



OBSERVATOIRE  
**PhiLab**



## L'année **PhiLanthropique** | **PhiLanthropic year**

2017

NOVEMBRE /  
NOVEMBER

### BULLETIN MENSUEL DU PHILAB – PHILAB'S MONTHLY

---

#### PHILANTHROPIE ET ENVIRONNEMENT *PHILANTHROPY AND ENVIRONMENT*

Le rôle du secteur philanthropique par rapport aux questions environnementales est un enjeu qui anime grandement les réflexions du PhiLab. Lors de notre conférence internationale qui s'est déroulée en avril dernier, une démarche avait été lancée avec plusieurs acteurs de la société civile pour définir collectivement les responsabilités des fondations subventionnaires face à la crise sociale et écologique. En réunissant des références qui portent sur l'engagement des fondations envers des causes environnementales, ce bulletin espère raviver le débat sur ces importantes questions et, qui sait, ouvrir peut-être de nouvelles pistes de réflexions.

Bonne lecture!

*The role of the philanthropic sector toward environmental issues is a matter that greatly motivates PhiLab's reflections. At our international conference last April, an initiative was launched with several civil society actors to collectively define the responsibilities of grantmaking foundations concerning the social and ecological crisis. By gathering references on the commitment of foundations to environmental causes, this monthly hopes to revive the debate on these important issues and, who knows, perhaps open new avenues for reflection.*

*Wish you good reading!*

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES | TABLE OF CONTENTS

Philanthropie et environnement <i>and environment</i> .....	<i>Philanthropy</i> 1
Les philanthropies environnementales, comparaisons nationales <i>Environmental philanthropies, national comparisons</i> .....	3
Impact des fondations sur le mouvement écologiste <i>Impact of grantmaking foundations on the environmental movement</i> .....	4
Conservation de l'environnement selon les fondations philanthropiques <i>Conservation of the environment according to philanthropic foundations</i> .....	7
Justice environnementale et activités politiques <i>Environmental justice and climate advocacy</i> .....	8
Donations pour l'éducation environnementale <i>for environmental education</i> .....	<i>Giving</i> 10

LES PHILANTHROPIES ENVIRONNEMENTALES,  
COMPARAISONS NATIONALES ENVIRONMENTAL  
PHILANTHROPIES, NATIONAL COMPARISONS

- Tally Katz-Gerro et Hoon-Young Lee (2014). « Environmental Philanthropy and Environmental Behavior in Five Countries: Is There Convergence Among Youth? », *Voluntas*, volume 26, p. 1485–1509.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266-014-9496-4>

Abstract :

This paper compares and contrasts environmental philanthropy, environmental behavior, and their determinants among university students in five countries: Canada, Germany, Israel, South Korea, and the United States. The paper's unique contribution to the nonprofit literature is its focus on environmental philanthropy as an unexplored form of philanthropic behavior, and the ability to test environmental philanthropy in an international setting and in comparison to other modes of environmental behavior. By environmental philanthropy, we mean giving to, and volunteering in, various environmental non-governmental organizations, and by environmental behavior, we refer to daily behaviors in the private sphere with ecological implications. We hypothesize that although the five countries vary on several characteristics, the student populations—who are young, educated, and exposed to global ideas and norms—will be relatively similar to each other in their environmental and philanthropic behavior and in the determinants of such behavior. To test this hypothesis, a standardized questionnaire was administered to 8,477 students on five campuses. Results show significant differences between students in their environmental philanthropic behavior, as well as in the demographic and attitudinal determinants of such behaviors.

Résumé :

Cet article compare et met en contraste la philanthropie environnementale, le comportement environnemental et leurs déterminants chez les étudiants universitaires de cinq pays : Canada, Allemagne, Israël, Corée du Sud et États-Unis. L'apport singulier de cet article à la documentation sur le secteur à but non lucratif est d'avoir pour sujet central la philanthropie environnementale comme une forme inexplorée du comportement philanthropique, et la possibilité de tester la philanthropie environnementale dans un cadre international et par rapport aux autres modes de comportements environnementaux. Par philanthropie environnementale, nous entendons les dons faits aux diverses organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) environnementales et le bénévolat dans ces organisations, et par

comportement environnemental, nous nous référons à des comportements quotidiens dans la vie privée ayant des conséquences écologiques. Nous émettons l'hypothèse que bien que les cinq pays divergent sur plusieurs caractéristiques, les populations d'élèves – qui sont jeunes, instruits et exposés à des idées et à des normes mondiales – seront relativement semblables les uns aux autres quant à leurs comportements environnementaux et philanthropiques et aux facteurs de ces comportements. Pour tester cette hypothèse, un questionnaire standardisé a été distribué à 8,477 étudiants sur cinq campus. Les résultats montrent des différences significatives entre les élèves en ce qui concerne leurs comportements philanthropiques environnementaux ainsi que les facteurs démographiques et comportementaux de ces comportements.

## IMPACT DES FONDATIONS SUR LE MOUVEMENT

ÉCOLOGISTE

*IMPACT*

*OF GRANTMAKING FOUNDATIONS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL  
MOVEMENT*

- **Francisco G Delfin Jr et Shui-Yan Tang (2007).** « **Elitism, pluralism, or resource dependency: patterns of environmental philanthropy among private foundations in California** », *Environment and Planning A*, volume 39, p. 2167 – 2186.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23539904\\_Elitism\\_Pluralism\\_or\\_Resource\\_Dependency\\_Patterns\\_of\\_Environmental\\_Philanthropy\\_Among\\_Private\\_Foundations\\_in\\_California](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23539904_Elitism_Pluralism_or_Resource_Dependency_Patterns_of_Environmental_Philanthropy_Among_Private_Foundations_in_California)

Résumé – *Abstract* :

We map the distribution of environmental grants provided by selected California foundations in 2000 and the degree of dependency of the grantees on foundation support to test theoretical claims about foundations' role in contemporary environmentalism. Contrary to assertions by critics of elitism, there is no consistent favoritism of the so-called 'mainstream', 'flagship', national environmental organizations as recipients of foundations' grants. Instead, donors support a variety of causes with varying levels of funding based on recipients perceived expertise and needs – finding consistent with pluralist and resource-dependency arguments. On the receiving end, we find that the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that have greater reliance on foundation money are those which are younger, have fewer paying members, and are not involved in local-level or toxics issues. Overall, we find that no single theory can adequately explain the trends in giving and in

dependency. Future research building on these findings can proceed along two directions: a theoretical path in search of a more universal theory of foundation giving; or an empirical path focusing on clarifying different types of NGO grantees, the longitudinal patterns of environmental giving, and the impact of foundation funding on NGO grantees.

- **Francisco G. Delfin, Jr. and Shui-Yan Tang (2008).** « **Foundation Impact on Environmental Nongovernmental Organizations** », *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Volume 37, Numéro 4, p. 603-625.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237459781\\_Foundation\\_Impact\\_on\\_Environmental\\_Nongovernmental\\_Organizations\\_The\\_Grantees%27\\_Perspective](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237459781_Foundation_Impact_on_Environmental_Nongovernmental_Organizations_The_Grantees%27_Perspective)

Résumé – *Abstract* :

A survey of U.S. environmental nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) receiving grants in 2000 from private California foundations allowed the authors to evaluate conflicting claims on the impact of foundation funding on nonprofit grantees. Different from the view of elitist critics that foundations co-opt their grant recipients, these NGO respondents view foundations as mildly constructive across several organizational domains. These results are more consistent with pluralist and resource dependency arguments that view foundation donors as supportive of NGO capacity building. Whether the funding impact is cooptation or capacity building has less to do with NGOs' degree of dependency on philanthropic funds and more with grant types received and their organizational traits. Multiyear programmatic grants are associated with capacity-building, whereas 1-year program grants are associated with cooptation. A simplistic interpretation of elitist theory may underestimate the diversity of motivations among funders and the tremendous administrative costs associated with a rigid supervision of grantees.

- **Tim Bartley (2007).** « **How Foundations Shape Social Movements: The Construction of an Organizational Field and the Rise of Forest Certification** », *Social Problems*, Vol. 54, No. 3, p. 229-255.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2007.54.3.229>

Résumé – *Abstract* :

*Social movement scholars have demonstrated that foundation patronage channels social movements away from radical activities toward moderate goals, but accounts of how this process occurs are underdeveloped. Existing research typically focuses on foundations' differential selection of grant recipients (i.e., "cherry-picking" non-threatening groups) and transformation of particular recipient organizations over time (i.e., professionalizing grassroots groups). Scholars have overlooked ways in which foundations shape social movements by building or restructuring entire organizational fields. Foundation-led "field-building" activities may embed social movement organizations (SMOs) in new contexts and enroll them in new projects, thus channeling protest in subtle ways. This argument is illustrated with the case of forest certification—a form of governance created in the 1990s as a moderate, market-based alternative to disruptive environmental boycotts. Drawing on qualitative and quantitative data, I show how foundations coordinated their grant-making to build a field of forest certification, enrolled social movement organizations in this project, and used the leverage of protest to further their field-building agenda.*

- **Robert J. Brulle (2014). « Institutionalizing delay: foundation funding and the creation of U.S. climate change counter-movement organizations », Springer Link, Volume 122, Issue 4, p 681–694**

Lien Web – *Web link* :

<https://stephenstewart.ca/images/InstitutionalizingDelay.pdf>

Résumé – *Abstract* :

This paper conducts an analysis of the financial resource mobilization of the organizations that make up the climate change counter-movement (CCCM) in the United States. Utilizing IRS data, total annual income is compiled for a sample of CCCM organizations (including advocacy organizations, think tanks, and trade associations). These data are coupled with IRS data on philanthropic foundation funding of these CCCM organizations contained in the Foundation Center's data base. This results in a data sample that contains financial information for the time period 2003 to 2010 on the annual income of 91 CCCM organizations funded by 140 different foundations. An examination of these data shows that these 91 CCCM organizations have an annual income of just over \$900 million, with an annual average of \$64 million in identifiable foundation support. The overwhelming majority of the philanthropic support comes from conservative foundations. Additionally, there is evidence of a trend toward concealing the sources of CCCM funding through the use of donor directed philanthropies.

CONSERVATION DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT SELON LES  
FONDATIONS PHILANTHROPIQUES  
*CONSERVATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACCORDING TO  
PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATIONS*

- **George Holmes (2015).** « **Philanthrocapitalism, biodiversity conservation and development** », dans : Behrooz Morvaridi (ed.), *New philanthropy and social justice. Debating the conceptual and policy discourse*. Policy Press at the University of Bristol, p. 81 – 99.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1t89dwz.10>

Extrait de l'article – *Article excerpt* :

This chapter examines philanthrocapitalism's role in the rise of privately owned nature reserves in southern Chile. In the last two decades such reserves, some totalling more than 300,000 hectares, have emerged as a major land use in Chilean Patagonia. Drawing on 40 interviews with owners and managers of private nature reserves, as well as other actors, this chapter considers how the discourses and practices of these private reserves reflect philanthrocapitalist ideas. Such an empirical analysis has profound implications for debates on the role of philanthropy and the private sector in biodiversity conservation worldwide.

- **Maano Ramutsindela, Marja Spienburg et Harry Wels.** « **Sponsoring nature: environmental philanthropy for conservation** », *Earthscan*, London, 2011, 207 pages.

Compte-rendu du livre par Charlene Watson, de London School of Economics –  
*Book review by Charlene Watson, from London School of Economics* :

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1068/c471wr2>

Résumé – *Abstract* :

Saving the world's flora and fauna, especially high-profile examples such as chimpanzees, whales and the tropical rain forests, is big business. Individuals and companies channel their resources to the preservation of nature through various ways, one of which is the funding of environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs). This book is the first to comprehensively address this issue and focus on a dominant theme in environmental philanthropy, the links between ENGOs and CBOs and their sponsors, especially the private sector.

It has been argued that donor support is based on recipient's perceived expertise and needs, with no favouritism of flagship environmental organizations as recipients of donor funds. A counterview holds that the private sector prefers to fund mainstream ENGOs for environmental research and policy reforms congenial to industrial capital. The authors show that the debate about these arguments, together with the empirical evidence on which they are based, may shed light on certain aspects of the nature of environmental philanthropy. The book evaluates practical examples of environmental philanthropy from Africa and elsewhere against philosophical questions about the material and geographical expressions of philanthropy, and the North-South connections among philanthropists and ENGOs and CBOs.

JUSTICE ENVIRONNEMENTALE ET ACTIVITES

POLITIQUES

ENVIRONMENTAL

JUSTICE AND CLIMATE ADVOCACY

- Deborah McCarthy (2004). « *Environmental Justice Grantmaking: Elites and Activists Collaborate to Transform Philanthropy* », *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 74, No. 2, p. 250–270.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2004.00089.x/abstract>

Résumé – *Abstract* :

The rise of environmental justice activism since the 1980s provides an exceptional opportunity to study the relations between a grassroots movement and philanthropic foundations. I utilize archival documents and interviews with activists and funders to pose two guiding questions. One, to what degree has the environmental justice movement gained access to foundations? Two, to what degree does this movement maintain self-determination in its relations with foundations? This paper shows that the movement successfully

established connections with a few key foundations. I also show how environmental justice grantee organizations maneuvered around some of the foundation- related constraints that might otherwise present very real threats to their self-determination. This analysis builds on, but also goes beyond, the channeling and co-optation literatures that emphasize the potentially negative influence of foundation funding on grantees. It also contributes to the newly developing social relations perspective which conceptualizes social movement philanthropy as a relationship that is mediated by many factors (for instance, the political orientation of the funder and grantee, among others).

- Amy Luers (2012). « Rethinking US climate advocacy », *Springer Link*, Volume 120, Issue 1-2, p. 13-19.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-013-0797-1>

Résumé – *Abstract* :

The US climate movement has failed to create the political support needed to pass significant climate policy. It is time to reassess climate advocacy. To develop a strategy for philanthropy to strengthen climate engagement, I interviewed over 40 climate advocates, more than a dozen representatives from the foundation community, and a dozen academics. My assessment led me to conclude that climate advocates have focused too narrowly on specific policy goals and insufficiently on influencing the larger political landscape. I suggest four ways to improve climate advocacy: 1) Increase focus on medium and longer-term goals; 2) Start with people and not carbon; 3) Focus more on values and less on science; and 4) Evaluate what works and share what we learn. To accomplish these strategies, social scientists and advocates must work together to build a culture of learning. Meanwhile, philanthropy must empower experimentation and incentivize knowledge sharing.

DONATIONS POUR L'ÉDUCATION ENVIRONNEMENTALE  
*GIVING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION*

- Nicole M. Ardoin & Alison W. Bowers (2012). « Trends in Philanthropic Support: Foundation Giving in Environmental Education », *The Journal of Environmental Education*, vol. 43, issue 4, p. 259-273.

Lien Web – *Web link* :

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2012.654830>

Résumé – *Abstract* :

Despite public support, environmental education (EE) is rarely a priority for funders, even those interested in the environment or education. We examined reasons behind the paucity of EE funding, focusing on U.S. foundations, which are one of the largest sources of support for environmental efforts. We analyzed historical giving data and interviewed a dozen funders. Over the 2003 to 2007 period, we found EE funding represented approximately 5% of overall environment funding in the United States. Reasons for the low level of EE support included definitional complexity, uncertainty about efficacy, and inclusion of EE funding within issue-specific grants, such as those focused on climate change.



**PhiLab**

LABORATOIRE MONTRÉALAIS  
DE RECHERCHE SUR LA  
PHILANTHROPIE CANADIENNE

Produit par David Grant-Poitras  
Candidat à la Maitrise en Sociologie  
UQAM

---

Faites-nous parvenir vos références sur le thème « Philanthropie et environnement ». Écrivez-nous au [philab@uqam.ca](mailto:philab@uqam.ca) et il nous fera grand plaisir de les ajouter au bulletin. De plus, vous pouvez nous suivre via notre site internet [www.philab.uqam.ca](http://www.philab.uqam.ca), sur Twitter [@PhiLabMTL](https://twitter.com/PhiLabMTL) ou même en vous abonnant à notre Infolettre.

On vous revoit le mois prochain !

*Send us your references on Environmental Philanthropy. Write us to [philab@uqam.ca](mailto:philab@uqam.ca) and we will be pleased to add them to the monthly. Moreover, you may follow us by our Web site [www.philab.uqam.ca](http://www.philab.uqam.ca), on Twitter [@PhiLabMTL](https://twitter.com/PhiLabMTL) or even in subscribing to our Newsletter.*

*See you next month !*