



Nothing about us without us: innovating grantmaking processes with participatory methodology

Tyler Dale Hauger*

Department of Sociology and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

(Received 25 February 2021; final version received 7 March 2022)

This paper aims to advance the state of knowledge related to innovation and philanthropy, by exploring the emerging field of ‘participatory grantmaking’ (PGM) through the lens of innovation literature. While there are increasing amounts of European and global grantmakers utilizing more participatory methodologies in their grantmaking as a means to move power and increase the collective ability to create social good, there is yet to be any literature specifically exploring the links between these two fields. This conceptual paper, therefore, uses a broad reading of innovation literature to argue that it is most fruitful to consider PGM as innovation within four modalities: as a form of social innovation, process innovation, both radical and incremental innovation, and user-driven innovation. The paper ultimately finds that user-driven innovation (and in particular co-creation / co-production as a strategy to user-driven innovation) may provide the best examples of theory and practical relevance for those utilizing PGM as a means to democratize philanthropy in Europe and beyond.

Keywords: participatory grantmaking; philanthropy; innovation; social innovation; user-driven innovation; participation; co-production

1. Introduction

In September 2016, Eni Lestari (Indonesian domestic worker and chairperson of the International Migrants Alliance) became the first migrant from a grassroots movement to address the UN General Assembly. In her historic speech to government leaders who were on the cusp of setting global migration policy, she boldly declared a sentiment that was first used by disability rights groups in South Africa and is now used by marginalized groups across the globe: *do not talk about us without us* (UN NGLS, 2016). Those whose futures are decided upon must be in rooms of power and be part of the conversation if we are to make lasting, deep social change.

While grantmaking foundations in Europe and around the globe may not have the same form of power as government bodies or multilateral institutions, it is hard not to recognize the importance of Lestari’s challenge of ‘nothing about us without us’ in the field of philanthropy as well. Grantmakers most often utilize grantmaking processes

*Present address: Karibu Foundation, Stavangergata 35, Oslo 0467, Norway.
Email: tylerhauger@gmail.com, tyler@karibu.no

where decisions about applications, grants, and the futures of grantees happen behind closed doors where the grantees themselves have little to no agency in the decision-making process. For grantmakers working specially to challenge long standing economic and social injustices, one can wonder if such closed-door practices actually risk reinforcing unjust power relations that already inherently exist in a relationship where one party has economic resources while the other party is seeking it.

This paper investigates these tensions by exploring one set of ways that grantmakers are innovating their grantmaking processes with an aim to challenge and transform power dynamics that inherently exist in the process itself. In particular, this paper will be exploring the emerging phenomenon of ‘participatory grantmaking’ (PGM), where *grantmakers* involve *non-grantmakers* in funding decision processes.

1.1. *Focus of paper, structure, and brief overview of methodology*

For most grantmakers who employ more traditional grantmaking processes, PGM can be perceived as quite innovative. As PGM becomes more recognized and utilized within the field, however, the use of the term ‘innovation’ is often used without deeper analysis or conceptual clarity. Simultaneously, research within the field of innovation has yet to draw from the rich experiences of grantmakers who are already daring to innovate traditional grantmaking processes through participatory methodologies. Literature that *actually* examines the PGM specifically through the lens of innovation research has yet to be produced.

This conceptual paper, therefore, aims to synthesize two areas of study (namely innovation and participatory grantmaking) in order to begin identifying some concrete theoretical links between the two. The paper specifically explores the overarching question of *how we can understand what is happening in philanthropy related to PGM as a form of innovation*.

In order to address this question, this paper focuses specifically on two research objectives:

- (1) to explore the landscape of PGM in light of the literature on innovation
- (2) to conceptualize PGM as modalities of innovation that have the most potential for future exploration

Structurally, the paper begins by painting a broad picture of the phenomenon of ‘participatory grantmaking’ that is currently emerging within philanthropy by using empirical illustrations from the field. While the paper does not claim to be an empirical piece, I do provide illustrations from the landscape of PGM and experiences of grantmakers who are innovating their grantmaking processes. The paper, therefore, makes use of three of the most frequently referenced publications on PGM that are used by researchers and practitioners alike as a source of wider trends from the ground. The paper also incorporates an in-depth interview with the then-convener of the world’s largest global network of PGM practitioners as a means of triangulation. Further information on the choice of this data will be presented in Section 3.

Based on an interpretation of what is occurring on the ground related to PGM, the paper then draws in a broad reading of the literature on innovation as a heuristic tool of analysis. I identify some of the most relevant studies within various groups of innovation as a means of conceptualizing PGM as a form of innovation. The paper ultimately argues that PGM can best be considered innovation within the framework of

four specific modalities of innovation: as a form of social innovation, as a form of process innovation, as a form of both radical and incremental innovation, and as a form of user-led innovation (especially through a strategy of co-production or co-creation).

I conclude the paper with a discussion of some of the implications (for both scholars and practitioners) of understanding PGM within these four modalities of innovation. This paper thus aims to advance the state of knowledge on these fields by identifying connections, illustrating how relevant theory from a range of disciplines can inform practice, and by contributing to conceptual integration across multiple theoretical perspectives.

2. The state of the research

This paper can primarily be understood as contribution to the academic field of innovation research. It is nevertheless important to acknowledge the intersection of this paper with the state of the research in several other relevant fields – including (but not exclusively) research related to participation, participatory grantmaking, and co-production/co-creation.

It would be remiss to explore the emerging phenomena of PGM without recognizing its roots in the theoretical and practical experience in the field of ‘participation’ – especially since participation is experienced in most of the theoretical concepts described in this paper. The idea of participatory practices and public engagement is hardly new, with participatory development literature dating back to at least the 1970s. Brazilian activist Paulo Freire (1970) provided one of the clearest expressions of the participatory ethos that continues to influence a number of fields, while more recent scholars such as Reason and Bradbury (2008) have paved the way for larger work of analysis through the lens of participatory action research. Arnstein (1969) developed a typology and ‘ladder of participation’ that ranges from manipulation to citizen control (a typology that is often cited, adapted, and utilized by practitioners of PGM). The literature on participation is extensive, and is often cross-disciplinary its focus.

Research on PGM itself is also growing and is recognized in several fields. There are a number of case studies that have looked at PGM within a number of geographic (e.g. McNamara, Cumming, and Pulis 2018; Meyer et al. 2021), large research studies that have begun to outline the landscape of participatory practices in foundations (Husted, Finchum-Mason, and Suárez 2021), and non-academic works with detailed, narrative accounts on the history and practice of participatory funding (Wrobel and Massey 2021). There is also a growing number of practitioner tools and resources aimed at helping grantmakers consider questions of participation (e.g. via Grantcraft, the Stanford Social Innovation Review, and Non-Profit Quarterly). While there have been a few studies that look at the internal innovation potential of philanthropy (e.g. Fulton, Blau, and Kasper 2005; Brown 2019; Gouwenberg et al. 2016; Bahr 2019), most research on innovation and philanthropy has been externally oriented (e.g. philanthropy’s financial investment toward the innovation of others).

The question of participation has also emerged more clearly in the literature on humanitarian innovation. Betts and Bloom (2014), for example, developed an outline for how and why the humanitarian sector has innovated, with stakeholders being key actors in the process. Much of this literature has been focused on the inclusion of the rights of those most affected to be involved, yet it has not extended into institutionalized, philanthropic grantmaking bodies. There is also an increasing amount of literature related to social impact investment (e.g. Bugg-Levine and Emerson 2011), yet perspectives on participation are still lacking in this field.

This paper arguably also has clear theoretic parallels to the growing research on co-creation/co-production. Brandsen, Steen, and Verschuere (2018) describe this field as a ‘joint effort of citizens and public sector professions in the initiation, planning, design, and implementation’ of public services (2018, 2). The field was first introduced in the context of active involvement of service recipients in the service delivery process by among others Ostrom et al. (1973), yet there is a renewed focus on the field by researchers in public administration and not least those researchers looking at the scope of co-production within voluntary organizations (Benjamin and Brudney 2018). Here the concrete focus of the field is related to how service users actively participate in the design and implementation of services that affect them. The apparent links with this field, innovation, and PGM will be further explored later in this paper.

In summary, this paper can be understood as building on, filling lunacies, and not least contributing to conceptual connections across various disciplines.

3. Participatory grantmaking in practice

This section paints a broad picture of the field of PGM and brings forward empirical illustrations from three comprehensive reports that have been developed in recent years. These publications specifically present the range and depth of PGM models that are being used by grantmakers, and are often referenced by both practitioners and researchers alike.

The first publication is ‘Deciding Together: Shifting Power and Resources Through Participatory Grantmaking’ (2018) by Cynthia Gibson and edited by Jen Bokoff. The report was commissioned by Grantcraft, a service of Foundation Center. The second is ‘Participatory Grantmaking: Has Its Time Come’ (2017) by Cynthia Gibson, which was commissioned by the Ford Foundation. These reports were created with input from over 40 participatory grantmakers, and even more individual practitioners in the field. The publications explore challenges, lessons learned, and best practices for engaging in inclusive grantmaking. They also include a number of models that can assist grantmakers in trying some of the innovative PGM strategies. These reports are frequently cited as an important guide to understanding the mechanics of PGM, and as guides to assisting those who want to attempt some of the strategies into their own work.

The third report is ‘Participatory Philanthropy’ (2015) by Lani Evans. This report was written as part of the author’s *Winston Churchill Fellowship*. The author traveled and met with a wide range of thinkers, radical philanthropists and participatory practitioners, primarily in the United Kingdom and North America. The report lifts up case studies from grantmakers who have instigated PGM processes into their working structures, with detailed overviews of various models of participation that have been implemented by grantmakers – and the publication provides one of the first typologies of models in practice.

The second area of data was a personal interview with the then-convener of the ‘PGM Community of Practice’, Hannah Paterson, which was conducted in December 2020. The PGM Community of Practice was established in March 2020 as a space for practitioners to share their work, ideas and hopes for the future of PGM and now is the world’s largest network of practitioners of PGM. As of time of publishing, there were over 800 members from all over the world – including Europe, Australia, Singapore, USA and Africa – involved in the community of practice. This interview (along with a number of supplementary articles and blog posts that are available in Philanthropic circles) primarily aimed to triangulate the empirical evidence provided by the reports. All citations of Paterson in this text have been included with consent.

The choice of these sources cannot be understood as exhaustive and does have its limitations. With an emerging focus on PGM in literature across several fields (as noted in the literature review), there is large amount of empirical evidence on PGM that could be of interest and may supplement this data. Additionally, it must also be acknowledged that the publications are primary lifting up examples from practitioners that come from the standpoint and motivation that shifting philanthropy towards PGM is inherently a positive value. The publications also describe themselves as entry points for grantmakers who are exploring new ways to make their work more participatory. In this sense, the data may be overweighted towards the positive benefits of PGM. Yet, the primary strength of using these publications is that they serve as some of the most cited and utilized documents related to the practice of PGM within the field of philanthropy today. They are often utilized as both a blueprint and springboard for other grantmakers as the field of PGM expands, and thus provide a solid basis for demonstrating the broad landscape and common understandings of PGM within philanthropy today.

3.1. PGM: an ethos of ‘nothing about us without us’

While there is not one single definition of PGM, Gibson defines PGM as ‘ceding decision-making power about funding – including the strategy and criteria behind those decisions – to the very communities that funders aim to serve’ (2018, 7). What stands implicit in this definition is the idea PGM is anchored in a belief that turning over decision-making power to the grantees themselves in the grantmaking process is *the right thing to do*. It is a value-based decision, that emphasizes shifting of power in the relationship between parties. Advocates of PGM argue that such practices are a lever for democratizing philanthropy, and that PGM processes themselves generates outcomes such as changes in participants’ agency, power, and leadership.

Gibson, Evans, and Paterson all point to the slogan of the disability-rights movement of ‘Nothing about us without us’. Here, the idea is an attitude that the people who are being most affected by decisions have a right to make those decisions. In all three of the reports, the rights-based ‘ethos’ was a central element to the work of many who had moved towards more participatory models. This ethos includes values of transparency, collaboration, and involving people directly affected by where funding is allocated in those decisions.

Evans develops this further, noting that heart of the matter is indeed power relations. She writes:

Participatory practices also alter the power dynamics in the relationships. If we decide together, then as a funder, I’m not doing **to** you anymore, I’m doing **with** you. Ideally this shift helps to redress the power imbalance that exists between giver and receiver, and leads to a more robust and reciprocal relationship. Grant recipients are able to show weaknesses and discuss challenges, rather than presenting only the fundable lens. (2015, 6)

As Evans observes, participatory philanthropy emerged from grassroots activism that assumes that ‘better decisions will be made because of the knowledge and information contributed by communities and end-users’ (2015, 5). The solutions to real-world problems can best be solved by those that live those experiences. Gibson also notes that the shift to more participatory practices is also based on the assumption that the challenges people are facing globally are too complex for just one solution from one group; there is a need for collaborate approaches that are built on trust on collaboration (2018, 21).

For many of the donors that have started implementing PGMs, a solid basis in this ethos is one of the first steps to begin implementing PGM models. Gibson offers the

following example from a respondent, that ‘if you are on board with the idea that the people who are closest to issues probably have some good ideas about how to solve them – you’re probably on your way to incorporating a participatory ethos’ (2018, 51).

3.2. Models of participation (the role of the grantees)

Gibson, Evans, and Paterson all note that there are various models and degrees of how far one can go when it comes to participatory practices within an organization’s grant giving structures. In their overview of various organizations who have already implemented PGM into their work, they all found that there is no ‘one size fits all’ model.

Building on the work of Arnstein (1969) and her ‘ladder of participation’, Gibson (2017) develops a model that she calls a ‘Framework for Participatory Grantmaking’, which helps frame the various ways of understanding the relationship between grantmaker and grantee. The four categories she details are: (a) informing (grantmakers tell non-grantmakers receive), (b) consulting (grant-makers receive, non-grantmakers tell), (c) involving (two-way communication that allows both parties to hear, understand, and discuss a variety of perspectives, and d.) deciding (two-way communication that leads to joint decision making). Gibson develops this further by describing how this is being done in practice, with a number of case studies and examples (Figure 1).

Evans – developing one of the first typologies for participatory philanthropy – details several ‘models in practice’ that are already institutionalized by grantmakers globally. The categories that she utilizes includes (among others):

- REPRESENTATIVE PARTICIPATION: bringing in practitioners, sector experts, or individuals with lived experience to add depth and knowledge to discussions or decisions. Often leans on one person ‘representing’ larger groups (2015, 8);
- ROLLING COLLECTIVES: engages grant recipients in the process of both giving and receiving funding. Grant recipients get the opportunity to become allocation committee member during or after their time as grantees (2015, 11);

Participatory Grantmaking: Draft Overall Framework



Figure 1. Participatory grantmaking: draft overall framework (Gibson 2018).

- **CLOSED COLLECTIVES:** often used when funds are distributed to a particular community of interest in a particular geographic area. All organizations working in a space come together to discuss trends, opportunities, and gaps and decide best how to use funds (2015, 13).
- **OPEN COLLECTIVES:** all interested parties participate in decision making. Often used in situations with large technological capacities or where this is an important value (for example, in the case of the Wikimedia Foundation which is based in open-source efforts); (2015, 15)
- **DIRECT TRANSFERS:** model where the organizational middleman is not in the picture at all; funds are directly transferred into individuals with lived experience, allowing them to decide where donations effecting their lives will be spent. Often unconditional funding where puts emphasis on efficacy and self-determination (2015, 17).

Paterson notes that are a number of additional models that have now been developed, that are not covered in these reports (Paterson, 2020 personal interview). These models are quickly developing, and different hybrid models are being born and tested.

The degree that these models are ‘new’ for grantmakers are quite relative, and there are large debates in the field about the extent of what is actually participation vs. symbolic lip service. Gibson notes this tension:

For some grantmakers, inviting grantee feedback is a huge step forward in opening up a process that has traditionally been shrouded in secrecy. It is also a good way to start the participatory process in more traditional institutions, which may not be ready—structurally or attitudinally—to dive into participatory grantmaking. Others, however, believe that if non-grantmakers are asked for feed-back but are left out of decision-making processes that may (or may not) incorporate that feedback, their participation could be seen as little more than window dressing. (2017, 19)

3.3. Steps towards implementation

When it comes to implementing new participatory practices, all three sources note that *incremental* steps may be the key to success. Gibson (2018) spoke with a number of funders who had already begun to implement PGM, and she argues that change can be a massive undertaking. A number of funders have therefore found that taking small steps of incorporating participatory mythologies into their activities is a necessary route to implementing such innovative processes as it lays important groundwork. Some of the funders who have successfully implemented PGM practices have started with just one or two portfolios or program areas, others started with start-up capital to try with ‘R&D’ investments, and others started with bringing in just a few grantmakers together with grantees help inform on the decision making and strategies of the organization (2018, 53). Several foundations found that a continual testing and tweaking of the new process was completely necessarily, noting that the aim of the process was to continually get better at what they were doing.

Evans (2015, 22) also suggests that even incremental changes can ultimately have a big impact. In her concluding remarks, she challenges every funder to use 10% of their allocated funds and put them into some form of participatory practice model over a short period of time with a theory that it could significantly move Philanthropy as a whole.

Gibson (2017, 39) notes that one place to start could be to begin with a pilot project, where a grantmaker convenes a group of practitioners, nonprofit representatives (both

grantees and non-grantees), people with experience with participatory approaches in order fields, and others that could be advisors to the program. Here one could discuss more broadly what a participatory practice could look like in a specific organization.

Paterson notes, however, that there is a clear distinction between implementation for traditional donors trying to ‘pivot’ to PGM models vs. those that are built from scratch to be participatory funds (Paterson, 2020 personal interview). The implementation processes between these two groups are quite different, and experience has shown that those that are trying to pivot to PGM within their own current structures may experience additional challenges than those that are establishing PGM structures from the ground up.

3.4. Institutional hurdles

The data suggests that there are a number of institutional challenges that can arise in the process of implementation. Gibson, for example, notes that the structures of the organization itself can cause challenges. Moving to more participatory models may be harder for more structured, hierarchical organizations.

Embedding a more participatory ethos into any organization is hard, but its particularly challenging for institutions with more bureaucratic, siloed structures. Participatory grantmaking rests on collaboration, rather than hierarch and rigid departmental and job responsibility distinctions, and streamlines and transparent processes, rather than closed-off bureaucracies. (2018, 49)

Larger or more traditional funders, that may be entrenched in previous ways of doing things, may struggle. Conversely, the size of an organization might have implications on whether one can actually implement such practices. Evans notes that capacity is a concern, as time commitments and depths of relationships with funded group makes it difficult for smaller funders (2015, 7). Gibson’s findings point to a similar note: that it may be challenging for very small funders with little staff resources to undertake large participatory processes. Her findings show that smaller organizations must be realistic of what they can accomplish, and that they should begin with more incremental steps rather than radical changes.

Another challenge is the fact that implementing PGM has larger effects on the structures of the funder. Gibson reports of the experiences of one foundation, where moving to change the practices of one participatory process ultimately had effects on many other processes within the organization. ‘It starts affecting everything you do, as well as how you think about your activities and structure’ (2018, 51). Changing the processes had impact on the relationships and expectations of grantees, and it was difficult to move back to the ‘way things were before’ as it might signal that the trust with grantees was not deserved.

Evans notes that one of the largest obstacles to implementing PGM practices may be something not so visible: The attitudes of the grantmakers themselves. Not all funders are willing to give over power to the communities they are funding, to trust fully that the communities can handle the grantmaking decisions, to take on new risks, or to let go of the ways that it has been done before (2015, 7). This also appears to relate to other implicit hurdles that Gibson raises in the collaborative process. If donors don’t actually act on what they hear from the participants, for example, they quickly lose credibility and trust with the participants. In this sense, establishing new ways of doing things can be at odds with trying to otherwise continue with business as usual:

Acknowledging what participants have to say thought direct action is a critical part of ceding power and empowering participants to feel heard. Involving participants and then carrying on

with business as usual does nothing to shift who has the power and disregards community knowledge. (2018, 54)

Evaluation and measuring the impact of the implementation of PGM can be another hurdle: did implementation of these new processes actually have any notable effect, and if so – what was it? Here Gibson, Evans, and Paterson all point to a number of resources that are being developed to help gauge the impact and evaluation of innovative processes related to PGM. Gibson admits, however, that there is so far little research that shows that participatory grantmaking *actually* leads to the positive outcomes it sets to do (2018, 30). One needs to primarily look at research related to participatory models outside of Philanthropy to see concrete data on the positive impacts of participatory practice. Paterson believes that a major reason for the lack of evaluation is that organizations don't have the time or capacities to actually follow up on proper evaluation when they are trying to run new programs simultaneously (Paterson, 2020 personal interview).

There are a number of other hurdles that are articulated, among others getting all leadership in the grantmakers' structures onboard, decision-makers not willing to give up power, conflicts of interest and power dynamics within grantee participants, challenges of representativeness, challenges of geographical or thematic distance between grantees involved vs. close geographic or thematic convergence, security concerns, issues of differing visions and needs amongst grantmaker and grantee, and many more.

4. PGM as a form of innovation: 4 modalities

Given this broad landscape, how can we understand PGM as a form of innovation? Innovation, by most definitions, is inherently a process of making something useful out of an idea. It is not the idea itself that is the key; but it is the *process* of moving an idea into something *useable/useful* with the goal of ultimately creating value or having effect. It is a creative, collaborative activity with many actors; and it often understood as a 'collective achievement' (Aasen and Amundsen 2011 – own translation). The field of innovation research itself is often categorized into various classifications with distinct lenses and research domains, and there is thus a need for conceptual clarity when using 'innovation' to describe PGM.

This section develops my argument that PGM can be considered a form of innovation within philanthropy, by identifying several key modalities of innovation that I argue have particular relevance. In particular, I reason that the most fruitful way for scholars to consider PGM as innovation is within the following modalities: social innovation, process innovation, radical and incremental innovation (degrees of novelty), and user-led innovation. Although these modalities have their distinct features, they also overlap at times and may even reinforce each other. As a heuristics tool, however, they provide beneficial insights into concrete areas of analysis and potential for further exploration.

4.1. Modality I: social innovation

Most research around innovation has historically been related to the business sector, yet there is an emerging academic field related to the concept of *social innovation* with some convergence on a few of its key characteristics. Poll and Ville (2009, 881) suggest that

an innovation is termed a *social* innovation if the implied new idea has the potential to improve either the quality or the quantity of life ... innovations conducive to better education, better environmental quality and longer life expectancy [being] a few.

Here, the idea is that social innovation is innovation that has potential to address intractable social issues.

Most scholars argue that there is a distinct difference between conventional commercial innovation and social innovation, specifically related to the *aim* of the process. The aim of social innovation is generally understood as creating social change and value, rather than commercial innovation or financial value. While conventional commercial innovation may lead to economic growth or social value, social benefits are not its explicit goal. As Phills, Deiglmeier, and Miller (2008) note, social innovation is a novel solution to a social problem ‘that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals’. The ‘value’ or ‘effect’ that is created or amplified (or the ‘result of an innovation process’, as Torild Oddane specifies when clarifying innovation terms) is *social change* or *social good* to some degree or another (2017, 73).

In outlying their ‘social connectedness theory’ of social innovation, Mulgan et al. (2007) note that social innovation also has a very clear distinction from its broader counterpart: social innovation is not found in the *results* of the innovation process – but it is also in the transformed relationships in the *process* itself:

Social innovations, unlike most technological ones, leave behind compelling new social relationships between previously separate individuals and groups. These matter greatly to the people involved, contribute to the diffusion and embedding of the innovation, and fuel a cumulative dynamic whereby each innovation opens up the possibility of further innovations (as the organisation or group further differentiates itself from itself and becomes more confident about its capacity to exercise power). (2007, 35)

Mulgan et al.’s understanding places emphasis that especially within collaborative social innovation, the new relationships built are catalyst for continue innovation and social change. In this way, democratic values are created and relevant problem areas are understood in a different way than when people with a professional knowledge of the problem design the solutions alone.

It is important to acknowledge that the literature generally recognizes that social innovation doesn’t necessarily need to be seen as so distinct (or removed) from the literature on other innovation processes. Authors such as Mulgan et al. (2007), West and Farr (1990), and Oddane and Wathne (2017) all note that when it comes to factors that stimulate and encourage social innovation, there are many similarities with those that promote innovation in the private sector, including: innovation-supporting leaders; specific sources of finance; empowered, incentivized and well-trained innovative individuals; and more.

Yet, the motives for innovation and the judgement of ‘success’ of social innovation is bound to be very different than that within the profit-orientated innovation paradigm. As Howaldt and Schwarz (2010, 22) note, social innovations ‘are oriented toward social practice and require reflection on the social relationship structure’. They often require another set of theories, lenses, and exploratory mechanisms that innovation perspectives that are focused solely on technology and the economy cannot fully address (Howaldt and Schwarz 2010, 66).

When we look at the empirical data on the landscape of PGM through the lens of this literature, it is evident that PGM finds its home in research related to social innovation – both in terms of aims and methodologies. PGM aims to cede and shift power to the grantees themselves during the process of making grants, emphasizing clearly the creation or strengthening of social values rather than commercial value. The literature on PGM points to less measurable values such as collaboration, agency, transparency, justice, and equity.

This is also amplified within the ethos that ‘nothing about us without us’ is *the right thing to do*, even if it comes with commercial or institutional costs.

This parallels the literature’s general consensus that social innovations (and the end results of the innovation process) are aimed at creating social good. The goal of the innovation process itself for grantmakers who have implemented PGM was to address the ‘wicked problem’ of social and economic injustice or imbalance between the parties involved in the grantmaking process.

Advocates of PGM maintain that active and genuine participation from grantees themselves will create new social, collaborate relationships to solve big problems. This is reinforced by both Gibson and Evan’s points that PGM is based on the assumption that complex social problems require *collaborate approaches* and trust with many sets of stakeholders. Here there are also parallels to Mulgan (2012) analysis that social innovation can be seen when social value is created in both *ends* and *means*.

4.2. Modality 2: process innovation

One form of typology that is often used for understanding various research on innovation is centered around four dimensions of the ‘innovation space’. The model is used to clarify various types of innovation and to help explore how comprehensive innovation is, and it can also be used as a tool to identify where there is unexplored space for innovation opportunities. One of these dimensions is ‘Process Innovation’, or *changes in the ways that products or services are created or delivered* within an organization. More concretely, this can be understood as the ‘implementation of new or significantly improved production or delivery methods’ (OECD 2005, 9). This includes significant changes in among other things techniques, equipment and/or software.

There are some notable characteristics of process innovation; three of which I will mention here. First, process innovations are deeply entrenched in internal operations of an organization – often having wider ramifications on the organization as a whole. As Sjödin (2019) points out, ‘a principal challenge in process innovation centres on its systemic nature, meaning that change in one part of the production system will affect several other sub-systems and processes’. When you change a process in how a service is delivered, it often requires broader changes in an organization even when the changes appear on the surface to be contained to one area.

Secondly (and interrelatedly), process innovation – and innovation as a whole – often requires what is referred to as an ‘ambidextrous’ ability of an organization. It requires organizations that can both continue with business as usual while also being able to attempt new things. While citing Christiansen (1997), Aasen and Amundsen (2011) argue that established organizations may have particular challenges with being able to continue with existing processes while *also* creating / utilizing new processes at the same time. If one wants to try something radically different than before, organizations may need to think of some hybrid organizational form with separate units to try the new and run the old. Related to this, there is also the challenge of ‘routines’ of an organization. Tidd and Bessant (2018, 70) point to idea of routines (the pattern of ‘how we do things here’) as being both a strength and obstacle for managing innovation. They note that certain routines (especially for older organizations) can become a barrier to thinking different. The routines of an organization represent ingrained patterns about how things are operated, and some actors can become too committed to the old ways and can’t change. Innovation requires the building of new routines, while also having the ability to recognize when and how to destroy old routines.

A third characteristic or challenge of process innovation is measuring the impact of the changes. As Kendall and Knapp (2000) point out, the impact of product goods or technologies can be measured by their intermediate or final outputs/outcomes. Process innovation is more reliant on *subjective* impressions of impact. The impact would vary on the various perspectives and experiences of each stakeholder, and the changes would be relative to that status of where the organization was at a previous point.

When looking at the data and broad experiences of implementing PGM, it is evident that PGM is primarily a case of process innovation (changes in the ways that products or services are created or delivered within an organization). Advocates and practitioners of PGM argue that there is indeed a larger shift in the way the organization operates when it changes its grantmaking processes, echoing the argument of Sjödin (2019) that changes in how a service is delivered often requires broader changes in an organization. Gibson found that some of her respondents noted that changing the processes of grantmaking so drastically made it difficult to move back to the 'way things were before'. This could also be related to new major changes lined to budgets, staffing, new programmatic structures, new technological needs, needs for competencies in a staff, new challenges related to the inter-personal between staff and grantees (and between grantees with each other), unexpected conflicts of interest, and more.

The implementation of PGM also appears to require a great deal of 'ambidexterity' for a grantmaker. This was a point that also came up several times in the data. As Gibson found, it that is may be challenging for very small funds with little staff resources to undertake large participatory processes. Simultaneously, innovation literature argues that it may be difficult for established organizations to continue with existing processes while *also* creating / utilizing new processes simultaneously. It may be difficult to break away from the ways of doing things before. Here, the literature on PGM point to the same types of hurdles that other forms of process innovation experience: among other things that large, older, hierarchical grantmakers may find it more challenging to implement major process innovations related to PGM.

4.3. Modality 3: radical and incremental innovation (degrees of novelty)

Nearly all of the innovation theorists agree that innovation happens in various degrees of novelty (and that novelty is a criterion for whether something can be considered an innovation). The literature often builds upon a continuum of incremental to radical change, which can serve as model to look at conceivable changes to the current way of doing things.

Incremental innovation, on one hand, can be described as enhancement or upgrade of an already existing product, service, process, organization or method. It focuses more on improving upon things that are already being done. The literature often notes that this is understood to be related to 'doing what we already do, but better'. Incremental innovations are 'the nuts-and-bolts kind of innovation – the modification, refinement, simplification, consolidation, and enhancement' of existing ways of doing things (Gaynor 2002, 24). On the other hand, one finds more 'radical' forms of change. As Oddane notes, 'radical innovation involves the introduction of a new concept departing significantly from past practice. The more an innovation deviates from an existing alternative, the more radical it is' (2008, 35). Authors like Utterback (1994) note that radical innovation is that which creates something new, which transforms or destroys the old way of doing things. The introduction of such an innovation often brings along remarkably more extensive organizational changes to many areas of an organization. Another difference between

these two terms could be that incremental innovation relates to innovating the routines that often lead to predictable change (as a logical extension of existing knowledge), while radical innovation is competence-destroying (requiring the organization to process completely new kinds of information) with a high amount of uncertainty (Henderson 1993).

While Oddane (2008) argues that the incremental-radical continuum requires a number of subjective judgments, and that it is not possible to articulate objective criteria for identifying innovations as radical in particular, she did map out some of the commonly used criteria for the theoretical typology. Here she outlined the theoretical continuum based on criteria of risks, timeframes, goals, organizational properties, and potential results of radical and incremental innovation in a number of cases. She generally found that the distinction between incremental vs. radical innovation could be understood within the dichotomy of: short term vs. long-term, common vs. not so common, and low vs. high risk. While these categories help to differentiate some of the commonly cited criteria, Oddane argues that differentiation of radical from incremental innovation is subject to great ambiguity. It is based on an assumption that innovations may be divided into neat dichotomies, and this is likely not the case in real life.

What becomes evident when reading the broad landscape of PGM, however, is that it is an oversimplification to try to directly apply a 'radical' vs. 'incremental' dichotomy when it comes to PGM as innovation. Moreover, it might require incremental steps in order to create radical change.

When looking at its basic goal, PGM aims to be very radical for both the Philanthropic sector but also for grantmakers themselves. Gibson even goes so far to say that PGM is 'a lever for disrupting and democratizing philanthropy' (2018, 7). For many grantmakers, moving towards more participatory practices may change entirely the organization's way of doing things – and it requires a whole new set of competencies that the grantmakers may not have had from before. It also comes with risks – both in terms of impact, but also in terms of the need for new capacities in grantmaker and grantee alike.

Simultaneously, the data seems to suggest that incremental steps towards radical innovation may be key to success. Gibson argues that change can be a massive undertaking – and small steps may be the necessary route to implementing such innovation processes. She found that a number of grantmakers incorporated small amounts of participatory steps into their work. Evans noted similar points, and even went so far to challenge every grantmaker to make incremental changes in order to move towards radical change in the industry.

Another challenge with trying to apply a strict 'incremental' vs. 'radical' innovation dichotomy to PGM is that the 'radicalness' of the changes also depends on where the grantmaker is today. It is a rather subjective categorization that needs to be looked at from case to case. While one grantmaker could see one category of Gibson's 'Framework for Participatory Grantmaking' to be quite elementary and already in practice, another could find changes or participation of grantees to be quite radically new. For many grantmakers, the 'ethos' of PGM could be quite foreign – while for others, the ethos could already be well established in the organization and staff's culture.

Through this perspective, the literature on PGM seems to confirm Oddane's argument that it is not possible to divide these innovations into neat dichotomies for separating incremental vs. radical innovation, without looking more closely at a case-by-case basis of grantmakers. These categories need to be understood in nuanced ways, as the 'differentiation of radical from incremental innovation is subject to great ambiguity' (2008, iv). Even if one wants to take incremental steps into PGM (as suggested in the literature) – one

still needs to consider the more radical implications if it is an entirely new way of doing things. In this sense, it would be more useful to consider the specifics of each case to look at technical uncertainty, the challenges of time, energy, and focus to PGM taking away human resources from regular operation of the grantmaker, the long-term vs. short-term effects of such processes, and a consideration of the risks associated with the change. Nevertheless, one sees clear evidence of both radical and incremental innovation related to PGM.

4.4. *Modality 4: user-driven innovation*

When looking at the drivers and strategies of innovation, the literature often explores ‘user’ or ‘customer’-driven innovation. The terms are based in a supplier-centric perspective and functional relationship where there are ‘producers’ and ‘users’ of new products or services.

The idea of ‘user-driven innovation’ (UDI) is based on Eric von Hippel’s (1988) work, which was inspired by Everett Rogers’ seminal work ‘Diffusion of innovation’ (1962). Von Hippel acknowledges that *recipients* of a product or services often have the best solutions for modifications or even completely new products (2005). Here the emphasis is that users-led processes will often lead to greater possibilities compared to more traditional, internal and producer-led development systems for innovation. While scholars have begun to see a dramatic shift towards more open, democratized, forms of innovation, research on UDI remains in its early stages. Scholars such as Alam (2006), however, have found that service users are the most significant source of innovation and change in service delivery. Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2000) find that end-user most dramatically contribute to creating new value and changing the system.

There is a general consensus in the field that almost all innovation demands some form of collaborative arrangement, and that user-led innovation can be a critical collaborative element needed for the development and adoption of complex processes. In this sense, researchers in UDI do not claim that end-users are the sole source of innovation (especially given that breadth and depth of the users’ contributions in the innovation process vary greatly). Nevertheless, there is an emerging consensus in the field that the strategic orientation towards the user may be a precursor of the implementation of UDI methodologies (Tacer and Ruzzier 2015). The literature is also clear that UDI is inherently interdisciplinary, given the dynamic and interdisciplinary problem-solving processes that are demanded.

When looking back to the empirical evidence on PGM, there is immediate relevance within this modality of innovation. PGM is at its core about innovating grantmaking process to ensure that ‘users’ / grantees are the drivers of the process itself. The grantees have expertise and experiences that the grantmaker does not have. Users are often jointly included (or even co-creators) in the process in order to bring forth new possibilities that one wouldn’t find in more traditional, internal, and producer-led systems for innovation. In many cases, the traditional roles of “producer” and “user” are thereby broken down in order to build more equitable relations in the grantmaking process. And above all, the ‘ethos’ of PGM is to have a clear strategic orientation towards the end users (grantees). While the terminology of using ‘end user’ can easily be seen as politically/historically problematic in the field of social- and economic justice grantmaking, the typology of ‘users’ being those that receive the benefit of the service does have practical applicability to PGM.

A primary limitation of explaining PGM in its narrowest understanding of UDI without further development is the risk of underestimating the importance of drivers

of / barriers to innovation that are found in the *grantmakers* themselves (something that Gibson, Evans, and Patterson all note are important catalysts for PGM to actually occur). It also risks undervaluing the value of collaborative, dynamic *relationship* between grantmakers and grantees while innovating the grantmaking processes. One most acknowledge the broader, inter-disciplinary ramifications (as also indicated by scholars of UDI) of placing PGM in this modality.

For this reason, I believe it is helpful to incorporate a wider, interdisciplinary lens by understanding PGM as a form of UDI *that specifically utilizes 'co-production' or 'co-creation' as a strategy*. As noted in the literature review, Brandsen, Steen, and Verschuere (2018) note that the research field of co-production and co-creation is interested in looking at how service users actively participate in the co-production and co-creation of the services that affect them. These two inter-related (but also distinct) strategies can be understood as the service provider and the service receiver coming together to create a new service or process that has significant (new) social value. Solutions are often developed *together* with stakeholders instead of *to* them, and end-users become a clear source and focus of innovation. In this sense, research on co-creation and co-production often looks at how service providers collaborative with end-users to define, design, introduce, and drive solutions. One can see direct parallels to the perspectives on PGM raised by Evans (2015) for example, where power is shifted in order to transform the process from a 'I'm doing to you' to a 'I'm doing with you' relationship. With both a co-creation / co-production strategy and PGM, it is a transformation from an 'us' and 'you', to a common and collective 'we'.

The field of co-production and co-creation is also interested in looking at the democratic effect of the participation of end-users in the process. Here researchers (e.g. Verschuere et al. 2018) have begun to more concretely look at measuring the democratizing effect and added value of co-production strategies, by exploring measurements of equity, inclusion (or exclusion), (lack of) impact while participating or co-producing, and empowerment of participants or co-producers.

In this sense, a broader co-production / co-creation strategy to UDI becomes very beneficial as it helps to explore the strategies and impact of PGM and touches upon several factors simultaneously: the already existing power dynamics between parties, the collaborative nature of the parities as a catalyst to innovation of services, and the need to measure more normative democratic values as created-value of the innovation process.

5. Conclusions, limitations, and future research

The paper has sought to explore the overarching question of *how we can understand what is happening in philanthropy related to PGM as a form of innovation*. In order to do this, the paper focused on two research objectives: (1) to explore the landscape of PGM in light of the literature on innovation, and (2) to conceptualize PGM as modalities of innovation that have the most potential for future exploration.

This concluding section highlights the main argument of the paper, specifically that the PGM as innovation can best be understood within four modalities: a form of social innovation, a form of process innovation, a form of both radical and incremental innovation, and a form of user-driven innovation (specifically with a co-creation/co-production strategy). I also describe some of the implications of situating PGM as innovation within these modalities, as well as point to suggestions for future research.

The paper's main claims can be summarized as follows:

(1) *PGM is a form of social innovation*

PGM at its core is based on a belief that new social values are created by ensuring that grantees are part of the process (and not just recipients of the process). And it is based on the belief that a *lack of innovation* in this field (in other words, the status quo of the more traditional grantmaking processes) can actually be contributing to reinforcing unequal power dynamics. In this sense, the 'values created' during the innovation process (and result) are ones that are not necessarily of interest to wider, more traditional market-based innovation research. To gauge the success of PGM as an innovation (related to such outcomes as power, strengthening of leadership skills in the network, capacity building of marginalized groups, sense of diversity, equity, and inclusion, or how having participation in the decisions around grants actually improves the choice of which projects are strategically correct to support), one would need entirely different tools than what a vast majority of traditional, market-focused innovation literature can provide.

It is much more promising to understand PGM as a form of social innovation in particular, especially in terms of the potential mutual benefit for both fields (innovation and PGM). For researchers in social innovation, the expanding research on PGM has the potential to bring in a rich source of experiences and empirical data that can contribute to building larger understanding of how new methods result in social change. For scholars of PGM, social innovation literature has the potential to provide a solid basis of explanatory theory on how one can manage and measure innovations in the form of social change. The main limitation of situating PGM within this modality, however, is that social innovation literature and research is considerably less studied and funded than its market-focused counterpart. And the breadth of 'social innovation' as field demands identifying much more concrete unites of comparison in order to continue deeper analysis.

(2) *PGM is a form of process innovation*

When looking at PGM through the framework of what scholars often refer to as the 'innovation space', it becomes clear that PGM is a form of 'process innovation'. Process innovation's main level of analysis is that it relates to *changes in the ways that products or services are created or delivered* within an organization. This has clear parallels for grantmakers who are innovating the way they do grantmaking. The literature also points to certain characteristics of process innovation that again have clear parallels with the empirical illustrations on PGM. This includes the understanding that process innovations are deeply entrenched in internal operations of an organization and often have wider ramifications on the organization (similar to PGM), that it often relates to the 'ambidexterity' of an organization, and that it is difficult to measure the impact of the changes (as also previously discussed related to PGM). All of these elements are observed in the data on PGM.

The advantage for scholars and practitioners alike in understanding PGM as a form of process innovation is that it broadens the range of comparative analysis, theoretic bases, and not least practical case studies from *outside* the field of PGM. As process innovation largely focuses internally on the organization/business as its level of analysis, one can draw conclusions and experiences from outside of solely philanthropy. The comparative value becomes richer and broader, as it relates to the *how* of innovation management from

a much larger set of data. In this sense, there is ample room to bridge these two fields even further.

(3) *PGM is a form of both radical and incremental innovation*

When looking at literature on PGM through the lens of innovation, a clear tension emerges of whether PGM as an innovation should be understood as incremental or radical. As demonstrated in this paper, I argue that PGM could best be understood as both radical and incremental innovation in many respects. PGM is a form of incremental innovations for grantmakers who already have an established ‘ethos’ of participation in their organizational structures, but it can also be quite radical and demand a lot of new competencies for the grantmaker. At the same time, advocates of PGM suggest that incremental changes towards PGM can have radical effects on social and economic equality and on the Philanthropic sector as a whole.

The challenge of not being able to identify PGM on one end or other of this continuum is that it becomes harder to draw out theoretical or explanatory conclusions from the innovation literature, as each end of this continuum suggests very different internal (and external) implications for the innovation process. The claim that PGM finds itself as both radical and incremental innovation (depending on the case) unequivocally requires much deeper case-by-case analyses in order to draw out any practical and/or theoretical implications related to PGM.

(4) *PGM is a form of user-led innovation, but specifically UDI with a co-production or co-creation strategy*

User-driven innovation emphasizes the experiences and expertise of end-users as a central driver for innovation. It acknowledges that recipients of a product or services often have the best solutions for modifications or even completely new products/processes. And scholars generally recognize that there is an inherent need for interdisciplinary strategies to UDI (as there often is to all forms of innovation), given the dynamic problem-solving processes that are demanded.

In this sense, I argue that PGM is indeed a form of UDI – and that it is most promising to understand it as form of UDI that specifically utilizes *co-creation / co-production* as a strategy to innovation. PGM relates to grantmakers including grantees in the decision-making process. It is a process whose goal is to shift power from a ‘I’m doing to you’ to a ‘I’m doing with you’ relationship. It assumes that better decisions will be made because of the knowledge and information contributed by communities and grantees, and that trust and rebalancing of the relationship can contribute to complementarity (or even some form of mutuality). PGM thus utilizes co-creation and co-production approaches as it aims to transform the relationship between the two parties with stark power differences (the service provider and the service recipient) in order to become collaborative partners that define, design, introduce, and drive solutions. The created value of this dynamic relationship lies in more normative democratic values such as collaboration, agency, transparency, justice, and equity.

I believe that understanding PGM as a form of UDI that uses *co-production/co-creation strategies* likely presents the *most* fruitful place for researchers and practitioners alike to explore further links. These two segments of research appear to have several practical applications when it comes to identifying additional theoretic frameworks, best practices, methodologies, and lessons learned during implementation. There are a number of

very promising opportunities for deeper comparative examination and practical relevance for those utilizing PGM as a means to democratize philanthropy in Europe and beyond, and room for promising future research.

5.1. *Limitations*

There are three major limitations to this study that could also be addressed in future research.

First, the paper incorporates a relatively small amount of empirical evidence on PGM. As a conceptual paper, I have emphasized the value of incorporating the broad landscape of PGM as an emerging phenomenon to begin drawing initial links. There is a need, however, to incorporate a much larger base of empirical data on PGM in order to draw any definitive conclusions.

Second, the paper does not attempt to problematize the normative assumption that power is *actually* moved by incorporating grantees into the grantmaking process (and not least that moving power is a positive social value). Some scholars and practitioners may assert that PGM is a clever but superficial or misleading presentation of sharing power, since as the relationship will always inherently be anchored in unequal power dynamics. PGM scholars generally agree that there is currently little data on the *actual* effect (value created) of PGM as a form innovation. While such a critical analysis on the impact of PGM as an innovation falls outside of the scope of this paper, such an analysis would inherently strengthen the conceptual analysis on the links between these two fields.

Third, it is not possible to claim that this paper provides an exhaustive picture of the literature and current analysis on innovation as an academic field or that it is generalizable. This is especially the case when the choice of literature is used as a heuristic tool, and ‘participation’ of various actors is intrinsic in the collaborative nature of all innovation. Nor can a paper of this length do justice to all of the burgeoning research on innovation, PGM, or intersecting fields (e.g. co-production/co-creation). This paper therefore acknowledges, as the first piece of its kind to begin synthesizing and identifying connections between these very broad fields, that its primary contribution is to serve as an entry point or groundwork for future studies.

5.2. *Closing word*

In his *Jacobin Magazine* essay, ‘The Philanthropic Complex’, novelist and social critic Curtis White (2012) wrote that Philanthropy, at its core, is a great paradox. While the philanthropic sector thinks that it *ought* to want a world with just systems that the activists it supports are working for, it actually wants something else entirely: the maintenance of its own privileges and the stability of the social and economic systems that made its existence possible in the first place. Inherent in this is an assumption that when a foundation is asked to abandon their privileges, what they actually hear is ‘a request that they will their own destruction’. Not unreasonably, White notes, ‘they are bewildered by the suggestion and unwilling to do so’.

Regardless of whether or not participatory models are indeed *the* models that can be used to shift power in grantmaking (or if there are other innovative models that can also aim to do this), there is still a need within the philanthropic sector to make continued attempts at examining power and privilege that inherently are part of the picture. There is a need for innovative thinking in the field in order to increase our collective ability

to create social good and improve society. My hope is that this paper can help to lay the groundwork for additional steps in that direction.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Emil André Røyrvik of the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) and Eilert Rostrup of the Karibu Foundation for their support and guidance while writing this text.

Disclosure statement

The author is a full-time employee of the Karibu Foundation, who is currently implementing a pilot in participatory grantmaking.

Notes on contributor

Tyler Dale Hauger is a senior advisor at the Karibu Foundation in Oslo, Norway – a grant-giving foundation that supports civil society movements in the global South that are lifting up alternatives to the dominant paradigms of power, distribution, and development. He holds B.A. from St. Olaf College in Minnesota, USA and a M.Phil. from the University of Oslo, Norway.

References

- Aasen, T. M. B., and O. Amundsen. 2011. *Innovasjon som kollektiv prestasjon* [Innovation as a Collective Achievement]. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Alam, Ian. 2006. "Removing the Fuzziness from the Fuzzy Front-End of Service Innovations Through Customer Interactions." *Industrial Marketing Management* 35: 468–480.
- Arnstein, S. 1969. "A Ladder of Community Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35: 216–224.
- Bahr, Kristina Jaskyte. 2019. "An Exploratory Study of Types of Innovation in US Foundations." *Administrative Sciences* 9 (4): 1–14.
- Benjamin, Lehn M., and Jeffrey L. Brudney. 2018. "What Do Voluntary Sector Studies Offer Research on Co-Production?" In *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services*, edited by Taco Brandsen, Trui Steen, and Bram Verschuere, 49–60. New York: Routledge.
- Betts, A., and L. Bloom. 2014. *Humanitarian Innovation: The State of the art*. New York: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).
- Brandsen, T., T. Steen, and B. Verschuere, eds. 2018. *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, C. 2019. "Unlocking the Innovation Potential of Philanthropic Foundations." PhD diss., Swinburne University of Technology.
- Bugg-Levine, A., and J. Emerson. 2011. "Impact Investing: Transforming How We Make Money While Making a Difference." *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization* 6 (3): 9–18.
- Christiansen, C. M. 1997. *The Innovators Dilemma. When new Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Evans, Lani. 2015. *Participatory Philanthropy: An Overview*. Winston Churchill Fellowship. <https://philanthropy.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Participatory-Philanthropy-Churchill.pdf>.
- Freire, Paolo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Fulton, K., A. Blau, and Gabriel Kasper. 2005. *The Seeds of Change in Philanthropy*. Cambridge, MA: Monitor Company Group, LLP.
- Gaynor, G. H. 2002. *Innovation by Design: What It Takes to Keep Your Company on the Cutting Edge*. New York: AMACOM.
- Gibson, Cynthia. 2017. *Participatory Grantmaking: Has Its Times Come?* New York: Ford Foundation. https://www.fordfoundation.org/media/3599/participatory_grantmaking-lmv7.pdf.

- Gibson, Cynthia. 2018. *Deciding Together: Shifting Power and Resources Through Participatory Grantmaking*. Edited by J. Bokoff. Grantcraft, Foundation Centre. https://grantcraft.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/12/DecidingTogether_Final_20181002.pdf.
- Gouwenberg, B., D. Ali, B. Hoolwerf, R. Bekkers, T. Schuyt, and J. Smit. 2016. "Foundations Supporting Research and Innovation in Europe: Results and Lessons from the Eufori Study." *The Foundation Review* 8 (1): 108–115.
- Henderson, R. 1993. "Underinvestment and Incompetence as Responses to Radical Innovation: Evidence from the Photolithographic Alignment Equipment Industry." *The RAND Journal of Economics* 24 (2): 248–270. Accessed November 27, 2020. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2555761>.
- Howaldt, J., and M. Schwarz. 2010. "Social Innovation: Concepts, Research Fields and International Trends." IMA/ ZLW.
- Husted, K., E. Finchum-Mason, and D. Suárez. 2021. "Sharing Power? The Landscape of Participatory Practices & Grantmaking Among Large US Foundations." University of Washington Philanthropy Project.
- Kendall, Jeremy, and Martin Knapp. 2000. "Measuring the Performance of Voluntary Organizations." *Public Management* 2: 105–132.
- McNamara, M. J., S. J. Cumming, and J. Pulis. 2018. "Negotiating Bottom-Up Participation in the Complex Game of Philanthropy: Insights from the Community Ideas Factory: Revue canadienne de recherche sur les OSBL et l'économie sociale." *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research* 9 (2): 41–61.
- Meyer, M., E. Goering, K. Hopkins, C. Hyde, N. Mattocks, and J. Denlinger. 2021. "Walking the Talk in Participatory Philanthropy." *The Foundation Review* 13 (2): 23–37.
- Mulgan, Geoff. 2012. "The Theoretical Foundations of Social Innovation." In *Social Innovation*, edited by Alex Nicholls and Alex Murdock, 33–65. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mulgan, G., S. Tucker, R. Ali, and B. Sanders. 2007. *Social Innovation: What It Is, Why It Matters and How It Can Be Accelerated*. Oxford: Young Foundation/Saïd Business School.
- Oddane, Torild. 2008. "Organizational Conditions for Innovation: A Multiperspective Approach to Innovation in a Large Industrial Company." PhD diss., Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.
- Oddane, Torild, and A. Wathne. 2017. *Kreativitet og innovasjon. Fem sider av nesten samme sak* [Creativity and Innovation. Five Sides of Almost the Same Case]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- OECD. 2005. *Oslo Manual. Guidelines for Collecting Data and Interpreting Innovation Data*.
- Ostrom, E., W. H. Baugh, R. Guarasci, R. B. Parks, and G. P. Whitaker. 1973. *Community Organization and the Provision of Police Services*. Administrative & Policy Studies Series. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Phills, J. A., Jr., K. Deiglmeier, and D. T. Miller. 2008. "Rediscovering Social Innovation." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 6 (4): 34–43.
- Poll, E., and S. Ville. 2009. "Social Innovation: Buzz Word or Enduring Term." *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 38 (6): 878–885.
- Prahalad, C. K., and V. Ramaswamy. 2000. "Co-Opting Customer Competence." *Harvard Business Review*, January–February: 79–87.
- Reason, P., and H. Bradbury. 2008. "Concluding Reflections: Whither Action Research." In *Handbook of Action Research*, edited by Peter Reason and Hilary Bradbury, 695–707. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Rogers, Everett M. 1962. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Sjödin, D. 2019. "Knowledge Processing and Ecosystem Co-Creation for Process Innovation: Managing Joint Knowledge Processing in Process Innovation Projects." *International Entrepreneurship and Management* 15: 135–162. doi:10.1007/s11365-018-0550-3.
- Tacer, B., and M. Ruzzier. 2015. "User-Driven Innovation: An Exploratory Study." *Economic and Business Review* 17 (1): 69–92.
- Tidd, J., and J. Bessant. 2018. *Managing Innovation: Integrating Technological, Market and Organizational Change*. 6th ed. Hoboken: Wiley.
- UN NGLS. 2016. "Eni Lestari, International Migrants Alliance – UN Summit for Refugees & Migrants Opening Ceremony." YouTube Video, 4:40. October 5. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rYMCJfeq0nE>.
- Utterback, J. 1994. *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Verschuere, B., D. Vanleene, T. Steen, and T. Brandsen. 2018. "Democratic Co-Production: Concepts and Determinants." In *Co-production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in*

- Public Services*, edited by Taco Brandsen, Trui Steen, and Bram Verschuere, 49–60. New York: Routledge.
- von Hippel, Eric. 1988. *The Sources of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- von Hippel, E. 2005. *Democratizing Innovation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- West, M. A., and J. L. Farr. 1990. “Innovation at Work.” In *Innovation and Creativity at Work*, edited by M. A. West and J. L. Farr, 1–13. Chichester: Wiley.
- White, Curtis. 2012. “The Philanthropic Complex.” *Jacobin Magazine*, Issue 6, Spring 2012. <https://jacobinmag.com/category/spring-2012/>.
- Wrobel, B., and M. Massey. 2021. *Letting Go: How Philanthropists and Impact Investors Can Do the Most Good by Giving Up Control*. Published Independently.