No part of the philanthropic landscape appears to be as diverse as the ways in which individuals and for-profit organizations seek to do good. While philanthropy is not a new phenomenon, its diversification of practices and the emergence of (third party) organizations and new vehicles call for a renewed understanding. The studies in this dissertation represent a more in-depth exploration of contemporary forms of private and corporate philanthropy.

First, I examine temporary episodic volunteering by examining National Days of Service initiated by a third party. National Days of Service are state- or countrywide volunteering programs in which individuals and groups support nonprofit organizations by giving their time to a one-day, time-limited volunteer project. In the first two studies, I show how nonprofit organizations integrate National Days of Service and how they can do so more meaningfully.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Every year, the third Tuesday in September is Prinsjesdag (“Prince’s Day”) in the Netherlands. On that day, the reigning monarch of the Netherlands delivers the so-called Troonrede (“Speech from the Throne”) on behalf of the government. This speech sets out the most important plans of the government policy and marks the start of the parliamentary year. On 17 September 2019, in his capacity as Head of State, King Willem-Alexander delivered his Speech from the Throne. Early on in his speech he says, “But anyone who considers the world at large will appreciate how remarkable it is to live in a country where people are able to feel safe and secure. Where freedom goes hand in hand with tolerance and a sense of responsibility. And where people are still always willing to lend each other a helping hand.” He continues: “The Netherlands remains a country of volunteers and of sensible compromises in broad areas of common ground. From the young to the elderly, from the work floor to the boardroom, and from Willemstad to Amsterdam, people want to get involved and contribute. That is what unites us and what, together, we must cherish.” This is not the first time the King highlights the voluntary efforts of the Dutch. In 2018, in his Speech from the Throne, King Willem-Alexander said: “Building a close-knit society is a matter for everyone in our country (...) The Netherlands is a country of volunteers, churches and associations.” In both speeches King Willem-Alexander highlights the charitable giving of the Dutch. Both times he signals the importance of our giving behavior and declares the Netherlands to be a country of volunteers.

Certainly, the Netherlands is a country with a long and “rich philanthropic history” and landscape (Wiepking and Bekkers, 2015, p.211). Indeed, compared to many other European countries, the Dutch have high volunteering rates (Schmeets and
Arends, 2017). These volunteer rates remained relatively stable between 1977 and 2008 as 42.0% to 45.0% of the Dutch population volunteered. Between 2012 and 2016, these rates fluctuate between 48.0% and 50.0%. Data on Dutch volunteer rates are inconclusive, as there is also data indicating volunteer rates slightly decreased in the last decade (Schmeets and Arends, 2017). Giving in the Netherlands (2017), indicates that 36.0% of the Dutch population volunteered for a nonprofit organization in 2016. Although volunteer rates seem to remain fairly constant, the average amount of hours donated by volunteers decreased. In 2016, volunteers gave on average 14.5 hours per month (Bekkers et al., 2017), whereas in 1975 and 1990 volunteers gave on average 17.6 and 20.0 hours a month (Dekker and De Hart, 2009).

When looking at financial contributions, for-profit organizations became a more important source of philanthropy and charitable giving. For-profit organizations donated 693 billion euro to nonprofit organizations (including sponsorships) in 1997, accounting for 27.0% of total charitable contributions. In 2015, however, corporate donations accounted for 35.0% of the total charitable contributions in the Netherlands, whereby for-profit organizations donated no less than 2.007 billion euro (including sponsorships) (Bekkers et al., 2017). According to the same study, the increase in charitable giving by for-profit organizations is largely due to an increase in corporate volunteering as for-profit organizations seem to increasingly contribute time and manpower to nonprofit organizations. Within the Netherlands, for-profit organizations are the second largest contributor where household giving makes up for the biggest share. In 1997, individual households donated 1.528 billion euro accounting for 59.5% of all charitable giving. In 2015, household giving consisted of 2.611 billion euro, accounting for 45.6% of total charitable contributions. This differs from US data, where households make up the lion’s share of philanthropic contributions, followed by foundations and legacies, and corporate philanthropy comes only fourth (Giving USA Foundation, 2019).

Undeniably, the philanthropic landscape changed rapidly in the last few decades. Recent years witnessed a diversification of private and corporate philanthropy practices. Individuals changed their philanthropic behavior, and for-profit organizations became important philanthropic actors playing a more essential role in philanthropy by contributing more by donating money, time, and manpower. These changes are observable in many other countries besides the Netherlands. Consequently, no part of the philanthropic landscape nowadays appears to be as diverse as the ways in which individuals and for-profit organizations seek to do good. The philanthropic landscape grew increasingly more crowded as more and more organizations and
philanthropic practices came to populate the terrain. These entail various channels to practice private and corporate philanthropy, including third parties, intermediaries, foundations, and other organizational forms. These channels or practices became part of the philanthropic infrastructure and provide different pathways into private and corporate philanthropy. While philanthropy in its own is not a new phenomenon, its increasing diversity raises questions and sparks academic interest. The changing landscape calls for a better understanding of the values, consequences, and management practices of these new channels and practices. Especially since these new trends and practices of philanthropy present new challenges for nonprofit organizations. Prompted by these challenges, I wrote this dissertation.

Over time, I met with volunteers and with nonprofit organizations, for-profit organizations, (collective) corporate foundations, and third party intermediary organizations, and spoke with them about the ways in which they seek to do good. As both private and corporate philanthropy continue to change, the number of individuals and organizations who wrestle with the question on how to adjust to present day forms of giving or how to go about their own giving will only increase in the coming years. This dissertation is for those professionals who work in nonprofit organizations, for-profit organizations, third parties and alike, and for others who wish to understand contemporary private and corporate philanthropy.

In the dissertation, I aim to enhance our understanding of two substantive areas of research encompassing various contemporary channels of private and corporate philanthropy. First, I examine modern volunteering by examining National Days of Service initiated by a third party. Second, I look into modern practices of corporate philanthropy by examining various vehicles or channels that stand between a corporate donor and a nonprofit recipient. I refer to such channels, vehicles or practices as “indirect corporate philanthropy or giving”. Indirect corporate philanthropy includes corporate giving channeled through (collective) corporate foundations and third party intermediary organizations. These modern vehicles place a firm’s corporate philanthropy at arm’s length of the for-profit organization, making the relation between donor and recipient indirect.

1.1 Themes in the Dissertation

1.1.1 The Concept of Philanthropy

The word philanthropy originates from the ancient Greek “phillen” meaning “love of” and “antropos” meaning “mankind” or “humanity”, and translates into “the expression
of love to human beings” (Fernandez, 2011, p.14) or “the love of mankind” (Wiepking, 2008, p. V). As the name etymologically implies, philanthropists are “lovers of humanity”. Generally speaking, philanthropy aims “to promote the welfare, happiness, and culture of mankind” (Bremner, 1988, p.3).

Stretching back to the earliest societies, philanthropy has a long history and exists in most historical periods. Philanthropy exists in all cultures and is intertwined with many of the world’s religions (Fernandez, 2011; Frumkin, 2010). Although philanthropy has been around for centuries, there appears to be no universally, theoretically accepted definition. Philanthropy is a “complex”, “sprawling” (Frumkin, 2008, p.11), and “essentially contested” concept (Daly, 2012, p.535) as the meaning of philanthropy changed over time and its meaning differs between contexts. Definitions of philanthropy differ depending on social contexts and the individual defining it (Fernandez, 2011).

Philanthropy is a very broad field and differs in donor, scale, purpose, and gift (Ramutsindela et al., 2013). Logically, different types and forms of philanthropy emerged over time in the academic literature. In the broadest sense, philanthropy includes all voluntary action undertaken for the public good (Payton, 1988). Philanthropy commonly refers to the giving of money, but also refers to the giving of time (volunteering) (Payton and Moody, 2008; Bussell and Forbes, 2002), giving of in-kind goods (in-kind philanthropy) (Bussell and Forbes, 2002), and giving of blood or anatomical parts (known as health-related philanthropy) (Meslin et al., 2008).

Philanthropy can also come from different philanthropic actors: individuals, foundations, and for-profit organizations (Andreoni, 2006). Based upon its donor one can distinguish between private, institutional, and corporate philanthropy. Private philanthropy refers to voluntary donations made by individuals to charitable organizations they consider worthy to support (Gewirth, 1987). Institutional philanthropy refers to organizations and foundations that fundraise and manage the allocation of funds (Sandfort, 2008). Corporate philanthropy refers to the philanthropic endeavours of for-profit organizations, including voluntary financial contributions, in-kind donations and corporate volunteering to social and charitable causes (Gautier and Pache, 2015; Liket and Simaens, 2015; Porter and Kramer, 2006).

Scholars devoted significant attention to understand why individuals, foundations, and for-profit organizations seek to do good. According to Rudich (2009), three main theories explain (private) philanthropic behaviour: altruism, social exchange theory, and identification theory. Motives for corporate philanthropy are often positioned on

---

1Foundations refer to privately-owned, non-membership based organizations that accumulate wealth, are managed by directors and trustees, and aim to advance social causes (Anheier, 2001).
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a continuum ranging from pure altruism towards pure business interests (Gautier and Pache, 2015; Moir and Taffler, 2004), confirming the application of altruism and social exchange theory within corporate philanthropy as well. Altruism refers to philanthropy motivated by the “love of mankind”, without expecting any rewards in return (Bekkers, 2013; Bekkers and Wiepking, 2011; Gautier and Pache, 2015; Hemingway and Maclagan, 2004; Rudich, 2009; Sánchez, 2000). Social exchange theory focuses on the reciprocal relationships between donors and recipients. According to social exchange theory individuals or for-profit organizations will donate money, time, goods or other resources to help others, when such giving benefits both the donor and the recipient (Rudich, 2009). Identification theory explains philanthropy by creating mutually rewarding donor-recipient relationships (Rudich, 2009).

Since nonprofit organizations compete more for financial and human resources due to government cutbacks (Van Slyke and Brooks, 2005), nonprofit organizations benefit more and more from financial donations and from gifts in time. As volunteers and philanthropic donations have great value for nonprofit organizations, understanding the changes within the philanthropic landscape merits attention. New developments and trends set forth solid reasons for ongoing research in the field.

As the changes within the philanthropic landscape are voluminous, this dissertation focuses on one trend in particular: the increase in third parties or vehicles providing individuals and for-profit organizations various pathways into private and corporate philanthropy.

1.1.2 Private Philanthropy: Third Parties Re-embedding Volunteering

Traditionally, the volunteering landscape consists of three actors: the volunteers who give their time, the nonprofit organization where the volunteer performs the voluntary work, and the beneficiaries that benefit from the services provided by the nonprofit organization and its volunteers (Haski-Leventhal et al., 2010). Recent years, however, witnessed an increase in volunteering opportunities harvested by other actors and parties. Such actors encourage individuals to volunteer and recruit volunteers to give their time to other nonprofit organizations. These actors include for instance for-profit organizations, schools, governments, and nonprofit organizations such as volunteer centers or alike. Examples of volunteer opportunities harvested by third parties include National Days of Service (Cnaan and Handy, 2005), corporate volunteering (Grant, 2012; Lee and Higgins, 2001), service-learning in education (Hurd, 2006), volunteer tourism or voluntourism (Wearing, 2001, 2003), family-volunteering (Littlepage et al.,
2003), single-volunteering, and volunteering to governments in stipend volunteer programs (Hustinx and Meijs, 2011). Hustinx (2010) and Hustinx and Meijs (2011) refer to these practices as a functional re-embedding strategy. This strategy refers to the recent interventions or strategies by governments, organizations, institutions or other actors to re-integrate, re-construct or restore present-day volunteering by mobilizing volunteers.

Due to this strategy and these new actors a distinction can be made between “home organizations” and “host organizations” (Salamon and Anheier, 1996). The home organization refers to the organization recruiting the volunteers. The host organization refers to the nonprofit organization where the volunteers are actually placed and carry out their voluntary work. In their volunteer stewardship framework, Brudney et al. (2019) refer to this as the unitary or shared volunteer guidance. Unitary guidance exists when the home and host organization are the same, whereas shared volunteer guidance exists when the home and host organizations differ. The same authors refer to two volunteer programs where the home and host organizations differ: secondary volunteer programs and intermediary volunteer programs (see Table 1.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance of volunteers</th>
<th>Access to volunteer energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitary</td>
<td>Membership model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(membership associations, sports associations, self-help groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Secondary model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(corporate volunteering programs, service-learning in education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Volunteer Stewardship Framework Brudney et al. (2019, p.5)
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Within secondary volunteer programs, volunteers are recruited within clearly defined home organizations (i.e., for-profit organizations, schools, and so forth). Brudney et al. (2019) refer to this access to volunteers as a “private resource”. Volunteers, however, perform the actual voluntary work with other (host) nonprofit organizations and are thus guided by both organizations. The guidance of volunteers is thus shared between the home and host organizations. Examples includes the aforementioned corporate volunteering, service-learning and government stipend volunteer programs (Brudney et al., 2019). Haski-Leventhal et al. (2010) refer to this as “third party involvement”. Within intermediary volunteer programs, volunteer access or volunteers are recruited among the broader population or broader community by a home (nonprofit) organization. Brudney et al. (2019) refer to this as recruitment or volunteer access in a “common pool”. Volunteers are thus recruited outside the boundaries of the recruiting organization. The recruited volunteers perform the actual voluntary work with other host nonprofit organizations, and yet again the volunteer guidance is shared. Examples include nonprofit organizations or initiatives encouraging voluntourism, family- and single-volunteering, or National Days of Service. Within the dissertation, I focus specifically on National Days of Service adhering to the intermediary volunteer program.

National Days of Service as a form of temporary episodic volunteering

National Days of Service are state- or countrywide volunteering programs in which individuals and groups support nonprofit organizations by giving their service to a one-day time-limited service project. Volunteers are often recruited among a broad population or wider community by a home (nonprofit) organization, and perform the voluntary work with other host nonprofit organizations. National Days of Service or so-called “Done-in-a-Day” (DIAD) volunteering projects are prominent across the globe. These events mobilize large numbers of people to engage in one-off volunteer service and build an ethic of volunteering (Christensen et al., 2005). On Sewa Day, for example, over 75,000 volunteers participate in 250 projects in 25 countries around the world. In the Netherlands, NLdoet mobilizes 300,000 people to donate their time to 8,000 projects. In the U.S., on 9/11 Day alone, tens of millions of Americans spend time volunteering. Other examples include Make a Difference Day and Martin Luther King Jr. day in the U.S., Mitsvah Day International primarily in the U.K., and Mandela Day in South Africa. Others are specifically intended to promote youth
participation, for instance, Join Hands Day and Global Youth Service Day in the United States, and Aktion 72 Stunden in Switzerland.

National Days of Service aim not only to put the huge volume of donated volunteer labor to work toward meeting community needs but also, and perhaps more importantly, to raise the profile of volunteering, stimulate more volunteering, create an ethic of volunteering and a volunteer legacy (i.e., the carryover effect of ongoing volunteering). National Days of Service neatly fit the 21st century zeitgeist of volunteering characterized by episodic, short-term, and project-based volunteer commitments. These National Days of Service encourage a form of volunteering known as episodic volunteering (Macduff, 1990). Although episodic volunteering became increasingly popular and is an emerging and growing reality in volunteerism (Cnaan and Handy, 2005), no universally consistent conceptualization of episodic volunteering exists. Episodic volunteering is often described by the duration of participation (short-term), frequency of participation (one or two occasions), and nature of the volunteer task (project-based) (Hyde et al., 2014).

To better understand the different types of episodic volunteers, scholars developed more differentiated classifications. Macduff (1990, 2004) identified three types of episodic volunteers based on the time and duration of service: temporary, interim and occasional episodic volunteering. Temporary episodic volunteers give service that is short in duration (up to a few hours or a day) and do not return to or are otherwise engaged with the nonprofit organization. Interim volunteers give service on a regular basis for less than six months, and occasional episodic volunteers provide service at regular intervals for short periods of time. National Days of Service thus encourage temporary episodic volunteering.

During the last decades, the growing number of short-term volunteering opportunities and episodic volunteers turned this “new” type of volunteering into a recognized type of volunteering (Macduff, 1990, 2005; Cnaan and Handy, 2005; Beder and Fast, 2008). The amount of individuals who prefer this type of volunteering, to more traditional volunteer engagements (for example, on a weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly basis) is imprecise but undoubtedly substantial. The trend is confirmed by global survey data that shows that while the total number of volunteers increased, the total number

\[\text{Footnote 2: The basic criterion used by scholars to distinguish between traditional, regular volunteers versus episodic volunteers is the regularity or frequency of volunteer involvement (Hustinx et al., 2008; Macduff, 2005). In general, most researchers agree that regular volunteers carry out activities at least once per month during a 12 month period – while the involvement of episodic volunteers is less frequent (Handy et al., 2006; Low et al., 2007). Regular volunteers are furthermore characterized by having an ongoing and high commitment to a cause or an organization (Hustinx and Lammertyn, 2003).}\]
of volunteer hours decreased (Cnaan and Handy, 2005; Handy et al., 2006; Macduff, 2004; McCurley and Ellis, 2003; Nunn, 2000) - thus more volunteers are contributing fewer hours.

In addition to the increasing demand for short-term and flexible volunteer assignments, nonprofit organizations seek ways to use short-term volunteers to advance their mission (Nunn, 2000). Nonprofit organizations increasingly plan, organize and stage episodic volunteer assignments (i.e., discrete task-specific projects) (Hustinx and Lammertyn, 2003), and events evoking episodic volunteering became more common. Episodic volunteers are of paramount importance during fundraising events (Beder and Fast, 2008), crisis and disaster relief (Greiner and Wikle, 2008), and community events, such as large and small-scale (sporting) events (Cuskelly et al., 2006; Hamm et al., 2008; Harris, 2012a; Koutrou et al., 2016; Riemer et al., 2007; Williams et al., 1995), festivals (Handy et al., 2006) and one-day special events such as National Days of Service and park or beach clean-ups.

Current state of research on temporary episodic volunteering and National Days of Service

The increasing amount of episodic volunteers and short-term volunteering opportunities, sparked an interest in episodic volunteering among scholars. While definitions on episodic volunteering continue to vary, episodic volunteering continues to be poorly understood, making it hard for research to progress in this field (Hyde et al., 2014). Most research focuses on episodic volunteers and examines their demographics (Hustinx et al., 2008; Pauline and Pauline, 2009), commitment and motivations (Allison et al., 2002; Beder and Fast, 2008; Hamm et al., 2008; Han and Nguyen, 2008; Handy et al., 2006; Hustinx et al., 2008; Pauline et al., 2008), and retention (Bryen and Madden, 2006; Hyde et al., 2016). These studies provide an understanding of how and why certain individuals choose to participate sporadically and what sustains them in this.

With the exception of Christensen et al. (2005), there is surprisingly little literature on temporary episodic volunteering or National Days of Service in particular. As National Days of Service are growing in number and importance, host nonprofit organizations must learn to adapt to the size and demands of this new type of volunteer involvement. Furthermore, the temporary episodic character of service-learning, corporate-, family-, and single-volunteering makes temporary episodic volunteering a notably emergent and pervasive alternative form of volunteering.
New practices are needed as the sporadic and short-term nature of temporary episodic volunteering makes volunteer management practices focused on regular and ongoing volunteer commitment rather unpractical and more wasteful than efficient (Brudney and Meijs, 2014). Hitherto, it remains unclear how host nonprofit organizations integrate National Days of Service and similar one-off events or how they can do so more meaningfully.

1.1.3 Corporate Philanthropy at Arm’s Length

Corporate philanthropy as a contested concept

The legitimacy, appropriateness, role, and effectiveness of corporate philanthropy engendered a long debate. Friedman (1970) makes a strong case against corporate philanthropy as he argues that the only “social responsibility of business is to increase its profits.” Friedman (1962) concludes that if charitable contributions should be made, they should be made by individual shareholders or individual employees and not by the firm. He perceives corporate philanthropy as spending someone else’s money. He acknowledges that corporate charitable contributions can be made, but that this can only be decided by its shareholders (Friedman, 1962). According to the same author, for-profit organizations only have an economic contract. This contract indicates that for-profit organizations have the primary aim to make profits and obtain their right to exist when they benefit their shareholders. Charitable contributions would limit firm profits and shareholder values. Indeed, until 1954 U.S. law only allowed for-profit organizations to make contributions to nonprofit recipients when the firm (i.e., its shareholders) directly benefited from this activity (Burlingame and Smith, 1999; Stendardi Jr, 1992). After 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court established a “business judgement rule”, allowing for-profit organizations to make contributions that would promote firm’s interest according to their own judgement (Stendardi Jr, 1992).

Nowadays, it can be said that for-profit organizations have two contracts. An economic contract with the firm’s investors aimed at increasing profits and shareholder values, as well as a social contract with the community to improve social welfare and the environment (Carroll, 1979; Carroll and Shabana, 2010; Donaldson, 1982; Donaldson and Dunfee, 1994). In a time facing global societal and environmental issues coinciding with stressed government support, the ability of for-profit organizations to step in and help solve global issues has never been more important. In their response to living up to their social contract, for-profit organizations take the lead in addressing social and environmental issues by engaging in business-nonprofit partnerships (Austin,
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2000a,b), corporate philanthropy (Gautier and Pache, 2015; Liket and Simaens, 2015), corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012; Carroll, 1979; Carroll and Shabana, 2010; Davis, 1973; Godfrey and Hatch, 2007) and corporate community involvement (CCI) (Van Der Voort et al., 2009) among others. The boundaries between these concepts, however, are rather vague.

This dissertation centers on corporate philanthropy defined as voluntary financial contributions, in-kind donations and donations of time to social and charitable causes (Gautier and Pache, 2015; Liket and Simaens, 2015; Porter and Kramer, 2006). Corporate philanthropy is oftentimes discussed in relation to other concepts surrounding a firm’s social responsibilities and social contract. As such, corporate philanthropy is mostly seen as an integrative part of CSR (Von Schnurbein et al., 2016). Carroll (1979) proposed one of the most widely used conceptualizations of CSR. In his seminal work, Carroll (1979) places corporate philanthropy on top of the pyramid above a firm’s economic, legal, and ethical responsibilities. Thereby making corporate philanthropy a discretionary responsibility and viewed as peripheral CSR or as the “icing on the cake” (Carroll, 1979, p.42). Besides being conceptualized as part of CSR, corporate philanthropy is similar to CCI. Some definitions even imply the two are identical. For instance, Van Der Voort et al. (2009) and Burke et al. (1986) refer to CCI as the provision of corporate funds, goods and services, and the provision of time by a firm’s employees aimed toward nonprofit and civic organizations. Other scholars differentiate between the two, arguing that corporate philanthropy falls under the umbrella term of CCI (Seitanidi and Ryan, 2007). Herein CCI also incorporates sponsorships and cause-related marketing. Corporate philanthropy is furthermore surrounded by conceptualizations of corporate social performance (CSP) and Shared Value (Liket and Simaens, 2015), and widely promoted as an important strategy to good corporate citizenship (CC) (Saia et al., 2003).

While corporate philanthropy, seems to be traditionally conceptualized as an integrative part of broader concepts, it is nowadays viewed as an independent instrument (Brammer and Millington, 2006; Chen et al., 2008; Godfrey, 2005; Hall, 2006; Seifert et al., 2003; Wang and Qian, 2011), and researched as a concept in its own right. For extensive reviews see Gautier and Pache (2015) and Liket and Simaens (2015). Corporate philanthropy not only evolved in theory, but also in practice. This includes a paradigm shift towards mobilizing corporate resources to separate entities outside firm boundaries and the rise of third party intermediary organizations.
Corporate philanthropy at Arm’s Length

Traditionally seen, the decisions concerning corporate philanthropy were often made at management’s discretion (Buchholtz et al., 1999). Hereby for-profit organizations made direct contributions to nonprofit organizations. In this traditional and direct form, the responsibility for corporate philanthropy often resides within a corporate agent, such as the CEO (Gautier and Pache, 2015). In this case, the CEO can be seen as a philanthropist whereby the for-profit organization constitutes the vehicle to give.

Already in the 1980s, Morris and Biederman (1985) argue that firms should recruit a strong and independent manager to put some distance between the CEO and a firm’s giving. The authors call upon For-profit organizations to structuralize and smoothen corporate philanthropy by centralizing all philanthropic endeavors within a specific department or manager. This department or manager often focuses on the corporations’ interaction with society or the firm’s CSR efforts (Altuntas and Turker, 2015; Husted, 2003). Within these two practices corporate philanthropy is an internal activity, taking place within firm boundaries. I refer to these two practices as “direct corporate philanthropy”, whereby corporate donors practice corporate philanthropy towards nonprofit recipient groups in a direct relation.

Today, the field of philanthropy became more diverse and important parts of corporate philanthropy are channeled through separate vehicles that stand between corporate donors and nonprofit recipient groups. In these indirect channels, for-profit organizations practice corporate philanthropy through or are supported by separate entities such as a corporate or company-sponsored foundations (Gautier and Pache, 2015; Petrovits, 2006; Webb, 1994) or third party intermediaries (Lee, 2015). For-profit organizations use these vehicles to shape, formalize, and structure firms’ philanthropic endeavors. In doing so, for-profit organizations place their philanthropy outside firm boundaries and at arm’s length. Corporate philanthropy is then no longer at management’s discretion, but is shaped and organized by the discretion of the separate entity. These vehicles can be seen as channels or practices for “indirect corporate philanthropy”. Within this dissertation, I focus upon the various channels for indirect corporate philanthropy depicted in Figure 1.1. I specifically focus on (collective) corporate foundations and third party intermediary organizations.
Figure 1.1: Channels to practice corporate philanthropy

Corporate Foundations

Establishing a corporate foundation is one of the options available to a corporation deciding about how to donate money, time, or in-kind goods. In recent years, the creation of corporate foundations prospers (Anheier, 2003; Herlin and Pedersen, 2013). According to Brown et al. (2006) monetary donations through corporate foundations accounted for 34 percent of total corporate giving in the United States in 2002.

Roza et al. (2019) indicate three criteria characterize a corporate foundation. Corporate foundations are (1) legal separate entities, (2) pursue public-benefit purposes, and (3) are set up, funded, and to a large extent controlled by a for-profit organization (i.e., founding firm). Furthermore, for-profit organizations establishing a separate corporate foundation tend to constantly maintain a relationship. This can either be through their name, funding, trustees, administration, and employee involvement (Westhues and Einwiller, 2006). According to Roza et al. (2019) corporate foundations are corporate philanthropy tools in the hands of managers or firm owners as the corporate foundation predominantly depends on funding derived from the (founding) for-profit organization. According to the same authors, for-profit organizations “can pursue constant influence on all areas of the corporate foundation: governance, asset...
management, grant-giving, communication, who to employ and so forth” (Roza et al., 2019, p.1-13).

Ample research examines the rationale behind establishing a corporate foundation. The majority of scholars claim that mixed motivations inform the rationals behind a corporate foundation: serving both public interests as well as the interests of the founding for-profit organization (Herlin and Pedersen, 2013; Porter and Kramer, 2002; Rey-Garcia et al., 2012). One rationale relates to legitimacy (Petrovits, 2006; Westhues and Einwiller, 2006), whereby corporate foundations may signal long-term commitment to their philanthropy and charitable causes. In doing so, corporate foundations enhance the for-profit organization’s reputation and image (Webb, 1994). Other scholars echo the reputation enhancement and profit maximization of corporate foundations (Pedrini and Minciullo, 2011; Petrovits, 2006; Westhues and Einwiller, 2006). Another rationale relates to the foundation’s ability to structure and centralize philanthropic endeavors (Varcoe and Sloane, 2003). Due to centralized planning and staffing, corporate foundations are said to enhance the efficiency of corporate philanthropy (Webb, 1994). In addition, financial rationales include the foundations ability to maintain stable levels of giving (Kramer et al., 2004; Nelson, 1970; Petrovits, 2006), the ability to make grants out of accumulated reserves when the foundation receives less funding from the founding corporation (Nelson, 1970; Webb, 1994), and tax benefits (Park, 1996; Webb, 1994). That corporate foundations place corporate giving at arm’s length from founding for-profit organizations has not gone unnoticed by scholars. Both Kramer et al. (2004) and Petrovits (2006) acknowledge that corporate foundations lead to the separation of CEOs or corporate managers from giving decisions. A corporate foundation is said to reduce a CEO’s or manager’s ability to use corporate philanthropy for private benefits (Brown et al., 2006). Moreover, corporate foundations would enable external stakeholders to partake as board representatives of the foundation, providing the foundation with relevant expertise, credibility and greater transparency (Kramer et al., 2004). Nevertheless, it is found that corporate foundations “are more likely to involve corporate officers in the management of their corporate giving programs” (Brown et al., 2006, p.865).

One of the downsides of a corporate foundation is therefore its inability - in some instances - to be significantly different from direct giving programs. Meanwhile, when they are different, there is a risk of alienating corporate philanthropy from the corporation’s corporate strategy (Kramer et al., 2004). Hereby philanthropic endeavors may not be as strongly associated with the founding for-profit organization as the corporate executives wish (Webb, 1994). In addition, a corporate foundation
will require additional start-up costs as well as personnel and legal counsel (Webb, 1994).

**Collective Charity**

As the majority of scholars focuses on the practice of by individual for-profit organizations, some scholars raised interests for an alternative approach for corporate philanthropy in a collective setting (Porter and Kramer, 2002; Marquis et al., 2017). Marquis et al. (2017, p.3) state that - in China - a change is visible in the attitudes of entrepreneurs towards (corporate) philanthropy. These new attitudes oftentimes express a “collective ethos”. Chinese entrepreneurs do not longer create individual philanthropic projects or foundations, but search for like-minded individuals or organizations to collaborate on joint projects. Marquis et al. (2017) refer to this trend as a shift towards “collective charity”.

Also in western countries, collective giving practices gain attention. Porter and Kramer (2002) state that corporate philanthropy is amendable to and ready for collective efforts. Porter and Kramer (2002, p.16) even argue that “collective action will often be more effective than a solo effort in addressing context and enhancing the value created”. For instance, the philanthropic endeavors of organizational members of an industry cluster - including competitors - could have an all-powerful effect on the competitiveness of the cluster as well as improve the performance of all for-profit organizations involved (Porter and Kramer, 2002). Moreover, collaboration would enable for-profit organizations to spread and distribute costs, and to forge business-nonprofit partnerships with (nonprofit) organizations that would be hesitant to partner up on efforts that would benefit a single for-profit organization (Porter and Kramer, 2002).

Despite the articulated benefits, collective giving practices are relatively scarce and still in its infancy. This may be due to the fact that for-profit organizations may wish to fly solo given the accrued benefits of corporate philanthropy on an individual level. For instance, corporate philanthropy can be used as a differentiation strategy, (Seifert et al., 2004), to gain a competitive advantage (Mescon and Tilson, 1987), or to enhance a firm’s legitimacy and reputation (Bruch, 2005; Chen et al., 2008; Dowling and Pfeffer, 1975). Up to date, some collective giving practices came to populate the corporate philanthropic landscape. In these collective practices corporate donors pool their talent, resources and decision making. Collective initiatives serve the philanthropic interests of multiple for-profit organizations simultaneously, and often
pursue a mission greater than individual recognition. Such collective initiatives operate on the premises that for-profit organizations can act collectively and cooperate in their corporate philanthropy. These initiatives are - although not numerous - found globally. These initiatives often arise from specific industry-clusters or industry-associations and take the form of multiple-donor foundations. Understanding collective corporate philanthropy is important as it provides a new model for entrepreneurs and for-profit organizations all around the world (Marquis et al., 2017).

**Third Party Intermediary Organizations**

Corporate philanthropy can be perceived as a cross-sector partnership (Austin, 2000a,b) and specifically as business-nonprofit partnerships (Harris, 2012b). Business-nonprofit partnerships, however, are difficult ventures as for-profit and nonprofit organizations appear to be unnatural partners. Competing missions, logics, strategic orientations, interests, rationalities, and cultures make business-nonprofit partnerships a difficult venture (Austin, 2000b; Bryson et al., 2006; Jamali and Keshishian, 2009; Kolk et al., 2008). Mutual distrust, complex settings, and power imbalances amplify these challenges and complicate business-nonprofit partnerships (Bryson et al., 2006; Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Kolk et al., 2008).

The inherent challenges to business-nonprofit partnerships give rise and a raison d’être to third party intermediary organizations that facilitate, encourage, stimulate and support business-nonprofit partnerships, including corporate philanthropy (Brown and Kalegaonkar, 2002; Lee, 2015; Stadtlter and Probst, 2012; Tribbia and Moser, 2008). Several scholars recognize the importance of third party intermediary organizations within cross-sector partnerships (Manning and Roessler, 2014). Scholars acknowledge third party intermediary organizations fulfill both initiating as well as supporting roles throughout the entire partnership (Bryson et al., 2006; Lee, 2015; Manning and Roessler, 2014).

A distinction exists between internal and external intermediaries. Where internal intermediaries are employed or operate from within one of the partner organizations, external intermediaries are legally independent and work on behalf of partner organizations (Manning and Roessler, 2014; Tennyson, 2005; Warner, 2003). Intermediaries may furthermore be individuals who fulfill an intermediary role, as well as organizations, and can be commercial or nonprofit oriented (Tennyson, 2005).
Current state of research on corporate philanthropy at arm’s length

Corporate philanthropy received significant attention in the past decades. Hitherto, we have a decent understanding of major aspects of the phenomenon, including its essence, motivations, practices and processes, and outcomes (for a review see Gautier and Pache (2015); Liket and Simaens (2015). Our understanding of corporate giving practices includes decision-making processes (Brammer and Millington, 2006; Abzug and Webb, 1996; Brudney and Ferrell, 2002; Smith, 1994), relations between corporate donors and recipients (Husted, 2003; Tracey et al., 2005), and the position of corporate philanthropy within the for-profit organization (Carrigan, 1997). The latter, however, argues corporate philanthropy either falls within the authority of the CEO or belongs to a specific department - oftentimes as “an ad hoc activity given only part-time attention by a member of staff who has other ‘more pressing’ duties” (Carrigan, 1997, p.46).

Scant research focuses on the various channels (outside firm boundaries) for-profit organizations use to practice corporate philanthropy. Where contemporary collective practices are overlooked, some literature focuses on corporate foundations established by individual for-profit organizations. Scholars examine the motives to establish corporate foundations (Nelson, 1970; Petrovits, 2006; Webb, 1994), their role (Herlin and Pedersen, 2013; Park, 1996; Westhues and Einwiller, 2006), the influence of CEOs or founding firms on corporate foundation giving (Pedrini and Minciullo, 2011; Werbel and Carter, 2002), the knowledge transfers between a foundation and its founding firm (Minciullo and Pedrini, 2015), and governance (Mindlin, 2012; Rey-Garcia et al., 2012). Third party intermediary organizations are also underexposed in scholarly literature - with the exception of Roza (2016) and Lee (2015). The majority of scholars fail to examine cross-sector partnerships including corporate philanthropy beyond dyadic or dual interactions (Arenas et al., 2013) The same authors call to advance the knowledge on the processes and triad interactions underlying cross-sector partnerships.

Scholars, hitherto, largely ignored the paradigm shift towards indirect corporate philanthropy. Scholars are especially silent regarding the values, consequences, and management practices of the indirect vehicles or channels. The paradigm shift towards using indirect, outside vehicles sets forth solid reasons for ongoing research in the field as we need a deeper understanding of the values, consequences, and management practices of these vehicles and channels.

In the dissertation I aim to unravel some of these modern outside channels of corporate philanthropy. The dissertation zooms in on (collective) corporate foundations
and third party intermediary organizations. This is particularly relevant as these vehicles are complex phenomena involving various stakeholders. This quest is above all justified as both corporate foundations and third-party intermediary organizations grow in number, size and importance (Anheier, 2001; Herlin and Pedersen, 2013; Lee, 2015; Ostrander, 2007; Rey-Garcia et al., 2012; Rochester et al., 2010; Stadtler and Probst, 2012). In doing so, I respond to calls from Roza et al. (2019) to better understand corporate philanthropy by unravelling the various channels through which for-profit organizations practice corporate philanthropy. Likewise, I shed light on the processes and practices underlying corporate philanthropy as these processes are hitherto little understood (Gautier and Pache, 2015).

1.2 Main Contributions

This dissertation has a ‘simple’ goal: to address and clarify the values, consequences, and management practices associated with third party organizations and other vehicles that provide individuals or for-profit organizations pathways into private or corporate philanthropy. The aim of the dissertation is to increase scholarly understanding in two substantive areas of research.

1. The dissertation aims to contribute to the growing body of literature on temporary episodic volunteering and specifically on National Days of Service. As National Days of Service became more common around the globe and mobilize huge amount of volunteers, it is a critical and growing phenomenon within the field of volunteer research and volunteer management. The dissertation aims to make a contribution to the literature on National Days of Service by examining (1) how (host) nonprofit organizations design National Days of Service projects to yield volunteer satisfaction (Chapter 2); by examining (2) how different types of (host) nonprofit organizations practice National Days of Service (Chapter 3). In doing so, the dissertation examines how (host) nonprofit organizations integrate National Days of Service and how they can do so more meaningfully.

2. The dissertation aims to contribute to the literature on corporate philanthropy and related literature on business-nonprofit partnerships. The dissertation aims to make a contribution by examining (1) why for-profit organizations outsource corporate philanthropy to collective giving vehicles such as a collective corporate foundation, and what the consequences are of doing so (Chapter 4); by examining (2) what makes third party intermediary organizations valuable in business-
nonprofit partnerships in the context of corporate philanthropy (Chapter 5). I doing so, the dissertation aims to contribute to the aforementioned literature by enhancing our understanding of corporate philanthropy taking place at arm’s length from the for-profit organization.

1.3 Outline of the Dissertation

The dissertation comprises six chapters including four essays covering various aspects of contemporary forms of private and corporate philanthropy, an introduction and a conclusion. The four essays consist of two empirical studies in the context of modern volunteering - specifically on National Days of Service (Chapters 2 and 3), and two empirical studies on indirect corporate philanthropy whereby each study examines a vehicle of indirect corporate philanthropy (a collective corporate foundation and third party intermediary organizations) (Chapter 4 and 5).

All four studies are developed as independent contributions and can be read as individual essays. The four studies are aligned in the phenomenon under study as they are guided by the objective to increase our understanding of contemporary forms of private and corporate philanthropy. Table 1.2 provides an overview of the studies and summarizes the phenomenon under study, research questions, and methodologies of all four studies. In the following, I present a brief abstract of each study in the dissertation.

Abstract Chapter 2. Although temporary episodic volunteering events such as National Days of Service have grown increasingly popular over the past decades, surprisingly little systematic research focuses on the design of National Day of Service projects to yield satisfying volunteer experiences. By examining in-depth a National Days of Service in the Netherlands, this article seeks to provide guidance on this design issue. The data emanate from interviews with host nonprofit organizations and volunteer centers, enriched by trained participant observers, as well as focus groups with Day of Service volunteers. Based on work design theory, the findings suggest ways for host nonprofit organizations to promote volunteer satisfaction in National Days of Service by designing Day of Service projects to incorporate task significance, direct beneficiary contact and social support, feedback from others, job-based feedback, task identity, and limited autonomy. Furthermore, findings reveal adequate planning and preparation, and an appropriate workload also yield volunteer satisfaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon under study</th>
<th>Chapter 2</th>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th>Chapter 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private philanthropy; National Days of Service</td>
<td>Private philanthropy; National Days of Service</td>
<td>Corporate philanthropy; Collective corporate foundation</td>
<td>Corporate philanthropy; Third party intermediary organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question(s)</td>
<td>How to design National Days of Service to yield satisfying volunteer experiences?</td>
<td>How do sports associations practice National Days of Service compared to service delivery organizations?</td>
<td>What are the rationales and consequences of outsourcing corporate philanthropy to a collective corporate foundation?</td>
<td>What makes third party intermediary organizations within business-nonprofit partnerships valuable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Interviews, participant observations, focus groups</td>
<td>Survey data</td>
<td>Interviews, company documents</td>
<td>Focus groups, interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Directed qualitative content analysis</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
<td>Inductive thematic analysis</td>
<td>Inductive thematic analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Overview of the four studies
Abstract Chapter 3. This study focuses on the tension between temporary episodic volunteering events such as National Days of Service, and the membership nature of sports associations. National Days of Service evoke volunteering among a broader population. Mutual support organizations such as sports associations are membership-based, so that National Days of Service contradict the membership-nature of these sports associations. The study examines whether sports associations adapt themselves in order to access a broader volunteer population (non-members) in National Days of Service; or if their inherent nature leads to a different use of National Days of Service. The study compares their use of National Days of Service with that of service delivery organizations, as the latter are more aligned with the volunteers evoked in National Days of Service. Based on empirical analysis of a sample of 1,030 sports associations and 4,293 service delivery organizations offering volunteering activities in an annual National Day of Service in the Netherlands, for the period 2012-2015, findings indicate that sports associations and service delivery organizations differ in the types of volunteers attracted, the recruitment methods used, and the results attained.

Abstract Chapter 4. The study distinguishes between in-house (direct) corporate giving and outsourced (indirect) corporate giving, bringing corporate philanthropy back to a make-or-buy decision. In addition, corporate donors can go down a collaborative path and participate in collective initiatives, such as a collective corporate foundation. This entails a corporate foundation serving the interests of multiple corporate donors simultaneously. The study examines the rationales and consequences of outsourcing one’s corporate philanthropy by means of a collective corporate foundation. The study entails a single case study in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Primary data stems from interviews with various stakeholders, including (former- and non-) donor-organizations. The study finds two rationales guiding corporate decision makers facing the make-or-buy decision of corporate philanthropy: (1) available resources; (2) need for efficiency. Second, the study finds three consequences of using a collective corporate foundation to shape corporate philanthropy: (1) loss of control, (2) loss of involvement, and (3) fewer individual organizational benefits. Third, the study identifies a trade-off between the identified rationales and consequences. The chapter concludes by relating the rationales back to a strategic management and an economic view on outsourcing, and by discussing the limitations and implications of the study findings.
Abstract Chapter 5. Business-nonprofit partnerships are in general a difficult venture, and numerous challenges jeopardize business-nonprofit partnerships. These challenges give rise to third party intermediary organizations specialized in facilitating business-nonprofit partnerships. As third party intermediary organizations grow in number and importance, the study explores what makes these intermediary organizations valuable within business-nonprofit partnerships. A case study of third party intermediary organizations facilitating corporate community involvement in the Netherlands provides the research context. Data stem from focus groups and in-depth interviews with representatives of third party intermediary organizations, nonprofit and for-profit organizations, and local government. Case findings show third party intermediary organizations provide for-profit and nonprofit organizations with the required organizational social capital and human capital, and lower transaction costs. By overcoming three barriers (inadequate networks, insufficient resources, being unconscious or unknowledgeable), third party intermediary organizations provide a pathway into, and an infrastructure for, business-nonprofit partnerships such as corporate community involvement. Our research also reveal that third party intermediary organizations change business-nonprofit partnerships in distinct ways. The results of this study inform for-profit and nonprofit organizations, enabling them to assess whether to involve third party intermediary organizations; and inform intermediary organizations on how to obtain legitimate and credible business-nonprofit partnerships.

Chapter 6 concludes the dissertation. In this final chapter, I state the main findings and contributions of each chapter. I furthermore discuss the practical implications of each chapter and provide avenues for future research.

1.4 Declaration of Contribution

In the subsequent section, I declare my contribution to the different chapters of this dissertation and acknowledge the contribution of others where relevant.

Chapter 1. The author of this dissertation independently did the majority of work in this chapter. I sent a draft of the chapter to my supervisor and second supervisor for comments. Thereafter, I incorporated their feedback into the final version.

Chapter 2. This chapter is co-authored by Prof. Dr. Lucas C.P.M. Meijs and Prof. Dr. Jeff L. Brudney. The author of this dissertation is the lead author of this
chapter and independently did the majority of work. Specifically, the author of this dissertation undertook the initial conceptualization, development of the research question, literature review, collection and analysis of empirical data, and the majority of writing. At several points during the process, the co-authors improved parts of this chapter by providing detailed feedback on conceptual or methodological issues and related literature, and by reviewing the chapter. This chapter appeared at (peer-reviewed) management and nonprofit sector conferences, and is currently under peer review in the 4th round at a top journal for nonprofit sector research.

**Chapter 3.** This chapter is co-authored by Prof. Dr. Lucas C.P.M. Meijs, Prof. Dr. Jeff L. Brudney, and Dr. Jan-Willem van der Roest. The author of this dissertation is the lead author of this chapter and independently did the majority of work. Specifically, the author of this dissertation undertook the initial conceptualization, development of the research question, literature review, preparation and analysis of empirical data, and the majority of writing. At several points during the process, the co-authors improved parts of this chapter by providing detailed feedback on conceptual or methodological issues and related literature, and by reviewing the chapter. This chapter appeared at (peer-reviewed) management and nonprofit sector conferences, and is currently under peer review in the 1st round at a journal for nonprofit sector research.


**Chapter 5.** This chapter is co-authored by Prof. Dr. Lucas C.P.M. Meijs. The author of this dissertation is the lead author of this chapter and independently did the majority of work. The author formulated the research question, performed the literature review, collected and analyzed the data, interpreted the findings, and wrote the manuscript. At several points during the process, the co-author improved parts
of this chapter by providing detailed feedback and by reviewing the chapter. This chapter appeared at (peer-reviewed) management and nonprofit sector conferences and is currently under peer review in the 1st round at a management journal.

Chapter 6. The author of this dissertation independently did the majority of work in this chapter. I sent a draft of the chapter to my supervisor and second supervisor for comments. Thereafter, I incorporated their feedback into the final version.
Chapter 4

What For-profit Organizations Can(’t) Gain with a Collective Corporate Foundation¹

4.1 Introduction

Recent years witnessed a diversification of the “how” of corporate philanthropy. Over time, the landscape of corporate philanthropy grew increasingly more crowded, as more and more organizational forms and philanthropic practices came to populate the terrain and became part of the giving repertoire. Traditionally, for-profit organizations make direct grants to nonprofit recipients. The responsibility for corporate giving then resides with a company agent such as the CEO or a member of top management (Gautier and Pache, 2015), or philanthropic endeavors are carried out by a particular department that structures, unifies, and smoothens corporate giving (CSR-, public affairs-, or corporate communications department) (Altuntas and Turker, 2015; Husted, 2003). Nowadays, more and more for-profit organizations make voluntary donations through separate (outside) vehicles or entities. A frequently used entity are corporate foundations, also called company-sponsored or company foundations (Gautier and

The corporation then indirectly gives to nonprofit organizations and uses a corporate foundation as an intermediary entity that grants final donations to nonprofit recipients.

The diversification of the how of corporate philanthropy enables us to make a distinction between in-house (direct) corporate giving and external or outsourced (indirect) corporate giving. In-house (direct) corporate giving entails organizing and managing corporate philanthropy by particular individuals or departments within the corporation. External, outsourced (indirect) corporate giving entails organizing and managing corporate philanthropy by legal separate entities such as corporate foundations (Rey-Garcia et al., 2012) or third-party providers such as intermediary organizations (Lee, 2015). In these instances, for-profit organizations organize and manage their corporate giving externally - outside firm boundaries at arm’s length from the for-profit organization.

The distinction brings corporate giving back to a make-or-buy decision, as outsource decisions have their origin in the existence of make-or-buy alternatives. According to Greer et al. (1999), outsourcing refers to the performance of tasks - that otherwise would be performed in-house - by outside parties on a recurring basis. Following the definition on outsourcing by Turnbull (2002), I define outsourcing in the context of corporate philanthropy as placing responsibility for various elements of corporate philanthropy with legal separate entities and/or third party providers. Outsourcing is comparable to governmental contracting out, where governments can decide to delegate the delivery of services to private organizations, instead of delivering the services themselves (Ferris and Graddy, 1986).

Besides shaping, organizing, and managing corporate giving individually, for-profit organizations can go down a collaborative path with like-minded organizations and combine their corporate philanthropy. One could expect for-profit organizations to even have a more fundamental impact on societal issues when opting collective giving strategies, as one can argue collective business efforts have comparative advantages over individual efforts in various areas (i.e., pooling resources, ruling out any suspicion on individual gains, reaching scale and critical mass, demonstrating common commitment) (e.g., Fourie and Eloff (2005)). Porter and Kramer (2002, p.11) state that “corporate philanthropy is ripe for collective activity,” as “collective action will often be more effective than a solo effort in addressing context and enhancing the value created” (Porter and Kramer, 2002, p.16). Marquis et al. (2017, p.3) state that, in China, a change is visible in the attitudes of entrepreneurs towards (corporate) philanthropy. These new attitudes oftentimes express a “collective ethos”. Chinese entrepreneurs
no longer create individual philanthropic projects or foundations, but search for like-minded individuals or organizations to collaborate on joint projects. Marquis et al. (2017) refer to this trend as a shift towards “collective charity”. Table 4.1 depicts the various channels available to for-profit organizations to practice corporate philanthropy. We can make a distinction between direct and indirect channels, as well as individual (involving a single for-profit organization) and collective (involving multiple for-profit organizations) giving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct (internal, within firm boundaries)</th>
<th>Individual giving</th>
<th>Collective giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO / department</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (external, outside firm boundaries)</td>
<td>Corporate foundation</td>
<td>Collective charity, including multiple donor foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Available options for for-profit organizations to practice corporate philanthropy

Corporate foundations and other corporate philanthropic entities are increasingly promoting and adapting collective giving strategies. For instance, corporate foundations serving the interests of multiple corporate donors simultaneously, came to populate the corporate philanthropic landscape. Within the study, I focus on these corporate foundations serving multiple corporate donors and label them as “collective corporate foundations”. Collective corporate foundations are thereby an example of an outsourced (external) collective corporate giving channel.

4.1.1 Study Purpose and Case Context

The research question in the study is: What are the rationales and consequences of outsourcing corporate philanthropy to a collective corporate foundation? Hereby, I dive into the rationales that guide corporate decision makers in the make-or-buy decision of corporate giving, as well as the decision between individual or collective giving strategies. Furthermore, I wonder what the implications are of a for-profit
organization’s choice when deciding to indirectly donate to nonprofit organizations through a collective separate entity.\(^2\)

The study finds two rationales guiding corporate decision makers facing the make-or-buy decision of corporate philanthropy and opting for external collective giving practices: (1) the amount of available resources and (2) the need for efficiency. These rationales relate to a strategic management and an economic view on outsourcing. The strategic management view follows a resource-based view on the firm and the resource dependency theory. The economic view on outsourcing entails transaction cost economics and agency theory (Lee et al., 2000). Second, the study identifies three main consequences of outsourcing corporate philanthropy to a collective corporate foundation: (1) a loss of control, (2) a loss of involvement, and (3) fewer individual organizational benefits.

I find these rationales and consequences by means of a single instrumental case study (Stake, 1995), concerning a collective corporate foundation located in the port of Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Established by an industry association, the DeltaPORT Donation Foundation (in Dutch: DeltaPORT Donatiefonds) finds its origin in 1974.\(^3\) The foundation embodies a corporate foundation for the port’s industry and has the goal to give something back to the local community and to compensate for the industry’s hindrance. The foundation provides small monetary donations to nonprofit organizations located in 17 municipalities surrounding the port active in sports, culture, and well-being. The foundation constitutes a entity for for-profit organizations to engage in and shape (collective) corporate giving. Currently 82 for-profit organizations contribute to the foundation (i.e., donor organizations). Donations constitute a fixed amount based on the number of employees ($13 per employee) or an amount agreed upon with the founding industry association. The foundation’s operating budget ($400,000) comes from two main sources: (1) donor organizations (55%), and (2) the foundations official partner (45%) (DeltaPORT Donatiefonds, 2016).\(^4\) Some representatives of donor organizations also serve as board members of the foundation as representatives of the industry. Where a corporate foundation generally has a single corporate donor, this foundation has multiple. Thereby the foundation serves multiple corporate donor interests simultaneously.

\(^2\)Within this study, “for-profit organizations” are personified as the term is used as if for-profit organizations undertake actions themselves. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that for-profit organizations operate through people.

\(^3\)Deltalinqs is the port’s industry association and commits itself to represent the joint interests of industrial for-profit organizations in the port of Rotterdam.

\(^4\)In 2007, Deltalinqs approached the Port of Rotterdam Authority to become a partner of the foundation. The Port of Rotterdam Authority is a publicly owned but corporatized port-development company.
4.1 Introduction

Given its structure, functioning, and multiple served donor interests, the foundation provides a collective voice and vehicle for corporate philanthropy.

4.1.2 Collective Corporate Foundations

The boundary of what is considered a corporate foundation is blurry and can be disputed. Within the limited literature on corporate foundations there is no single accepted definition (Rey-Garcia et al., 2012). There are a few characteristics differentiating corporate foundations from other types of foundations. First, corporate foundations are separate legal entities and are often founded by a for-profit organization whose name is frequently part of the foundation’s name. Second, a corporate foundation obtains the majority of its operating income and other resources from a (founding) for-profit organization’s generosity. Third, the foundation’s board often includes owners, directors, or top managers from the founding for-profit organization (Rey-Garcia et al., 2012; Roza et al., 2019). Following a more subjective definition, the foundation should self-identify as a corporate foundation (see also the characteristic of a family foundation from Moody et al. (2011)). Although not founded by a for-profit corporation, DeltaPORT Donation Foundation fulfils most of the differentiating characteristics (i.e., operating income, board composition). In this case, self-identification is an important aspect with respect to the DeltaPORT Donation Foundation, as the foundation is depicted as a corporate foundation for the port’s industry. The foundation differs from a community foundation, as the foundation is not accessible to every (corporate) donor. Only for-profit organizations located in the port area, and member of the founding industry association, can make donations.

Collective corporate foundations are a relatively emerging phenomenon. Similar initiatives are foundations established or supported by the collective efforts of multiple for-profit organizations, serving multiple donor interests simultaneously. Although still in its infancy, existing examples are found globally and arise from specific industry clusters or industry associations. The Toy Industry Foundation, for instance, constitutes the focal point for the philanthropic efforts of the North American toy industry, where for-profit organizations can accomplish philanthropic goals by donating funds (Toy Association, nd; Toy Industry Foundation, nd). Another example of a collective corporate foundation is the Industrial Fabrics Foundation in the U.S., as this foundation constitutes “the philanthropic voice of the specialty fabrics industry for nearly 20 years” (Industry Fabrics Foundation, nd). Another example is the SBF Foundation established by the Singapore Business Federation. “The SBF Foundation is a collective foundation of the business community, serving the needs of the local community” in
Singapore (SBF Foundation, 2015, p.1). Marquis et al. (2017) furthermore indicate that there are many examples of collective philanthropy in China.

The potential to collectively fund or found a separate collective (corporate) foundation is tremendous. For instance, both small or large for-profit organizations and industry clusters could go down a collaborative path in their corporate philanthropy. Business clusters such as Silicon Valley or small-scale clusters could give a collective voice to their corporate giving. For instance, small-scale retailer associations could engage in collective giving by setting up a collective corporate foundation for retailers in a specific region.

4.1.3 Contributions

The bulk of current corporate philanthropy literature deals with various facets of direct corporate giving for individual corporations (e.g., motivations, determinants, processes, outcomes) (Gautier and Pache, 2015; Liket and Simaens, 2015). Moreover, scant research examines the rationales behind establishing a corporate foundation (Petrovits, 2006; Webb, 1994). Academics, hitherto, ignore when and why for-profit organizations engage in indirect, collective giving strategies and use collective initiatives as a vehicle to practice corporate giving. In doing so, academics insufficiently articulated what differs indirect giving from direct giving, as well as individual versus collective corporate giving strategies. Hereby, scholars also ignore the consequences of the various corporate giving channels resulting from these practices. The inductive study intends to overcome this lacuna by providing exploratory insights on the above topics. The novelty of the study lies in the effort to conceptualize corporate giving as a make-or-buy decision and as an individual or collective corporate giving decision. As such, the chapter aspires to make a contribution to the corporate philanthropy literature by examining the rationales and consequences related to the make-or-buy decision as well as the individual or collective decision of corporate giving. Understanding collective corporate philanthropy is important as it provides a new model for entrepreneurs and for-profit organizations all around the world, according to Marquis et al. (2017). Moreover, an enhanced understanding helps corporate decision makers to identify where they should focus their philanthropic endeavors and guides them in the decision between in-house or outsourced giving channels as well as individual versus collective giving strategies. Meanwhile, findings assist collective corporate foundations to enhance the quality of its operations. This in return helps

---

5 A business or industry cluster is a geographic concentration of interconnected businesses, suppliers, or institutions in a particular region or field (Porter, 2000).
these foundations to attract more funding from for-profit organizations outsourcing
corporate philanthropy to collective entities. Likewise, the findings apply to other
multiple donor foundations (e.g., community foundations) or collective initiatives
(e.g., giving circles), as the rationales and consequences for (corporate) donors might
be comparable.

4.2 Data and Methodology

4.2.1 Data Collection
As I focus on a case to illustrate the topic of interest, the study entails a single
instrumental case study (Stake, 1995). I build an in-depth, contextual understanding
of the case relaying on multiple data sources (Yin, 2003). Primary data were gathered
from a sample of (former) donor organizations, the founding industry association
and partner organization, and (former) board members of the corporate collective
foundation. Furthermore, for-profit organizations able to donate to the foundation, but
who rather keep their corporate giving in-house or individually were also selected (non-
donor organizations). The CEO of Deltalinqs formally consented with the research.
The researcher in cooperation with the CEO purposefully selected the final sample.
The sample included individuals available and willing to participate and experienced
with the phenomenon of interest (Creswell and Clark, 2011). Six telephone interviews
and 13 face-to-face interviews at the interviewee’s place of work gathered the primary
data. All 19 interviews were semi-structured, meaning that a list of high-level themes
and key questions as a checklist was composed beforehand. Key themes included
the rationales or motivations for various channels for corporate giving, differences
between various channels, as well as advantages and disadvantages in respect to one
another. The intent was to come to a real conversation with the interviewee, allow
deviations, and explore issues that were not thought about prior to the interview.
Questions were continuously adapted in accordance with the role of the interviewee.
Nineteen respondents were formally interviewed for the current study, including three
current and two former board members, three and two representatives of the founding
industry association and the partner organization, and four, three, and one corporate
decision-maker(s) within donor organizations, former donor organizations, and non-
donor organizations. All corporate decision-makers were responsible for corporate
philanthropy within their organization. All corporate interviewees held positions as
CEO, middle manager (i.e., corporate communication, external affairs, or public affairs
manager), or management assistant. Three board members of DeltaPORT Donation
Foundation served as community representatives and held positions as mayor or public relations expert. I include several stakeholders to capture a holistic view with regard to the subject of analysis, whereas the triangulated use of multiple interviews ensured greater trustworthiness of the data. Interviews took place in April and May 2017 and ranged in length between 30 and 70 minutes. Interviews amounted to a total of over 14 hours. All interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim, which formed the input for the data analysis. Interview transcripts amounted to 369 pages of raw data.

Additionally, I gathered publicly available information via websites and CSR reports from donor organizations. Documentary evidence was used to understand the context of the case study, permitting more perceptive exchanges with interviewees, and support findings from primary data.

4.2.2 Data Analysis

Data analysis followed a strategy of thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis offers an accessible and theoretically flexible approach for analyzing qualitative data that searches for themes and patterns (Braun and Clarke, 2006). As this study explores rationales, a realist/essentialist paradigm was taken, in order to enable the researcher to report experiences, meanings, and the reality of the interviewees (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Using an inductive approach, the themes identified are data-driven and are strongly linked to the data itself. Furthermore, the researcher used semantic themes. With a semantic approach, “the themes are identified within the explicit or surface meaning of the data and the analyst is not looking for anything beyond what a participant has said” (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.13). The analysis included reading transcripts completely through to get a sense of the entire data set. This was followed by re-reading and coding segments, re-coding, and grouping codes into broad clusters of similar topics or nodes, primarily around the research question.

4.3 Results

We seek to explore the rationales and consequences of a for-profit organization’s choice to practice corporate philanthropy through a collective corporate foundation. Table 4.2 presents a description of the five primary themes with illustrative quotes. Each interviewee has a unique label referring to the type or organizational position of the interviewee and an alphabetic letter assigned to the interviewee within each group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exemplary Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of available resources</td>
<td>The amount of available corporate resources to practice corporate philanthropy is limited as corporate giving often constitutes a peripheral activity. A collective corporate foundation enables for-profit organizations, both SMEs as well as MNEs, to practice corporate giving in a low-threshold manner.</td>
<td>“Imagine [for-profit organization X] is setting up their own foundation, then [for-profit organization Y] will set one up too, and [for-profit organization Z] will do the same (...) Nonetheless, there are only a few large for-profit organizations who can actually make that happen. A few who have the manpower, the knowledge, and the capital to do so” (Partner organization, representative B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>The collective corporate foundation enables for-profit organizations to receive a high social return for philanthropic endeavours by making a relative small investment of resources</td>
<td>“You can do things that for-profit organizations cannot do on an individual basis. Both financially, as organizationally” (CEO donor organization B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>When donating to a collective corporate foundation, a for-profit organization is giving the foundation control over its philanthropic endeavours and activities, unless one takes an active (board) role within the foundation.</td>
<td>“So yes, in the end you do not exactly know where you donate to, but you assume that that happens in good faith by [the foundation]” (CEO donor organization D).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loss of involvement (Consequence) Indirect corporate philanthropy places corporate giving at arm’s length from the for-profit organization compared to direct corporate philanthropy. When for-profit organizations do not take an active role within the collective corporate foundation, the for-profit organization is uninvolved in policy or decision making, and seems to a lesser extent engaged and committed towards the philanthropic endeavours.

“Certainly in times when things are rough for-profit organizations often say: ‘Well, not right now’ when approached by the collective initiative. The decision to stop is easily and perhaps more likely made, when corporate giving takes places on a distance, compared to when you are participating in it, and when you are very actively involved” (Partner organization, representative C).

Fewer individual organizational benefits (Consequence) With a collective corporate foundation serving multiple corporate donors simultaneously, individual for-profit organizations are unlikely to receive individual organizational benefits from the philanthropic endeavours, unless the partnership with the foundation is properly communicated.

“In the moment you are giving directly, it is much clearer. Then the funds are directly from us [for-profit organization B] to the nonprofit initiative” (CEO donor organization B).

“The direct visibility, however, is less, because those nonprofit organizations who make a request to the foundation might not make a direct association with [for-profit organization B]” (CEO donor organization B).

Table 4.2: Illustrative comments supporting case findings

**Amount of available resources.** An important consideration for outsourcing corporate philanthropy via a collective corporate foundation is the amount of corporate resources for-profit organizations have available for corporate giving. For-profit organizations receive many requests for donations on a weekly or even daily basis. Small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) often lack the capacity in terms of
personnel, time, and money to handle those requests. An interviewee attests:

“There are many small for-profit organizations in the port that are not small in the amount of work or transshipment they do, but organizationally small (...) These for-profit organizations do not have the ability to engage in extensive interaction with the local environment or whatever. For those for-profit organizations [this foundation] poses a solution” (Board member B).

The same rationale applies to subsidiaries or local branches of multinational enterprises (MNEs). Subsidiaries located in the port are operational subsidiaries with limited budgets and resources to engage in peripheral activities such as corporate giving (Founding industry association, representative C). The headquarters of MNEs often take on the peripheral activities, and subsidiaries in host countries are more focused on performing only the core activities. The collective corporate foundation then becomes a vehicle enabling subsidiaries to shape and engage in local corporate philanthropy in a low-threshold manner.

“Local management is limited in terms of policy development, communication, and stakeholder management. These for-profit organizations are focused on their core activities. So they do the operations, a bit of risk management and safety management. But they do not possess the CSR managers” (Partner organization, representative B).

In this way, outsourcing philanthropic endeavors to an outside entity enables SMEs and local subsidiaries of MNEs to give. When outsourcing corporate giving to the foundation, donor organizations can refer incoming donor requests to the foundation. The foundation thereby presents a vehicle to channel donation requests (Board member C). It goes, however, beyond the sole matter of handling requests:

“If you organize it individually, you have to spend a lot more time on it. You have to account for [corporate giving], you have to set up your own policy: When do you grant a request and when do you reject one? You take care of the entire implementation that, in the end, also has to be controlled” (Board member E).
For-profit organizations oftentimes unaware of community needs and issues, are said to be unable to make adequate decisions regarding donation requests (Partner organization, representative A). When a for-profit organization decides to organize corporate philanthropy internally, there is a need to open up continuous dialogues with the local community in order to make well-informed decisions (CEO former donor organization C). If for-profit organizations shun this dialogue, the for-profit organization may end up supporting pet causes of a company agent (Founding industry association, representative B). Engaging in such a dialogue, however, is a time-consuming activity with high participation or opportunity costs of organizational time. The collective corporate foundation has the capacity to adequately take care of donor requests, due to its board composition. With its community representatives, the foundation has all associated knowledge to make well-informed and adequate decisions (CEO donor organization A). As there is a need for specialized expertise, there sometimes seems to be a need for outsourcing. In this way it is rational to outsource corporate giving, given that someone else can perform the activity better.

Interviewees moreover explain that especially subsidiaries of MNEs need to invest significant resources to establish relationships with the local community to become knowledgeable about community needs. This is due to their international workforce and their distance to the local community. Local community relationships, however, require an investment of resources that subsidiaries often lack for peripheral activities (Partner organization, representative B). Outsourcing corporate philanthropy by means of a collective corporate foundation allows the subsidiary to buy itself into the local community.

“The port also has large international for-profit organizations, whereby their headquarters are located in the United States. These for-profit organizations don’t know the local community that well. Also the personnel is becoming more and more international within these for-profit organizations. So by becoming part of [the foundation], I think it enables for-profit organizations to maintain that local feeling” (Partner organization, representative C).

It is unrealistic to assume that every for-profit organization has the resources and capacity to organize philanthropy in-house or through an individual corporate foundation (Partner organization, representative B). Economic pressures force many for-profit organizations to consider outsourcing to external entities as an alternative for corporate giving. A collective corporate foundation enables for-profit organizations to
concentrate resources on core business activities where the organization has expertise and is likely to do best. The collective corporate foundation brings, above all, new funds to the philanthropic table and enables SMEs and subsidiaries of MNEs to give locally, when they are individually unable to organize corporate giving themselves due to their limited resources.

**Efficiency.** Efficiency is another critical construct for understanding the consideration to practice corporate giving internally or externally, and individually or collectively. External collective giving practices are a relatively small investment providing for-profit organizations with a high (social) return. The consideration for efficiency is found in at least three different ways.

First, shaping corporate giving by means of a collective corporate foundation enables donor organizations to redirect donation requests to the foundation. A collective corporate foundation then provides an efficient way for for-profit organizations to channel incoming requests. Two interviewees explain:

“We often see that for-profit organizations say to individual nonprofit requests, ‘Sorry, we organize our corporate giving in the context of [the foundation], so please go there to get your share’, so it saves you a lot of small donation requests and work” (Board member A).

“It entails also some efficiency for for-profit organizations, because these for-profit organizations do not have to take care of many donation requests. As a for-profit organization you receive many requests, and if you want to handle them neatly, you have to give them at least an answer (...) Thus, either way, someone in your organization is spending time on it” (Funding industry association, representative C).

Second, I find that by means of a collective corporate foundation, the donations of donor organizations result in a high (social) return for for-profit organizations from a philanthropic perspective. The collective corporate foundation pulls together a collection of philanthropic endeavors, meaning the total operating budget is accumulated. This enables the collective to meet nonprofit organizations requesting high monetary donations. These requests would be infeasible to meet with the funds individual corporations have available. An interviewee attests:
“Social initiatives can also easier be supported and on a bigger scale being [the foundation]. Especially compared to what you are individually capable of as a for-profit organization. I mean, you sometimes see initiatives of which you say, ‘I would like to contribute to that initiative’, but as a small for-profit organization you cannot participate infinitely” (CEO donor organization B).

Additionally, given that the total operating budget is larger of collective corporate foundation, more donation requests are honoured and thereby more nonprofit organizations are (indirectly) reached by one for-profit organization. For instance, an individual for-profit organization via a collective corporate foundation can support the local football association, the local tennis club, the rotary club, the ice skating range, the card association, the local petting zoo, and so forth (CEO donor organization B; Founding industry association, representative B). The philanthropic endeavours of the collective corporate foundation result in more visibility for one’s corporate philanthropy in the local community. The power of a for-profit organization’s philanthropic endeavours is thus magnified; for-profit organizations gain a broader range of supported nonprofit organizations. Likewise, the foundation enables for-profit organizations to make donations year-round (Founding industry association, representative B), whereas individual for-profit organizations with limited budgets may run dry quickly.

Third, using a separate, external foundation to organize and shape corporate philanthropy allows for-profit organizations to mitigate risk and liabilities. External and indirect giving creates opportunities for for-profit organizations to shift the risk and uncertainty associated with corporate giving to a third-party. In this case, this entails the collective corporate foundation for instance. First, when a donation request is declined, it is never the for-profit organization rejecting the request. The foundation is the rejecting party, indicating that critique about the rejection is directed towards the collective corporate foundation in lieu of donor organizations (Founding industry association, representative C). Second, when a wrong decision is made the collective corporate foundation is held accountable.

Loss of control. For-profit organizations giving indirectly via a collective corporate foundation experience a loss of control, as they indicate they have less control over their philanthropic endeavours. Separate external entities create a principle-agent problem as donor organizations (principles) formally delegate the authority
of corporate philanthropy to the foundation or other entity (agent). For-profit organizations support the collective corporate foundation in good faith. They trust the foundation’s board to make decisions in line with the philanthropic interests of donor organizations (CEO donor organization D). Additional agency costs may occur to monitor and control the external entity. The loss of control creates the possibility that donor organizations indirectly support nonprofit organizations that insufficiently comply with the norms and values of the donor organizations. If insufficiently in line with donor interests, for-profit organizations may decide to reorganize philanthropy internally (Management assistant former donor organization B). Keeping one’s corporate philanthropy internal enables for-profit organizations to keep full control over their philanthropic endeavors and to shape and adjust corporate giving to the needs and wants of the individual for-profit organization (CEO former donor organization C).

“With [the foundation] you relinquish the choice of where you donate to towards the board. So thereby you make it indirect. By a direct choice you are the one making the decisions” (Founding industry association, representative C).

A collective entity, however, does not always immediately indicates for-profit organizations lose control over their corporate giving. For-profit organizations can retain their control by taking an active role within the external entity. For instance, by becoming a board member or an advisor. Nevertheless, it depends on the structure and magnitude of the collective entity if donor organizations could obtain such an active role. Furthermore, taking an active role will also require a larger investment of organizational time or other resources.

**Loss of involvement.** Indirect collective corporate giving practices place corporate giving at a distance or at arm’s length of the for-profit organization. Hereby for-profit organizations might seem to a lesser extent committed to the philanthropic activities; especially compared with internal, individual corporate philanthropy practices. When for-profit organizations need to cut costs external philanthropic endeavours are one of the first things for-profit organizations will cease doing (Partner organization, representative C).

Second, in this particular case study, for-profit organizations engage in a rather passive way of corporate giving. Participation is often limited to the activity of simply writing a check book - with the exception of some for-profit organizations acting as
industry representatives within the foundation’s board. The lion’s share of donor organizations thus practice their corporate giving by a rather passive activity instead of making their own policy and decisions. Using the collective corporate foundation may then be seen as an easy way of practicing corporate giving and as an easy way to deal with donation requests (Middle manager non-donor organization A). As donor organisations are to a lesser extent involved with the foundation and its activities, it limits the firm’s feelings of ownership towards the foundation and its operations (Partner organization, representative C). Yet again, taking a more proactive role in a collective giving initiative can raise involvement and commitment levels among for-profit organizations, but also requires the devotion of more organizational resources.

**Fewer individual organizational benefits.** Using the collective corporate foundation to practice corporate giving places one’s corporate philanthropy on a distance from the for-profit organization. An interviewee states:

“When you organize corporate philanthropy via [the foundation] the link with our own for-profit organization is missing, compared with when you directly organize things yourself with the local community. That is the difference” (CEO donor organization B).

This indirectness affects the benefits derived from corporate giving by donor organizations. For-profit organizations receive more individual, organizational benefits from direct individual corporate giving programs compared with external and collective giving. Honoured donation requests made through a collective corporate foundation are made under the foundation’s umbrella-name. Hereby, it is unlikely for donor organizations to receive individual benefits from their philanthropic endeavours as for-profit organizations are not individually mentioned by name. For-profit organizations then lack potential benefits such as differentiation from competitors, brand awareness or brand recognition. Due to nonprofit recipients and the community at large being largely unaware of the donor organizations supporting the foundation. Two interviewees clarify:

“If something would be donated with a sign indicating: ‘This piece of art is donated by [the foundation], I do not think a lot of people will visit Google on their computer and see what [the foundation] entails and which organizations support it, and think by themselves ‘I am thankful to [for-
profit organization X] and I am thankful to [for-profit organization Y] for providing this to us” (Board member C).

“In the moment you give directly, it is much clearer. Then [corporate philanthropy] is directly from [for-profit organization] to the initiative” (CEO donor organization B).

From the case study, it seems that indirect collective giving endeavours are more invisible or hidden, compared with direct individual corporate giving. Collective corporate giving might be inappropriate if for-profit organizations desire to use corporate philanthropy to serve marketing-related purposes or as a means for differentiation. A direct and individual corporate giving program is far more beneficial in that perspective. On the other hand, when donor organizations are unable to receive individual benefits for their philanthropic endeavours, giving is perceived as more neutral and legitimate as a collective entity rules out the suspicion of individual gains. As indirect collective corporate giving is more hidden and invisible, for-profit organizations are not able to showcase corporate philanthropy to serve hidden agendas (Middle manager donor organization C).

Nevertheless, this consequence might be restricted to the particular case study, as donor organizations take a rather passive stance in communicating their donations to the collective corporate foundation towards external stakeholders. Documentary evidence shows that only three out of 82 donor organizations (3.6%) mention the collective corporate foundation on corporate websites or within CSR reports solely. Four donor organizations (4.9%) mention the foundation in conjunction with internal, individual giving programs. Twenty-two donor organizations (25.6%) only mention their own direct giving programs, whereas 54 donor organizations (65.9%) suppress their giving at all in their external communication (i.e., on websites and in CSR reports). One can argue that when donor organizations are much more communicative about their contribution to the collective corporate foundation, and actively communicate about the philanthropic endeavors of the collective, one could obtain publicity and differentiation. At least, the latter can be only obtained when competitors do not contribute to the same collective initiative.
4.4 Discussion

A central theme within the study is to understand the factors that guide corporate decision makers in the make-or-buy (internal versus external) and individual or collective corporate giving decisions; to understand the underlying rationales and consequences of these decisions. Figure 4.1 vertically shows various channels of corporate philanthropy on a horizontal continuum, ranging from pure direct or in-house giving (within firm boundaries) to corporate giving via external channels outside firm boundaries. Figure 4.1 also illustrates the rationales (depicted in light grey) and consequences (depicted in dark grey) of indirect and collective corporate giving.

Based upon two rationales, corporate decision makers consider indirect collective giving such as a collective corporate foundation. First, it allows for-profit organizations to concentrate resources on core business activities. Second, it allows for-profit organizations to organize corporate giving as efficient as possible. For-profit organizations refer donation requests almost effortlessly to a knowledgeable third party that can perform the activity better; for-profit organizations collectively honour more and higher donations and do this year-round; it allows for-profit organizations to mitigate risks and liabilities to a third party. This is all based on the belief that a collective giving entity is an efficient way to engage in corporate giving. Especially for those for-profit organizations who cannot do so individually or internally due to the required
resources. With limited resources they can now gain exposure to a broad range of nonprofit organizations. The collective corporate foundation thus provides an effective service desired by corporate donors. In doing so, a collective corporate foundation for corporate giving is comparable to federations as vehicles for private giving (i.e., secular federations such as United Way or religiously grounded federations). Frumkin (2010, p.147) indicates that at the core of the federation giving model is “the argument that funds pooled together can have a greater impact and that the expert selection of recipient organizations can lead to greater community benefits.” Using a collective corporate foundation to shape corporate giving is thus not a fad and provides certain corporate and community benefits. For instance, it enables the pooling of resources, rules out any suspicion on individual gains, reaches scale and critical mass, and demonstrates common commitment (Fourie and Eloff, 2005).

Case findings also provide insight into the consequences of a for-profit organization’s decision to outsource corporate giving to a collective entity. First, corporate donors loose a certain amount of control regarding their philanthropic endeavours. Especially when they do not have an active role in the decision-making within that collective entity, and the collective entity will make its own decisions. Second, corporate donors are to a lesser extent involved with the collective corporate foundation and its activities. Third, a collective initiative serving multiple corporate donors is disadvantageous when for-profit organizations wish to use philanthropy to serve marketing-related purposes (i.e., to gain publicity) or as a means for differentiation. These are often elements that are normally seen as important factors to develop an individual corporate foundation or organize corporate giving within firm boundaries.

A trade-off, however, exists between the aforementioned rationales and boundaries. To overcome the first two consequences, and to become more involved and to retain more control, a larger investment of corporate resources is required - such as time or personnel - by taking a rather active role within the collective entity. Nevertheless, the magnitude and structure of the collective initiative will influence to what extent donor organizations can take proactive roles. Lastly, the third consequence is surmountable by devoting sufficient resources to marketing, PR, or communications efforts to proactively communicate a donor’s involvement within a collective initiative.

**Theoretical Explanations**

Outsourcing literature uses three major theoretical perspectives to explain the make-or-buy decision: a strategic management view, an economic view, and a social view
The strategic management view adapts resource-based theories; the economic view focuses on the transaction cost approach; the social view focuses on the relationship between clients and service providers, and adapts power-political theories and social exchange theory.

The two rationales (i.e., the amount of available resources and efficiency) relate to the strategic management view and the economic view. Both views made valuable contributions to and influenced the study of outsourcing (McIvor, 2009; Ndubisi, 2011). First, the economic view entails transaction cost economics and agency theory. Transaction cost economics focus on why firms exist (Williamson, 1975). Transaction cost economics specify the conditions under which for-profit organizations should manage a function internally (i.e., within firm boundaries), and specify the conditions that suit external exchanges (i.e., outside firm boundaries). The outsource decision is brought back to the central question whether a transaction can be more efficiently performed internally or externally by a third party (Geyskens et al., 2006). Transaction costs relate to the level of uncertainty, the frequency of activities, and specificity (Williamson, 1981). If these increase, the transaction costs for outsourcing will also increase (e.g., operational costs and contracting costs). Based on transaction cost economics, for-profit organizations engage in make-or-buy decisions to minimize costs, and outsource an activity when external transaction costs are lower than the internal transaction costs (Ndubisi, 2011, p.110). External transaction costs include arranging costs, actual outsourcing cost, and monitoring and control costs (Shook et al., 2009).

Consider now the transaction costs associated with the various channels of corporate giving. External corporate giving (outside firms boundaries) via a collective corporate foundation entails relatively low external transaction costs (e.g., simply writing a check book, referring donation request, as well as minimal monitoring and control costs). The external transaction costs are significantly higher for an individual corporate foundation (e.g., setting up an entire foundation, own policies and strategies, decision-making, monitoring, building and managing community relationships, and so forth). Likewise, the internal transaction costs that exist when organizing corporate giving within firm boundaries are also higher (e.g., need for own policy making, decision-making, building and maintaining community relationships, implementation, and accountability). Outsourcing to a collective entity thus helps for-profit organizations to avoid high costs related to internal corporate giving programs or individual endeavours, and helps them to gain access to specialized expertise.

Agency theory (Jensen and Meckling, 1976) complements the economic view on outsourcing. Agency theory posits that when the principle delegates responsibility to
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the agent, the principle should monitor the agent. A for-profit organization should outsource an activity when the agent is deemed more efficient and is trusted by the principle (see for a review Ndubisi (2011)). The collective corporate foundation is indeed found to perform corporate giving more efficient and is trusted by corporate donors to act on their (philanthropic) behalf.

A complementary view to understand the case findings, is a strategic management perspective. This perspective consists of resource-dependency theory and a resource-based view of the firm. From a resource-dependency perspective (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1981), for-profit organizations seek to acquire and maintain resources and control. In doing so, for-profit organizations seek to minimize dependency on others, while at the same time increase the dependency of others on the for-profit organization. In terms of outsourcing, for-profit organizations that lack the resources to perform an activity should seek relationships with other parties to obtain those resources (Ndubisi, 2011, p.110). The case study shows that for-profit organizations oftentimes opt for a collective giving entity when they lack the resources to organize corporate giving in-house or on an individual basis.

As transaction cost economics focus on why for-profit organizations exist, the resource-based view of the firm focuses on why for-profit organizations differ in performance. From the resource-based view, a for-profit organization is viewed as a collection of resources that can create competitive advantages (Peteraf, 1993); leading to the distinction between core and peripheral activities. From a resource-based view, findings inform for-profit organizations “not to outsource capabilities, functions or activities that create competitive advantage,” (Ndubisi, 2011, p.110) - known as the core activities. A resource-based view argues that for-profit organizations should concentrate on their core business activities and exploit competencies based on their knowledge and expertise, rather than channel resources to peripheral activities, as this is more efficient (see for a review Carey et al. (2006)). Case findings show that SMEs as well as local subsidiaries of MNEs focus on their core activities. Corporate philanthropy is often seen as a peripheral activity, indicating that limited resources are channelled to corporate giving. Based on the case findings, the following propositions are offered:

**P1.** Adhering to the logic of transaction cost economics, when external transaction costs are lower than the costs associated to perform corporate giving internally within firm boundaries or individually outside firm boundaries, the greater the likelihood corporate giving will be outsourced to a
collective separate entity outside firm boundaries.

**P2.** Adhering to the logic of agency theory, when another party is deemed more efficient and is deemed trustworthy, the greater the likelihood corporate giving will be outsourced to a collective separate entity outside firm boundaries.

**P3.** Adhering to the logic of a resource-based view, when corporate philanthropy is more seen as a peripheral activity, the greater the likelihood corporate giving will be outsourced to a collective separate entity outside firm boundaries.

**P4.** Adhering to the logic of resource-dependency theory, when for-profit organizations have limited resources available to organize corporate giving, the greater the likelihood corporate giving will be outsourced to a collective separate entity outside firm boundaries.

**P5.** Outsourcing corporate giving to a collective entity outside firm boundaries will lessen the for-profit organization’s control over its corporate giving, unless an active role within the entity is taken.

**P6.** Outsourcing corporate giving to a collective entity outside firm boundaries will lessen a for-profit organization’s involvement with its corporate giving, unless an active role within the entity is taken.

**P7.** Outsourcing corporate giving to a collective entity will result in fewer individual organizational benefits (e.g., strategic and marketing related benefits), unless the connection between the two entities is well communicated to (external) stakeholders.

**Practical Implications**

“The essence of strategic giving” (Frumkin, 2010) describes two key dimensions influencing an individual’s giving style. First, the level of one’s engagement or involvement, and secondly one’s desired public profile. Case findings indicate that these key dimensions also apply to the context of corporate giving, but should be supplemented
with two other key dimensions. I argue that four key dimensions influence corporate decision making to decide on the channel to practice corporate philanthropy: (1) corporate philanthropy being a core or peripheral activity; (2) the amount of resources available or the need for efficiency; (3) the level of desired control and involvement; (4) the desired public profile in using corporate giving as a marketing or differentiation devise. Corporate decision makers should thus consider to what extent corporate giving is a peripheral or core activity; how much resources they can and want to devote; how much control and engagement they want in their giving; what kind of public profile and how much public exposure and visibility they desire with their philanthropic behavior. In accordance with Frumkin (2010), I argue these choices are often shaped by the motives that underlie corporate giving.

First, I recommend corporate decision makers to consider the role of corporate philanthropy within their organization. Does corporate giving constitutes a core or peripheral activity? With corporate giving as a core activity, a for-profit organization wants to excel in its giving, and take a competitive advantage with its philanthropic endeavours. Being a core activity, corporate philanthropy should be kept within firms boundaries or entail individual (internal or external) practices. Enough resources should be made available to organize corporate giving adequately. With corporate giving as a peripheral activity, corporate giving is neither critical nor something the for-profit organization wants to take a competitive advantage of, indicating that corporate philanthropy can be outsourced to external (collective) entities. Second, I recommend corporate decision makers with limited resources for corporate giving and those who wish to organize corporate giving efficiently to consider to outsource its giving to a collective entity. Outsourcing refers to placing responsibility for various elements of corporate philanthropy with legal separate entities and/or third party providers. Third, I recommend corporate decision makers to ponder to what extent they want to control and be involved or engaged with their philanthropic endeavors. Those who do not want to relinquish control and be more involved should keep corporate giving within firms boundaries. Fourth, I recommend for-profit organizations to organize giving in-house and individually that wish to use corporate giving as a marketing or differentiation device. I do note, however, that a trade-off exists between these considerations. A for-profit organization could potentially obtain more control, more involvement, and more individual organizational benefits in exchange for larger investments, as more resources are required to obtain these. Subsequently, this affects the amount of resources needed for corporate giving.
This enhanced understanding helps corporate decision makers identify where they should focus their philanthropic endeavours. Moreover, it guides them in the make-or-buy decision of corporate philanthropy and in deciding between individual versus collective giving channels. Likewise, findings can encourage collective giving practices, and stimulate for-profit organizations to establish a collective giving initiative (such as a collective corporate foundation) together when for-profit organizations lack the resources to organize corporate philanthropy in-house and on an individual basis. Furthermore, providing empirical evidence on the key dimensions influencing the make-or-buy decision of corporate giving assists external entities to enhance the quality of its operations. Operations can be improved as findings inform the foundation of the key factors that count heavily for corporate decision makers. This in return might help foundations or other (collective) initiatives to attract funding from corporate donors.

Limitations

As every research, the study entails its own limitations. First, my research entails a case study with inherent limitations. The corporate collective foundation within this case study is a grant-making foundation, rather than an operating foundation (i.e., a foundation operating its own programs) or a mixed foundation (Anheier, 2001). As grant-making foundations are only part of the philanthropic landscape, case findings might remain narrow due to the passive involvement and dynamics inherent to the narrow operations of the foundation. The transferability of the results to other settings can be questioned. Future research can examine to which extent the findings are applicable to other multiple-donor foundations (e.g., community foundations and federations) or collective giving initiatives (e.g., giving circles).\(^6\) Findings might also be limited to the potential peculiarities of the Dutch system and influenced by national circumstances. That is to say, findings might be influenced the Dutch nonprofit or civil society regimes (Salamon and Anheier, 1998), philanthropic history, and philanthropic landscape.

Second, the study entails limitations regarding data collection and analysis. As qualitative data collection and analysis are a useful starting point for exploratory research, these methods have their own limitations (e.g., interview and interview-
wee biases, risk of excess information, bounded to the interviewees’ memory and knowledge). Moreover, as the question why for-profit organizations use a collective corporate foundation as an external entity to practice corporate philanthropy has a lot in common with the question of why for-profit organizations engage in corporate giving, interviewees might have a good idea of the desirable answers (social desirability bias). This could potentially be overcome by taking an ethnographic or holistic approach in future research. Nevertheless, the assurance of anonymity was used to encourage respondents to speak candidly. Furthermore, to get more insights into the philanthropic endeavours of donor organizations, I gathered information from publicly accessible documents from donor organizations. It is possible that only part of their efforts are obtained as it is imaginable that for-profit organizations donate without publicly communicating about it to external stakeholders. Moreover, while the research sample covers a wide range of stakeholders, the size of the sample warrants mention: 19 interviewees. Despite achieving saturation in the data collection and providing robust findings and stable patterns, it would be interesting to conduct a study with a larger sample. Additionally, the purposive selection of respondents also limits the generalizability of the study’s findings. Lastly, within the thematic analysis the researcher had an active role in identifying themes and patterns in the data set, and selected those that were of interest (Taylor and Ussher, 2001).

**Recommendations for Future Research**

First of all, I encourage future research to provide insights into other rationales that might impact the make-or-buy decision as well as the decision for individual or collective giving practices. Another or multiple rationales might be based in a social view (Lee et al., 2000). For instance, it might be that when prominent for-profit organizations in a certain area or industry support a particular collective corporate giving entity, isomorphic pressures are at play. Giving to the collective initiative can then become the norm and (friendly) competition between for-profit organizations can stimulate non-donor organizations to give. As this research focuses more on the strategic management and economic view related to outsourcing, future research might take a more social view to explore the rationales for external collective giving practices (Lee et al., 2000).

Likewise, some key findings raise questions for future research. First, future research can examine the contribution of a separate collective corporate giving entity to organizational performance in terms of corporate philanthropy. It is plausible
that some for-profit organizations outsource routine philanthropic activities (i.e., handling donation requests) to give in-house corporate giving a more strategic role (i.e., strategic giving and employee-volunteering). This indicates, that it is not always a matter of a make “or” buy decision.

Second, collective giving entities such as a collective corporate foundation, might entail implications for nonprofit organizations. One questions to address is to what extent collective giving entities change the transaction costs for nonprofit recipients. For instance, when for-profit organizations organize corporate philanthropy individually (and in-house) for-profit organizations can be addressed on an individual basis. When multiple for-profit organizations channel corporate philanthropy by means of a collective corporate foundation, I wonder if this has implications for nonprofit professionals. Will these professionals only address the collective or also the individual for-profit organizations supporting the collective corporate foundation? Moreover, does this differs if the request directed at the collective initiative is honored or rejected? Third, as I conclude that both outsourcing and collective giving add value to corporate giving processes and outcomes (i.e., better decision making), I wonder if it adds value to nonprofit organizations. Are decisions indeed better made in a collective corporate foundation compared to in-house or individual corporate giving?

Fourth, acknowledging that various types of corporate foundations and intermediary vehicles exists, it is promising to obtain an overview of the various available channels for corporate giving (individual or collective). Efforts might expand and deepen Figure 4.1. The continuum might contain more entities, channels, or corporate philanthropic practices that nowadays populate the corporate giving landscape. This can be part of wider efforts to understand the corporate giving infrastructure, landscape, and the corporate giving repertoire.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Findings

Due to their diversity, the four studies that make up this dissertation provide a broad overview on the various contemporary channels of both private and corporate philanthropy. The studies vary in their phenomenon under study: National Days of Service (Chapter 2 and 3), a collective corporate foundation (Chapter 4), and third party intermediary organizations facilitating corporate philanthropy (Chapter 5). Moreover, the studies include qualitative empirical studies (Chapter 2, 4 and 5) and a quantitative empirical study (Chapter 3). The four studies together contribute to different, but related, aspects of present-day philanthropy. More specifically, the dissertation zooms in on the phenomenon of temporary episodic volunteering within National Days of Service initiated by a third party (Chapter 2 and 3); two modern practices for indirect corporate giving, being collective corporate foundations (Chapter 4) and third party intermediary organizations (Chapter 5). Although each study is a distinct essay, the dissertation as a whole encompasses two overall themes: National Days of Service and corporate philanthropy at arm’s length. As a totality, the dissertation enhances our understanding of these two substantive areas of research. I mainly use these two themes to structure the main contributions, as well as the practical implications, and future research.

In Chapter 2, I examine how nonprofit organizations can design National Days of Service projects to yield satisfying volunteer experiences. I apply a directed qualitative content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005) on data deriving from in-depth interviews with host nonprofit organizations and volunteer centers, participant observation
reports, and focus groups with Day of Service volunteers. Based on work design theory (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, 1980), these data provide insights on how host nonprofit organization can enhance volunteer (job) satisfaction in National Days of Service and similar one-off events. The results reveal that especially task significance, direct beneficiary contact and social support, job-based feedback and feedback from others, task identity and limited autonomy promote satisfying volunteer experiences. Furthermore, findings indicate that adequate planning and preparation, and an appropriate workload also promote volunteer satisfaction.

In Chapter 3, I continue to enhance the understanding of National Days of Service from an organizational perspective. I examine how different types of host nonprofit organizations participate in and practice National Days of Service. I focus specifically on sports associations as a prime example of mutual support or membership organizations. These organizations are membership-based and their inherent nature seems to contradict with the volunteer energy evoked within National Days of Service - being community-wide (Brudney et al., 2019). Where National Days of Service might present a challenge for sport organizations, the approach to volunteer recruitment within these events seems to reconcile with service delivery organizations. Service delivery organizations produce benefits for external clients and recruit volunteers community-wide. I statistically analyse a sample of 1,030 sports associations and 4,293 service delivery organizations participating as hosts in an annual National Day of Service in the Netherlands between 2012 and 2015. I find that sports associations conform to their inherent nature in National Days of Service. Sports associations differ from service delivery organizations in the types of volunteers attracted, the recruitment methods used, and the results attained by their participation in the National Day of Service. More specifically, findings suggest that sports associations enlist more internal and fewer external volunteers compared to service delivery organizations; use more internally-oriented recruitment methods; achieve results with a more internal scope or narrow reach.

In Chapter 4, I differentiate between direct and indirect corporate philanthropy as well as individual and collective giving practices. Based on a case study of a collective corporate foundation, I investigate the rationales and consequences associated with a for-profit organization’s decision to practice corporate philanthropy through such an external collective entity. An inductive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) of in-depth interviews with various stakeholders and documentary evidence, provides insights into the organizational rationales and consequences underlying this corporate decision. The chapter finds two rationales informing corporate decision makers to
practice corporate philanthropy through a collective corporate foundation. First, it allows for-profit organizations to concentrate resources on core business activities. Second, it allows for-profit organizations to organize corporate giving as efficient as possible. Results also reveal three organizational consequences of using a collective corporate foundation to practice corporate philanthropy: (1) Corporate donors experience a loss of control; (2) corporate donors are to a lesser extent involved with the philanthropic activities; (3) a collective corporate foundation serving multiple corporate donors results in fewer individual organizational benefits. These consequences indicate that collective indirect channels are inappropriate when corporate donors wish to use corporate philanthropy to serve marketing-related purposes or as a means for differentiation. Moreover, I propose that a trade-off exists between these rationales and consequences. From these results, I identify four key dimensions that influence a for-profit organization’s decision for direct/indirect and individual/collective giving practices: (1) corporate philanthropy being a core or peripheral activity; (2) the amount of corporate resources available; (3) firm’s level of desired control and involvement; (4) firm’s desired public profile.

In Chapter 5, I address the question: What makes third party intermediary organizations valuable within business-nonprofit partnerships such as corporate community involvement? In the study, I conceptualize corporate community involvement similar to corporate philanthropy referring to a for-profit organization’s provision of financial contributions, in-kind donations, and corporate volunteering (Van Der Voort et al., 2009). The study focuses on an exploratory case study of third party intermediary organizations facilitating local corporate community involvement in the Netherlands. I perform a systematic inductive approach (Gioia et al., 2013) on focus group and interview data gathered in an 18-month period. I find that third party intermediary organizations overcome three barriers that prevent nonprofit and for-profit organizations to engage in corporate community involvement. First, third party intermediary organizations provide for-profit and nonprofit organizations with the required organizational social capital when actors lack adequate networks. Second, third party intermediary organizations lower transaction costs involved in business-nonprofit partnership selection and formation. Third, third party intermediary organizations provide human capital (i.e., knowledge and experiences) so actors can grasp the potential of business-nonprofit partnerships. Findings furthermore suggest that third party intermediary organizations change business-nonprofit partnerships in distinctive ways. First, third party intermediary organizations stimulate more long-term and reciprocal partnerships and thereby move business-nonprofit partnerships forwards on the collab-
oration continuum of Austin (2000b). Second, third party intermediary organizations stimulate collective action. Third, intermediary organizations de-emotionalize partner selection and ensure an equal distribution of business-nonprofit partnerships among the local community.

Table 6.1 summarizes the findings and key contributions of the four studies in the dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 2 (National Days of Service)</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings provide a holistic framework for understanding how to design National Days of Service projects to yield volunteer job satisfaction. National Day of Service volunteers are most likely to have fulfilling experiences when their National Day of Service project incorporates task significance, interaction outside the organization (beneficiary contact), social support, feedback from others, job-based feedback, task identity, limited autonomy, and are well planned and prepared with an appropriate workload.</td>
<td>The chapter contributes to the literature on National Days of Service by examining the impact of overlooked organizational and management factors, i.e., job design, on the critical outcome of volunteer satisfaction. Moreover, by grounding the study in work design theory it extends temporary episodic volunteer management by adapting research derived from paid employment.</td>
<td>The chapter reveals that organizational and management factors can generate volunteer job satisfaction in National Days of Service. The findings affirm the importance of social characteristics and underscore the salience of task characteristics such as task identity and job-based feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3 (National Days of Service)</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results demonstrate that sports associations and service delivery organizations differ in volunteer recruitment methods, volunteers</td>
<td>The chapter contributes to the literature on National Days of Service by examining how different nonprofit organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main findings

(Chapter 3 continued)

| | 
|---|---|
| **6.1 Summary of Findings** | **Contributions** |
| Recruited, and results achieved in National Days of Service. Sports associations enlist more internal and fewer external volunteers; use more internally-oriented recruitment methods; achieved internal and narrow results compared to service delivery organizations. | Practice these events. Results inform our understanding of the functioning of National Days of Service in sport organizations and membership organizations alike, and add to the scant literature addressing volunteering within membership organizations. |

Findings provide evidence that sports associations conform to their inherent nature (membership-base and -purpose) in National Days of Service.

### Chapter 4

(Corporate Philanthropy)

| | 
|---|---|
| **Findings** | **The chapter makes a contribution to the corporate philanthropy literature as previous literature centers on direct and individual corporate philanthropy. Furthermore, the chapter identifies four key dimensions within corporate giving decision making overlooked in previous literature.** |
| Findings reveal two rationales guiding corporate decision makers facing the decision between direct/indirect and individual/collective giving practices: (1) the amount of available resources and (2) the need for efficiency. Findings also highlight three consequences for for-profit organizations when using an indirect and collective giving practice: (1) loss of control, (2) loss of involvement, and (3) fewer individual organizational benefits. | The chapter’s novelty lies in bringing corporate philanthropy back to a make-or-buy decision, and relating the rationales back to a strategic management and an economic view on outsourcing. |

Based upon the findings, the study identifies four key...
## Main findings

(Chapter 4 continued)

Dimensions that influence a firm’s decision between corporate giving channels: (1) corporate philanthropy being a core or peripheral activity, (2) the amount of resources, (3) level of desired control and involvement, and (4) the desired public profile.

## Contributions

First, the chapter adds to the literature on business-nonprofit partnerships more broadly. The study goes beyond dyadic relationships, examines the influence of third party intermediary organizations on business-nonprofit partnerships, and examines how business-nonprofit partnership manifest on a local level.

Third party intermediary organizations change business-nonprofit partnerships in distinct ways. They (1) move business-nonprofit partnerships forward on the collaboration value continuum (Austin, 2000b); (2) stimulate collective action; (3) de-emotionalize partner selection and ensure an equal distribution of partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 5</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Corporate Philanthropy)</td>
<td>Third party intermediary organizations provide an infrastructure for business-nonprofit partnerships by providing social and human capital, and by lowering transaction costs. They overcome three barriers: inadequate networks, limited resources, and being unconscious or unknowledgeable.</td>
<td>First, the chapter adds to the literature on business-nonprofit partnerships more broadly. The study goes beyond dyadic relationships, examines the influence of third party intermediary organizations on business-nonprofit partnerships, and examines how business-nonprofit partnership manifest on a local level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1: Summary of the main findings and contributions of studies in the dissertation
6.2 Contributions of the Dissertation

This dissertation contributes mostly to the literature on temporary episodic volunteering and National Days of Service in particular (Chapter 2 and 3), and corporate philanthropy and business-nonprofit partnerships (Chapter 4 and 5). In the following section I expand on the contributions to these two areas of research.

6.2.1 Contributions to National Day of Service Literature

At a time when temporary episodic volunteering including National Days of Service and similar one-off events are perceived to be more common, and nonprofit organizations rely on and organize more short-term volunteer opportunities, increasing our understanding of National Days of Service is more important than ever. Despite the interest and growth in National Days of Service, there is surprisingly little literature on these one-off events (Christensen et al., 2005). Most of the scholarly research focuses on episodic volunteering more broadly and centers on the volunteers. Hitherto, we have a solid understanding on their demographics (Hustinx, 2010; Pauline et al., 2008), commitment and motivations (Dunn et al., 2016), and retention (Bryson et al., 2006; Hyde et al., 2016; Koutrou et al., 2016). Nevertheless, research on episodic volunteering is largely descriptive and empirical investigations are rare (Handy et al., 2006; Hyde et al., 2014, 2016; Wilson, 2012).

In their accounts of episodic volunteering, scholars largely ignored how nonprofit organizations practice National Days of Service, and how nonprofit organizations participate and use these and similar one-off events. Thus in contrast to previous literature, the dissertation empirically examines National Days of Service from an organizational perspective. I show how nonprofit organizations integrate National Days of Service and how they can do so more meaningfully.

Chapter 2 contributes to the literature on National Days of Service, by examining how nonprofit organizations can design National Days of Service projects to yield satisfying volunteer experiences. In doing so, the chapter investigates the impact of overlooked organizational and management factors (i.e., job design) on the critical outcome of volunteer satisfaction. By grounding the study in work design theory and by evaluating how this framework can be adapted to National Days of Service, the chapter contributes to the National Day of Service literature by adhering to calls from Cnaan and Cascio (1998) and Studer and Von Schnurbein (2013) to extend volunteer management by adapting research derived from paid employment. Moreover, the chapter identifies nine work design aspects of the volunteering environment that affect
Day of Service volunteer satisfaction. In doing so, findings reaffirms the importance of social characteristics for Day of Service volunteer satisfaction and underscores the salience of task characteristics such as task identity and job-based feedback. Furthermore, the nine work design aspects affecting volunteer satisfaction are all within the control of the organization. Thus the chapter reveals the organization and management factors (i.e., job design) generating temporary episodic volunteering job satisfaction.

Chapter 3 sheds light on the functioning of National Days of Service in sport organizations and membership organizations alike. The growing popularity of these events (Christensen et al., 2005), and the large proportion of membership organizations in the voluntary sector (Breuer et al., 2017; Hallmann and Fairley, 2018; Handy, 1988; Meijs, 1997), justifies the research. As there is no previous research on how different nonprofit organizations participate and practice National Days of Service, the chapter fills a notably gap. In doing so, the study also adds to the scant literature addressing volunteering in membership organizations (Gazley, 2013; Mook et al., 2007).

### 6.2.2 Contributions to Corporate Philanthropy Literature

Various vehicles or channels exist for for-profit organizations to organize, shape, and manage its corporate philanthropy. This includes providing the CEO or a manager with the responsibility for a firm’s corporate philanthropy (Gautier and Pache, 2015), or structure and centralize a firm’s corporate philanthropy in a specific department (Altuntas and Turker, 2015; Husted, 2003). For-profit organizations can also practice their corporate philanthropy outside firm boundaries. These practices for indirect corporate giving include for example third-party intermediary organizations (Lee, 2015) or corporate foundations (Rey-Garcia et al., 2012; Petrovits, 2006). Besides shaping, organizing, and managing corporate giving individually, for-profit organizations can also go down a collaborative path with like-minded for-profit organizations and combine their corporate philanthropy. When practicing corporate philanthropy outside firm boundaries a for-profit organization places its corporate giving at arm’s length. The dissertation focuses on two outside vehicles and associated values and consequences.

Corporate philanthropy literature centers on various facets of direct and individual corporate giving. Thus, we have a decent understanding of major aspects of the phenomenon including its essence, motivations, practices and processes, and outcomes (Gautier and Pache, 2015; Liket and Simaens, 2015). In their accounts of corporate philanthropy, scholars largely ignore the various channels available to for-profit orga-
nizations to engage in corporate giving, especially those practices including indirect corporate giving. Chapter 4 and 5 aim to fill this gap.

Chapter 4 examines a collective corporate giving practice. Collective (corporate) philanthropy provides a new model for entrepreneurs and for-profit organizations all around the world (Marquis et al., 2017). In contrast to previous literature, Chapter 4 focuses on an indirect and collective corporate giving practice: a collective corporate foundation. Chapter 4 contributes to the corporate philanthropy literature by examining when and why for-profit organizations engage in indirect, collective giving strategies and use a collective corporate foundation as a vehicle to engage in corporate philanthropy. Findings enhance the understanding of the rationales and consequences related to a for-profit organization’s choice between indirect and direct corporate philanthropy, as well as individual and collective giving strategies. In doing so, the chapter brings back corporate philanthropy to a make-or-buy decision, and articulates what differs direct and individual corporate philanthropy from indirect and collective corporate philanthropy. The rationales found in the chapter are furthermore related to a strategic management and an economic view on outsourcing.

Based on exploratory research, Chapter 5 contributes to the business-nonprofit partnership literature more broadly and corporate community involvement literature in particular. First, the study advances the understanding of the value of third party intermediary organizations in business-nonprofit partnerships such as corporate community involvement. This is valuable as business-nonprofit partnerships lack the academic attention they deserve (Harris, 2012b). Chapter 5 advances our knowledge on the role of third party intermediary organizations in manifesting business-nonprofit partnerships on a local level. The study suggest that third party intermediary organizations provide an infrastructure for business-nonprofit partnerships such as corporate community involvement. These organizations overcome three barriers experienced by nonprofit and for-profit organizations preventing them to engage in business-nonprofit partnerships. These include having inadequate networks, having insufficient resources, and being unknowledgeable or inexperienced. Thus, Chapter 5 sheds light on the conditions underlying business-nonprofit partnerships. Moreover, I find that third party intermediary organizations de-emotionalize partnership selections and ensure a more equal distribution of business-nonprofit partnerships among a local community. These are all elements overlooked in previous literature. Despite their upsurge, their growth in number, and their importance (Lee, 2015; Rochester et al., 2010; Stadtler and Probst, 2012) these contemporary organizations received hitherto limited scholarly attention (Lee, 2015; Manning and Roessler, 2014). The chapter responds to calls
from Lee (2015) and Herlin and Pedersen (2013) to examine the influence of third party intermediary organizations on business-nonprofit partnerships. I show third party intermediary organizations accelerate and change business-nonprofit partnerships. Likewise, the chapter responds to a recent call from Arenas et al. (2013), to examine cross-sectoral partnerships beyond dyadic interactions and to investigate the processes and triad interactions underlying cross-sector partnerships. In contrast to tacking a dual/dyadic perspective in previous literature (see for instance Seitanidi et al. (2010)), the chapter closely looks at the triad/tri-part relationship between for-profit, nonprofit, and third party intermediary organizations. Lastly, according to Harris (2012b), scholars need to focus on examining business-nonprofit partnerships on the international, national and local level.

The chapter makes a second contribution to the literature on corporate community involvement in particular. As collaborative processes or conditions underlying corporate community involvement are little understood (Gautier and Pache, 2015), the study shows how corporate community involvement manifests in practice through the support of third party intermediary organizations. Chapter 5 also highlights how or when small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) engage in corporate community involvement. Research on corporate community involvement normally overlooks SMEs. Therefore, little is understood about how SMEs engage in corporate community involvment (Amaeshi et al., 2016; Madden et al., 2006) or the underlying conditions of doing so (Lepoutre and Heene, 2006). By overcoming the three barriers (inadequate networks, limited resources, and being unconscious or unknowledgeable), third party intermediaries enable especially SMEs to engage in corporate community involvement.

6.3 Implications for Practice

6.3.1 National Days of Service and Similar Events

As Chapter 2 and 3 examine National Days of Service from an organizational perspective, the chapters have practical implications for volunteer centers and nonprofit organizations.

Chapter 2 highlights that host nonprofit organizations can design National Days of Service projects to yield volunteer satisfaction. The study provides nonprofit organizations a pathway to organize fulfilling National Days of Service projects for volunteers. Findings suggests that nonprofit organization may achieve this by designing National Days of Service projects that incorporate task significance, direct beneficiary contact and social support, job-based feedback and feedback from others, task identity
and limited autonomy. As the chapter identifies certain work design factors to elicit Day of Service volunteer job satisfaction, findings inform volunteer managers on how to design National Days of Service projects. Second, volunteer managers can determine whether their current projects and practices are suitable for National Days of Service. Although the findings emanate from National Days of Service, I believe practical implications may go beyond these events. As corporate volunteering (Grant, 2012), family-volunteering (Littlepage et al., 2003), and single-volunteering (Hustinx and Meijs, 2011) are often performed in a similar one-off and one-day manner, the findings might inform volunteer centers, nonprofit and for-profit practitioners on how to design these time-delimited events.

Chapter 3 demonstrates that sports associations do not routinely mimic National Days of Service examples from service delivery organizations. I do recommend sports associations that wish to attain results with a broader reach beyond the association’s boundaries to incorporate more externally-oriented recruitment methods and to recruit more non-member volunteers. They could do so by using the local media or a (local) volunteer center to recruitment volunteers for National Days of Service. This might be especially relevant as recent research indicates that recruitment and retention of volunteers for (large) sports associations has become problematic in the last years (Wicker and Breuer, 2013; Lucassen and Reitsma, 2018). National Days of Service can provide an entry into sustained volunteering (for example Hustinx and Lammertyn (2003)). As sports associations may need to search beyond the association’s boundaries to recruit non-members (Wicker et al., 2018; Lucassen and Reitsma, 2018) National Days of Service might provide a way to do so. Although the chapter is limited to sports associations, I believe the analysis is relevant to other mutual support or membership associations as sports associations have many characteristics in common to other mutual support and membership associations (see Ibsen et al. (2019)).

### 6.3.2 Corporate Philanthropy at Arm’s Length

Chapter 4 helps corporate decision makers to identify where they should focus their philanthropic endeavors and guides them in the decision between various corporate giving practices (direct/indirect and individual/collective). Based on the results, the chapter identifies four key dimensions that influence a for-profit organization’s giving style: (1) corporate philanthropy being a core or peripheral activity, (2) the amount of corporate resources available, (3) a firm’s level of desired control and involvement, and (4) a firm’s desired public profile including the desire to use corporate giving as a marketing or differentiation devise. Based upon these four dimensions, for-profit
organizations can decide on an appropriate giving practice (i.e., direct versus indirect, individual versus collective). First, for-profit organizations need to consider the role of corporate philanthropy within their for-profit organization: core/peripheral activity. Second, for-profit organizations should decide on the amount of resources that can be directed towards organizing corporate philanthropy. Third, I recommend corporate decision makers to ponder to what extent they want to control and be engaged with its corporate giving. Fourth, corporate decision makers need to consider if they want to use their philanthropic endeavors as a marketing or differentiation device, or if they wish to pursue a mission greater than individual recognition. When corporate philanthropy entails a peripheral activity, receives limited corporate resources, low levels of control or involvement are sufficient, and individual recognition is not desired – indirect and/or collective giving practices are suitable. Direct and/or individual practices are recommended when corporate philanthropy entails a more core activity, sufficient corporate can be made available, control and commitment is desirable, and/or individual recognition is appreciated.

Second, findings can assist collective corporate foundations to enhance the quality of their operations. Operations can be improved as findings inform collective corporate foundations of the factors that count heavily for corporate decision makers. For instance, collective corporate foundations might attract funding from more corporate donors when they focus on the benefits they provide (i.e., the rationales identified in the study). Moreover, findings inform other collective initiatives or multiple-donor foundations as the rationales and consequences might be comparable. Third, findings can stimulate the practice of collective giving strategies and stimulate for-profit organizations to establish a collective initiative together when these organizations lack the resources to organize corporate philanthropy individually and internally.

The findings of Chapter 5 inform both for-profit and nonprofit organizations, and third party intermediary organizations. First, knowing what makes third party intermediary organizations so valuable within business-nonprofit partnerships such as corporate community involvement, informs nonprofit and for-profit organizations to assess whether to involve third party intermediary organizations. Nonprofit and for-profit organizations who feel they do not possess an adequate network, do not possess the required resources, or who either feel unknowledgeable or inexperienced could decide to work with third party intermediary organizations. This understanding is also valuable for third party intermediary organizations themselves, as they might exploit their added values in their business model. In addition, the chapter indicates third party intermediary organizations have a noble role as they awaken nonprofit and for-profit
organizations who are unconscious or unaware of the potential of business-nonprofit collaboration. Third, the chapter also provides some advice to third party intermediary organizations on how to sustain their legitimacy and credibility. This merits careful attention as intermediary organizations require legitimate statuses among multiple audiences to establish continuous commitment in each partner (Herlin and Pedersen, 2013). I recommend third party intermediary organizations to find the right balance between unburdening nonprofit or for-profit organizations and facilitating too much on behalf of partnership partners. When third party intermediary organizations take up too much in the partnership, they reduce partner’s creativity to form, develop, and manage the partnership themselves and kill partners’ involvement. Moreover, when third party intermediary organizations take upon too much work, the partnerships they facilitate can be seen as effortless ways of corporate community involvement - influencing the legitimacy of their activities.

6.4 Future Research

The dissertation offers directions for future work in the respective two substantive areas of research: National Days of Service and corporate philanthropy at arm’s length.

6.4.1 National Days of Service

First, future work could extend the qualitative study in Chapter 2 with a quantitative study. A quantitative study could provide in-depth information on the exact relations between the nine identified work design characteristics and volunteer job satisfaction of Day of Service volunteers. Furthermore, future (quantitative) work might explore to what extent the findings apply to a broader range of (temporary) episodic volunteer contexts.

In Chapter 3, there was broad agreement that sports associations seem to stick to their membership-approach in National Days of Service. Nevertheless, it remains unclear whether their performance emanates from their unwillingness to adapt as a conscious choice - perhaps because they are hesitant to include non-members (Lam and Kuperus, 2007) - or if they are unable to adapt because they do not know how. Thus, the question may be not whether sports associations (do) adapt, but rather if they can adapt to National Days of Service? Future qualitative research could examine whether sports associations (or other membership organizations) consciously make this decision or whether their knowledge basis limits their ability to adapt. Second, future
work could also focus on National Days of Service within membership organizations more broadly. Given the extensive diversity of size, structure and purpose of sports associations (Byers, 2009), I suggest that variations in the integration and use of National Days of Service across the sector are possible.

Although Chapter 2 and 3 represent two of the first empirical studies on National Days of Service from an organizational perspective, I hope these chapters pave the way forward to more accurate and expanded examinations.

6.4.2 Corporate Philanthropy at Arm’s Length

Chapter 4, based upon a case study of a collective corporate foundation, opens up various interesting avenues to explore in future research. As the chapter brings corporate philanthropy back to a make-or-buy decision, future work might investigate if corporate philanthropy is indeed a make “or” buy decision. Some for-profit organizations might outsource routine philanthropic activities (i.e., handling donation requests) to give their direct corporate giving a more strategic role (i.e., focus on strategic giving and employee engagement). Second, there might be much room to advance our understanding of the rationales with a more social view. I encourage future research to provide insights into social rationales that might impact the make-or-buy decision as well as the decision for individual for collective giving strategies. For instance, isomorphic pressures may be at play. Third, as the chapter takes on a for-profit perspective, the nonprofit perspective remains under-examined. Therefore, future work could examine the implications of indirect/collective corporate giving practices (such as a collective corporate foundations) on nonprofit organizations.

Although Chapter 5 represents one of the first empirical studies examining third party intermediary organizations facilitating corporate community involvement, I hope the chapter paves the way forward to more accurate examinations and other intriguing avenues uncovered in the study. First, it remains unclear how third party intermediary organizations successfully bridge cross-sectoral gaps and how specific characteristics might influence intermediary capacity. Future research could shed light on what makes third party intermediary organizations successful. That is to say, future research could clarify which mechanisms, procedures, or characteristics third party intermediary organizations should use or possess to achieve satisfactory results. Second, the data indicate some third party intermediary organizations go beyond matching supply and demand and play a more active role as “market-makers”. Future research could investigate this proactive role of third party intermediary organizations more in-depth from various perspectives - including nonprofit organizations or the third sector more
broadly. Additionally, as I acknowledge the study findings provide a relatively rose-colored picture of third party intermediary organizations, the study also highlighted the more gloomy side of these intermediary actors. Future research could examine this gloomy side further. For instance, interesting questions include: Can third party intermediary organizations inhibit or harm business-nonprofit partnerships?; What do for-profit or nonprofit organizations lose from involving a third party intermediary organization? These and other future reflections are fundamental for developing and improving the triad relationships within business-nonprofit partnerships.

Lastly, this dissertation acknowledges that various channels for and practices of corporate philanthropy exist. Mapping the corporate philanthropic landscape in detail, including all the organizational forms, vehicles, channels, and practices that populate the terrain merits attention. Efforts might expand Figure 1.1, found in the introduction of this dissertation, as the continuum might contain many more organizations, channels, vehicles, and philanthropic practices that populate the corporate philanthropic repertoire nowadays. I hope this dissertation inspires future scholarly work.

### 6.4.3 Ownership within Corporate Philanthropy at Arm’s Length

The paradigm of mobilizing corporate resources through separate entities places corporate philanthropy outside firm boundaries and at arm’s length from the for-profit organization. As this dissertation acknowledges this paradigm and advances our understanding on the values and consequences of two indirect corporate giving practices, the dissertation raises other important questions. Most importantly, the studies collectively raise questions about “ownership” of these outside channels and their philanthropic endeavors.

For instance, Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 both highlight a for-profit organization’s loss of involvement and control when corporate philanthropy is channeled through a collective corporate foundation. These findings would indicate a certain loss of ownership. On the other hand, some for-profit organizations tend to constantly maintain a relationship with and influence operations of the external vehicle. This is illustrated by various corporate foundations that are closely linked to a for-profit organization in terms of their name, funding, trustees, administration, and employee involvement (Westhues and Einwiller, 2006). According to Roza et al. (2019), corporate foundations can even been seen as corporate philanthropy tools in the hands of managers or firm owners. Thus although placed outside firm boundaries in a legal separate entity, a for-profit organization can still claim and maintain ownership of
its philanthropic activities. It seems that corporate foundations have ambiguous and latent ownership statuses. The question arises what happens with (organizational) ownership when a for-profit organization places the responsibility or daily operations of corporate philanthropy outside firm boundaries?

It seems that actual formal or legal-economic ownership is not a prerequisite or neither a necessary or sufficient condition to obtain ownership statuses. It seems to be possible to claim (organizational) ownership while having no legal-economic ownership. We therefore require a better understanding of how organizational ownership unfolds in alternative organizational contexts.

Hitherto, there is no theory that explains the existing ownership statuses and ownership relations between a for-profit organization and its philanthropic endeavors outside firm boundaries. As current theories of organizational ownership insufficiently reflect the scope of real phenomena, it is well justified or even necessary to search for additional elements which would form a more realistic theory. Organizational ownership is not often studied as a concept in its own right, but solely as a static variable influencing other organizational outcomes (e.g., corporate performance, investments, innovation) (Demsetz and Villalonga, 2001; Cho, 1998; Baysinger et al., 1991). Organizational ownership merits scholarly attention as organizational ownership underpins our understanding or organizations of all kinds (Bencherki and Bourgoin, 2019). Moreover, organizational ownership influences organizational behavior, perceptions, emotions, and motivations (Björnberg and Nicholson, 2012; Pierce et al., 2001; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004). The few studies that deal with property and related notions are said to be limited in scope and depth, whereby the studies generally adopt a legal-economic view (Bencherki and Bourgoin, 2019).

Economic theories indeed function as a field-defining theoretical framework of ownership and claim-making in economic, management and organization studies. The prevalent legal-economic on claim-making resonates from theories of the firm. In theories of the firm, organizations are seen as a nexus of contracts (Jensen and Meckling, 1976). Theories informing organizational ownership include transaction cost economics, agency theory, and classical and modern property or contract theory (Coase, 1937; Fama and Jensen, 1983a; Grossman and Hart, 1986).

Economic theory fragments ownership into three formal rights: (1) the right to retain residual earnings; (2) the right to formally control the organization and use its assets; (3) the right to sell, alienate or transfer the previous two rights to a new owner (Alchian and Demsetz, 1972; Ben-Ner and Jones, 1995; Ben-Ner and Van Hoomissen, 1994; Hansmann, 1980, 1996). The characteristics of these rights are important in
distinguishing organizational forms from one another (Fama and Jensen, 1983a).
Organizations have a variety of ownership structures, including a surprisingly large
variety of organizations in which ownership is disclaimed by those who supply capital
(e.g., consumers, workers, or other suppliers) - often called alternative ownership
structures (Hansmann, 1996). Nonprofit organizations are portrayed as organizations
without residual claimants and are thereby seen as organizations without owners or
whom are self-owned (Brody, 1995; Fama and Jensen, 1983a,b; Hansmann, 1996).
Organizational economics rest their inception of organizational ownership within the
nonprofit sector on a by-law imposed rule that precludes a nonprofit organization to
distribute profits to owners. This rule is known as the non-distribution constraint
(Hansmann, 1980).

This legal-economic view on organizational ownership is clearly useful to account
for the structural, legal, and financial side of ownership in conventional contexts (e.g.,
large investor-owned for-profit organizations) (Fama and Jensen, 1983a,b). This view
insufficiently accounts for organizational ownership in particular settings, leaving
organizational ownership contested. For instance, these include nonprofit organizations
such as corporate foundations.

The legal-economic view on organizational ownership seems to results in a rather
static, reductionist, and representational concept of organizational ownership. The
legal-economic account on organizational ownership is incomplete and exhibits short-
comings – due to over-generalizations necessary in any theory. First, the traditional
view limits how organizational ownership is obtained. Ownership is set \textit{ex ante}, speci-
fied in contracts, legally given, dichotomous, and results in representations formally
defined categories of ownership (Bencherki and Bourgoin, 2019). Second, the tradi-
tional view limits what is owned, as ownership only constitutes assets, property rights,
and economic values. Hereby neglecting other values such as social values.

Research questions to address could include: Is it possible to re-conceptualize
organizational ownership and go beyond the narrow economic definition? How are
claims of organizational ownership made and accepted in organizational contexts
lacking legal-economic ownership? I echo Bencherki and Bourgoin (2019) and encourage
future research to dive into the concept of organizational ownership and to open
up and unravel its black box. One can do so by offering a critique on existing legal-
economic literature and by extending the legal-economic account of organizational
ownership. A variety of perspectives – political, psychological, or sociological – can
extend the traditional view of organizational ownership. Fruitful avenues could include
research examining how organizational ownership unfolds as a social process within
social interactions and negotiations, or could utilize language-centered perspectives on the phenomena. The latter will embed organizational ownership in the larger communicational ontology of organizations, and will enrich ownership literature with interpretation, texts, and communicative acts. This would fit a research stream that unfurls organizational phenomena from static concepts with a representational stance towards a performative one.

An enhanced understanding will contribute to ownership literature and will most likely entail implications for governance and stakeholder literature. For instance, an extended view on organizational ownership provides a new way to identify owners in organizational contexts lacking legal-economic owners. Hereby one can provide an answer to the question: Whom should be held accountable? This subsequently could evolve governance mechanisms to hold these owners accountable. Furthermore, an extended approach on organizational ownership would inform stakeholder identification and salience, and can help us understand various stakeholder dynamics and their relation with an organization in alternative organizational settings. Theoretical and practical implications will not be limited to corporate foundations, but can be extended to other alternative forms of organizing (e.g., nonprofit organizations, cooperatives, social enterprises).

6.4.4 Broader Research Agenda

As a final thought, this dissertation enriches our understanding on two substantive areas of research modestly. Although this dissertation answers a few research questions, there still remain many untrodden research avenues. I am eager to delve further into private and corporate philanthropy and map their respective practices and landscapes.

Areas of research include the themes addressed in this dissertation, but also go beyond. I urge researchers to delve into contemporary volunteer management. Especially volunteer management involving the secondary and intermediary volunteer models, as “the shared volunteer models have not received serious treatment” (Brudney et al., 2019, p.75). These models also touch upon contemporary forms of volunteering, including episodic volunteering more broadly (Macduff, 2004; Weber, 2002), corporate or employee volunteering (Grant, 2012; Lee and Higgins, 2001), service-learning (Astin and Sax, 1998), family volunteering (Littlepage et al., 2003), single volunteering (Hustinx et al., 2010), and volunteer tourism or voluntourism (Wearing, 2001) among others. Next to volunteer management, other forms or private philanthropy deserve more academic attention. These include contemporary forms of monetary donations (i.e., charitable crowdfunding, giving circles (Eikenberry and Breeze, 2015)), but also
gift or in-kind donations (Bussell and Forbes, 2002), as well as the giving of bodily products or parts (labeled as health-related philanthropy) (Meslin et al., 2008).

Besides these forms of private philanthropy, I solicit researchers to examine corporate philanthropy and business-nonprofit relationships more broadly, as both deserve more attention (Harris, 2012b). First, although the dissertation explores several vehicles for corporate philanthropy, there might be various other organizational forms, vehicles, channels, or practices populating the corporate giving terrain that are hitherto unexplored. Moreover, it still remains unclear what the organizational or individual antecedents are that influence the choice for a particular vehicle for corporate philanthropy. Second, a practice gaining attention among for-profit organizations entails involving their customer base within their business-nonprofit partnerships and corporate philanthropy Rodell et al. (2019). We can label this for instance as customer engagement or customer involvement. For example, for-profit organizations call upon or appeal to their customers to volunteer or to make financial or in-kind donations throughout the for-profit organization to benefit specific nonprofit organizations. For-profit organizations then go beyond their conventional roles of donor and become a vehicle to give for others. These practices seem to blur the boundaries between private and corporate philanthropy. Furthermore, it would be intriguing to examine if there are differences in the practices and processes of corporate philanthropy between for-profit organizations in serving business-to-business or business-to-consumer environments. Furthermore, as corporate foundations remain under-explored (Roza et al., 2019), I urge researchers to advance our understanding of this phenomenon. For example, future research could examine how a socioemotional wealth perspective (Berrone et al., 2012) informs the relationship between a founding for-profit organization and the corporate foundation. Moreover, it would be interesting to examine in what way managers make sense or deal with potential role or identity conflicts when employed by both the for-profit organization and the corporate foundation – wearing two different hats. Fourth, I echo Harris (2012b), that the nonprofit perspective in business-nonprofit relationships merits attention. For instance, there is a need to develop a theory on the relationship and activities between the two. This includes an advanced understanding on the expectations of benefits held by nonprofit organizations and the extent to which those benefits are achieved in practice. Intriguing questions include: What do nonprofit organizations gain or lose from business-nonprofit partnerships?; Are nonprofit organizations willing or reluctant partners?; How do benefits differ across activities or partnerships?; To what extent do business-nonprofit relationships serve the public benefit goals of nonprofit organizations? (Harris, 2012b)).
These, and many others, are just a few examples of the untrodden research paths within contemporary private and corporate philanthropy.
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Summary

No part of the philanthropic landscape appears to be as diverse as the ways in which individuals and for-profit organizations seek to do good. While philanthropy in its own is not a new phenomenon, its diversity and the emergence of (third party) organizations and new channels call for a better or renewed understanding. In this dissertation, I address the various organizations and channels available nowadays to individual and corporate philanthropists. In particular, I aim to clarify their values, consequences, and associated management practices. The four studies in this dissertation answer four research questions, all aimed at studying different facets of private and corporate philanthropy.

The goal of this dissertation is to increase scholarly understanding in two substantive areas of research. First, I examine temporary episodic volunteering by examining National Days of Service initiated by a third party. National Days of Service are state- or countrywide volunteering programs in which individuals and groups support nonprofit organizations by giving their time to a one-day, time-limited volunteer project. Second, I examine a collective corporate foundation and third party intermediary organizations. These two vehicles channel important parts of corporate philanthropy and stand between corporate donors and nonprofit recipients. These vehicles place corporate philanthropy outside firm boundaries and at arm’s length.

In the first study, I explore how nonprofit organizations can design National Days of Service projects to yield volunteer satisfaction. The study combines interview data, participant observations, and focus groups. By adopting work design theory, the study suggests ways for nonprofit organizations to promote volunteer satisfaction. The study finds that task significance, direct beneficiary contact and social support, feedback from others, job-based feedback, task identity, and limited autonomy yield volunteer satisfaction in National Days of Service projects. Furthermore, findings reveal adequate planning and preparation, and an appropriate workload also elicit volunteer satisfaction.
In the second study, I examine how different nonprofit organizations practice National Days of Service. I distinguish between two types of nonprofit organizations: mutual support and service delivery organizations. Mutual support organizations strive to serve and benefit their own members (i.e., sports associations); service delivery organizations produce benefits for (external) constituencies or clients. National Days of Service evoke volunteering among the broad population outside and beyond the nonprofit organization’s boundaries. This reconciles with the volunteer recruitment of service delivery organizations, but contradicts the membership-nature of mutual support organizations such as sports associations. I hypothesize that sports associations, as mutual support organizations, compared to service-delivery attract different volunteers, use different volunteer recruitment methods, and attain different results with their participation in National Days of Service. Our data emanate from survey responses of 1,030 sports associations and 4,293 service delivery organizations that participated as host nonprofit organizations in an annual National Day of Service in the Netherlands. Findings reveal that sports associations enlist more internal and fewer external volunteers; use more internally-oriented recruitment methods; and achieve results with a more internal scope.

In the third study, I differentiate between direct and indirect corporate philanthropy as well as individual and collective corporate giving practices. I explore the rationales and consequences associated with a firm’s decision to practice corporate philanthropy through a corporate foundation serving the interests of multiple corporate donors simultaneously: a collective corporate foundation. A thematic analysis of interview data reveals two rationales (limited corporate resources available; desire for efficiency), and three consequences (loss of control; loss of involvement; fewer individual organizational benefits). From these results, I identify four key dimensions that influence a firm’s decision between direct or indirect, and individual or collective giving practices. First, for-profit organizations should ponder whether corporate giving is a core or peripheral activity. Second, the amount of corporate resources a firm has available to practice corporate philanthropy. Third, the firm’s level of desired control and involvement. Fourth, the firm’s desired public profile with corporate giving.

In the fourth study, I explore what makes third party intermediary organizations valuable within business-nonprofit partnerships in the context of corporate community involvement. A single case study provided the research context. Data emanate from focus groups and interviews. The results show that third party intermediary organizations overcome various barriers that prevent nonprofit and for-profit organizations to engage in corporate community involvement. First, third party intermediary organiza-
tions provide the required organizational social capital when for-profit or nonprofit
organizations lack adequate cross-sectoral networks. Second, third party intermediary
organizations lower transaction costs involved in partnership selection and formation.
Third, third party intermediary organizations provide knowledge and experiences
(known as human capital) enabling for-profit and nonprofit organization to grasp
the potential of corporate community involvement. The results furthermore illustrate
that third party intermediary organizations change business-nonprofit partnerships
in distinctive ways. They enhance the value of the partnership, stimulate collective
action, de-emotionalize partnership selection and ensure an equal distribution of
corporate community involvement in the local community.

Altogether, the studies in this dissertation represent a more in-depth exploration of
contemporary private and corporate philanthropy. The four studies advance scholarship
in two areas. With the first two studies, I contribute to the literature on and practice of
temporary episodic volunteering and National Days of Service. I show how nonprofit
organizations integrate National Days of Service and how they can do so more
meaningfully. With the last two studies, I contribute to the literature on and practice of
corporate philanthropy specifically and business-nonprofit partnerships more broadly.
I demonstrate how two channels of corporate philanthropy add value and what the
consequences are for the donor and recipient.

The four studies pave the way forward to more expanded examinations of various
facets of contemporary private and corporate giving. After all, there remain many
untrodden research paths within private and corporate philanthropy.
De manieren waarop individuen en bedrijven goed kunnen doen is een van de meest diverse onderdelen van het filantropisch landschap. Hoewel filantropie geen nieuw fenomeen is, roept deze diversiteit alsook de opkomst van derde partijen en nieuwe kanalen vragen op voor een beter of hernieuwd begrip. In dit proefschrift adresseer ik de verschillende organisaties en kanalen die vandaag de dag toegankelijk zijn voor individuen en bedrijven om te geven. Specifiek wil ik de waarden, gevolgen en bijbehorende managementpraktijken van deze nieuwe organisaties en kanalen verduidelijken. De vier studies in dit proefschrift geven aldus antwoord op vier onderzoeksvragen gericht op verschillende facetten van filantropie door individuen en bedrijven. Dit laatste noemt men ook wel maatschappelijk betrokken ondernemen (MBO).

Het doel van dit proefschrift is het vergroten van wetenschappelijke kennis op twee specifieke onderwerpen. Ten eerste bestudeer ik tijdelijk kortstondig vrijwilligerswerk in nationale eendaagse vrijwilligersevenementen geïnitieerd door een derde partij. Tijdens deze vrijwilligersevenementen ondersteunen individuen en groepen non-profitorganisaties als vrijwilliger voor één dag. Ten tweede bestudeer ik een collectieve corporate foundation en maatschappelijke bemiddelaars. Deze laatste noemen we ook wel derde partijen of intermediairs. Deze opkomende organisaties kanaliseren belangrijke elementen van MBO en staan tussen het bedrijf (de donor) en de ontvanger (de non-profitorganisatie).

In de eerste studie onderzoek ik welke factoren vrijwilligers tevredenstellen gedurende nationale eendaagse vrijwilligersevenementen. Het onderzoek maakt gebruik van work design theorie en combineert interviews, observaties en discussiegroepen. De resultaten suggereren meerdere manieren waarop non-profitorganisaties de tevre-
Samenvatting
denheid van eendaagse vrijwilligers kunnen bewerkstelligen. Dit kan onder andere
door de betekenis van de vrijwilligerstaak te benadrukken, de vrijwilligers in direct
contact te brengen met de begunstigden en te zorgen voor goede ondersteuning.
Daarnaast leveren feedback van anderen, zichtbaar resultaat van het werk, en de taak
een duidelijk begin en einde geven ook tevredenheid onder eendaagse vrijwilligers op.
Ook zijn vrijwilligers tevreden wanneer zij beperkte autonomie hebben tijdens het
eendaagse vrijwilligersevenement. Als laatste leiden een adequate planning, voldoende
voorbereiding en een passende werklast ook tot de tevredenheid van vrijwilligers.

In de tweede studie onderzoek ik hoe verschillende non-profitorganisaties (o.a.
(sport)verenigingen en dienstverlenende non-profitorganisaties) gebruik maken van
landelijke eendaagse vrijwilligersevenementen. Verenigingen dienen hun eigen leden
en lidmaatschap. Dienstverlenende organisaties leveren goederen of diensten aan
externe cliënten. Nationale eendaagse vrijwilligersevenementen roepen op tot een-
daags vrijwilligerswerk onder de brede bevolking en stimuleren individuen buiten de
grenzen van de eigen non-profitorganisatie tot deelname. Dit komt overeen met hoe
dienstverlenende non-profitorganisaties normaliter hun vrijwilligers werven, maar is
tegenstrijdig met hoe (sport)verenigingen hun vrijwilligers werven (namelijk vanuit de
eigen lidmaatschap). Ik veronderstel dat (sport)verenigingen in vergelijking met dien-
stverlenende non-profitorganisaties andere vrijwilligers aantrekken, verschillende werv-
ingsmethodes voor vrijwilligers gebruiken en verschillende resultaten behalen met hun
deelname aan nationale eendaagse vrijwilligersevenementen. De analyse is gebaseerd
op unieke enquête data bestaande uit 1,030 (sport)verenigingen en 4,293 dienstver-
lenende non-profit organisaties. Uit de bevindingen blijkt dat (sport)verenigingen
meer eigen en minder vrijwilligers van buitenaf aantrekken, meer intern-georiënteerde
wervingsmethodes gebruiken, en meer resultaten bereiken met een intern bereik.

In de derde studie maak ik onderscheid tussen direct en indirect MBO en tussen
individuele en collectieve vormen van MBO. Ik onderzoek de beweegredenen en
gevolgen van de keuze van een bedrijf om MBO onder te brengen in een corporate
foundation die de belangen van meerdere bedrijven tegelijk dient: een collectieve
Corporate foundation. Een thematische analyse van interview data suggereert twee
beweegredenen (beperkte beschikbare middelen en de behoefte of wens voor efficiëntie),
en drie gevolgen (verlies van controle, verlies van betrokkenheid en minder individuele
organisatie voordelen). Op basis van deze resultaten identificeer ik vier belangrijke
dimensies die een rol spelen in de besluitvorming om MBO op directe of indirecte
en individuele of collectieve wijze vorm te geven. Ten eerste zal een bedrijf moeten
overwegen of MBO tot haar kern- of nevenactiviteiten behoort. Ten tweede is de
beslissing afhankelijk van de hoeveelheid middelen die beschikbaar zijn voor MBO. Ten derde speelt het gewenste niveau van controle en betrokkenheid een rol. Ten vierde is het gewenste publieke MBO-profiel van het bedrijf van belang.

In de vierde studie onderzoek ik wat de waarde is van maatschappelijke bemiddelaars binnen partnerschappen tussen bedrijven en non-profitorganisaties in de context van MBO. Het onderzoek combineert discussiegroepen en interviews. De onderzoeksresultaten laten zien dat maatschappelijke bemiddelaars een aantal barrières overkomen die non-profit organisaties of bedrijven ervan weerhouden zich te verwikkelen in MBO-partnerschappen. In de eerste plaats zorgen maatschappelijke bemiddelaars voor het benodigde sociaal kapitaal van zowel non-profit organisaties als bedrijven wanneer het hen ontbreekt aan de juiste netwerken. Ten tweede verlagen maatschappelijke bemiddelaars de transactiekosten voor de selectie en vorming van partnerschappen. Ten derde verstrekken maatschappelijke bemiddelaars de kennis en ervaring (menselijk kapitaal) zodat bedrijven en non-profitorganisaties het potentieel van MBO-partnerschappen kunnen begrijpen en benutten. Daarnaast illustreren de bevindingen dat maatschappelijke bemiddelaars partnerschappen tussen bedrijven en non-profitorganisaties op verschillende manieren veranderen. Maatschappelijke bemiddelaars zorgen voor een waardeverhoging in het partnerschap, bevorderen collectieve of gezamenlijk actie, stimuleren partnerschap selectie waarbij emotie een mindere rol speelt en zorgen voor een gelijke verdeling van MBO-partnerschappen onder bedrijven en non-profit organisaties in een lokale gemeenschap.

Al met al leiden de studies in dit proefschrift tot een diepgaande verkenning van hedendaagse vormen van geven, zowel door individuen als bedrijven. De vier studies bevorderen de wetenschap in twee onderzoeksgebieden. Met de eerste twee studies lever ik een bijdrage aan de literatuur omtrent tijdelijk kortstondig vrijwilligerswerk en nationale eendaagse vrijwilligersevenementen. Ik laat zien hoe non-profitorganisaties tijdelijke kortstondige vrijwilligersprogramma’s integreren en hoe ze dit zinvoller kunnen doen. Met de laatste twee studies lever ik een bijdrage aan de literatuur omtrent partnerschappen tussen bedrijven en non-profit organisaties in het algemeen en MBO in het bijzonder. Ik laat zien hoe twee kanalen van MBO (collectieve corporate foundations en maatschappelijke bemiddelaars) waarde toevoegen en wat de consequenties zijn voor zowel de donor als de ontvanger.

De vier studies maken de weg vrij voor uitgebreidere onderzoeken naar verschillende facetten van filantropie door individuen en bedrijven. Binnen individuele filantropie en MBO resteren immers nog veel onbewandelde onderzoekspaden.
Zusammenfassung

(Summary in German)


Sommario

(Summary in Italian)

Nessuna parte del panorama filantropico sembra essere così diversa quanto le modalità con cui gli individui e le organizzazioni a scopo di lucro cercano di fare del bene. Mentre la filantropia non è di per sé un fenomeno nuovo, la diversificazione delle sue pratiche e l’emergere di organizzazioni (terze) e di nuovi canali sollevano interrogativi e invocano una migliore o rinnovata comprensione. In questa tesi, mi occupo delle varie organizzazioni e dei canali oggi disponibili per i filantropi individuali e aziendali. In particolare, intendo chiarire i loro valori, le conseguenze e le connesse pratiche di gestione. I quattro studi di questa tesi rispondono a quattro domande di ricerca, tutte volte a studiare i diversi aspetti della filantropia individuale e aziendale.

L’obiettivo di questa tesi è quello di aumentare la comprensione accademica in due aree sostanziali di ricerca. In primo luogo, esamino il "volontariato episodico temporaneo" esaminando le giornate nazionali di servizio iniziate da parti terze. Le giornate nazionali di servizio sono iniziative di volontariato a livello statale o nazionale in cui individui e gruppi sostengono organizzazioni senza scopo di lucro dedicando il loro tempo ad un progetto di volontariato di una giornata o di durata limitata nel tempo. In secondo luogo, esamino fondazioni collettive d’impresa e organizzazioni intermediarie terze. Questi due veicoli indirizzano parti importanti della filantropia aziendale e si interpongono tra i donatori aziendali e i destinatari senza scopo di lucro. Questi veicoli collocano la filantropia aziendale al di fuori dei confini aziendali.

Nel primo studio, esploro come le organizzazioni senza scopo di lucro possono progettare giornate nazionali di volontariato per massimizzare la soddisfazione dei volontari. Lo studio combina dati raccolti tramite interviste, osservazione partecipante e focus groups. Adottando la teoria del work design, lo studio suggerisce modi con cui le organizzazioni senza scopo di lucro possono migliorare la soddisfazione dei volontari.
Lo studio rileva che rilevanza della task, contatto diretto con i beneficiari e il supporto sociale, ricevere feedback da altri e feedback relativo al lavoro, task identity e limitata autonomia portano ad una maggiore soddisfazione dei volontari con incarichi di lavoro temporanei (di un giorno). Inoltre, i risultati rivelano che un’adeguata pianificazione e preparazione ed un adeguato carico di lavoro generano soddisfazione tra i volontari.

Nel secondo studio, esamino il modo in cui diverse organizzazioni non-profit (organizzazioni di mutuo sostegno e di erogazione di servizi) utilizzano le giornate nazionali di servizio. Le giornate nazionali di servizio invitano il volontariato tra la popolazione generale e quindi al di fuori dei confini dell’organizzazione non-profit. Questo ben si concilia con il reclutamento volontario tipico delle organizzazioni di erogazione di servizi, ma è in contrasto con la natura associativa delle organizzazioni di mutuo sostegno come le associazioni sportive. Ipotizzo che le organizzazioni sportive, rispetto alle organizzazioni di erogazione di servizi, attraggono volontari diversi, utilizzano diversi metodi di reclutamento e ottengono risultati differenti con la loro partecipazione alle giornate nazionali di servizio. I dati provengono dai rispondenti al sondaggio di 1,030 associazioni sportive e 4,293 organizzazioni di erogazione di servizi. Infatti, i risultati rivelano che le associazioni sportive arruolano più volontari interni e meno volontari esterni; usano metodi di reclutamento più orientati verso persone interne all’organizzazione; e ottengono risultati con una portata più interna.

Nel terzo studio, distinguo tra la filantropia aziendale diretta e indiretta e le pratiche di donazione individuale e collettiva. Esploro le ragioni e le conseguenze associate alla decisione di un’azienda di praticare la filantropia aziendale attraverso una fondazione aziendale che serve gli interessi di più donatori aziendali contemporaneamente: una fondazione aziendale collettiva. Un’analisi tematica di intervista rivela due ragioni (risorse disponibili limitate; desiderio di efficienza) e tre conseguenze (perdita di controllo; perdita di coinvolgimento; minori benefici organizzativi individuali). Da questi risultati, identifico quattro dimensioni chiave che influenzano la scelta di un’azienda fra pratiche di donazione diretta o indiretta, individuale o collettiva. In primo luogo, le organizzazioni a scopo di lucro dovrebbero riflettere se le attività filantropiche sono un’attività centrale o periferica. In secondo luogo, la decisione dipende dalla quantità di risorse disponibili per lo svolgimento di attività di filantropia aziendale. In terzo luogo, il livello di controllo e coinvolgimento desiderato dell’azienda è di particolare importanza. In quarto luogo, la scelta è influenzata anche dal profilo pubblico che l’azienda desidera ottenere con le attività filantropiche aziendali.
Nel quarto studio, esploro le organizzazioni intermediarie terze e cosa le rende utili nelle partnership business-non-profit nel contesto del coinvolgimento aziendale con la comunità. Basandomi su focus group e interviste, mostro che le organizzazioni intermediarie terze superano le barriere che impediscono alle organizzazioni non-profit e for-profit di impegnarsi nel coinvolgimento comunitario. In primo luogo, le organizzazioni intermediarie terze forniscono il capitale sociale organizzativo necessario quando le organizzazioni a scopo di lucro o non-profit non dispongono di reti sociali adeguate. In secondo luogo, le organizzazioni intermediarie terze riducono i costi di transazione legati alla selezione e alla costituzione delle partnership. In terzo luogo, le organizzazioni intermediarie terze forniscono conoscenze ed esperienze (note come capitale umano) che consentono alle organizzazioni a scopo di lucro e non-profit di cogliere il potenziale dal coinvolgimento aziendale con la comunità. Lo studio illustra inoltre che le organizzazioni intermediarie terze cambiano le partnership tra imprese e organizzazioni senza scopo di lucro in modi diversi. Raggiungono la valorizzazione delle partnership, stimolano l’azione collettiva, de-emozionalizzano la selezione delle partnership e garantiscono un’equa distribuzione del coinvolgimento aziendale con la comunità.

Nel complesso, gli studi di questa tesi rappresentano un’esplorazione più approfondita delle forme contemporanee di filantropia privata e aziendale. I quattro studi mirano a far progredire la nostra comprensione in due aree. Con i primi due studi, contribuisco alla letteratura sul volontariato episodico temporaneo e sulle giornate nazionali di servizio. Mostro come le organizzazioni non-profit integriano i programmi di volontariato episodico temporaneo e come possono farlo in modo più significativo. Con gli ultimi due studi, contribuisco in modo specifico alla letteratura sulla filantropia aziendale e, più in generale, alle partnership tra imprese e organizzazioni non-profit. Dimostro come due canali di filantropia aziendale portano valore aggiunto e quali sono le conseguenze per il donatore aziendale e il destinatario senza scopo di lucro.

I quattro studi arricchiscono la nostra comprensione su due aree di ricerca sostanziali, spero che aprano la strada ad indagini più approfondite. Dopo tutto, rimangono ancora molti percorsi di ricerca non battuti nell’ambito della filantropia privata e aziendale.
Sumario  
(Summary in Spanish)

Ninguna parte del campo de la filantropía parece ser tan diverso como las formas de hacer el bien en ese sentido de las personas y de las organizaciones con ánimo de lucro. Aunque la filantropía no es un nuevo fenómeno en sí mismo, la diversificación de sus prácticas y el surgimiento de organizaciones (de terceros) y nuevos canales, plantean preguntas y demandan una mejor y renovada comprensión del mismo. En esta disertación, abordo varias organizaciones y canales disponibles hoy en día para filántropos individuales y corporativos. En particular, trato de aclarar sus valores, consecuencias y prácticas de gestión asociadas. Los cuatro estudios de la disertación responden a cuatro preguntas de investigación, todas destinadas al estudio de diferentes aspectos de la filantropía tanto individual como corporativa.

El objetivo de esta disertación es aumentar el grado de comprensión académica en dos áreas sustanciales de investigación. Primero, analizo el “voluntariado episódico temporal”, examinando National Days of Service iniciados por un tercero. National Days of Service son programas de voluntariado estatales o nacionales en los que personas y grupos apoyan a organizaciones sin fines de lucro, dedicando su tiempo a un proyecto de voluntariado por un tiempo limitado de un día. Segundo, examino una fundación corporativa colectiva y organizaciones intermediarias de terceros. Estos dos vehículos canalizan partes importantes de la filantropía corporativa y se posicionan entre donantes corporativos y destinatarios sin fines de lucro.

En el primer estudio, exploro cómo las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro pueden diseñar programas de voluntariado de National Days of Service ceder la satisfacción del voluntariado. El estudio combina datos de entrevistas, observaciones de participante, y grupos focales. Adoptando la teoría del work design, el estudio propone distintas formas para que las organizaciones sin fines de lucro mejoren la satisfacción de los
voluntarios. En el estudio se detecta que la importancia de la tarea, el contacto directo con los beneficiarios y el apoyo social, el feedback de otros, el feedback basado en el trabajo, la identidad de la tarea y la autonomía limitada, logran la satisfacción del voluntario en tareas temporales (de un día). Además, estos hallazgos revelan una planificación y preparación adecuadas, y una carga de trabajo apropiada ceder la satisfacción del voluntario.

En el segundo estudio, examino cómo las diferentes organizaciones sin fines de lucro (organizaciones de apoyo mutuo y prestación de servicios) utilizan los programas de voluntariado de National Days of Service. Estos programas promueven el voluntariado entre la extensa población fuera de los límites de las organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro. Esto comulga con el reclutamiento de voluntarios de organizaciones de prestación de servicios, pero contradice la naturaleza de pertenencia de las organizaciones de apoyo mutuo, como las asociaciones deportivas. Hago la hipótesis de que las organizaciones deportivas en comparación con las de prestación de servicios atraen a voluntarios distintos, utilizan métodos de reclutamiento diferentes y logran también resultados distintos con su participación en los National Days of Service. El análisis se basa en datos de encuestas de 1,030 asociaciones deportivas y 4,293 organizaciones de prestación de servicios. De hecho, los resultados revelan que las asociaciones deportivas reclutan más voluntarios internos y menos voluntarios externos; utilizan más métodos de reclutamiento internamente orientados; y logran resultados con un mayor alcance interno. Sugiero así que las asociaciones deportivas se adhieran a su naturaleza de pertenencia y no imiten de manera mecánica los programas de National Days of Service.

En el tercer estudio, distingo entre la filantropía corporativa directa e indirecta, así como entre las prácticas de donación individuales y colectivas. Exploro los fundamentos y las consecuencias asociadas con la decisión de una compañía de practicar la filantropía corporativa, a través de una fundación corporativa que sirve simultáneamente a los intereses de múltiples donantes corporativos: una fundación corporativa colectiva. Un análisis temático de entrevistas revela dos fundamentos (recursos limitados disponibles; deseo de eficiencia) y tres consecuencias (pérdida de control; pérdida de implicación; menos beneficios organizacionales individuales). A partir de estos resultados, identifico cuatro dimensiones clave que influyen en las decisiones que toma una empresa entre prácticas de donaciones directas o indirectas, y prácticas individuales o colectivas. Primero, las organizaciones con fines de lucro deberían considerar si las donaciones corporativas son una actividad central o periférica. En segundo lugar, la decisión depende de la cantidad de recursos disponibles para practicar la filantropía corporativa.
Tercero, se debe tener en cuenta el nivel deseado de control e implicación de la empresa. Cuarto, el perfil público deseado de la empresa con donaciones corporativas también influye en la decisión.

En el cuarto estudio, exploro lo que hace que las organizaciones intermediarias tengan valor dentro de las asociaciones empresariales sin ánimo de lucro en el contexto de la comunidad corporativa involucrada. Basándome en un caso de estudio con datos de entrevistas y grupos focales, demuestro que las organizaciones intermediarias de terceros superan las barreras que evitan que las organizaciones con y sin fines de lucro, participen en esta involucración de la comunidad corporativa. Primero, las organizaciones intermediarias de terceros proporcionan el capital social organizacional requerido cuando las organizaciones con o sin fines de lucro carecen de redes adecuadas. En segundo lugar, las organizaciones intermediarias de terceros reducen los costes de transacción implicados en la selección y formación de compañías asociadas. En tercer lugar, las organizaciones intermediarias de terceros proporcionan conocimientos y experiencia (conocidas como capital humano), permitiendo a las organizaciones con fines de lucro y sin fines de lucro aprovechar el potencial de la participación de la comunidad corporativa. Además, el estudio muestra que las organizaciones intermediarias de terceros cambian las asociaciones empresariales sin fines de lucro de una manera distintiva. Logran una mejora en el valor de la asociación, estimulan la acción colectiva, hacen reducir la parte emocional en la selección de la asociación y aseguran una distribución equitativa en la participación de la comunidad corporativa.

En conjunto, los estudios de esta disertación representan una exploración más profunda de las formas contemporáneas de filantropía, tanto privada como corporativa. Los cuatro estudios tienen como objetivo avanzar nuestra comprensión sobre dos áreas. Con los dos primeros estudios, contribuyo a la literatura sobre voluntariado episódico temporal y National Days of Service. Muestro cómo las organizaciones sin fines de lucro integran programas temporales de voluntariado episódico y cómo pueden hacerlo de manera más significativa. Con los dos últimos estudios, contribuyo a la literatura sobre filantropía corporativa en concreto, y asociaciones empresariales sin fines de lucro en general. Demuestro cómo dos canales de filantropía corporativa añaden valor, y cuáles son las consecuencias para el donante corporativo y el beneficiario sin fines de lucro.

Los cuatro estudios enriquecen espero que allanen el camino hacia análisis más amplios. Después de todo, quedan muchos caminos de investigación sin explorar dentro de la filantropía privada y corporativa.
摘要 (Summary in Chinese)

在有关公益慈善的实践中，似乎个人和营利性组织总是可以提出更加新颖和多彩的行善方式。尽管公益慈善早已不是新的社会现象，但近些年公益慈善实践的愈发多样化，（第三方）组织和新型慈善工具及渠道的大量涌现，我们有必要对于公益慈善的发展现状进行梳理，从而更全面和深刻地理解这一社会现象。本文将介绍当下个人和企业慈善家使用的渠道和组织方式，分析它们的社会价值和影响，并总结与其相关的管理实践经验。本论文的四项研究回应了与个人和企业慈善事业领域中的四个主要问题，以期提升这两个研究领域的学术认识。

首先，本文以第三方发起的“国家服务日（National Days of Service）”为例来分析“短期阵发性志愿服务（temporary episodic volunteering）”这一现象。国家服务日是州或国家/地区范围内的志愿服务计划，其中，个人和团体通过参与为期一天的志愿者项目来支持非营利组织。在第一项研究中，本文聚焦于分析非营利组织如何通过全国服务日志愿者计划设计，以最大程度地提升志愿者满意度。结合工作设计理论，该研究为非营利组织提高志愿者满意度的方法提供了建议。在第二项研究中，本文比较了不同类型的非营利组织在践行“国家服务日志愿者计划”上的异同。调查结果表明，体育协会更多地侧重面向内部的招聘方法，招募更多的内部志愿者，更关注于在内部范围取得成果。

其次，本文研究了集体企业基金会（collective corporate foundation）和第三方中介组织。这两种工具是企业慈善的重要组成部分，位于企业捐赠者和接受资助的非营利组织之间。在第三项研究中，本文区分了直接和间接的企业慈善以及个人和集体的捐赠实践。该项研究还分析了企业通过同时服务多个企业捐赠人利益的企业基金会来实践企业慈善事业的路径和结果：集体公司基金会。根据调查结果，本文发现了四个关键维度对企业捐赠决策过程的影响。在第四项研究中，本文探讨了在企业社区参与的背景下，第三方中介组织在商业与非营利合作伙伴关系中的价值所在。研究表明，第三方中介组织克服了阻碍非营利和营利性组织在融入企业社区参与过程的困难，并进一步发现，第三方中介组织以其独特的方式改变了商业与非营利组织的伙伴关系。
综上所述，本论文的四项研究对当代个人和企业的慈善形式进行了深入的探索，
提升了我们在两个大方面的认识。一方面，前两项研究通过探究非营利组织如何整合短期
阵发志愿服务计划，对“短期阵发性志愿服务”和“全国服务日”的文献和实践做出了贡
献。另一方面，后两项研究通过探析企业慈善的渠道、价值提升方式，以及对捐赠和受赠
者的影响，为企业慈善事业和商业与非营利伙伴关系的文献和实践做出了贡献。
About the Author

Stephanie Antonia Maas was born in 1991 in Haarlem, the Netherlands. She obtained her BSc. Business Administration from Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam. She continued her studies at Rotterdam School of Management (RSM), Erasmus University and obtained her MSc. Global Business and Stakeholder Management. Stephanie thereafter started her PhD at the Business-Society Management Department at RSM, and worked as an academic researcher and project lead for RSM’s Community Service Programme alongside her PhD.

In her PhD, Stephanie’s research centers on contemporary forms of giving, including both private and corporate philanthropy. She focuses on topics such as trends in volunteerism and modern channels for corporate giving. The latter often takes place at arm’s length from the for-profit organization. Broader research interests include (peripheral) CSR, business-nonprofit relationships, and nonprofit management.

As an academic researcher, Stephanie taught several courses on both BSc. and MSc. level, including courses on nonprofit management, social entrepreneurship, consultancy, and academic research in both national and international contexts (Shanghai; Cape Town). She also served as an advisor for the Erasmus Consultancy Project (Colombia, 2017) and guided numerous BSc. and MSc. theses, and BSc. internships on private and corporate philanthropy as well as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and beyond. She also worked on various research projects centering on corporate foundations, (corporate) volunteering, impact measurement, and a European funded research project on service-learning.
During the final year of her PhD, Stephanie joint RSM’s Positive Change Initiative and became project manager of RSM’s Community Service Program. As project manager she set up an employee engagement program to centralize and enhance RSM’s community involvement. Doing so, she organized, facilitated and coordinated volunteering activities for RSM employees. Central to this was forging and managing collaborations with internal stakeholders as well as nonprofit organizations.
Author’s Portfolio

Publications

Book Chapters


Under Review


Working Papers


Conferences

2019 Academy of Management (AOM) (Boston, USA); Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) (San Diego, USA); European Research Network on Philanthropy (ERNOP) (Basel, Switzerland).

2018 Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) (Austin, USA); European Group for Organization Studies (EGOS) (Tallinn, Estonia); International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) (Amsterdam, the Netherlands).

2017 Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) (Grand Rapids, USA).
2016 Academy of Management (AOM) (Anaheim, USA); Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) (Washington D.C., USA); International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) (Stockholm, Sweden).

2015 Academy of Management (AOM) (Vancouver, Canada); Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) (Chicago, USA); Voluntary Sector and Volunteering Research (VSVR) (Leeds, UK).

Invited Conference Paper Presentations

2018 Symposium for Commerce & Philanthropy (SCP) (Beijing, China).

Doctoral Consortia


Pre-colloquium PhD Workshop, 35th Colloquium of European Group for Organization Studies (EGOS). Edinburgh, UK (1 - 2 July 2019).


Ad-hoc Reviewer

Journals  Nonprofit Voluntary and Sector Quarterly (NVSQ);
Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit
Organizations

Conferences  Academy of Management (AOM) Annual Meeting;
European Academy of Management (EURAM) Conference

Honors and Awards

Top Reviewer Award for the Public & Nonprofit Division (PNP) of the Academy of

Shortlisted for KPMG’s Sustainability Thesis Awards (2013-2014)
MSc. Thesis: Do-in-a-day episodic volunteering as a gateway to long-term volunteering.

Teaching and Supervising Activities

2015 - 2020  Managing Nonprofit Organizations,
MSc. Global Business and Sustainability (Elective),
Co-instructor.

2019 - 2020  International Research Course: Cape Town, South Africa,
MSc. Business Administration Part-time (Core course),
Lecturer and instructor.

Master Thesis, MSc. Business Administration Part-time;
Master Thesis, MSc. Master in Management;
Master Thesis, MSc. International Management/CEMS,
Thesis coach and co-reader.

2016 - 2018  International Research Course: Shanghai, China,
MSc. Business Administration Part-time (Core course),
Lecturer and instructor.

2015 - 2018  Applied research course to benefit social entrepreneurs and nonprofit organizations, MSc. Business Administration Part-time (Core course), Instructor.

2015 - 2018  Bachelor Internships, BSc. Business Administration, Research advisor.


2014 - 2018  Experiential Learning: Consultancy to Social Entrepreneurs, BSc. Business Administration (Minor), Co-instructor.