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**The Role of philanthropic organizations in marginal groups: The Israeli case**

Philanthropic activity has an important role in Neo liberal states, especially with respect to marginal groups. This paper analyzes the unique role Philanthropy has within marginal groups. We investigated this when researching the establishment of philanthropic organization among Jewish marginal groups in the state of Israel.

We use the qualitative method in our research. Twenty-two heads of philanthropic organizations were interviewed, representing the variety of marginal Jewish groups in Israel.

In this paper we concentrate of the reasons and procedure of the creation of the philanthropic organizations. We investigated the surrounding of the organization and the motives for establishing it.

We suggest that our method of investigation can be utilized in researching and understanding the appearance of philanthropic organization within marginal groups at large.

Literature review:

Philanthropy serves as a major tool in the operation of marginal communities, especially in Neo-liberal countries. (Dodgson & Gann, 2020; Maurrasse, 2020). This paper will examine the role of philanthropic endeavors in marginal Jewish communities in Israel.

In welfare states government either marginalizes or empoweres marginal groups. Thus marginal organization's activity was a result or reaction to governmental policy of aiding the marginal group members. Scholarship emphasize the perception of a “transformation” of development, that “puts people first”, which was common with volunteer aid. Gamzu & Motzafi-Heller investigated the daily encounter of volunteers with members of their multiply marginalized host community is southern Israel. They exposed the complex social reality of what it means to “develop” and “empower” a population routinely framed as disadvantaged and targeted for aid. (Gamzu & Motzafi-Haller, 2016).

 In the aftermath of Welfare state and rise of Neo-Liberal states, government involvement in running the public sector decreased. The retreat of governments from functions created a vacuum, which non-profit and philanthropic organizations filled. (Raddon, 2008; Eikenberry & Mirabella, 2018; MacLeavy, 2020, Alexander & Fernandez, 2021). The vacuum was fulfilled by third sector organizations. (Zimmer & Friese, 2008). Philanthropic organizations are an important part of the third sector organizations and their operations are investigated here. (Leat, 2015). Philanthropy is growing rapidly in most countries in the industrialized world. (Adam, 2004) and is finding new forms and meanings in civil societies. (Harrow & Jung, 2011, Fioramonti & Thümler, 2013).

 By philanthropy we refer to activities in all fields of life, aiding community members to live within a socially and culturally accepted ideology. (Schyut, 2010).

 When discussing philanthropy, one must draw a sharp distinction between charity and philanthropy. (Schultz, 2009; Tracy, Philips & Haugh, 2005; Wright, 2001). Both Charity and Philanthropy organizations exist within power deprived marginal communities. (Reece, Hanlon & Edwards, 2022, Carboni & Eikenberry, 2021, Valenzuela-Garcia, Lubbers & Rice, 2019). Abrahamson demonstrated how many American philanthropic organizations were reborn of charity organizations particularly religion-based organizations. (Abrahamson, 2013). Spero (2014) claimed that this was the case in Russia, China, India, and Brazil as well. We claim that this is true also in Israel.

In each case, the surrounding society was either unwilling or objected to assist the marginal groups for a variety of reasons, thus forcing the departmentalized community to use philanthropy as a major tool. Charitable activities were not enough, and vast philanthropic action was needed to aid marginal groups. Schuyt claimed that philanthropy organizations, though emerged from charity organizations had a different goal. It was a social arrangement to fulfil needs. (Schuyt, 2013).

 This paper analyzes the impulse of philanthropy rather than its effect on society. (Borenstein, 2009). Though aimed at financial institutions, we will use the social value of productive entrepreneurship theory offered by Acs and others when we investigate philanthropic marginal organizations (Acs, Boardman, & McNeely, 2013).

 Analyzing the role of philanthropic organization is especially vital regarding marginal groups. Marginal groups operate within the outskirts of society either by choice or by necessity (Cullen & Pretes, 2019). On occasions, marginal groups, and in particular religious ones (Bratkowski & Regis, 2003), create philanthropic organizations in an attempt to preserve their willingly separation from mainstream society (Tafoya, 2014). Marginal groups often combine financial, social, and political agendas, when deciding to form a philanthropic organization (Fyall & Allard, 2017).

 People's social identity is a product of their own self-concept derived from a perceived membership in a distinct social group. People can simultaneously be members of multiple social groups. Social groups are often associated with social identity which reflects social class, academic performance, gender and gender roles, sexuality, religion, ability, and racial identity (Drezner & Huehls, 2014).

People belonging to Marginal groups either wish to maintain their sense of belonging or aim to acculturate themselves within the dominant society. Thus, two different marginal groups exist. One aiming to enclave the group and the other to acculturate and sometimes to assimilate. The difference between the groups reflects different attitudes toward the concepts of Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion. Social Inclusion refers to people and groups aiming to submerge within the main social group (Lombe & Sherraden, 2008). Social self-Exclusion is defined by Razer, et al. as a state in which individuals or groups ‘lack effective participation in key activities or benefits of the society in which they live’ (Razer, Friedman, & Warshofsky, 2013: 1152).

 However, it is important to recognize that marginalization is more than a state: it encompasses feelings about that state. To be marginalized is to have a sense that one does not belong and, in so doing, to feel that one is neither a valued member of a community and able to make a valuable contribution within that community nor able to access the range of services and/or opportunities open to others. In effect, to feel, and be, excluded. For some, marginalization can be experienced as transient, and context related. (Razer, et al., 2013). Social self-Exclusion forms part of their identity and lived experience. (Armstrong, D. Armstrong, AC. & Spandagou, 2011).

 Jewish Israeli philanthropic ventures reflect the transition from pre-modern traditions to the new philanthropy era. (Calipha, & Gidron, 2021, Katz & Greenspan, 2015). Berrebi and Yonah portrayed an in-depth survey of Israeli philanthropic activity. (Berrebi & Yonah, 2017). State initiated privatization enhanced non-profits organization activity in Israel (Krauz-Lahav, & Kemp, 2020, Shiffer, 2018).

This work concentrates on two Jewish marginal groups: Ultra-Orthodox Jews and immigrants.

 Ultra-Orthodox Jewish organizations constitute much philanthropical marginal organizations in Israel. Religious fundamentalists, (Almond, Scott Appleby, and Sivan, 2003) including Israel's ultra-orthodox known as Haredim[[1]](#footnote-1), do not like the idea of the ‘state’ as a sovereign entity (Stadler, Lomsky-Feder, & Ben-Ari 2008). In their view, God is sovereign, and the law that should rightfully guide the citizen is religious law. They also regard the nation-state as a belligerent body that undermines their unique way of life.

When discussing immigrant marginal groups, we concentrate on immigrants from Ethiopia (Baratz & Kalnisky, 2017) and Caucasus (Ellenbogen-Frankovitz, [Sorek](https://brookdale.jdc.org.il/en/team/yoa-sorek/), King & Dolev, 2005; Geist Pinfold, & Peters, 2021). Immigrants from the Caucasus are considered marginal compared to immigrants compared with other Ex-Soviet Union countries, representing the preferred mainstream immigrants. (Bram, 2006). These groups tend to cooperate with each other in order to integrate as soon as possible into the mainstream society. This allows them to integrate despite obstacles set government and mainstream social groups. These organizations provided complementary services to newcomers while struggling with hostile government policies. (Binhas & Moskovich 2015).

Research Tools & Research Population:

Qualitative methodology and semi-structured in-depth interviews were employed in the current research. The qualitative approach enables us to understand formal and informal factors leading to establishing marginal groups' philanthropic organizations. Participants were asked how they viewed the process of establishing their organization. The interviewers encouraged participants to address any areas that they felt were relevant to the survey. Additionally, the interviewers also encouraged the participants to engage freely in conversation about philanthropy in marginal groups.

We interviewed leaders of twenty-three non philanthropic marginal Jewish organizations, representing the main two Jewish marginal populations in Israel - Ultra-orthodox Jews (17 interviewees), Immigrants (6 interviewees).

Questions were asked regarding the motivations of creating a philanthropic organization; Changes in organizational aims during the organization life cycle; changes in operation during the Covid-19 pandemic. In the current paper we concentrate on factors and motivations to establish a philanthropic organization.

Six main themes were investigated:

1. The intentions at time of establishing philanthropic organizations in marginal groups.
2. The motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.

- Social motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.

- Personal motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.

1. The aims of philanthropic organizations at early stages.
2. Originals customers of philanthropic organizations.
3. Mapping the organizations’ communal environment.
4. Interface with the organizations’ surrounding environment.

Findings:

The marginal groups identified are divided into three categories:

1. Organizations aiming to maintain and strengthen the social and cultural enclaves they reside in, while adhering their distinct identity. We use here the term conserving organizations. Conserving organizations aim to conserve the unique characteristics of the marginal group while withholding integration into mainstream society. A spectrum was found between conserving and extremely conserving groups. Most groups identified within these categories belong to the Ultra-Orthodox religious cycles in Jewish Israeli Society.
	1. **Motives for establishing philanthropic organizations**

**Social motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.**

Two different social motives were found:

1. Coping with the needs of the group including livelihood (20, February 24, 2021) and poverty (22, February 24, 2021).

2. Coping with specific needs within the group: health (17, February 23, 2021) and sexism (18, February 23, 2021) issues.

**Personal motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.**

Two versions of personal motives were found. Encountering the need in person (19, February 23, 2021). Continuing familial heritage (8, February 11, 2021).

* 1. **The intentions at time of establishing philanthropic organizations in marginal groups**

 When asked what the intended when they established philanthropic organizations, most Ultra-orthodox interviewees referred to identifying a need to provide a solution, mostly economic aid: assisting families of a low financial funds (7, February 10, 2021), social and health: aiding people with kidney disease while creating awareness to this issue in Ultra-orthodox society (7, February 10, 2021), and cultural: creating awareness to Jewish core values needs (7, February 10, 2021). The founders also referred to their personal experience as a motivating factor. In mentioned above case aiding people with kidney disease organization (7, February 10, 2021) was established

by an entrepreneur who encountered personally with the issue. Another instigator identified the need to assist families with many children, based on his own experience (7, February 10, 2021). Sometimes the organizer was motivated by spiritual leaders (1, December 20, 2020) or by familial predecessors (8, February 11, 2021).

* 1. **Aims of philanthropic** **organizations in time of establishment.**

We identified two variants of aims:

1. Organizations offering social welfare jacket to the community. Providing food, appliances, transportation, and clothing (8, February 11, 2021).
2. Organizations concentrating on specific issues - preventing community's schools' dropouts (1, December 20, 2020); assisting kidney failure patients (17, February 23, 2021); preventing sexual violence (18, February 23, 2021).
	1. **Originals customers of philanthropic organizations.**

The entire marginal community in the locality (4, January 24, 2021) or nationwide (18, February 23, 2021), or subgroups: youth nationwide (1, December 20, 2020) and local (22, February 24, 2021).

* 1. **Mapping the organizations’ communal environment.**

Organizations that operated solely in the community engaged in charity- especially food (8, February 11, 2021), religious studying (9, February 11, 2021) and welfare (12, February 18, 2021).

* 1. **Interface with the organizations’ surrounding environment.**

Organizations applying for funds to government agencies were denied (4, January 24, 2021).

1. Organizations aiming to incorporate into the social and cultural mainstream bodies. We use here the term social inclusive organizations. These Melting-pot style organizations aiming to integrate into mainstream society.
	1. **Motives for establishing philanthropic organizations**

**Social motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.**

One motive was to nurture young immigrants to obtain leadership of the community (11, February 17, 2021), by empowering academic undergraduates and graduates (13, February 18, 2021), special attention to teenagers (14, February 19, 2021).

Another motive was cop with prejudice towards the community (9, February 11, 2021), especially in the workplace (13, February 18, 2021), this while maintaining cultural and social identifies (10, February 15, 2021).

**Personal motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.**

No personal motives were mentioned in the interviews.

* 1. **The intentions at time of establishing philanthropic organizations in marginal groups**

Here all interviewees focused on the general need. Two major reasons stood out:

The need to assist marginalized groups - especially young people appear in two cases: assisting Ethiopian young academics placement in the labor market (13, February 18, 2021) and supplying technological education enabling integration in the High-tech industry (11, February 17, 2021).

The need to adverse the social and cultural stigmatization of young Caucasus immigrants was also mentioned (10, February 15, 2021).

One organization incorporated aiding marginal groups within its general vision of supporting the Galilee inhibitions (15, February 21, 2021).

* 1. **Aims of philanthropic organizations.**

Organizations concentrating on specific issues:

1. Empowering adolescent dropouts (14, February 19, 2021), and young members of the community (10, February 15, 2021).
2. Employment placement of University graduates (13, February 18, 2021) and into high-tech industry (11, February 17, 2021).
	1. **Originals customers of philanthropic organizations.**

Disadvantaged potent (13, February 18, 2021) or youth (10, February 15, 2021) sectors within the marginal groups.

* 1. **Mapping the organizations’ communal environment.**

Existing organizations within the community engaged in cultural issues, not in communal development (16, February 22, 2021).

* 1. **Interface with the organizations’ surrounding environment.**

The organizations sprung out of existing governmental (14, February 19, 2021) or semi-governmental agencies (9, February 11, 2021). Government funding formed a minor percent of the budget (13, February 18, 2021), or a main percent (11, February 17, 2021).

1. Hybrid Organizations aiming at social inclusion, while sustaining some social or cultural exclusiveness. Organizations seeking to integrate into mainstream society while conserving group uniqueness.
	1. **Motives for establishing philanthropic organizations**

**Social motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.**

Providing educational and economic assistance (5, February 7, 2021). Suppling financial support to all members of the local settlement (2, January 7, 2021). Enhancing traditional Jewish values (21, February 24, 2021).

**Personal motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.**

No personal motives were mentioned in the interviews.

* 1. **The intentions at time of establishing philanthropic organizations in marginal groups**

We found just three organizations. One was created since no parallel body (either internal or external) existed (5, February 7, 2021). The second was initiated by the spiritual mentor of the founder (2, January 7, 2021). The third was to support local avant-gardes core groups efforts in non-ultra-orthodox settlements (21, February 24, 2021).

* 1. **Aims of philanthropic organizations.**

Enhancing financial (2, January 7, 2021) and educational (5, February 7, 2021) sustainability skills. Supporting groups that advance core values of Judaism (21, February 24, 2021).

* 1. **Originals customers of philanthropic organizations.**

New(5, February 7, 2021) and potential members (2, January 7, 2021) of the community.

* 1. **Mapping the organizations’ communal environment.**

Existing organizations within the community engaged different subjects (20, February 24, 2021).

* 1. **Interface with the organizations’ surrounding environment.**

Government and municipal funded part of the budget (5, February 7, 2021), resources, facilities, and funds came from the municipality (2, January 7, 2021).

**[[Place Table 1 about here]]**

Table 1. Philanthropic organizations objectives.

Discussion:

Existing research focuses on marginal groups facing marginalization by the governing bodies of society (Alexander. & Fernandez, 2021). This narrative suggests that marginal group's organizations are formed in reaction to the discriminatory policies of the dominate society (Bram, 2006). We claim that when analyzing marginal organizations, a deeper investigation of the creation of these institutions is necessary is needed. We offer here a new way of categorizing philanthropic organizations in marginal groups.

We identified three variations of marginal philanthropic organizations. Those organizations are investigated here, analyzing them at the period of establishing.

Types of marginal Organizations:

* Organizations intending to remain a cultural enclave.
* Organizations intending to incorporate into cultural mainstream society.
* Hybrid Organizations intending at social inclusion, while sustaining some cultural uniqueness.

These philanthropic organizations differ in the following six parameters:

1. Motives for establishing philanthropic organizations.

Cultural enclave organizations look for maintaining the group and provide the immediate needs of the group and with specific needs within the group. Organizations aiming to incorporate into cultural mainstream society face two challenges: Nurturing young immigrants to obtain leadership & coping with prejudice towards the community. By this they enable this incorporation in the long run. Hybrid organizations combing providing immediate assistance with enhancing group values in the long run. Only cultural organizations initiators discussed personal motives.

1. Intentions at time of establishing philanthropic organizations in marginal groups.

Providing economic aid and/or cultural solutions is the goal of cultural enclave organizations. On the other hand, assisting young members of the community and coping with cultural and social prejudice is the intent of organizations aiming to incorporate into cultural mainstream society. Culture enclave organizations thus offer concrete solutions for essential needs while incorporating organizations encounter long term needs of enhancing group members and legitimizing the group. Hybrid organizations appeared since no parallel body existed and were inspired spiritual mentors.

1. Aims of philanthropic organizations at early stages.

Cultural enclave organizations offer an overall package assisting group members, by providing a social welfare jacket and also by referring to specific issues such as health and sexism concerning specific populations. On the other hand, incorporating organization engages with specific issues like empowering adolescent dropouts and employment of University graduates, relating to subgroups. Thus, culture enclave organizations offer general and specific solutions to the entire group, while incorporating organizations of enhance group members enabling them to create a better future. Hybrid organizations enhance sustainability skills and advancing core values.

1. Originals customers of philanthropic organizations.

Cultural enclave organizations address needy community members - nationwide and local. On the other hand, incorporating organization engages with community members, mainly disadvantaged populations, and young people. Hybrid organizations' customers consist of new and needy members of the group and potential members outside the group, identifying with its causes.

1. Interface with the organizations’ communal environment.

Prior to the establishment of cultural enclave philanthropic organizations, charity organizations existed. This corresponds with the claim that philanthropic organizations appear as a rebirth of charity organizations in modern marginal societies. (Abrahamson, 2013, & Spero, 2014). Incorporating organizations and hybrid had no precedent within the communal environment.

1. Interface with the organizations’ surrounding environment.

Cultural enclave philanthropic organizations had no interaction with surrounding environment organizations. Incorporating organizations and hybrid had interactions with the surrounding environment, both on governmental, semi-governmental and municipal levels.

Bibliography:

Abrahamson, E. J. (2013). *Beyond Charity: A Century of Philanthropic Innovation*. New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Acs, Z. J., Boardman, M. C., & McNeely, C. L. (2013). The social value of productive entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 40: 785-796.

Adam T. (ed.) (2004). *Philanthropy, Patronage and Civil Society. Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Alexander, J. & Fernandez, K. (2021). The Impact of Neoliberalism on Civil Society and Nonprofit Advocacy. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, vol. 12, (2): 367-394.

Almond, G. A., Scott Appleby, R., and Sivan, E. (2003). *Strong Religion: The Rise of Fundamentalisms around the World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Armstrong, D., Armstrong, AC., and Spandagou, I. (2011). Inclusion: By choice or by chance? *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 15(1): 29–39.

Baratz, L., & Kalnisky, E. (2017). The identities of the Ethiopian community in Israel. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 11 (1), 37-50

Bartkowski, J. P., & Regis, H. A. (2003). *Charitable choices: Religion, race, and poverty in the post-welfare Era*. New York: NYU Press.

Berrebi, C., & Yonah, H. (2017). Philanthropy in Israel: An Updated Picture. Taub Center for Social Policy Studies. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3629246>

Binhas, A. & Moskovich, Y. (2015) Coalitions and Collaboration among Three Civil Society Immigrant Organisations in Israel, *Journal of Organisational Transformation & Social Change,* 12:3, 194-210,

Bornstein, E. (2009). The Impulse of Philanthropy. *Cultural Anthropology*, 24: 4, 622-651

Bram, C. (2006). Influencing Social Policy to Recognize Cultural Diversity: The Limitations of Anthropologist Involvement**.** *Practicing Anthropology*, 28 (3): 8–11

Brown, B. (2000). Orthodox Judaism. In: J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Calipha, R., & Gidron, B. (2021). The Evolution of the Israeli Third Sector: A Conceptual and Empirical Analysis. *Voluntaristics Review*, *5*(4), 1-73

Carboni, J. L., & Eikenberry, A. M. (2021). Do Giving Circles Democratize Philanthropy? Donor Identity and Giving to Historically Marginalized Groups. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32, 247–256

Cullen, B. T., & Pretes, M. (2000). The meaning of marginality: Interpretations and perceptions in social science. *The Social Science Journal*, 37:2, 215-229

Dodgson, M., & Gann, D. (2020). What Is Philanthropy and Why Is It Important and Controversial? *Philanthropy, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. London, Springer, 1-15.

Drezner, N.D., & Huehls, F. (2014). Social Identity and Philanthropy. *Fundraising and Institutional Advancement: Theory, Practice, and New Paradigms*. London: Routledge. 91-102.

Eikenberry, A. M., & Mirabella, Roseanne M. (2018). Extreme Philanthropy: Philanthrocapitalism, Effective Altruism, and the Discourse of Neoliberalism. *Political Science and Politics*, 51:1, 43-47

Ellenbogen-Frankovitz, S., [Sorek,](https://brookdale.jdc.org.il/en/team/yoa-sorek/) Y., King, J., & Dolev, T. (2005). *The Integration of Immigrants from the Caucasus: Needs, Policies and Future Challenges***.** Jerusalem: JDC-Brookdale.

Fioramonti, L., & Thümler, E. (2013). Civil Society, Crisis, and Change: Towards a Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Civil Society*, 9:2, 225-232

Fyall, R., & Allard, S. W. (2017). Nonprofits and Political Activity: A Joint Consideration of the Political Activities, Programs, and Organizational Characteristics of Social Service Nonprofits. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership, and Governance*, 41 (3): 275-300.

Gamzu, S., & Motzafi-Haller, P. (2016). The face of development aid: volunteers and their hosts in southern Israel. *Development in Practice*, 26 (7), 876-891

Geist Pinfold, R. & Peters, J. (2021). The limits of Israel’s periphery doctrine: Lessons from the Caucasus and Central Asia. *Mediterranean Politics*, 26 (1), 25-49

Harrow, J., & Jung, T. (2011) Philanthropy is Dead, Long Live Philanthropy? *Public Management Review*, 13:8, 1047-1056

Katz, H., Greenspan, I. (2015). Giving in Israel: From Old Religious Traditions to an Emerging Culture of Philanthropy. In: Wiepking, P., Handy, F. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 316-337

Krauz-Lahav, N., & Kemp, A. (2020). Elite without Elitism? Boundary Work and the Israeli Elite Philanthropy in a Changing Field of Power. *Social Problems*, 67(2), 324-341

Leat, D. (2015). Vignette: Muddy Waters - Difficulties in the relationship between philanthropy, the private and the public sectors. In: T. Jung, S.D. Philips & J. Harrow (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. (215-219). London: Routledge.

Lombe, M., & Sherraden, M., (2008). Inclusion in the Policy Process: An Agenda for Participation of the Marginalized. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 7:2-3, 199-213

MacLeavy, J. (2020). Neoliberalism and welfare. *The Handbook of Neoliberalism*. Simon Springer, Kean Birch & Julie MacLeavy (eds.), London: Routledge, 252-261

Maurrasse, D. J., (2020). *Philanthropy and Society*. New York: Routledge.

Raddon, MB. (2008). Neoliberal Legacies: Planned Giving and the New Philanthropy. *Studies in Political Economy*, 81:1, 27-48

Razer, M., Friedman, V.J., & Warshofsky, B. (2013). Schools as agents of social exclusion and inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 17(11): 1152–1170

Reece, J., Hanlon, B., & Edwards, R. (2022). Philanthropic Investment in Equity: Cultivating Grass Roots Leaders for the Equitable Revitalization of Marginalized Communities. *International Journal of Community Well-Being*, 1-29.‏

Schultz, W. L. (2009). Philanthropy Transformed: Emerging Change and Changes in Charities. *Journal of Future Studies*, 13 (3), 1-18.

Schyut, T.N.M. (2013). *Philanthropy and the Philanthropy Sector: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Schyut, T.N.M. (2010). Philanthropy in European welfare states: a challenging promise? *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 76, 774-789.

Shiffer, V. (2018). The Impact of Privatization on the Non-profit Sector and on Civil Society in Israel. In: Paz-Fuchs, A., Mandelkern, R., Galnoor, I. (eds.), *The Privatization of Israel*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 341-364.

Spero, J. (2014). *Charity and Philanthropy in Russia, China, India, and Brazil*. New York: Columbia University, Foundation Center.

Stadler, N., Lomsky-Feder, E., & Ben-Ari, E. (2008) Fundamentalism's encounters with citizenship: the *Haredim* in Israel. *Citizenship Studies*, 12:3, 215-231

Tafoya, D. W., (2014). *Marginal Organizations*. Analyzing Organizations at the *Edge of Society’s Mainstream*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tracey, P., Phillips, N. & Haugh, H., (2005). Beyond Philanthropy: Community Enterprise as a Basis for Corporate Citizenship. *J Bus Ethics* 58**,**327–344

[Valenzuela-Garcia, H.](https://www.emerald.com/insight/search?q=Hugo%20Valenzuela-Garcia), [Lubbers, M.J.](https://www.emerald.com/insight/search?q=Miranda%20Jessica%20Lubbers) & [Rice, J.G.](https://www.emerald.com/insight/search?q=James%20Gordon%20Rice), (2019). Charities under austerity: ethnographies of poverty and marginality in Western non-profit and charity associations.[*Journal of Organizational Ethnography*](https://www.emerald.com/insight/publication/issn/2046-6749), 8:1, 2-10

Wright, K. (2001). Generosity vs. Altruism: Philanthropy and Charity in the United States and United Kingdom. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 12**,**399–416

Zimmer, A., & Friese, M., (2008). Bringing society back in: Civil society, social capital and the third sector. In: W.A. Maloney & J.W. van Deth, *Civil Society and Governance in Europe, From National to International Linkages*. (19-44). Cheltenham, UK, and Northampton MS: Edward Elgar Publishing.

**Tables**

Table 1. Philanthropic organizations Objectives in marginal groups.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Types of organization | Cultural enclave Organizations | Incorporating Organizations  | Hybrid Organizations  |
| Number of interviewees | 13/22 | 6/22 | 3/22 |
| Number of quotes\* | 25 | 21 | 14 |
| Features of philanthropic organizations  |
| Motives | - Social motives:Coping with the needs of the groupand with specific needs within the group.- Personal motives:encountering in person and family heritage. | - Social motives:Nurturing young immigrants to obtain leadership.Coping with prejudice towards the community.- Personal motives: none. | - Social motives:Providing aid. EnhancingJewish values. - Personal motives: none. |
| Intentions at time of establishing | - Providing economic aid and / or cultural solutions.- Personal experience. | - Assisting young members of the community.- Coping with cultural and social prejudice. | - No parallel body existed. – Inspired by the spiritual mentor of the founder. |
| Aims | - Providing a social welfare jacket.- Specific issues:health and sexism. | - Specific issues:Empowering the adolescent dropouts and employment of University graduates. | - Specific issues:enhancing sustainability skills and advancing core values of Judaism. |
| Originals customers | -Marginal community members – nationwide includingLocal subgroups.  | - Marginal community members, mainly disadvantaged populations, and young people. | - New and needy members of the group and potential members outside the group, identifying with its causes. |
| Mapping the organizations’ communal environment. | - Charity organizations. | - Cultural issues Organizations  | -Organizations within the community engaged in different subjects.  |
| Interface with the organizations’ surrounding environment | No interaction with surrounding environment organizations. | - Governmental or semi-governmental organizations agencies.- Government funding.  | - Government and municipal funding. |

\*The number of quotes in which this objective appeared in all the interviews. Note that there was some overlapping, because some of the quotes were relevant to more than one primary objective.

**Appendices**

**Appendix A**

Interview information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of interview | Number of interviewees |
| December 20, 2020 | 1 |
| January 7, 2021 | 2 |
| January 24, 2021 | 3 |
| January 24, 2021 | 4 |
| February 7, 2021 | 5 |
| February 10, 2021 | 6 |
| February 10, 2021 | 7 |
| February 11, 2021 | 8 |
| February 11, 2021 | 9 |
| February 15, 2021 | 10 |
| February 17, 2021 | 11 |
| February 18, 2021 | 12 |
| February 18, 2021 | 13 |
| February 19, 2021 | 14 |
| February 21, 2021 | 15 |
| February 22, 2021 | 16 |
| February 23, 2021 | 17 |
| February 23, 2021 | 18 |
| February 23, 2021 | 19 |
| February 24, 2021 | 20 |
| February 24, 2021 | 21 |
| February 24, 2021 | 22 |

1. Haredim (Israeli Jewish Ultra-Orthodoxy) is the name given to the fundamentalist ideology and society that seek to protect religious Jews from the influences of modernization and secularization - usually by means of seclusion and a partial or complete distancing from the social and political expressions of modernization. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)