse they are as a group. They suggest that development officers must generate unique opportunities for women to give, in various forms that open spaces for many different kinds of women to find a niche that feels comfortable to them. Development officers need to educate, to raise women's philanthropic sights, to offer "permission" to some kinds of women to follow their hearts in terms of giving.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: May provide a contribution to understanding the connection between the donor to the foundation to the grantee; women as donors invest because they believe their investment has an impact on social change. The achievement vector is a model that can return evidence to them about the results of their investments.

22. Thomas, Caroline. (2000). *Global Governance, Development, and Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality*. London: Pluto Press.

This book grew out of a panel on international, human security at the British International Studies Association. The book is concerned with the convergence of international relations studies and human securities studies. The uneven distribution of the world's resources and the widening gap between rich and poor is directly linked with global human security issues. When states or international finance bodies do not attend to the problems wrought by global poverty, this can perpetuate problems associated with global security.

The most important aspect of this book for developing strategies for social change is the last chapter on "Alternative Pathways for the Twenty-First Century." The author suggests that the neo-liberal strategy of development does not put people at the center of its model for social change; she adds that economic policies must begin with human well-being at the center and must actually work for the planet. She outlines six areas that could be addressed differently from neo-liberal models of development. She suggests using this as a model for bringing about global social change. First, Thomas states that investment must be publicly regulated; neo-liberalism seeks private or self-regulation of international finance bodies, which only have to comply with a few regulations and which never have to open up their practices to public scrutiny. Second, she suggests developing a global code of conduct for with which states and companies must comply in order to be members of international financing institutions. Third, fair trade is a must, with guidelines being similar to the following: buying from responsible producers or suppliers, paying a fair price, providing financial credit where necessary to protect the producer against production uncertainties, encouraging equal rewards for men and women, pursuing environmentally sustainable production, providing low rates of interest, and, finally, establishing stable trade relationships. Fourth, national regulation of domestic practices of trade must exist as well; fifth, a democratization of global governance should occur, with international financial institutions not just representing poor countries, but having members of these countries as members of their regulatory and governing bodies. And finally, all of this must happen with citizens as the central, most important agents of social change.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Provides some guidelines for creating fair global economic agendas, which can be used to address how developing fair economic policies is connected to building movements for justice around the world.

23. Yeung, Aphelia M., & Mathieson, John A. (1998). *Global Benchmarks: Comprehensive Measures of Development*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

This volume presents the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID) data measuring the balance between economic, social, political, and environmental elements in developing countries. These data shed light on the development process and help to reveal effective approaches to development. The vector concept is used to show how balanced each country is in terms of development across the several categories and was designed deliberately to provide both a view of current status and future possibilities.

The authors begin by posing several questions about development, what it means, whether it should be interpreted as a set of absolute or relative measures, whether it should be based on income or output, and the breadth of the kinds of statuses it reflects, e.g., environment, political process, education, etc. The authors note that international leaders need to measure achievement in order to design development strategies, but that most have been unable to settle on a definitive method. Scholars and practitioners have argued about the question but have not agreed. Disagreement has not prevented some from moving forward; most have limited their definitions to economic progress (e.g., Adam Smith and the wealth of nations). By the 1950s, development was interpreted almost exclusively as economic growth or ever-increasing GNP or GDP. Even those interested in the welfare of populations relied on output per capita as the measure of progress as (in economic theory) this represents goods and services available for each person. These perspectives were supported by the economic principle of optimization, in which increasing income necessarily increases welfare. In reality, this is clearly not the case, as income distribution rarely follows a normal curve, but it has driven practice.

In recent years, other ideas have been promoted, of particular interest the idea that social indicators are equally as important as economic indicators. An early effort (1970s) to advance social indicators was the Physical Quality of Life Index which reflects a shift in emphasis to basic human needs. The PQLI measured performance on life expectancy, infant mortality, and literacy, each being an indicator of broader measures of well being (or a proxy for other variables, e.g., life expectancy also measures nutrition). Another effort, the Disparity Reduction Rate (DRR) measures rates of change and progress toward meeting basic needs. The gap between a country's performance and the best performance of any country is tested through this system. Together, the two systems measure both current performance and progress.

In the early 1990s, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) attempted to capture relevant measures by combining social and economic indicators into its Human Development Index. Three measures comprise this Index, life expectancy at birth, educational attainment, and GDP. The purpose is to capture statistically the capabilities

people need in order to participate in and contribute to society. The use of the HDI show that while enormous improvement has been achieved over the last thirty years on all measures, substantial deprivation remains in both developing and industrial countries. Many developing countries with lower GDPs, nonetheless attain human development at levels equal to those in industrial countries, i.e., the quality of life is as good in countries less developed as in some very developed countries.

The authors note that recent interest in quantitative indexing and scoring has driven the development of new comparative indexes, which has become easier as statistical data has become more readily available. All of these systems of measure are subject to various biases, but in general, provide adequate methods of generating information for policy makers.

This book presents what the authors call a “development web” model and indicators that provide a comprehensive picture of development performance. Beginning with discussions among various interested policy-making, development, and academic circles, the model attempts to capture the many factors important to comprehensive development. The conceptual premises that drive the model are that multi-dimensional measures more accurately reflect development in a wide array of public and private venues, that human well being is as important as economic output, and that multiple tools are available to explore the development universe. In other words, understanding development is (a) about understanding change, and (b) an evolving task in itself. The five explicit objectives of the web model are:

1. To measure development performance across a variety of indicators that address different aspects of welfare.
2. To evaluate national and regional performance and benchmark nations against best practices.
3. To provide a management tool for identifying and assessing priorities.
4. To monitor progress over time in order to be able to adjust priorities.
5. To establish a framework for examining relationships among important but different aspects of development.

In this model, the measures or variables are economic performance, competitiveness, health, education, environment, and democracy and freedom. Each measure forms one structural spoke (or vector) of the web with the highest possible performance represented by the line that forms the outside of the web. Each country’s performance is tracked along each vector, and a hexagonal shape drawn based on the performance on each vector. The final picture represents the country’s overall development, and provides a simple way to obtain a quick sense of how the country is doing. The measures can be aggregated or divided by region and compared in various ways. The

study examined 108 countries and scored them from 0 to 4 against accepted standards for performance in each of these areas. Benchmarks were established based on the performance of all of the countries. Most of the volume is devoted to sharing the findings of the study across the 108 countries.

Relevance to the Investing for Social Change project: Provides a useful model for thinking about the kinds of social change inputs and outcomes WFN and its members are interested in exploring and tracking. Offers a number of conceptual frames for moving the social change project forward, e.g., change as an ever-evolving process, change as a web of conditions moving in a positive direction, change as cumulative, change as deliberate.

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Origin of the vector concept, of the need to balance achievements in multiple areas to be successful at effecting real change. Very macro-level perspective, however, and the very fact of this perspective leads to the Investing for Social Change project idea that it is important to track change at more levels.

24. Zald, Mayer N. (1992). Looking Backward to Look Forward: Reflections on the past and future of the Resource Mobilization Research Program. In Aldon Morris & Carol McClurg Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Social movement theory for years focused on grievances and collective behavior as explanations for social movement success and development. For example, social theorists developed a set of ideas that explained a social movement as a response to some set of grievances or deprivation in society. These theorists hypothesized a direct link between deprivation, frustration, and consequent social action to remedy that deprivation. Second, collective behaviorists hypothesized that social movements developed as a result of enthusiasm, spontaneity, and conversion experiences; that is, enthusiasm for social movement goals are generated through feelings of group solidarity and a “collective effervescence” that arises when people are together working to reach shared goals. Collective effervescence, these feelings of solidarity and enthusiasm, mobilizes people to action when they participate in some sort of group activity. This enthusiasm can be both a resource for social change and an outcome.

After the movements of the 1960s, however, theorists began to re-think the cause and development of social movements. Resource mobilization theory developed as a response to the critiques of grievance and collective behavior theories as a result of seeing that some social movements in the 1960s were stronger, more enduring, and more successful than others. Why did some movements reach their goals and other didn't? Resource mobilization theorists suggest that the resources available for a movement, how the group is organized, and the relationship of the state to the social movement will determine social movement growth and outcomes, not social psychological explanations, such as collective effervescence and grievances or deprivations. Issues of power, conflict, and the variable distribution of political resources challenged traditional notions of social change and movements. For example, some theorists have studied the student movement of the 1960s; using a more structural approach, resource mobilization theorists postulated that mass higher education and blocked access to mobility as a result of increased credentialism created a “class” of people (students), who had the resources, organization, and a significant amount of access the political structure to develop a movement or be involved in multiple movements.

More recently, theorists have suggested resource mobilization theory is not broad enough and have developed more theories as to why social movements develop and succeed. For example, resource mobilization may help explain single movements, but can it help to explain whole epochs of social movements? These are things taken up by new social movement theory (NSM).

Relevance for the Investing for Social Change Project: Very theoretical; perhaps too much so to be of direct relevance.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY – NOT ANNOTATED

- Babcock, Patrick, Vargas, Arturo, Aron, Nan, Christopher, Gail, & Cortes, Michael. (1998). The Role of Foundations in Influencing Public Policy. *National Civic Review*, (8), pp. 117-26.
- Bennett, W. Lance. (1988). *News: The Politics of Illusion*. New York: Longman.
- Berger Peter L., & Luckmann, Thomas. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Doubleday.
- Buhle, Mari J. (1983). *Women and American Socialism*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Bynum, Victoria E. (1992). *Unruly Women*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2002). *Toward a Common Language*. Boston: The Center for Effective Philanthropy
- Elshtain, Jean B. (2002). *Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, & Martin, Patricia Y. (1995). *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Franz, Carol E., & Stewart, Abigail J. (1994). *Women Creating Lives: Identities, Resilience, & Resistance*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Frazer, Nancy. (1990). Struggle Over Needs: Outline of a Socialist-Feminist Critical Theory of Late-Capitalist Political Culture. In Gordon, Linda (Ed.), *Women, the State, and Welfare*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Gordon, Linda. (1994). *Pitied but Not Entitled*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gordon, Linda. (1990). Family Violence, Feminism, and Social Control. In Gordon, Linda (Ed.), *Women, the State, and Welfare*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Halpern, Charles R. (1997). Effective Philanthropy Requires Advocacy. *Foundation News & Commentary*, (May/June).

- Hartsook, Nancy C. M. (1996). Theoretical Bases for Coalition Building. In Heidi Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and Social Change*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Herman Edward S., & Chomsky, Noam. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hernes. Helga. M. (1987). Welfare state and woman power. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Hoefler, Richard. (2000). Making a Difference: Human Service Interest Group Influence on Social Welfare Program Regulations. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, (27), pp. 21-38.
- Institute for Women's Policy Research. (2001). *Safety Number One Factor Affecting Women's Civic Engagement*. News Release. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Kantor, Rosabeth M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kingdon, John W. (1984). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Letts, Christine, Ryan, William, & Grossman, Allen. (1999). *High Performance Nonprofit Organizations: Managing Upstream for Greater Impact*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Mansbridge, Jane J. (1986). *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marris, Peter, & Rein, Martin. (1967). *Dilemmas of Social Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morken, Kristin, and Selle, Per (1994). The Women's Shelter Movement. In Feliece Perlmutter (Ed.), *Women and Social Change*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Naples, Nancy, & Clark, Emily. (1996). Feminist Participatory Research and Empowerment: Going Public as Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse. In Heidi Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and Social Change*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (2000). *A Democratic Landscape: Funding Social Change in California*. www.ncrp.org/psr
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (1997). *Conservative Foundations Prevail in Shaping Public Policies*. www.ncrp.org/psr
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (1997). *Community-Based Research Gathers Momentum, Not Dust*. www.ncrp.org/articles/rp

- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (1995). *Community Organizing, Democratic Revitalization Through Bottom Up Reform*. www.ncrp.org/articles/dap
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (1995). *The New York Foundation and Empowerment-Oriented Grantmaking, One Foundation's Experience with Change*. www.ncrp.org/articles/dap
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (1995). *Conservative Foundations and their Activist Grantees*. www.ncrp.org/articles
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. *Advocacy History*. www.ncrp.org/advocacy
- Okin, Susan M. (1989). *Justice, Gender, and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Parry, Robert. (1999). *Consortium News* Putnam, Robert (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ragey, Nancy. (2001). *Giving in the 21st Century: Social Venture Philanthropy*. Silicon Valley, CA: Community Foundation of Silicon Valley.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. (1992). *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. Oxford: Oxford university Press.
- Roberts Enterprise Development Fund. *Social Return on Investment Reports*. San Francisco: The Roberts Foundation.
- Rodriguez, Linda M., Suárez-Balcázar, Yolanda, & Nelson, Mary. (2001). *Implementing an Outcomes Framework in Community-Based Organizations*. Chicago: Bethel New Life.
- Rubin, Beth A. (1996). *Shifts in the Social Contract: Understanding Change in American Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Sapiro, Virginia. (1990). The Gender Basis of American Social Policy. In Gordon, Linda (Ed.), *Women, the State, and Welfare*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Schechter, Susan. (1982). *Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement*. Boston: South End Press.
- Schor, Juliet B. (1992). *The Overworked American*. New York: Basic Books.
- Shaw, Sondra C. & Taylor, Martha A. (1995). *Reinventing Fundraising: Realizing the Potential for Women's Philanthropy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Skocpol, Theda. (1992). *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Sommers, Tish, & Shields, Laurie. (1987). *Women Take Care*. Gainesville, FL: Triad Publishing.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta, & Hartmann, Heidi. (1996). Small Happiness: The feminist Struggle to Integrate Social Research with Social Activism. In Heidi Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and Social Change*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Steinberg, Ronnie J. (1996). Advocacy Research for Feminist Policy Objectives. In Heidi Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and Social Change*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Teske, Robin L., & Tétreault, Mary Ann (Eds.). (2000). *Conscious Acts and the Politics of Social Change*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Women's Fund of the Greater Milwaukee Foundation. (2001). *Public Policy and Advocacy Study*. Milwaukee, WI: Women's Fund of the Greater Milwaukee Foundation.

Compiled by: Deborah L. Puntenney, Ph.D. and Rebecca Burwell