European Research Network On Philanthropy 8th International Conference
Copenhagen, 13-14 July 2017

Practicing What You Preach: The Impact of Masters-Level Study Upon Philanthropy Practitioners

(Working Paper)

Triona Fitton[a]

[a] University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7JE, UK

1. Abstract

As the nonprofit sector around the world has developed, a corresponding interest in university-level study of philanthropy and non-profit studies has also grown, particularly in the United States (Mirabella, 2007). However, an analysis of UK educational provision in philanthropic studies by Carrington (2009) and subsequently in a Europe-wide study by Keidan et al. (2014) found a need for further provision of philanthropy education, as the sector continues to professionalise in this country. Taking its lead from the continuing debates about the role of theory in this growing field of study (Donmoyer, 2009; Daly, 2012), this project aims to determine the impact of theoretical Masters-level study upon those working in the philanthropy, charity and fundraising sectors. In particular, it aims to uncover whether students experienced a change in their professional practice as a result of engaging in academic study of theoretical perspectives. Using a case study analysis of student perceptions and use of academic theory on a module of the MA in Philanthropic Studies, examined through a standardised online questionnaire, interview supplements and discourse analysis of their posts on weekly online forums, this paper will present and discuss 3 key themes emergent from the data: the 'ethical soup', the 'trickle effect' and the 'interdisciplinarity problem', linking these to established sociological theory. The paper will conclude with some suggestions of what theory in the academy can contribute to practitioner skills in the philanthropy sector, including both strengths and some limitations.

2. Context & Literature Review

The teaching and study of philanthropy within higher education is still a relatively new phenomenon. The term 'philanthropic studies' was only coined in the 1980s (Katz, 1999: 74), and initially only existed under that name in the United States, where philanthropic action is more embedded within the social psyche and where the non-profit sector has been increasingly depended upon for the delivery of public services (O'Neill, 2007). Several decades ago, the majority of HE courses that even broadly covered philanthropy (such as 'non profit studies', 'civil society studies' or 'third sector studies') based in the field were only available at American institutions (Crowder & Hodgkinson, 1992).

In 1996, there were only 179 courses at US universities that taught 'nonprofit management' education (Mirabella, 2007); the provision has grown exponentially, with 343 US institutions now offering courses in that subject area, according to the Seton Hall database (2017).

Of these, 251 offer graduate study, which is our focus here. Keidan et al. (2014), writing about this development in 2014, commented that: "This growth reflects a demand for employment based skills in the non profit sector and, more broadly, for professional education itself" (2014: 11). This comment reflected a similarly common theme in the UK at this time, following a HEFCE report (2014) on the growing need for a trained and qualified HE fundraising workforce in the UK. The UK non-profit sector more broadly has been under increasing pressure to 'upskill', as charities were forced to become more 'data driven', operate more competitively to secure government and public contributions, and are subject to rigorous scrutiny by the media following the economic recession, subsequent austerity measures and the cuts in funding to the sector as a whole.

The demand, therefore, for philanthropy education has also been shown to be present in the United Kingdom, despite the culture of philanthropy being less ingrained into the national culture (Wright, 2002: 7). Keidan et al (2014) in their study of philanthropic educational provision found that 24 institutions in Europe offer HE study in philanthropy, with only 4 offering postgraduate study at Masters level. This was prior to the commencement of teaching on the MA in Philanthropic Studies at the University of Kent, which began

Country	University	Centre/Chair on philanthropy	Degree in philanthropy	Course(s) in philanthropy	Professional training
UK	City University Cass Business School	P	P	P	P
	Northumbria University	×	P	P	×
	University of Cambridge Judge Business School	×	×	×	P
	University of Kent	P	×	P	×
	University of St Andrews	×	×	P	×

Figure 1. UK provision of graduate philanthropic studies courses (taken from Keidan et al, 2014: 20)

accepting students as of September 2016, when only one philanthropy and fundraising module was running at the institution. Figure 1 indicates the UK provision.

It is notable that of the provision shown above, philanthropic studies is housed within schools of management or business studies, with the exception of the relatively independent Centre for Research on Entrepreneurship, Wealth & Philanthropy (REWP) at Northumbria University, and the Centre for Philanthropy at the University of Kent which is housed within the School of Social Policy, Sociology & Social Research (SSPSSR). Elsewhere in the world, philanthropic studies is also taught in the area of public administration, social policy, political science and social work (Mirabella & Wish, 2001). Academic research into philanthropy also goes on in many other disciplines: clinical and social psychology, economics, arts management, marketing, anthropology, history and sociology to name but a few (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007: 298). The interdisciplinary nature of the study and teaching of philanthropy has been explored by Mirabella & Wish (2000), who describe the 'best place' debate persevering in US universities; the "tricky business" (Young, in Mirabella & Wish 2000: 220) of housing non-profit studies within the existing curriculum. Ultimately they find a juncture between the teaching of non-profit education in schools of business, and schools of social work/public administration (similar to social policy in the UK) which mirrors the divide between the business and public sectors, and end on a recommendation to look beyond "industry specific" disciplinary boundaries when studying the non-profit sector. This recommendation is echoed by discussions of sectoral hybridity here in the UK also, where a 'blurring' of the boundaries between the private, public and charity sectors has been identified (Billis, 2010).

Literature specific to the impacts of education in philanthropic studies to practitioners is limited, and those who researched the impact of similar US courses (such as non-profit management) found varying results. Some found overall positive perceptions from students (Fletcher, 2005), a perceived positive effect due to enhanced management skills (Mirabella & Wish 2000) and positive perceptions of the qualification by potential employers in non-profit organisations (Haas & Robinson, 1998). However, similar studies found negative impacts, for example, non-profit managers regarding the qualification as bottom of the list in terms of importance when hiring staff (Tschirhart, 1998) and the fact the qualification offered limited employment opportunities after graduation (Mirabella & Wish, 2000: 335).

In 1999, Stanley Katz noted that there has historically been a split within philanthropy between the 'doers' and the 'thinkers': There are those who work in the non profit sector and those who research it, but rarely does expertise span both areas. The divide between practice and theory is often lamented in the field of US public administration (Ospina & Dodge, 2005; Posner, 2009; Bushouse et al., 2011; Orr & Bennett, 2012), where many non-profit and philanthropy studies programmes originate. Their proposed solution is a form of 'pracademia' (Posner, 2009), a dialectic process that draws upon the positive elements of practice learned 'on the job', whilst simultaneously using the intellectual rigour, and theoretical foundations that come with good quality academic work. The MA in Philanthropic Studies aims to achieve this, and researching its potential is the purpose of this study

3. Methodology

The research design for this project was to conduct a case study analysis of one specific module within the Philanthropic Studies Masters course. The unit of analysis for this qualitative investigation is a convenience sample: the small student cohort taking the module SO840: *Fundamentals of Philanthropy*. This module is predominantly theoretical in its basis, covering topics ranging from corporate philanthropy and ethical practice to effective altruism; from theories about geographical variations in philanthropy to historical developments over time. The assignments are essay-based plus require weekly contributions to an online forum, where students answer and debate questions on a series of set readings.

Of the 15 students that took the MA, almost half were exempt from the study due to reasons indicated in Appendix A, where a full break down of the case study participants is also provided.

I conducted an online open ended questionnaire with 6 of the students on the course, and complemented the findings of these with supplementary interviews, and a documentary analysis of their interactions in the online forum that forms part of the assessment for the module in question. I sent the questionnaire once the module was complete, and asked them to reflect upon whether theory within the course had influenced or affected their work practice. The open-ended questions can be found in Appendix B. A case study method was selected due to the inappropriateness of other methods to this particular context: The number of students, 15, is are far too small for an internally-valid quantitative study, yet a phenomenological approach was also not suitable. The students are studying part time and most are combining their studies with full time work, therefore impingement on their time beyond what they already committed to their ongoing MA studies was out of the question. The aim of the methodology was, in line with the SRA's ethical guidelines, to "minimize disturbance both to the subjects themselves and to the subjects' relationships with their environment" (Bryman, 2012: 136). Online questionnaires fit comfortably with the mode of delivery the students were accustomed to (as the majority of the module is delivered online) and allowed students to elaborate on the questions in their own time.

As the response rate to the questionnaire was low, I conducted an additional documentary analysis of their discussions within the online forum of the module, and supplemented these with phone interviews conducted at a later date where I asked the students to elaborate on their comments in the questionnaire and forum. This enabled a mosaic of different interactions within the case study to develop, and for the researcher to examine student responses with the least disruption to their studies as is possible. Using unprompted discussion (as in the forums) also controlled for the likelihood of the researcher influencing the students' responses due to their role as a lecturer on the module: as Peel, Parry, Douglas & Lawton (2003) note, recruiting one's own students can mean the researcher has considerable control or even power over the participants as subjects, which can affect the validity of the outcoming data.

Nevertheless, a note must be made about the externality validity of a case study analysis such as this. A case study is "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context" (Yin, 2003: 13). Generalisability is not assumed to be the purpose of this study, as the MA in Philanthropic Studies at Kent is what Yin (2009: 48) would describe as a unique case or a 'revelatory' case – one that investigates a 'previously inaccessible' phenomenon. The MA in Philanthropic Studies at the University of Kent is the first of its kind in the United Kingdom, as there are no other Masters level courses specifically in Philanthropic Studies in the UK. The MA is offered via distance-learning, using a 'totally online mode' of delivery (Harasim, 2000: 47) as opposed to a mixed (blended learning) approach or an adjunct (totally offline) mode of delivery. In the US there are currently 82 universities offering online learning in philanthropic studies (Seton Hall Database, 2017) but in the UK there were previously none. For this reason, a comparison within the UK was not possible, and this online Masters course is of significant pedagogical interest due to its unique nature within the field.

Pseudonyms are used to protect the identity of the students, and informed consent was gathered prior to the research beginning, along with ethics approval from the University.

4. Findings and Discussion

The findings from this study showed, first and foremost, that generally the students experienced 'theory in action' (Gergen & Zielke, 2006) – they related what they were reading about in abstract form back to concrete experiences in their professional lives. These included both *reflective* accounts looking back at previous experiences, and *proactive* measures they would undertake in the future as a result of studying theory (see Appendix C for examples). The influence upon practice from the MA was described variously as, "profound" "a big change" and "significant". There were also some hints that certain elements of theory were not useful in applied practice. The findings have been organised into three main themes which were emergent from the data, and included both reflective and proactive responses from students in relation to their professional practice. They are as follows:

- The Ethical Soup
- The Trickle Down and Trickle Around Effect
- Overwhelming Interdisciplinarity

4.1 The 'Ethical Soup'

The MA in Philanthropic Studies is aimed at those working in the philanthropy sector, and the case study respondents are predominantly from that background. One of the key findings was that the study of theories of philanthropy induced a form of self-scrutiny and speculation about the purpose of their role that those working the sector did not anticipate:

"[the module has] Revolutionised my understanding of philanthropy [and] given me a greater insight into those people who find philanthropy very distasteful."

Susan, questionnaire

"I am also now questioning how much responsibility as a fundraiser I have to limit the power of my donors"

Susan, forum post

Questioning the nature of practice was extremely personal to the students, since this is the way the majority of them make their livelihoods. Umprompted discussion on the forums indicated that for one particular student, Georgina, reading theories around how we define philanthropy during the early stages of the module provoked a discussion of her own ethical standpoint within her role:

"On a practical day-to-day level (as fundraisers, researchers and non-profit leaders) should we just be grateful that wealthy philanthropists are willing to give away their fortunes, attempting (at least) to help those less fortunate? Should our role just be to encourage more philanthropy and to advise on how funds can best be used […]? Or should we be more outraged that wealth inequality is exacerbated by wealth creation, causing many of the problems in society that we are working to solve (putting us in the 'ethical soup' of fundraising)?"

Georgina, forum post

Georgina self-questioning suggests that the ethical position of a person working in the non-profit sector is unclear. She refers to two competing ideological undercurrents: whether they are doing what they believe to be best in the circumstances, or whether they ought to be working instead to change circumstances for the better. Fundraising as a profession has been under fire for its ethics ever since the publication of the Etherington Review (2015) which recommended increased regulation and scrutiny of fundraising activities. In Kantian ethics, the students are exercising their 'imperfect duty', they are fulfilling their duty within the scope and capacity of their role, but they are making moral exceptions, for example, not engaging too closely with how a philanthropic donor earned the money he is donating, and suspending concern about the wider implications this may hold.

At the end of her post, Georgina refers to Chris Carnie's (2016) description of the 'ethical soup' fundraisers and prospect researchers find themselves in when they are made aware of their own proximity to inequalities due to their role in securing funds from the affluent. This proximity to the subject matter they are studying contributes to a significant amount of reflexivity in the forum posts and interview responses. The mention of 'responsibility' by Susan highlights how those working in the philanthropy sector treat it as a profession – a role that is subject to a code of ethics and has a duty to wider society. French Sociologist Emile Durkheim (1950: 10) identified this phenomenon within traditional professions (law, education, medicine etc.) that have a moral responsibility, which plays a crucial role in maintaining a functioning society. Students in philanthropic studies therefore are encouraged to interrogate their own ethical and moral stance and consider how this contributes to principles of better practice, alongside working towards the other concrete characteristic of 'professionalism': an academic qualification.

4.2 The Trickle-Down and Trickle-Around Effect

The interviews asked participants to consider any previous training, study or continuing professional development (CPD) they previously had undertaken and whether this had had an impact on their practice. All with the exception of one had undertaken some previous professional training, including postgraduate qualifications in other areas such as Management and International Relations, short courses, webinars, conferences and workshops. Responses to the level of impact emphasised a 'light touch' approach that lessened the practical changes the participant made as a result:

"Fundraising/philanthropy/impact investment courses turned out to be superficial and had no greater impact on the job."

Alan, questionnaire

"I'm shocked at how little fundraising literature trickles down into practice"

Georgina, interview supplement

Therefore, studying theoretical approaches allowed students explore a more critical and robust approach to philanthropy, which lead one student to question the way CPD and training prioritises a certain worldview:

"Have I been brainwashed by years of being told at conferences and on training courses that a donor-focused approach is the best?"

Georgina, forum post

Again, this reflection upon their role leaves students questioning whether what they have previously accepted as 'the right way to do things' is misleading practitioners in the field. One student, Alan, speculates that this may be due to the lack of evidence-based training:

"The problem [with training] is that it bears little resemblance to reality […] I also suspect that little, if any, is based on evidence."

Alan, interview supplement

However, a surprising finding was that several of the students had themselves delivered CPD, fundraising and leadership training within their own roles. Therefore, theory within the module did not just impact upon the individual student but reached much further into their organisation through other team members and employees. A trickle-down effect was identified where theory learnt within the module was used by students in senior management roles who themselves delivered training and CPD, and this trickle-down was attributed the students learning new theories which informed their management and leadership in their own role:

"I have taught fundraising, and it's fascinating to see what's being taught […] We use consultants and do internal training, but it never occurred to me to use academic literature."

"I'm educating my organisation about donor motivations and how this is affecting our relationship [with donors]"

Ella, interview supplement

"I give my team stuff to read from the course"

Susan, interview supplement

The trickle-down effect, popularised by Thorsten Veblen (1899) is a phenomenon where those at the top of a hierarchy strive to be 'early adopters'. This then 'trickles down' to those hierarchically below them, at which point those at the top of the hierarchy will search out something else new to adopt. In this particular context, theory is grasped by the students, who view themselves as conduits of new knowledge they can then distribute through their professional practice. This phenomenon has been identified in studies on ethical team leadership, where the knowledge and influence of those in senior positions can have a 'cascading effect' (Mayer et al., 2009; Bass et al. 1987) from management to supervisor to staff member. It has also been identified in work on perceptions of justice and fairness in organisation management (Masterson 2001; Tepper & Taylor, 2003). In general, the role of leadership within fundraising teams is seen as crucial because the leader sets "the direction in which organisational objectives will be met" (Sargeant & Jay, 2014: 394). Academic theory therefore can be a robust reinforcement to strong leadership skills.

However, in addition to contributing to the CPD and training they were giving, participants also indicated that theoretical discussions had impacted upon their practice in terms of networking, allowing them to be more confident in informal conversations with peers and colleagues:

"The forum [discussion] has definitely helped me have different and more informed conversations with the fundraisers and researchers I work with on a daily basis. […] I will now more happily join in with conversations on topics outside my particular (narrow) field of expertise "

Natalie, questionnaire

Theory was also seen as helpful for establishing new connections. The following student, a major gifts advisor who worked internationally, felt that academic theory helped to initiate and provoke discussions with new connections, thus widening the number contacts within her field:

"Academic knowledge of philanthropy helped me establish new connections […] Many Italian fundraising/nonprofit professionals are curious about the field and systematised academic knowledge about philanthropy serves as a good starting point for further discussion or exchange of ideas. This leads also to new collaborations. […] Inspired by the selection of topics covered by the module, […] I've conducted research of the Italian philanthropy advisory market and created an informal network of philanthropy professionals."

Rebecca, questionnaire

The student directly linked her experience on the module with an increase in her confidence to speak with authority on issues directly linked to her work. This is in spite of her having a long career in fundraising and philanthropy management, with experience of teaching fundraising as part of that role (thus also participating in the trickle-down effect). The academic study of theory therefore also facilitates a 'trickle-around' effect alongside a trickle-down effect, where the horizontal transference of knowledge has an impact upon the work practices of the student by enhancing opportunities to network, opening up avenues for discussions that were previously inaccessible and allowing the students to distribute their knowledge in a way that enriches the field. Mirabellla & Wish (2000) identified a similar characteristic of increased opportunities for networking and collaboration, as well as an opportunity for innovation, in non-profit management courses in the United States.

It's worth noting that the one participant who didn't feel they used the theory from their course at any point within their professional practice, Mike, also hinted at the opportunity theory on the course provides to illuminate other professionals working in the sector in a discussion about a theory for a new development initiative:

"Based only on personal experience, I haven't observed much discussion at the individual, or even small charity level. In fact, what I've noted is a broad ignorance around this global initiative."

Mike, forum post

Weiss (1981, in Donmoyer 2009) describes how theory provides a "new language" for those working in the field to use to develop responses to specific issues. Although this student didn't acknowledge theory as being useful in his day job, he did use it to identify and respond to gaps within practitioner knowledge within the sector.

4.3. The Interdisciplinary Problem

Philanthropic Studies, as previously mentioned, is one of the most interdisciplinary subjects of specialised study in contemporary academia. This particular module features literature, theoretical models and studies from disciplines including history, economics, philosophy, sociology, social policy, business, psychology and even evolutionary biology. This resulted in a feeling on the forum, questionnaires and in the interviews that sometimes, certain aspects of theory simply weren't easily applicable to their practice:

"I admit it's hard to see how some of the topics, e.g. knowing the history of philanthropy, can really be useful in my current professional practice."

Natalie, questionnaire

"I enjoyed reading about biological altruism […] but found the emphasis on reproduction (or the selfish gene) did not add much to my understanding of donors."

Susan, forum post

Interdisciplinarity in the study of philanthropy corresponds with the fact that "different scholars approach the definition of philanthropy in different ways" (Daly, 2011: 536). The problem of bridging the gap between practitioners and academic scholars can be partly understood by this interdisciplinarity, as academics struggle to teach practitioners using compartmentalised 'knowledge' that are dependent upon the restrictions and implicit values of the given discipline. Michel Foucault (2003) in his work on knowledge and power describes how knowledge is 'disciplined' and divided up into categories in education to enable us analyse them with more ease. This knowledge is then subject to "selection, normalisation, hierarchalisation and centralisation" (2003: 181). This includes the absorption and subjugation of certain 'knowledge' over others – in particular, the superiority of academic knowledge over that which is "below the required level of erudition or scientificity" (ibid. : 6-7). Therein exists a two-fold problem, where teaching and research in philanthropy is not only is a dividing practice vertically, forming a hierarchy of knowledge which favours the academic over the practitioner, but also horizontally, into multifarious different disciplines that serve to obscure and detract from the usefulness of the theory when put into practice. The discipline within which this MA in philanthropic Studies resides (Social Policy) is therefore important as it serves to "shape the type and content of knowledge about philanthropy that is produced and disseminated" (Keidan, 2014: 43). However, Keidan notes that a more flexible multidisciplinary study of philanthropy should be encouraged (ibid.: 35).

Donmoyer (2009: 706) highlights the issue of 'idiosyncrasy' that is characteristic of philanthropy practice due to the regular need to deal with unique cases and the tendency to treat the atypical as commonplace. This is not a happy bedfellow with academic theory, Donmoyer suggests, because theory is by its very nature general, seeking to 'simplify complexity' (ibid.). The findings of this study suggest that atypical cases make certain disciplinary approaches very useful to some students, whilst being utterly useless to others. Susan (above) felt it difficult to apply theories of biological altruism to her work, yet another participant said the following:

"I enjoyed the different philosophical approaches to philanthropy, particularly the evolutionary biology theory of altruism. I have long thought there must be a deeper rationale to philanthropy."

Alan, questionnaire

The above statement highlights a crucial finding – that academic theory may not always have overtly obvious and tangible impacts on practice, yet it aids understanding, reflection and the synthesis of information that informs practice. This is described as 'creeping' knowledge (Weiss, 1981 in Donmoyer, 2009: 705) that finds its way into non-profit planning and policy making via academic theory.

5. Conclusion

A core tension within debates around philanthropy surrounds the concern that the academic study of philanthropy is "responsive and reflective of the needs of practitioners" (Daly, 2011: 538). It is clear from the findings that practitioners taking the MA Philanthropic Studies are indeed using theory in a number of ways – it is aiding them in being reflective and proactive. This results in two clear effects: it mires them within an 'ethical soup' that causes them to question their own motivations, the context of their role and their own contribution to social issues; and it encourages a trickle down/trickle around effect of knowledge which is seen as more useful than traditional CPD and training. There is an link between these two elements; as the ethics of fundraising and other roles within the philanthropy sector could be seen to be reproduced within the CPD and training, which is found to be lacking in an evidence basis. Could an increased employment of academic literature and, indeed, academic study towards qualifications such as an MA in Philanthropic Studies correct this issue and enhance the knowledge and skills of fundraising practitioners? Equallly, is enhanced communication, either hierarchically down through organisations or through horizontal networking, best served to help the sector on an informal level, through the dissemination of knowledge beyond the philanthropic sector bubble?

Theory has its limitations, as addressed in the final finding, whereby the interdisciplinary nature of philanthropic studies coinciding with the confines of traditional disciplinary boundaries renders certain elements of theory more useful to certain individuals than to others. Bridging these gaps and finding coherence across disciplines is necessary for constructing an academic programme that serves a need – a need that is identified both in the US and more recently here in the UK (Keidan et al. 2014), particularly as the philanthropy sector has grown in response to state funding withdrawal. An awareness of the issue of atypicality within practitioner roles and their ill-fit with generalisability and monodisciplinarity in academia is a valuable starting lesson from this preliminary investigation. The author recommends that further qualitative and reflexive research be undertaken into the provision of non-profit higher education alongside other forms of professional training, to offer more generalisable findings beyond those indicated in this small case study.

Acknowledgements

This project was made possible due to funding received from the Pears Foundation. The author would also like to thank Dr Jennifer Leigh for her feedback on the original manuscript.

References

Billis, D., 2010. Towards a theory of hybrid organisations. In D. Billis, *Hybrid Organizations and the Third Sector.* London: Palgrave MacMillan. 46-69

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M., 1987. Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group & Organization Management, 12*(1), 73-87.

Bushouse, B. K., Jacobson, W. S., Lambright, K. T., Llorens, J. J., Morse, R. S., & Poocharoen, O. O., 2011. Crossing the divide: Building bridges between public administration practitioners and scholars. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *21*(suppl 1), i99-i112.
Carnie, C., 2016. "Still wondering about major donors?" *Factary blog* [online] Available at: http://factary.com/2016/01/still-wondering-about-major-donors/ [Accessed 02/03/2017]
Daly, S., 2012. Philanthropy as an Essentially Contested Concept. *Voluntas*: *International Journal Of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations, 23*(3), 535-557
Donmoyer, R., 2009. Theories about the role of theory in nonprofit and philanthropic studies. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly. *38*(4), 701-713.
Durkheim, É., 1950. La Morale Professionnelle. In *Leçons de sociologie*. Paris: PUF.
Etherington, S., 2015. Regulating fundraising for the future: trust in charities, confidence in fundraising regulation. *NCVO*, September 2015.
Fletcher, K. M., 2005. The impact of receiving a master's degree in nonprofit management on graduates' professional lives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 34*(4), 433-447.
Foucault, M., 2003. *Society must be defended: Lectures at the College De France,* 1975–76, trans. David Macey. New York: Picador.
Gergen, K. J., & Zielke, B., 2006. Theory in action. *Theory & Psychology, 16*(3), 299-309.
Harasim, L., 2000. Shift happens: Online education as a new paradigm in learning. *The Internet and higher education*, *3*(1), 41-61.
Haas, P. J., & Robinson, M. G., 1998. The views of nonprofit executives on educating nonprofit managers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 8*(4), 349-362.
Katz, S. N., 1999. Where did the serious study of philanthropy come from, anyway*?. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *28*(1), 74-82.
Keidan, C., Jung, T., & Pharoah, C., 2014. *Philanthropy education in the UK and continental Europe: Current provision, perceptions and opportunities.* London, UK: Centre for Charitable Giving and Philanthropy.
Masterson, S. S., 2001. A trickle-down model of organizational justice: Relating employees' and customers' perceptions of and reactions to fairness, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4): 594-604.
Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B., 2009. How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model*. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108(1)*, 1-13.
Mirabella, R. M., & Wish, N. B., 1999. Educational impact of graduate nonprofit degree programs. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 9(3)*, 329-340.
Mirabella, R. M., & Wish, N. B., 2001. University-based educational programs in the management of nonprofit organizations: An updated census of US programs. *Public Performance & Management Review, 25*(1), 30-41.
Mirabella R. M., 2007. University‐Based Educational Programs in Non‐profit Management and Philanthropic Studies: A 10‐Year Review and Projections of Future Trends. *Non Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36(4 suppl), 11-27.
More Partnership., 2014. *An emerging profession: The Higher Education Philanthropy Workforce* . HEFCE Report, April 2014.
O'Neill, M., 2007. The future of nonprofit management education. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(4 suppl), 169S-176S.
Orr, K., & Bennett, M., 2012. Public administration scholarship and the politics of coproducing academic–practitioner research. *Public Administration Review*, *72*(4), 487-495.
Ospina, S. M., & Dodge, J., 2005. Narrative inquiry and the search for connectedness: Practitioners and

academics developing public administration scholarship. *Public Administration Review*, *65*(4), 409-423.
Payton, R. L., 1988. *Philanthropy: Voluntary action for the public good.* New York: American Council on Education.
Peel, E., Parry, O., Douglas, M. and Lawton, J., 2006. “It’s no skin off my nose”: why people take part in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research, 16(10)*, 1335-1349.
Posner, P. L., 2009. The Pracademic: An Agenda for Re-Engaging Practitioners and Academics. *Public Budgeting & Finance*, *29*(1), 12-26.
Sargeant, A., & Woodliffe, L., 2007. Gift giving: an interdisciplinary review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 12*(4), 275-307.
Sargeant, A., & Jay, E., 2014. *Fundraising management: analysis, planning and practice*. London: Routledge.
Seton Hall Database, 2017. *Nonprofit Management Education*. [Online] Available at: http://academic.shu.edu/npo/list.php?sort=name [Accessed 10/05/17]
Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C., 2003. Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*(1), 97-105.
Tschirhart, M., 1998. Nonprofit management education: Recommendations drawn from three stakeholder groups. In O’Neill. M. & Fletcher, K. *Nonprofit management education: US and world perspectives*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 61-80.
Van Til, J., 1990. Defining philanthropy. In *Critical issues in American philanthropy.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Veblen, T., 1994 [1899]. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. New York: Penguin Books.
Weiss, C., 1981. Policy research in the context of diffuse decision making. *Journal of Higher Education*, *53*(6), 619-639.
Wish, N. B., & Mirabella, R. M., 1998. Curricular variations in nonprofit management graduate programs. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 9*(1)*,* 99-110.
Wright, K., 2002. Generosity versus altruism: Philanthropy and charity in the US and UK. *Centre for Civil Society working paper*, London School of Economics and Political Science.
Yin, R. K., 2003. *Case study research: Design and methods* (Third Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Yin, R. K., 2009*. Case study research design and methods* (Fourth Edition). Los Angeles: Sage
Young, D. R., 1987. Executive leadership in nonprofit organizations. In Powell, W. W. (Ed.*) The nonprofit sector: A research handbook.* New Haven: Yale University Press. 167-179.

Appendix A. Participant Details & Exemptions

Participants	
Susan	**56, Director of Development in HE Institution**
Alan	**43, Director of Development in HE Institution**
Mike	**41, Executive Director in Finance**
Ella	**41, Director of Philanthropy in Non-Profit Organisation**
Georgina	**41, Research Director for Philanthropy Consultancy**
Rebecca	**37, Fundraising & Philanthropy Consultant**
Exempt Students	
# of Students	**Reason for exemption from study**
1	Withdrew from MA course prior to end of module SO840
2	Not currently working so could not offer reflection on implementation of practice
3	Currently intermitting from studies/non submission of work for module SO840

Appendix B. Interview Schedule

1. What is your gender?
2. What is your age?
3. What is your job title?
4. How long have you worked in the philanthropy/charity/third sector? Do you have any other relevant work experience?

5. Please describe the day to day work you undertake for your job?
6. Prior to undertaking Masters level study in Philanthropy, had you had any prior training, CPD or studied in this area? If so please give details (where, how long for, how regularly?):
7. What impact, if any, did your prior training, CPD or study have? Please give as many details as you can.
8. How has the module 'Fundamentals of Philanthropy' made you think differently about your day to day practice in your job?
9. Have you made any practical changes in your work as a result of studying 'Fundamentals of Philanthropy'? Please give examples.
10. Which content did you find relevant or useful, and why?
11. Was there any of the module content you didn't find useful for implementing your professional practice? Please give details.
12. What would you like to see more of in this particular module?
13. Did studying online have any impact upon your implementation of theory into your day to day practice?
14. Do you have any further comments on this module, the MA, or this research project?

Appendix C. Additional Examples of Reflective and Proactive Use of Theory

"Fundamentals of Philanthropy" significantly systematised my knowledge of the philanthropic field"

"As a fundraiser I have been very focused on the demand side - tools and techniques used for funds solicitations. The module overturned this logic, emphasising the focus on a donor - understanding the rationale of giving in terms of history, social and personal motivations. "

Rebecca, interview

"[the module has] reinforced many of the opinions/observations/conclusion I had about the sector I work in.[…] It has given me a greater insight and therefore confidence in applying the principles and practices that make up my day to day responsibilities"

Alan, interview

"[the module] allowed me to be more reflective on donor motivations and my cultivation strategy. […] I believe my cultivation is now more strategic and individually tailored"

"Reading about donor motivations led me to do much more thinking about the major donors I work with."

Ella, interview

"It has been interesting to apply this knowledge when reviewing how likely a prospect is to become a donor or when discussing potential research projects with clients"

Georgina, interview