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This paper reviews the term “theory of change” including its common usage in evaluative literature and its emerging usage in the field of philanthropy. A survey of U.S. foundations looked at their familiarity with theory of change: how they defined it, and how many theories they implemented based on a typology created by Frumkin (2002).

There was confusion about theory of change among top U.S. foundations. Only 54% indicated they were familiar with theory of change. Foundations familiar with the term had no clear consensus on the definition.

Eighty-six percent used at least one out of the five theories of change proposed by Frumkin. In contrast to Frumkin’s (2003) hypothesis that “grantmakers cannot coherently pursue all five theories of change at once…” (p. 11), foundations most frequently indicated that they used all five theories. Additional research on the effectiveness of using all five theories of change is needed.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The Foundation Center’s *Overview of Foundation Giving through 2003* (2004), notes that the approximately 65,000 U.S. foundations gave away a total of 29.7 billion dollars in 2003 (p. 3). This significant dollar resource is the engine that drives philanthropy. It is, some would say, its raison d’être. According to Mark Dowie (2001), a foundation’s purpose is to “imagine a better society and help bring it into existence by fostering change with money” (p. 4).

As a group, foundations within the United States have at their disposal significant monetary resources—resources with which they are expected to foster change and improve society. Some feel philanthropy’s track record with such financial resources has been spotty at best. Dowie (2001) notes that

...foundation staff and trustees spend thousands of working hours struggling to define values and concepts,... in the hopes of identifying a social need or problem that fits both the intention of their original donor and their own perceptions of how to use money to enhance the public good. Their collective imagination has created some of the best and worst institutions in American society, funded the most sublime and the most ridiculous projects, wasted money and spent it wisely. (p. xxxviii)

This is a harsh criticism, but who is to say what is wasted money and what is wisely spent? Clearly foundations would prefer to increase their rate of sublime projects and eliminate any trace of ridiculous projects. The tricky part is and always has been in the measuring.

The traditional method of measuring philanthropy’s effectiveness was to look at the foundation’s grantees and their outcomes. A survey of foundation practitioners
conducted by Orosz, Phillips, and Knowlton (2003) found widespread agreement that foundation effectiveness should be measured by grantee performance.

Foundations themselves and their actions seem to be no part of the equation. Their workings seem mysterious and unfathomable. Bloomfield (2002) states, “little is known about these institutions” (p. 4). Foundations have been equated with a black box (Bloomfield, 2002, p. 11); their inner workings go unseen and unexamined, their function reduced to handing out the cash.

But is it accurate to consider foundations merely the bankers of change? Bloomfield (2002) feels much is unknown about foundations including “how funders think about their missions and goals, how they construct the rationales behind their plans and actions, what decision elements and factors are at the core of their decisions, and how they make these choices” (p. 56). If a foundation’s internal workings, including how they think about their mission and goals and how they construct their rationales, were part of the equation when giving out the cash, then it would be apparent that foundations do not just hand over money and let the grantees create the outcomes. The funding comes with its own set of expectations and assumptions from the foundation. In short, the money has its own agenda.

Foundations do themselves, as well as their grantees, a great disservice if they skip directly to measuring grantee outcomes and overlook their own internal workings. This is the equivalent of blaming the stock market entirely for the poor performance of a financial portfolio without ever looking at the effect the investor has on the portfolio. The competency of the investor, the amount of money to be invested, the types of investment options available, and perhaps most significantly, the investment strategy and decisions of the investor all play a part in a portfolio’s performance.
The model for foundation effectiveness developed by Orosz et al. (2003) suggests that a foundation’s internal processes also contribute to the ultimate success or failure of its grantees. Their model identifies three internal foundation “levers” that contribute to the outcomes of grantees and ultimately to foundation effectiveness. These internal levers include “people, priorities and processes” (Orosz, J. Phillips, C. & Wyatt Knowlton, L. 2003, p. 9). The people lever includes organizational culture, leadership and staff capacity. Priorities include resources available and allocation parameters as well as grantmaking priorities. The process lever includes items such as organizational learning, evaluation, program design and decision-making. Included within program design is the theory of change.

This paper will take a closer look at one of the internal processes discussed by Orosz et al.— the theory of change. Theory of change is most often used in the context of program evaluation. The term theory of change highlights the underlying assumptions, beliefs and theories about creating change.

The literature suggests that the field of philanthropy has adopted the term theory of change as its own, giving it its own special twist to the meaning of the term. This paper reviews both usages of the term theory of change and attempts to evaluate whether philanthropy’s adoption of the term theory of change contributes new meaning and understanding to the field of philanthropy or should be considered merely faddish.

Research for this paper included a survey of the one hundred largest U.S. foundations, based on annual programmatic payout. The survey sought to determine whether the majority of these foundations were familiar with the term theory of change, how they defined the term, and how they applied it within their own grantmaking.
A greater understanding of theory of change within philanthropy has the potential to begin to tease out a vocabulary and build an understanding that can be used to describe what goes on inside that unfathomable black box of philanthropy.

CHAPTER 2
Literature Review

The model for foundation effectiveness developed by Orosz et al. indicates that internal program design and decision-making includes “theory of change and strategic alignment” (Orosz, J. Phillips, C. & Wyatt Knowlton, L., 2003, p. 9). The term theory of change has become quite popular among foundation professionals if the number of times the term crops up on major foundation’s web sites is any measure. The issue is how is the term being applied within the field of philanthropy. Currently, there is confusion over the use of the term theory of change, especially in the field of philanthropy.

One challenge is simply in the definition of the term theory of change. In some cases it appears that the term theory of change is used interchangeably with the term “logic model.” However, that is not always the case. Confusion exists even among professional evaluators. Their ongoing discussion about the term theory of change can be tracked on the Evaltalk listserv, which serves as a forum for professional evaluators. The ongoing discussion of the term theory of change serves as documentation of its evolving definition.

Doug Fraser, Australian consultant and author, provides this description of the distinction he draws between a logic model and theory of change in a recent Evaltalk posting:
The "logic" part is not about the fact that x turns into y turns into z, but about how and why. What matters is not what's in the boxes on the chart, but what's inside the arrows that connect them.

(Fraser, 2000)

According to the Harvard Family Research Project, a "theory of change is how one thinks the social change being sought can occur, and what needs to be in place to make it happen" (Weiss, H., Coffman, J. & Bohan–Baker, M., 2002, p. 2). Theory of change is the "set of beliefs that underlie action" (Weiss, H., 1998, p. 55). Theory of change may best be described as people's underlying assumptions of what the problem is and their ideas on how to solve the problem.

Another problem with the use of the term theory of change is the shift in usage that sometimes takes place when the term is used in the field of philanthropy. The term theory of change is most commonly found at the program level and is used as an evaluation term for programs. Two key authors who have talked about the importance of theory in program evaluation are Carol Weiss and Huey–Tsyh Chen.

Huey–Tsyh Chen defines a program as the "purposive and organized effort to intervene in an ongoing social process for the purpose of solving a problem or providing a service" (Chen, 1990, p. 39). Organizations that run programs, as well as the funders who fund programs, are interested in evaluating programs. Program evaluation usually focuses on outcomes, and according to Carol Weiss, rarely pays much "attention to the paths by which they were produced" (Weiss, 1998, p. 55). However, Weiss (1998) notes that, "For evaluation purposes, it is useful to know not only what the program is expected to achieve but also how it expects to achieve it" (p. 55). According to Weiss (1998), theory of change at a program level gets to the underlying ideas and assumptions that link "the program's inputs to attainment of the desired ends" (p. 55).
At times, foundations use the term theory of change at the program level. This is done when a foundation is interested in evaluating a specific program they have funded. However, a second definition, applied at the grantmaking level, seems to have been adopted by some foundations and applied with a vengeance. In 2002, the Harvard Family Research Project bemoaned the fact that the term theory of change has become a “hyper-popular buzz phrase in philanthropic and nonprofit communities” (Weiss, H., Coffman, J. & Bohan–Baker, M., 2002, p. 2).

Although the term theory of change may have the potential to make it into Tony Proscio’s next book on foundation jargon, its usage in the philanthropy world should not be completely discounted since it has been used to describe activities unique to philanthropy.

Two recent articles in Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, written by foundation professionals, illustrate this second usage. Both Michael Bailin from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation and Karl Stauber from the Northwest Area Foundation have written about their foundation’s own theory of change. Stauber (2001) describes what historically has served as the Northwest Area Foundation’s theory of change: a theory that, Stauber notes, was “adopted from the Carnegie–Rockefeller–Ford model of philanthropy” (Stauber, 2001, p. 394).

Stauber (2001) explains that “Under this model, foundations, working in close cooperation with other institutions, identify important social issues, explore possible approaches to addressing the issues, select one or more approaches deemed to be worthy of experimentation, fund the experiments at some scale, assess the results, and then, if appropriate transfer the model to permanent government funding” (p. 394).
Historically, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation’s theory of change was very similar. Bailin describes the theory of change that had been at work for almost 30 years at the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation as “a belief that we could change large public systems—education, child protection, and criminal justice, to name a few” (Bailin, 2003, p. 636).

Neither of these theories can be accurately classified as program theory. These theories of change describe something larger and more systemic. They are operating at a different level.

According to Bailin (2003), “Good organizations have a strong theory of change” (p. 637). Bailin (2003) notes that organizations have theories of change at both the “micro and a macro level” (p. 637). At each level, organizations should be able to explain “exactly what they do, with whom, at what cost; why that activity logically leads to measurable results; and how they define and recognize success when they see it” (Bailin, 2003, p. 637).

It seems that within the field of philanthropy, theory of change can be used not only at the micro or program evaluation level, but also as a way to describe part of the strategic grantmaking process at the macro level.

Mark Kramer, with the Center for Effective Philanthropy, feels that the development of a theory of change is one of the core principles of “strategic philanthropy.” As Kramer (2001) describes it, a foundation’s theory of change reflects its beliefs about “how to create change in society” (p. 42).

Peter Frumkin is another person who has written about theory of change at the strategic grantmaking level. He explains, “At the strategy level, foundations typically
adopt one or more theories of change that express their underlying beliefs about how progress is achieved in a given domain” (Frumkin, 2002, p.1).

If, as the model developed by Orosz et al. suggests, a foundation’s internal processes contribute to the ultimate success or failure of its grantees, then it would be misleading for foundations to use only the measurement of grantee program outcomes as their overall measurement of foundation effectiveness. Foundation effectiveness must also take into account a foundation’s internal processes including its theory of change.

Mark Kramer notes that a foundation’s strategy, which is based on its theory of change, cannot be “reverse engineered by investing heavily in after-the-fact evaluation, just as a recipe cannot be derived from the chemical analysis of a meal” (Kramer, 2001, p. 45). He warns that “Until the field turns its attention away from measuring results at the back end, and devotes ample resources to researching and determining more specific and realistic objectives at the front end, the ‘evaluation problem’ will remain as intractable as ever, and ‘strategy’ itself will mean anything at all” (Kramer, 2001, p. 45).

Rather than being relegated to the dust heap of “foundation jargon,” the second definition of theory of change highlights a critical component of philanthropy. Theory of change at the strategic grantmaking level begins to shine a bright light onto the underlying assumptions that exist, not within an implementing organization, but within the funding entity.

Theory of change gives name to the essence of the historical challenge of philanthropy. In tracing the roots of philanthropy, Orosz (2000) finds the first and most eloquent description of this challenge being articulated by Aristotle when he lamented about the difficulty of giving away money “to the right person, to the right extent, at the right time, for the right reason, and in the right way” (p. 1).
William Bloomfield found that early American philanthropists also appeared to struggle with how to give money away the “right way” (Bloomfield, 2002, p. 8). Bloomfield (2002) notes that the development of foundations was, in part, an answer to this problem. “In the late nineteenth century, potential donors struggling to decide which people were the most deserving of their support and which projects were most promising in terms of social value found that the legally incorporated foundation provided a ‘tangible framework for giving’ ” (Bloomfield, 2002, p. 8). That framework for giving was, according to Bloomfield (2002), based on “that institution’s particular theories about how change best occurs in society and the role philanthropy should play in influencing that change” (p. 90); in other words, by the foundation’s theory of change.

Historically, the most popular foundation theory of change was the one described earlier by Karl Stauber from the Northwest Area Foundation. Bloomfield calls this theory of change the “scientific method.” Bloomfield recounts that the theory was first proposed to John D. Rockefeller, Sr. by Fredrick T. Gates and ultimately implemented in Rockefeller’s foundations. This theory, not unlike other theories of social change, has its roots in the science of the day. Bloomfield (2002) notes “Gates was a student of Louis Pasteur’s new theory that specific germs causes diseases” (p. 91).

Applying this scientific theory to a social context, germ theory suggests that a root cause can be identified for every problem. The assumption then was that the root cause could be identified and subsequently eliminated, thus preventing the problem. Rockefeller sums up this theory of change when he states, “The best philanthropy is constantly in search of the finalities—a search for cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source” (Bloomfield, 2002, p. 91).
The history of the philanthropy of George Peabody provides yet another example of a theory of change. In this his theory of change focused on public policy. James Smith (2002), in writing about George Peabody’s philanthropy, noted some of the activities that made Peabody’s work shaping public policy so successful. They included having a politically powerful and influential board of trustees and conducting outreach campaigns that sought to reach influential community leaders including “religious and educational leaders, journalists, and state legislators…” (Smith, 2002, p. 4). Peabody also used the tactic of creating “demonstration projects” by funding schools in the south and used the power of leverage by requiring each district to “commit twice as much money as the Fund contributed and agree to adopt certain educational standards….“ (Smith, 2002, p. 4).

Today, the search for “root causes” by philanthropists and others interested in social change continues unabated. The call for leverage, including the commitment of dollars or other resources from several sources, is considered a given by most grantmakers. It is unlikely that many of the would-be social reformers of today are even familiar with the origins of these theories of change.

Fast-forward to today and one wonders how many of the four general statements that Orosz claims, “the great majority of U.S. foundations would probably agree with” have similar historical antecedents. According to Orosz (2000), most major U.S. foundations believe

- Foundations should primarily concentrate on philanthropy (root causes) as opposed to charity (meeting immediate needs).
- Foundations should primarily concentrate on supporting innovation as opposed to supporting ongoing programs.
• Foundations should primarily concentrate on leveraging funds as opposed to being the sole funder.

• Foundations should primarily concentrate on helping good ideas get a trial and a start as opposed to funding tested and proved approaches (p. 18).

Although not theories of change, these statements allude to those underlying assumptions about giving, assumptions that may have developed from layers of philanthropic tradition and remain implicit and therefore largely unexamined.

Although the use of the term theory of change within philanthropy is fairly new, several people have already ventured to create a list of the theories of change that are used by foundations. Orosz (2000) states that foundations’ theories of change can be clustered into four main types. They include:

• Passive—These are foundations that do not actively solicit proposals, but rather respond to any that make their way to them.

• Proactive—These are foundations that actively let the community know what their funding guidelines are and have usually developed funding areas of interest or priorities.

• Prescriptive—These foundations fund in clearly delineated fields of interest, and discourage unsolicited proposals.

• Peremptory—These foundations find and choose who they want to grant to. They may even operate their own programs and would not consider unsolicited proposals (p. 25–26).

Rather than theories of change, these may better be described as giving strategies that exist along a continuum of control that Orosz calls the 4 P Continuum. Clearly a
theory of change informs each one of these giving strategies, but they remain implicit within the statements.

Moving beyond questions of control in giving, Frumkin (2002) gets down to brass tacks when he poses the question: “how do foundations create change?” (p. 1). The answer a foundation devises for this question can be considered its theory of change.

Frumkin (2002) suggests that the entire universe of foundation theories of change can be grouped into five broad categories.

1) Training individuals for leadership in a field.

Frumkin (2002) notes that for this theory of change funders “focus on training and developing individuals for leadership in fields where change is needed.” Hoping to “create an army of change agents, ready both to change practice in the field and to lead efforts to change public policy” (p. 2).
2) **Building stronger organizations.**

This theory of change seeks to build up the institutions that provide programs and services. Foundations embracing this theory of change provide grants for things like technical assistance, planning, and capacity building. In some cases foundations will provide general operating support as a way to help build an organization’s capacity.

3) **Establishing new inter-organizational networks.**

Foundations funding inter-organizational networks hope that networks will share best practices, pool resources and mobilize together for advocacy purposes.

4) **Influencing politics.**

According to Frumkin (2002) philanthropy has used at least three different approaches to access political power and shape policy. The first is by stimulating “civic engagement” or “exposing citizens to politics and mobilizing them to take action” (p. 3). This could include funding “get-out-the-vote” efforts or organizing public meetings or debates. The second method is to fund nonprofits that provide public education on policy issues. The final method is to fund nonprofits that are involved in lobbying.

5) **Generating new ideas and proposals for a field.**

According to Frumkin (2002) this theory of change “… can have a tremendous impact when successful” (p. 3). Funding efforts are aimed at shaping public and elite policy opinion in fields such as health insurance and welfare policy. If their ideas are adopted, a foundation has an opportunity to convert a “modest philanthropic investment into major interventions in public life” (p. 3)

Frumkin sees these theories existing on a hierarchy. "Training individuals for leadership in a field," is conducted at the local level. The other theories are viewed as
moving along a continuum with "generating new ideas and proposals for a field" existing at the upper or national level.

Frumkin notes that some foundations prefer to work from the "bottom up" while others feel the place to start is with the "top down." Working from the "top down" would entail "... starting with the production of new ideas on the national scene, seeking to introduce these ideas into politics, building networks of dissemination, assisting organizations with the implementation of new programs, and then training individual leaders to bring change to the local level" (Frumkin, 2002b, p. 2).

William Mendel Bloomfield conducted a series of interviews with people in the field of philanthropy for his dissertation on philanthropic decision-making. From his interviews he was able to distill "five big ideas" that foundations believed could be used to "change the world" (Bloomfield, 2002, p. 94). These five big ideas include:

- Policy change—In the 1960s, foundations attempting to improve society focused on the "political context and advocacy."

- Network and partners—In the 1970s, foundations widely supported "collaboration and inter-organizational" projects in the belief that grantees and communities would be "successful only if they worked together" and formed partnerships with like-minded organizations and peers in the private and public sectors.

- Changing individuals—In the 1980s, foundations thought that problems facing communities and the nation would be solved if the right people were in charge, and therefore foundations supported "training programs, leadership development, and creating a few great people."
Organization development—In the 1990s, funding was dominated by the concept of “building strong organizations.” Foundations supported “technical assistance,” “board development,” and institutional capacity building.

Ideas—A concept that is woven “back and forth” between and among the four previously listed paradigms. The “big idea” of creating “new paradigms” is not rooted in any particular decade of activity but instead is continually pursued by foundations (Bloomfield, 2002, p. 95).

According to Bloomfield (2002), foundation decision-makers assume their theories of change will “add value and result in positive change for society” (p. 95). However, some who were interviewed, worried out loud “whether any reason exists to believe that any of these ‘big ideas’ are viable...” (Bloomfield, 2002, p. 95).

Chen (1990) notes that theories of change are frequently “implicit or unsystematic” (p. 39). Besides frequently being implicit, Weiss (1998) notes that theory of change does not have to be “uniformly accepted” (p.55). It does not, she states, even “have to be right” (Weiss, 1998, p.55). This may be especially true in the case of foundations, which are institutions that have no real economic incentive to “get it right.”

A foundation’s theory of change can easily be considered the most critical, yet most overlooked aspect of its grantmaking strategy. Theory of change often remains the invisible and unarticulated under-girding for all the activities and decisions that a foundation makes. Theories of change within foundations, according to Frumkin (2002), are in dire need of greater clarity and understanding. He notes, “the greatest opportunity for philanthropic impact has been neglected for way too long: philanthropy needs new basic research on ways of generating change and achieving leverage” (Frumkin, 2002, p. 10).
CHAPTER 3

Methods

Theory of change within philanthropy

Clearly there is confusion and perhaps some controversy within the field of philanthropy over the definition of theory of change. There is general agreement with the overall definition of theory of change, however the literature review shows that practitioners within the field of philanthropy apply the term at different levels.

Its traditional usage, as defined by authors such as Weiss (1998) and Chen (1990), is at the program level. However, the literature review has demonstrated that the term theory of change also exists at the grantmaking level, consistent with what authors Kramer (2001) consider strategic grantmaking. Kramer (2001) notes that a foundation’s theory of change would allow it to “define an improvement to society and identify the levers they can pull to make it happen...” (p. 1).

This survey will attempt to determine whether the top 100 U.S. foundations are familiar with the term theory of change and how they define the term. The survey will also attempt to determine whether foundations apply theory of change at the program level or at the grantmaking level.

This survey asks major U.S. foundations to indicate which, if any, of Frumkin’s five theories their foundation uses to “create change.” Frumkin made it clear that his was not an exhaustive list, but rather a first attempt to tease out the key theories of change under which foundations operate. This survey also probes major U.S. foundations to determine whether additional theories of change exist that are not mentioned by Frumkin.
Equally intriguing, Frumkin (2003) hypothesized that “grantmakers cannot coherently pursue all five theories of change at once” (p.11). This survey will capture the number of Frumkin’s theories of change foundations indicate that they use.

Frumkin (2003) states that it is unclear whether any of these strategies, tactics, schemes, and dreams actually improves the effectiveness of foundation giving or increases its social impact (p. 10). It is not within the scope of this Theory of Change survey to measure the effectiveness of any of the theories of change proposed for foundations. However, some basic characteristics of foundations can be compared. Hypotheses have been built around the expected differences between foundations that recognize the term theory of change and those that do not.

**Hypotheses**

*Foundations familiar with the term theory of change will be less likely to implement all five of Frumkin’s theories of change.*

According to Frumkin (2003), “Grantmakers cannot coherently pursue all five theories of change at once…” (p. 11). Theory of change, as it pertains to grantmaking, appears to have been adopted by the innovators and the early adopters within the field of philanthropy. Foundations that know about theory of change may also have an overall enhanced interest in effective grantmaking strategies and best practices in the field of philanthropy. A more focused grantmaking approach, that does not attempt to implement all five of Frumkin’s theories of change at once, may be considered a best practice in grantmaking.

*Foundations familiar with the term theory of change will be less likely to try to implement more than two grantmaking program areas.*
It may be that foundations that are using an emerging concept such as theory of change may also be more familiar with and utilize other best practices within the field of philanthropy. Recent articles on philanthropy including articles by Bailin (2003) and Stauber (2001) have discussed the importance of focus in grantmaking. It seems likely that the foundations that understand theory of change would be the same foundations that would seek to keep their grantmaking focused and therefore be more likely to limit their giving to one or two program areas.

*Foundations falling along the passive part of Orosz’s 4P continuum will be less likely to be familiar with the term theory of change than those at the higher end of the continuum.*

Foundations at the lower end of Orosz’s 4P continuum show less control over their grantmaking. As foundations move up the continuum, they exert more control and should therefore exhibit more focus in their grantmaking. More focused grantmaking should include the understanding of the term theory of change.

*Foundations familiar with theory of change will be more likely to have large grantmaking staffs.*

Frumkin (1997) notes that staffing at major U.S. foundations changed dramatically after the criticism and Congressional investigation of the 1960s. As a way to address criticism leveled at foundations, many foundations hired more program staff as a way to appear less elitist and more transparent to the public.

According to Frumkin (1997) once “foundations became more heavily staffed, they began to change the way grants were made” (p. 227). With the addition of programming staff, foundation trustees found themselves less involved with grantmaking decisions. When in the past trustees may have awarded grants based more on personal knowledge of the organization and the people involved, now program staff sought a
“more objective and more legitimate basis for evaluating grant requests...” (Frumkin, 1997, p. 228). This led to an increase in project grants as foundations moved away from general operating grants. This shift away from general operating grants to project grants “justified the cost and administrative burden brought on by the introduction of professional workers into foundations” (Frumkin, 1997, p. 229).

Frumkin (1997) referred to these changes as the “professionalization” of foundations (p. 228). Foundations with more professional staff should be more likely to be familiar with the term theory of change. In part, because theory of change is concerned with strategic, focused grantmaking and in part to merely justify the need for an educated staff that is familiar with cutting edge terminology.

*Foundations familiar with theory of change will be more likely to have staffs that are networked and participate in professional development.*

Based on the theory of diffusion of innovation through organizations, foundations that are more connected to major channels of communication within the field of philanthropy should be more likely to be familiar with the term theory of change. Key networks of communication that were looked at in this survey include subscriptions to professional journals and membership in professional organizations.
The survey

The survey sample included the one hundred largest independent foundations in the United States, based on their annual programmatic payout. Names and contact information for the foundations were obtained through The Foundation Center. Surveys were personally addressed to the Communications Director or to the CEO/President if the foundation did not have a Communications Director. A copy of the survey, information about the survey, a cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to each foundation between August 16th and August 20th of 2004.

Foundations were asked to mail back their completed survey by Monday September 13, 2004. A second mailing was sent out to foundations that had not responded to the first mailing on Friday September 17, 2004.

The survey asked the following questions:

1. Are you familiar with the term theory of change?

2. If yes, how do you define theory of change?

3. Some scholars have generated lists of the types of theories of change foundations may operate under. Please indicate whether you feel your foundation is involved in any of the following as a way to create change:

   - Training individuals for leadership in a field
   - Building stronger organizations
   - Establishing new inter-organizational networks
   - Influencing politics
   - Generating new ideas and proposals for a field

4. Are there other ways, not described above, that you feel your foundation utilizes to create change? If yes, please describe.
5. What percentage of the financial resources of the foundation do you feel is allotted towards its current theory or theories of change?

6. What percentage of the financial resources of the foundation do you feel is more flexible—allotted towards other areas outside of its existing theory or theories of change?

7. Name of foundation

8. Title of person completing survey

9. Number of FTEs of grantmaking staff for your foundation

10. Percentage of grantmaking staff who have graduate degrees

11. Among your grantmaking staff, what is the typical tenure in years

12. Does your foundation (check all that apply)
   • send staff to annual conferences/workshops that focus on philanthropy?
   • Belong to professional organization or association fro foundations?
   • Subscribe to literature in the field of philanthropy?
   • Provide training to staff?

13. Does your foundation require pre-employment training in grantmaking of potential grantmaking staff?

14. Does your foundation provide post-employment training in grantmaking to staff?

Additional information was gathered from The Foundation Center’s profiles on each foundation. Information collected from profiles included foundation assets, grant
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Results

The return rate

In total, forty-four foundations responded in some manner to the mailings. Nine foundations indicated that they were unable to complete the survey. Thirty-five foundations returned a survey, creating a response rate of thirty-five percent.

Research conducted by Hager, Wilson, Pollak and Rooney (2004) looked at return rates from nonprofit organizations of mailed surveys. In their literature search they found a variety of different response rates that were considered “acceptable” for research in the nonprofit field. Although they found no consensus within the literature, it appears that a return rate between twenty-five and fifty percent was most frequently cited as being acceptable.

Measuring foundations' understanding of the term theory of change

In the survey, foundations were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the term theory of change. Fifty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they were familiar with the term theory of change. Forty-six percent were not familiar with the term.

Table 1

| Breakdown of foundations that are and are not familiar with the term theory of change |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Number                            | Familiar                          |
|                                   | 19                                |
| Number                            | Not familiar                       |
|                                   | 16                                |
| Percentage                        | Familiar                          |
|                                   | 54%                               |
| Percentage                        | Not familiar                       |
|                                   | 46%                               |

Comparing understanding of theory of change to the number of theories of change

The variable — number of Frumkin’s theories of change — was compared between foundations that recognized theory of change and those that did not.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of foundations that are and are not familiar with the term theory of change and their usage of Frumkin’s theory of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used at least one of Frumkin’s theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not use any of Frumkin’s theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used at least one of Frumkin’s theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not use any of Frumkin’s theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of thirty-one or eighty-six percent of the foundations used at least one of Frumkin’s theories. One hundred percent of the foundations that were familiar with the term theory of change indicated that they used at least one of Frumkin’s theories of change. Seventy-five percent of the foundations that did not recognize the term theory of change...
change still indicated that they utilized at least one of Frumkin’s theories of change at their foundation.

Table 3

*Number and percentage of foundations familiar with theory of change that used at least one of Frumkin’s theories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Used at least one of Frumkin’s theories</th>
<th>Did not use any of Frumkin’s theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Number and percentage of foundations not familiar with theory of change that used at least one of Frumkin’s theories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Used at least one of Frumkin’s theories</th>
<th>Did not use any of Frumkin’s theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of foundations familiar with theory of change that used all five of Frumkin’s theories of change*

Ten out of nineteen or 53% of the foundations familiar with the theory of change also indicated that they implemented all five of Frumkin’s theories of change. Three out of sixteen or only 19% of the foundations not familiar with theory of change used all five theories of change.
Table 5

*Number and percentage of foundations familiar and not familiar with theory of change that use all five of Frumkin's theories of change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean number of theories and significance*

Foundations indicating that they were familiar with the term theory of change checked an average of four of Frumkin’s theories of change. Foundations that were not familiar with the term theory of change indicated that they implemented only an average of two of Frumkin’s theories.

In order to gauge whether this difference was statistically significant, a t-test of the means between the two groups was conducted. The mean number of theories implemented by foundations familiar with the term theory of change was 4.16. The mean number of theories for foundations that were not familiar with theory of change was 2.27.

Table 6

*Comparison of mean number of Frumkin's theories to foundations familiar and not familiar with theory of change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The p-value, or probability that the mean difference occurred by chance, was 0.002. A p-value of less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant, therefore the difference between the groups was found to be statistically significant.
Comparing understanding of theory of change to size of staff

The Theory of Change survey asked respondents to provide information on the size of their grantmaking staff. Although all of these foundations ranked in the top one hundred in the U.S. based on their annual programmatic payout, the size of their grantmaking staff varied greatly. Size ranged from one staff person to sixty-five staff people associated with grantmaking among the foundations that responded.

An analysis was made to see if there was any difference between foundations that recognized theory of change and those that did not and the size of their staff. The median grantmaking staff size for the group that recognized theory of change was thirteen. This group’s staff size ranged from a minimum of four to a maximum of sixty-five. Their first quartile was eight and the third quartile was twenty.

In contrast, the group of foundations that did not recognize the term theory of change had a median grantmaking staff size of five. It ranged from a high of fourteen to a low of one. The group’s first quartile was three. The group’s third quartile was eight.
Mean staff size and significance

In order to gauge whether this difference was statistically significant, a t-test of the means between the two groups was conducted. The mean of the group that recognized theory of change was 18.83. The mean of the group that did not was 5.88.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not Familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The p-value, or probability that the mean difference occurred by chance, was 0.003. A p-value of less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant, therefore the difference between the groups was found to be statistically significant.

Comparing understanding of theory of change to staff education level

The variable of the percent of staff with graduate degrees was compared between foundations that recognized the term theory of change and those that did not. The mean percent of staff that had graduate degrees from foundations that recognized theory of change was 75.1. The mean percent of the group that did not was 52.3.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The p-value was 0.06. The difference between the two groups was not statistically significant.

Comparing understanding of theory of change to networking and professionalization

A comparison was made between foundations that recognized theory of change and those that did not and the number of professional or networking activities their staff participated in. This survey also looked at the extent to which each foundation was networked and professionalized.

Foundations participating in at least three out of the four professional development activities listed in the survey were considered highly networked and professionalized. The majority of the foundations fit these criteria. Twenty-nine out of the
thirty-four foundations that answered this question checked at least three out of the four activities. Of this more networked group, seventeen, or 59% of foundations indicated they knew what theory of change was, while twelve or 41% indicated they did not.

Table 9

*Number and percentage of networked/professionalized foundations broke out by those foundations that are familiar with theory of change and those that are not*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean number of professional/networking activities and significance*

The mean number of professional activities participated in by foundations that were familiar with theory of change was 3.79. The mean number of professional activities for foundations that did not recognize theory of change was 3.19.

Table 10

*Mean number of professional/networking activities broke out by those foundations that are familiar with theory of change and those that are not*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The p value was 0.09. The difference in the amount of professional and networking activities that staff members from foundations that recognized theory of change and those that did not was not statistically significant.
Defining theory of change

Foundations that were familiar with the term theory of change were asked to provide a written definition. Eighty-four percent of the foundations that indicated they were familiar with theory of change were able to provide a written definition. See appendix for a complete list of responses given by foundations.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided a definition</th>
<th>Did not provide a definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of a written definition, one foundation provided a flow chart. Another provided a "policy chain" that outlined their theory of change but gave no general definition. Only one foundation that indicated that it was familiar with the term theory of change provided no additional information on how they view theory of change.

Responses to the question "how do you define theory of change" varied greatly. Many foundations linked the term theory of change to logic models. The majority of foundations used the term "logic model" or language associated with logic models such as "linkages," "outcomes," "actions" and "results." The foundation that provided a flow chart put the development of a theory of change ahead of the development of a logic model.

The literature review highlighted a difference in the usage of the term theory of change. The traditional usage, as defined by writers such as Chen and Weiss, is an evaluation term and places theory of change at the program level. The other, emerging
usage, applies the term theory of change to the foundation level and is consistent with the writings of Frumkin and Kramer.

Responses to the survey captured both types of usage. Some foundations talked about theory of change at the program planning level. A few indicated that theory of change encompassed their foundation's work as well. In these cases, the foundations also used terms like “funding strategies” and “grantmaking strategies.” In a few cases, a foundation used theory of change at a systems level, indicating that their foundation's actions were merely one component. Below is a typology that tries to describe the types of responses found in the survey.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Foundation level</th>
<th>System level</th>
<th>No level specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logic Model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Logic Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frumkin's theories of change

The survey then moved onto Frumkin's Theory of Change typology. Frumkin (2002) listed five different theories of change he felt were used by foundations. These theories included:

- Training individuals for leadership in a field
- Building stronger organizations
- Establishing new inter-organizational networks
- Influencing public policy
- Generating new ideas and proposals for a field (p.1).
Foundations were asked to indicate whether they used any of these theories of change to "create change." Of the thirty-five foundations surveyed, 89% indicated that they used at least one of the five theories of change proposed by Frumkin.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of foundations used Frumkin's theories</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used at least one of Frumkin's theories</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not use any of Frumkin's theories</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of all five of Frumkin's theories was the most popular option. Thirty-seven percent of the foundations indicated that they used all five of the theories. Twenty percent indicated that they used four theories, fourteen percent used three theories, three percent used two theories and fourteen percent used just one theory. Eleven percent did not use any of Frumkin's proposed theories of change.
Table 14

Number and percentage of foundations broke out by number of Frumkin's theories used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 theories</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 theories</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 theories</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 theories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 theory</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 theories</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most popular theory of change, checked by 80% of the respondents, was “building stronger organizations.” The next most popular theory of change was over ten percentage points lower. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that they worked to establish stronger networks, sixty-three percent tried to generate new ideas, and sixty percent sought to train individuals. The least popular theory of change was influencing public policy. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that they used that theory.

Table 15

Number and percentage of foundations that use each of Frumkin's theories of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory of change</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building stronger organizations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing stronger networks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating new ideas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training individuals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing public policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional theories of change

Foundations were then asked whether they used any other theories of change not proposed by Frumkin. Fifty-seven percent of the foundations indicated that they used other theories of change. See appendix for a complete list of responses given by foundations.

Although fifty-seven percent of the foundations indicated that they used additional theories of change, upon closer analysis it appears that some of the given responses can be collapsed into one of Frumkin’s five broad theories of change.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frumkin’s theories of change</th>
<th>Additional numbers based on written responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training individuals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building stronger organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing new inter-organizational networks</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing public policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating new ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the theory that sees the highest increase is the area of influencing public policy. Influencing public policy encompasses a number of activities. One survey respondent provided a very complete list of the steps involved in influencing policy. They included:

Step 1 - define the problem through documenting and quantifying the problem,

Step 2 - mobilize through education and grassroots organizing

Step 3 - implement policy change
In many cases, the foundations’ written responses describes just one of the steps involved in influencing public policy such as collecting data or public education. Foundations indicating that they provided any one of those components in their written comments were added to Frumkin’s influencing public policy theory of change.

It is possible that foundations indicating that they had additional theories of change just did not consider activities such as public education as a component of influencing public policy. It may also be that foundations shy away from categorizing themselves as working towards policy change.

One theory of change mentioned by a foundation that was not listed by Frumkin was “building facilities.” Historically this has been a very popular way to give away money. Way back in 1889, famous philanthropist Andrew Carnegie enumerated the “seven best uses to which a millionaire can devote the surplus of which should regard himself as only the trustee” (O’Connell, 1993, p.106-107). Each method he outlined involved building or expanding on a facility:

- Founding of a university
- Building free libraries
- Founding or extensions of hospitals, medical colleges, laboratories and other institutions connected with the alleviation of human suffering
- Public parks
- Building halls for meetings of all kinds and for concerts of elevating music
- Public swimming baths
- Church or churches in poor neighborhoods.

Of course the benefit or change that one would like to see in the community is based on what the facility does in the community not just from its mere presence.
According to Frumkin (2002) foundations that provide funds for construction feel they “strengthen the critical infrastructure of nonprofits and allow them to offer more effective programs in the long run” (p. 2). That is why the response “building facilities” was added to Frumkin’s building stronger organizations theory of change.

Beyond Frumkin's five theories of change

Besides developing a list of five theories of change foundations use, Frumkin (2002) lists seven “programmatic tactics” intended to create leverage (p. 4). These tactics, Frumkin (2002) feels, increases “the effectiveness of grants by choosing to support special classes of programs” (p. 4). They include:

- Support directed at geographical communities, not program areas
- Funding of new initiatives and pilot programs
- Support for nonprofit collaboration, not isolated work
- Private funding for public programs
- Funding of commercial ventures within nonprofits
- Support for organizations designed and set up by grantmakers
- Funding of independent evaluations

Several of the foundation’s written responses to the question of whether they had additional theories of change can better be categorized as a leverage program tactic as opposed to a theory of change.
Table 17

*Break out of responses that can be sorted into one of Frumkin’s leverage programmatic tactics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frumkin’s leverage program tactics</th>
<th>Numbers based on written responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to geographical areas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of new initiatives and pilots</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private funding for public programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding commercial ventures</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for foundation designed programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding independent evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional response that didn’t fit well into Frumkin’s list of leverage tactics, but clearly has leverage of resources as a goal, was the statement “we work hard to leverage resources so that many partners have a true stake in an initiative to make it more successful.”

Besides funding certain types of programs that encourage leverage, Frumkin (2002) says “foundations employ tactics that are centered on the nature and character of the grant itself” (p. 7). Frumkin (2002) believes foundations select the following types of grants as a way to create a larger impact.

- Project grants, not general operating support
- Short term grants
- Matching grants
- Loans and program-related investments, not grants
- Large grants
- Grants driven by proactive RFPs
• High engagement grantmaking
• Joint funding
• Technical assistance, planning and capacity building grants.

Several foundations indicated that another theory of change they utilized was to “build capacity.” Foundations in this survey indicated they were building capacity in everything from youth, to nonprofit organizations, to the community as a whole. However, one of the same foundations also admitted that creating capacity frequently meant training leaders and strengthening organizations. Therefore their responses were added to Frumkin’s theory of change as “training leaders” and “strengthening organizations,” but it should also be noted that capacity building could be considered a grantmaking tactic.

Several foundations talked about accountability or improving quality. This could be considered part of the grantmaking tactic of “high engagement grantmaking.”

Several responses provided by foundations did not fit any of Frumkin’s theories or tactics. However, some could be found on a list generated by Mark Friedman, author of *Results-Based Grantmaking*. Friedman (2000) listed twelve potential roles that he feels aligns with results based decision–making processes. Many are consistent with Frumkin’s theories of change but three show up only on his list and again in some of the surveyed foundation’s responses. They include:

• Help create new social technology. Examples given by Friedman included investment boards and a framework for results-based decision-making. Examples of “social technology” given by foundations responding to the survey included systems mapping and network analysis.
• Support new tools. An example given by Friedman were report cards on child, family and community well being. One foundation surveyed also cited the development of new tools and resources. That foundation gave the example of funding for digital teaching resources. (p. 6).

Once created, tools and resources are available forever and can dramatically change the way future problems are approached and solved.

Theories of change that do not fit within Frumkin’s typology

Some responses provided by foundations do not appear to fit into any of Frumkin’s existing theories or tactics. This includes several responses that focus on trying to change various systems. Frumkin (2002) mentions influencing policy as a theory of change. Policy is certainly a system that, if changed, can have dramatic effects. As one foundation responding to the survey stated, “If these policies are implemented …then the new policies will lead to changes that improve people’s lives…”

However, foundations might try to influence other systems with equally dramatic results. Other systems that responding foundations mentioned included business practices, professional associations, and changing the education system through curriculum change.

The final method, not found in any list, is the tried and true method of funding basic research. Although funding research might fit within Frumkin’s “generating new ideas and proposals for a field” theory of change, I would argue that basic research does not just generate new ideas for a field to mull over, instead new research discoveries immediately and significantly changes the knowledge base, fundamentally changing what is known about an issue.

Networking and professional development
Questions on the survey about participation in conferences, subscriptions to professional journals, membership in professional organizations and training of staff, were used to indicate networking and exposure to professional development. The survey data showed that the great majority of foundations were highly networked and exposed to professional development. Eighty-six percent of the responding foundations checked at least three out of the four questions relating to networking and professional development.

| Table 18 |
|---|---|---|
| Number and percentage of foundations that participated in at least three out of the four networking and professional development activities and those that did not |
| Number | 30 | 5 |
| Percentage | 86% | 14% |

Seventy-four percent of foundations indicated that their staff participated in all four networking and professional development activities. Only eleven percent of foundations participated in three activities, while nine percent participated in two activities. Three percent participated in one activity and another three percent indicated they did not participate in any networking and professional development activities.
Table 19

Number and percentage of foundations broke out by the number of networking and professional development activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Activities</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 activities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-seven percent of the foundations belonged to professional organizations or associations that focus on philanthropy. Ninety-one percent subscribed to literature in the field of philanthropy. Eighty-six percent of foundations sent staff to annual conferences or workshops that focused on philanthropy, while only seventy-seven percent provided training to their staff.

Annual payout

The Theory of Change survey asked foundations to indicate what percentage of their annual payout is allocated towards its theory or theories of change. Only seventy-four percent of the foundations elected to answer this question. Their answers ranged from a high of one hundred percent to a low of twenty-six percent. The average percent payout allocated towards the current foundation theory or theories was seventy-seven percent.

In addition, the survey asked what percentage of the annual payout is unallocated and could be used towards other areas outside of their existing theory of change. Answers
ranged from a high of one hundred percent to a low of zero percent with an average of seventeen percent.

*Training of grantmaking staff*

And finally the survey looked at training of grantmaking staff in foundations. Ninety-seven percent of the foundations do not require training in grantmaking before employment. However sixty-four percent of the foundations provided training to grantmaking staff after employment.

**CHAPTER 5**

**Discussion**

*Understanding theory of change*

The term theory of change is familiar to a little more than half of the top 100 foundations that responded to this survey. When asked to define the term, no one specific definition was given. The majority of the foundations linked the term to logic models. Some talked about theory of change at the program level; a few raised it to the foundation and/or the systems level. This variation reflects the general confusion about this term in the field.

Dr. Peter Frumkin has perhaps made the greatest contribution towards the discussion of theory of change and the work of foundations. He proposed five broad theories of change that foundations use to create change. This survey asked major U.S. foundations to indicate which, if any, of the five theories of change proposed by Frumkin (2002) they used. The theories of change proposed by Frumkin (2002) seem to be a useful description of what is used by foundations. Eighty-nine percent of the foundations
surveyed indicated that they used at least one of the five theories of change proposed by Frumkin.

One disconnect however, was in the number of theories foundations reported they used. Frumkin (2003) has indicated that he thinks “grantmakers cannot coherently pursue all five theories of change at once… (p. 11). However, the survey showed that a great many foundations report that they do, in fact, use all five, and in some cases have additional theories of change. Several of this paper’s hypotheses were based on Frumkin’s concern about foundations implementing too many theories of change at one time. Additional research is needed regarding whether foundations can “coherently” implement five theories and how that impacts a foundation’s effectiveness.

_Hypotheses_

*Foundations familiar with the term theory of change will be less likely to implement all five of Frumkin’s theories of change.*

Survey respondents were given a list of Frumkin’s theories of change and allowed to check all that they felt pertained to their foundation. This allowed foundations that had no knowledge of the term theory of change to still be able to check off the types of things their foundation did to “create change.” It turns out that foundations that were not familiar with the term theory of change were not hesitant to check off Frumkin’s theories. Seventy-five percent of the foundations that were not familiar with the term theory of change checked at least one of Frumkin’s theories.

Keeping in mind Frumkin’s admonishment that foundations cannot coherently pursue all five theories at once, I originally hypothesized foundations familiar with the term theory of change would be less likely to implement all five theories of change.
However, the opposite was true. Ten out of nineteen, or 53% of the foundations that were familiar with the term theory of change also indicated that they implemented all five of Frumkin’s theories of change. Three out of sixteen, or only 19% of the foundations that were not familiar with theory of change used all five theories of change.

Foundations that indicated they were familiar with theory of change checked more theories than foundations that were not familiar with theory of change. Foundations familiar with the term theory of change checked an average of four of Frumkin’s theories. Foundations that did not know what a theory of change was, indicated they only implemented an average of two of Frumkin’s theories.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean number of theories of change broke out by foundations that are familiar with theory of change and those that are not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the means of these two groups was found to be statistically significant.

Foundations familiar with the term theory of change will be less likely to try to implement more than two program areas.

Again, based on Frumkin’s concern that foundations would not be able to coherently implement all five of his theories, it was hypothesized that foundations familiar with the term theory of change would have a more focused grantmaking approach and therefore have fewer funded program areas.
This hypothesis was tested in several ways. In both cases information provided by The Foundation Center profiles was used. The first method looked at the number of program areas listed for each foundation. In some cases, however, no program areas were listed. This happened in ten of the cases. Interestingly, foundations that were not familiar with the term theory of change were twice as likely to not list any program areas.

Typically, foundations with no listed program areas focused on a specific geographic region or institution. These foundations were dropped out and the average number of program areas was calculated for both the foundations that were familiar with the term theory of change and those that were not. The average number of program areas was almost identical for the two groups. Foundations familiar with the term theory of change had an average of 5.2 program areas, while foundations that were not had an average of 5.4.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not Familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The p-value or probability that the means occurred by chance was 0.867. A p-value of less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant; therefore the difference between the two groups is not statistically significant.

The second method looked at the number of fields of interest listed for each foundation. These are less specific than program areas, but The Foundation Center profiles provided this information for every foundation. In this case, foundations that
indicated they were familiar with the term theory of change had an average of 11 fields of interest. Foundations that indicated they were not familiar with theory of change had an average of 8.86 different fields of interest.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The p-value, or probability that the mean occurred by chance was 0.416. A p-value of less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant; therefore the difference between the groups was not statistically significant.

Neither method supported the hypothesis that foundations that know about theory of change are more focused and have fewer fields of interest or program areas that they fund.

It is interesting that an increase in the understanding of theory of change does not equate with a lower number of theories of change for foundations in this survey. Instead it appears that foundations that understand theory of change are more likely to implement a larger not smaller number of theories of change.

Perhaps the number of theories of change implemented by a foundation is also associated with the number of staff. It may be that large grantmaking staffs give foundations the ability to work more like several smaller foundations. Larger grantmaking staffs may increase a foundation’s ability to implement more theories of
change and do it in a coherent or effective way. The same may be true of larger amounts of grant money that is granted by a foundation.

To check this, Pearson’s correlation was used to check the relationship between two quantitative, continuous variables. First a scatter plot was charted using size of staff of each responding foundation as the independent variable and the number of theories of change of each responding foundation as the dependent variable.

Figure 2
*Correlation of size of staff to number of theories of change*

The value of Pearson’s correlation coefficient or $r$ is 0.38. The value was found to be statistically significant. Therefore a weak positive correlation exists between the variables - size of foundation staff and number of theories of change implemented by the foundation.

Pearson’s correlation was also used to examine more closely the independent variable of the amount of money granted by a foundation and the dependent variable of
the number of theories implemented by a foundation. A scatter plot was created for these two variables.

Figure 3

*Correlation between amount of money granted to the number of theories implemented*

The value of Pearson’s correlation coefficient or $r$ is 0.20. Coefficients close to 0 indicate no correlation between two variables. Therefore there is no correlation between the variables amount of money granted and number of theories of change implemented by the foundation.

The most significant differences in the number of theories implemented seem to be clustered around issues of awareness. Foundations that are familiar with theory of change are more likely to implement more theories of change.
This survey did not provide any measurement of the effectiveness of foundation giving. Further study on the linkage between the number of theories a foundation pursues and the foundation’s overall effectiveness would be useful.

*Foundations falling along the passive part of Orosz’s 4P continuum will be less likely to be familiar with the term theory of change than those at the higher end of the continuum.*

Based on information provided by The Foundation Center on the foundation’s grantmaking methods, foundations were sorted into the Orosz’s 4 P Continuum. The continuum runs from the least amount of control over grantmaking to the highest level of control over grantmaking. The 4 Ps for giving are passive, proactive, prescriptive and peremptory. The original hypothesis was that the more passive a foundation was in its giving, the less likely it would have a theory of change.

None of the thirty-five respondents were classified as passive foundations. Twelve or thirty-five percent of the foundations were classified as proactive. Proactive foundations were foundations that provided information on how to apply for a grant and outlined general categories or areas of interest such as education, or the arts for funding. Proactive funders in this survey tended to serve a particular region or institution. These foundations seemed more open to funding a variety of activities, but were more specific about where or to whom they would provide funding to.

Thirteen or thirty-seven percent of the foundations were classified as prescriptive. Prescriptive foundations had selected areas of interest and were very specific about what they would fund within those categories. Ten or twenty-nine percent of the foundations were peremptory. Peremptory foundations did not accept unsolicited applications, but instead sought out the groups they wanted to fund. Peremptory foundations may also fund and operate their own programs.
Table 23

*Number and percentage of foundations sorted on 4P continuum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Prescriptive</th>
<th>Peremptory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the proactive foundations, sixty-six percent indicated that they had not heard of the term theory of change, while thirty-three percent indicated that they had. Only fifteen percent of the prescriptive foundations had not heard of the term theory of change. The vast majority, eighty-five percent, of prescriptive foundations had heard about the term theory of change. Fifty percent of the preemptory foundations had heard of the term theory of change while the other fifty percent had not.
Table 24

Percentage of foundations sorted on 4P continuum familiar and not familiar with theory of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive percentage</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive number</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive percentage</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peremptory number</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peremptory percentage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peremptory foundations, which are at the top of the control continuum, were evenly split between those that were familiar with the term theory of change and those that were not. However, there was a difference between proactive and prescriptive foundations in relationship to whether or not they knew about theory of change. Prescriptive foundations are higher on Orosz’s 4 P continuum and therefore exhibited more control over their grantmaking. In support of the original hypothesis, prescriptive foundations were also more likely to be familiar with the term theory of change than the proactive foundations.

In general, prescriptive foundations also operated with more theories of change. Prescriptive foundations had an average of 4.2 theories versus proactive foundations that had an average of 2.4. It appears that prescriptive foundations are more likely to understand theory of change and are more likely to have more specific and more numerous grantmaking strategies.
Foundations familiar with theory of change will be more likely to have large grantmaking staffs.

One of the most significant findings was the clear difference between foundations that were familiar with theory of change and those foundations that were not familiar with theory of change and the size of their grantmaking staffs. The mean staff size for foundations that were familiar with the term theory of change was 18.83, while the mean staff size for foundations that were not familiar with the term was only 5.88. Foundations with small grantmaking staffs were found to be less likely to be familiar with the term theory of change than foundations with large grantmaking staffs. This appears consistent with what Frumkin (1997) noted happened to foundations when they added grantmaking staff. As foundations added grantmaking staff they became more “professionalized,” and shifted to more a focused and project-based grantmaking.

Foundations familiar with theory of change will be more likely to have staff that are networked and participate in professional development.

There was no significant difference between foundations that were familiar with theory of change and those that were not in regard to the number of networking or professional development activities they participated in. The vast majority of foundations, eighty-five percent, participated in three out of the four networking and professional development activities listed on the survey. The mean number of activities that foundations that were familiar with theory of change participated in was 3.79. The mean number of activities that foundations that were not familiar with theory of change participated in was 3.19.
Conclusions

A review of the literature found that the term theory of change exists at two levels. It traditionally existed at the program level. Having been adopted by philanthropy, it also came to be used at a higher, strategic grantmaking level. For both definitions theory of change is considered an evaluative term and is linked to logic models.

There is confusion within the field of philanthropy about the term theory of change. Almost half of all foundations surveyed were unfamiliar with the term. Foundations that indicated that they were familiar with the term were then asked to provide a written definition. When asked to provide a written definition of theory of change, foundations provided a variety of definitions.

For those foundations familiar with the term theory of change, no consensus was found around what level it should be applied to. A few of the surveyed foundations assigned theory of change to the program level, a few assigned the term to the foundation level, while the vast majority assigned it no level at all.

It was originally hypothesized that foundations that understood the term theory of change would practice more focused grantmaking; grantmaking that would involve fewer theories of change and grantmaking program areas. This was based in part on Frumkin's (2003) hypothesis that foundations “cannot coherently pursue all five theories of change at once...” (p. 11). The survey found that foundations familiar with theory of change tended to operate under more theories of change not fewer theories of change than foundations that were not familiar with theory of change. There was virtually no difference found in the number of program areas between foundations that were familiar with theory of change and those that were not.
The survey tool utilized was not developed in a way that would show whether foundations were able to “coherently” implement the number of theories of change that they had, but further research on foundation effectiveness as it relates to theory of change is needed.

Although theory of change is sometimes used interchangeably with logic models, there is a fine distinction between the two. A logic model is a representation of the sum of inputs, activities and outputs, while theory of change is the set of underlying assumptions that drive the logic model.

According to Frumkin (1997), foundation staff seeks out opportunities to be viewed as objective and legitimate (p. 228). The use of logic models in grantmaking suggests an objective and strategic approach. This may be why one of the strongest correlations found in the survey was between the size of the foundation staff and the use of the term theory of change.

However, theory of change does not make a particularly good case for objectivity within grantmaking; instead it highlights the subjectivity of grantmaking. According to Weiss, Coffman and Bohan-Baker (2002),

A theory of change is how one thinks the social change being sought can occur, and what needs to be in place to make it happen. Typically a theory of change is based on a combination of objective evidence drawn from research or experience, and subjective opinion and personal ideology (p. 2).

Theory of change built on subjective opinion and personal ideology, according to Weiss (1998), “doesn’t have to be right” (p.55).

The adoption and use of theory of change to describe the underlying assumptions at work in grantmaking strategy is both appropriate and helpful. Theory of change should be considered the central building block for the internal workings of foundations.
Foundations cannot begin to measure effectiveness until they are able to articulate what currently remains largely unexamined—the assumptions and beliefs that underlie their grantmaking.
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APPENDICES
Theory of Change

Survey of U.S. Foundations

This survey is being done as part of a Master’s thesis on the use and practice of the term “theory of change” within the field of philanthropy. The goal of this project is to create a better understanding of the types of theories of change that may exist in major U.S. foundations. Your foundation was selected because it was identified by the Foundation Center as one of the largest U.S. foundations based on annual giving.

All identifying information on any particular organization or participant will be kept strictly confidential by the principal investigator. Participation is entirely voluntary.

Any questions about this project can be directed to the principal investigator, Angela Morris. Phone number 616-394-4514. Email amorris63@yahoo.com. Participants may request a copy of the final paper by contacting the principal investigator.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator, you may contact the Grand Valley State University Human Subjects Review Committee Chair, telephone 616-331-2472.
Theory of Change

Please answer the following questions about theory of change.

1. Are you familiar with the term theory of change?
   Yes  No

2. If yes, how do you define theory of change?

3. Some scholars have generated lists of the types of theories of change foundations may operate under. Please indicate whether you feel your foundation is involved in any of the following as a way to create change:
   - training individuals for leadership in a field
   - building stronger organizations
   - establishing new inter-organizational networks
   - influencing politics
   - generating new ideas and proposals for a field

4. Are there other ways, not described above, that you feel your foundation utilizes to create change? If yes, please describe.

5. What percentage of the financial resources of the foundation do you feel is allotted towards its current theory or theories of change?

6. What percentage of the financial resources of the foundation do you feel is more flexible—allotted towards other areas outside of its existing theory or theories of change?
Please answer the following additional questions about your foundation.

7. Name of foundation

8. Title of person completing survey

9. Does your foundation (check all that apply)
   - send staff to annual conferences/workshops that focus on philanthropy?
   - belong to professional organization or association for foundations?
   - subscribe to literature in the field of philanthropy?

10. Does your foundation require pre-employment training in grantmaking of potential grantmaking staff?
    
    Yes  No

11. Does your foundation provide post-employment training in grantmaking to staff?
    
    Yes  No

12. Would you like a copy of the final results of this survey?
    
    Yes  No

If yes, please provide an email where information can be sent.
RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTION NUMBER 2

How do you define theory of change?

- A theory of how original, intentional collective action – including but not limited to our organization’s action – will produce significant and sustainable change in the areas we have chosen to focus upon.

- The hypothesis, explanation or logical story about how a set of inputs can lead to a long-term outcome by the use of connected activities/strategies to outputs to short term outcomes.

- Theory of change being attempted in proposed program – giving specificity to aspects critical for clear program design.

- A theory of change is a representation (textual, pictoral, or diagram) of the various pieces of a system and its results. For example, in a particular policy field, it lays out the various institutions and actors, how they are related, what results they have and how outside factors (foundation action, environmental change, etc) influence the process of change within the system.

- Funding strategies designed to alter/improve social system on fields of activity. (e.g. the arts)

- A set of assumptions about a problem or opportunity you are trying to address linked to activities and outcomes you anticipate will bring about a desired result.

- A theory of change has been described as a logic model. That is, a connected set of “if...,then statements that begin with where we are and conclude with the attainment of goal(s). Example: If we find x, then y will happen. If Y and foundation provides Z, then A.....If u, then our goal is reached.
Theory of change is a way to describe the grantmaking program in terms of what we hope to accomplish (outcomes) and how we will know what has changed (indicators). A theory of change is a tool to provide a clear path to shorter-term outcomes. It enables the Foundation board, management, and staff to examine how individuals and collective program grants and other Foundation work lead to the identified outcomes. Examples of specific grantmaking strategies and interventions aimed at achieving the stated outcomes are also included in this paper, and more will be developed as the grantmaking program is implemented.

A theory of change is much like a logic model. You define the problem or issue you need to address and then determine the most effective/appropriate approaches to deal with/respond to that issue. The theory is generally based on some type of scientific research, evidence of best practices, etc.— an indication that this approach will solve the problem or assist with the issue. We base our theories of change on evidence-based approaches. Generally models that have evidence of efficacy.

We use it to refer to detailed strategic plans that identify goals, strategies, outcomes, progress indicators and baselines. We also use the term logic model.

cause --> effect

A description of a logic chain connecting a series of actions and reactions.

A theory of change is the framework that connects an entity’s strategy with its daily operations, providing a roadmap for achieving its targeted objectives. As such it must be: meaningful, plausible, doable, and measurable.
I have general awareness of term but not a thorough understanding. I believe change happens when there is solid, credible, factual research that is used by strong, effective, experienced advocates to impact the development of rational, thoughtful public policy.

A theory of change is a set of beliefs that are critical for achieving change. This includes information about the target population and its needs, strategies for what will be done and the intended outcomes of the action to be taken.

Our organization defines the Theory of Change as the pieces required to prompt a predefined outcome or result.
RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTION NUMBER 4

Are there other ways that you feel your foundation creates change?

- Creating incentives for private-sector participation in efforts to create public benefits.
- Influencing business practices
- Build capacity in youth
- Build capacity in community for collective vision and ways to move toward it (would usually involve leadership development, strengthening organizations, etc.)
- We are actively involved in organizations representing the many diverse faces of philanthropy at the national, state, and local levels. Our staff and management are frequent speakers and presenters at conferences, workshops and symposia and provide technical assistance in a variety of forms to other funders and nonprofit organizations. Many of our staff, over the last 20 years, has gone on to leadership and other positions within the field of philanthropy, both with funders and with national and state level organizations.
- fund educational/medical research to find causes/cures
- fund journalism education for/in academia and in the field (professionals) to strengthen individuals/industry
- build facilities to increase the capacity and development of nonprofit organizations
- Many, many
- Introducing new conceptual frameworks and tools for solving problems such as systemic thinking, network analysis, systems mapping etc.
• Making it possible for activities that government cannot pull off but wishes it could.

• By funding demonstration projects that illustrate policy change; funding research/studies/evaluations that provide new information to the field; funding projects that create or collect data to help illustrate the issues.

• Focused grantmaking, accountability of grantees

• We also operate as a convenor to bring people of diverse backgrounds together. We also work hard to leverage resources so that many partners have a true stake in an initiative to make it more successful.

• Creating new resources for scholarship (e.g. foreign language instruction; digital teaching and library materials)

• Supporting interdisciplinary teaching and learning

• We fund basic research to provide new knowledge in biology

• Neighborhood organizing

• Within our mission making sure deaf individuals are trained to listen and talk and be able to participate in mainstream society.

• In addition to establishing funding new inter-organizational networks. We have also focused on changing professional associations. We have also stimulated curriculum change in medicine, nursing and social work.

• Support of policy research and advocacy organizations

• Yes, through heightened public awareness of critical issues, basically educating the public on issues. We do this through our support of media such as public broadcasting and independent video and filmmakers who take up such issues the
public might not otherwise be aware of. Two of our three care areas for support are higher education and public broadcasting so this represents a marriage of the two.

- Improving quality