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ARSP 2011, 6th Issue
Editorial

By

Dr. M. May Seitanidi
Senior Lecturer in CSR & Director of the Centre for Organisational Ethics,
Hull University Business School, University of Hull, UK

I am delighted to share with you the sixth issue of the ARSP that consists of a collaborative effort of researchers and practitioners in the field of Cross Sector Social Partnerships across the world. This issue features international contributions on the role of government in partnerships.

Eight distinctive articles from Canada, Germany, Finland, Bulgaria, Kuwait, USA, The Netherlands and the UK demonstrate that the challenges of governments internationally are both at the local (for example on how to develop sustainable solutions on the local level across geographic regions, Clarke, p.4) and global (read Hyatt’s contribution, p. 9, on how to facilitate reduction of environmental and social impacts of global supply chains) levels. The feature includes interviews with executives from business (Kourula’s interview with Nokia’s director for social regulation, p. 6), enlightened government officials (Schwarz’s interview with the head of division in the Saxon Ministry for Culture and Sport, p.5) and critical civil society representatives (Alrifai’s interview with the chairman of the Economic Society of Kuwait, p. 8). The above are complimented by research insights including the role of legal instruments for the protection of the ‘public interest’ in Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) (Marcheva’s research on the role of regulation in partnerships, p. 7) and research-led initiatives developed by The Partnerships Resource Centre (Pfisterer’s article on identifying patterns of governments’ partnership portfolio management, p. 11). The feature concludes with a fresh approach by the New Economics Foundation that aims to develop dialogue structures empowering participants in order to achieve systemic shifts required for the development of solutions to complex social problems (Walker’s Connected Conversations approach, p. 13).

Andy Crane’s reflections (p. 14) on researching partnerships provides an interesting overview of the partnership research over the last 10 years, highlighting the role of Jem Bendell’s book ‘Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and Sustainable Development’ in encouraging critical research in cross sector social partnerships. John Selsky travels even further in the past, 65 years ago, connecting with Trist’s ghost (p. 16) in order to challenge Porter and Kramer’s recent HBR article and their firm-centric approach of ‘shared value’ creation. Our section editors present excellent collections for you with partnership publications (Kourula’s 9 page long selection of recent research, p.18-26), future and past partnership events (p.27-32) and partnership pedagogy resources (Leigh’s review of Raelin’s two books on leadership, p. 33-34). The good news is that we announce the arrival of a new centre: ‘The Partnerships Resource Centre’ in the Netherlands with already unique contributions in our field; we update you with the news from UNPOP’s existing partnership research programme and we conclude this issue with the presentation of new members and their research interests.

We hope the 6th issue of the ARSP will provide you with inspiration for your future research and collaborative actions! We are looking forward to your stories, news, papers, comments and suggestions for the 2012 issue. Until then, keep interacting for our collective social good! ◆
Partnerships for Sustainability at the Local Level

By
Dr. Amelia Clarke
Assistant Professor, University of Waterloo, Canada

Partnerships are increasingly common at the local level (Geddes, 2008). Local governments are partnering with other levels of government, businesses, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, and hospitals to achieve their common goals. For example, some local governments are partnering to pursue collaborative community (or regional) sustainable development strategies; also called Local Agenda 21s (Clarke & Erfan, 2007; ICLEI, 2002). A recent study showed that as of February 2009, there were 27 of these collaborative strategies in Canada (Clarke, 2010). These partnerships ranged from a few partners to over 160 organizations involved. Local governments may be the convener or they might be a participating partner organization (Clarke & Fuller, 2011).

On a whole, there are numerous benefits for a local government to engage in partnership (collaborative) approach instead of participation (consultation) approach when trying to tackle a complex issue such as sustainable development (Clarke, 2010; Clarke & Erfan, 2007). The partnership approach enables them to pursue sustainability for the entire geographic region instead of only focusing on what their organization’s mandate allows. It provides an opportunity for more organizations to help implement the vision, and therefore more can be collectively achieved. Complementary to this, cost for implementation is born by each partner, so considerable resources are leveraged beyond what the local government can afford alone. Interestingly, an additional benefit is that due to the engagement of many partners in the vision, the initiative generally endures changes in political leadership.

In Canada, four different governance structures are being used to implement the collaborative community sustainable development strategies. These are: 1) Implementation through Joint Projects; 2) Implementation through Partner Organizations; 3) Implementation through a Focal Organization; and 4) Informal Implementation (Clarke, 2010). Each of these governance structures has advantages and disadvantages. In particular, the first two are most effective for achieving sustainability goals, and maintaining ongoing momentum. The third one ensures that the local government retains control, but limits what can be achieved and monitored. The fourth one costs the least, but is hard to maintain. From the perspective of the partner organizations, all of the governance structures allow for the organizations to gain knowledge (Clarke, 2010). In summary, much can be achieved through a partnership approach, but having the right governance structure is critical for achieving your goals.

References:
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The INTEL Teach Programme, a partnership between INTEL Corp. and the Ministry of Education, is active in approximately 60 countries around the world. The initiative aims to improve teaching quality by using new media in class. INTEL Corp. provides the IT infrastructure and internet platform for online training courses, which are developed by teachers themselves. The initiative has reached more than 7 million teachers worldwide. In Germany, the programme has been offering online training courses for the last ten years, free of charge, for teachers directly applicable in schools and as part of the obligatory teacher further education programme. Nearly half of all German teachers have been registered on the INTEL Teach internet platform. The Saxon Education Institute, a special office of the State Ministry for Culture and Sport in Saxony (German federal state), is responsible for teacher training and evaluation and organises the programme in Saxony. Below I summarise (direct quotes in italics) the main points of an interview with Mr. Ingo Altmann, the Head of the Division in the Saxon Education Institute, followed by my own commentary.

"Partnerships between public and private actors in the field of education are absolutely necessary and will continue to play a significant role in the creation and provision of social goods in the future.” Companies frequently criticize the level of work skills obtained by school graduates. However, both public authorities and private companies often lack knowledge about each other’s structures and processes, accentuated by the lack of shared language. Opportunities for collaboration and exchange of ideas are necessary to bridge this gap.

"Exchange of experience between state and ministries takes place through commissions and committees, but cooperation between companies and ministries is still arranged on an individual, cause-related basis.” Companies usually present their project ideas to a ministry that ideally are congruent with the structural and political goals of the state authorities. However, there is no provision for regular exchange of information across ministries within a federal state and across federal states on such projects. Hence, there are missed opportunities for collaboration and lessons learned across within and across states.

"Interactions across partners”. One person is responsible in the company and the educational department respectively. Meetings take place regularly as well as during specific events. Overall, communication and process handling are clearly arranged and responsibility explicitly assigned to one representative in each organization.

"Result: thousands of teachers trained – knowledge gained.” During the first stage of the partnership around 8,000 master teachers were trained, who then trained more teachers themselves (multiplicators). The impact of these teachers is within their respective schools and among colleagues; however the impact of development, after the initial training process, has not yet been evaluated. During the second stage of the partnership, training has been provided to a broader audience; the programme is now available to all teachers in the state of Saxony.

"Individual and societal value created.” Teachers gained new skills and improved their usage of new media in class. The programme aims at preparing students for further education or even “leading them on a path towards lifelong learning”. Through students’ learning, parents benefit as well. A ‘learning community’ including teachers, students and parents delivers benefit to society as a whole. For example, the initiative ‘Senior citizens go online’ allowed older people to be trained by students increasing the knowledge of older people, it facilitated contact across generations, decreasing prejudice, and increasing mutual understanding and respect.

The interview made clear the challenges of the partnership such as a lack of understanding and knowledge of each other; lack of opportunities for exchange that would lead to a deep partnership; usually one-off project arrangements hinder exchange with/ learning from other public authorities; the long-term benefit is not usually evaluated after the initial ‘Memorandum of Understanding’, hence knowledge might not spread into the company. On the other hand the success factors include: there is personal commitment to “learn to run together”; acceptance rather than agreement is evident regarding the conditions and expectations of the partners; partnership initiatives require a fit within the political
context as well as shared values to strive for: e.g. to foster a “knowledge society” and to bridge the “digital divide”. On the other hand partnerships can be short-lived: sustainable success can be achieved when they foster networks that can be maintained after the original partnerships have ended. All the above factors ultimately depend on the gradual increase of mutual understanding, fostered by constant communication and flow of information.

This interview is part of the PhD project that involves three multinational IT companies in partnership with Ministries of Education in three European countries. The research focuses on managerial challenges and value creation from a corporate perspective in cross-sector partnerships within education. ◆

Partnership Perspectives from Practice

By
Dr. Arno Kourula
Postdoctoral Fellow at Stanford University, Department of Civil &Environmental Engineering

Interview with Pekka Isosomppi, Director of Social Regulation, Nokia

Nokia is a global leader in mobile technology with sales of €42 billion and approximately 132,000 employees. The company’s mission is “Connecting People” and Nokia describes its work in the following way: “Our job is to enable billions of people everywhere to get more of life’s opportunities through mobile.” (www.nokia.com). We met with Pekka Isosomppi, Nokia’s Director for Social Regulation, to hear his views about cross-sector partnerships.

May I please ask you to describe what your work entails? My work is to operate in the interface between Nokia and the outside world on various societal issues and their impact. These issues include the impact of mobile communication, concerns of consumer privacy and data protection, child online safety and so on.

What are key drivers for developing cross-sector partnerships (i.e. partnerships between business, government and civil society) for companies? I think the most important driver is the notion that these issues are complex and multi-faceted. There are no simple solutions available, but there are plenty of opportunities for all parties and sectors, and that they can be best addressed by working together in novel ways.

What are some key challenges in developing cross-sector partnerships for companies? Nokia wants to foster research and activities in general in issues related and close to our business. We do not necessarily want to, nor can we realistically, be involved, facilitate or orchestrate everything that is happening. However, dialogue is always fruitful and usually leads to new ideas and opportunities. How these opportunities materialize is a challenge.

What is the role of government in cross-sector partnerships in your opinion? Governments play an increasing role in partnerships. The biggest public sector challenges are quite similar around the world: How to provide better services when resources are not increasing at the pace of demand, for example in health and education. The role of ICT and more specifically mobile technologies is therefore paramount in productivity improvements, and governments are learning this.

How do you see cross-sector partnerships developing in the future? I think the movement is towards more versatile and novel partnerships, which incorporate actors from different fields and types of organization. Thanks to modern communication technologies, totally new kinds of networks and collaboration can be done.

Is there anything you would like to say to academics working in the field of cross-sector partnerships? The role of academia is actually the role of primus motor in collaboration. In the end, rigorous academic research that is open to discover new things is the source of energy for the industry and partnerships. We very much need academics who have open mind and who are actively pursuing their work in collaboration with the rest of the world. ◆
How much Regulation of Public Private Partnerships do we need?

By

Deyana Marcheva

Doctoral Candidate, Department of Law, Sofia University ‘Saint Kliment Ohridski’, Bulgaria
Attorney-at-law, Sofia Bar Association

The phenomenon of public-private partnerships (PPPs) washes away the boundaries between public and private laws, public goods and business interests, public management and business administration. At the EU level, the 2004 Green Paper on public-private partnerships is the most significant outcome of the debate on the necessity of PPP legislation. The follow-up initiatives in the EU however did not result in new binding regulations or directives regulating the issues around PPP formation and implementation. EU institutions did not go beyond recommendations and interpretive communications on how EU convention principles and EU public procurement directives should be applied and no further steps were taken to harmonise PPP national laws in Member States. It is left to each Member State to choose its domestic policy regarding definition and scope, types and forms of PPPs and to employ a legislative approach that fits best the national legal system – some countries have adopted specific PPP law (for example, Greece, Latvia, Poland etc.), others – PPP acceleration acts (Germany).

However, many practitioners across the EU complain about the lack of an EU legal framework for PPPs that in effect is holding back their expansion under conditions of effective competition and legal clarity.

In the process of accession to the EU, PPPs became popular in Bulgaria during the last five years. Despite the significant legal reform in concessions and public procurement legislation, Bulgaria still has an important amount of work to undertake to ensure compliance of business partnerships with the EU directives. One major problem is that lawmakers and practitioners from the executive authority in Bulgaria have developed a narrow view that all PPPs could be regulated under the umbrella of “concessions”. Bulgarian Concession Act regulates three types of concession: (i) public works concession; (ii) service concession; (iii) natural resource concession. A major conceptual flaw of the Bulgarian Concession Act is uniting public works and service concession in one common procedural and contractual framework, despite their differences in the motives during formation and the different challenges during their implementation. The Bulgarian concession regime assumes total clarity and thorough definition in advance of the concession object. Thus they exclude the possibility of identifying the scope and elements of PPP object in the course of negotiations between the partners. This leads to legal uncertainty with regards to the procedures and contracts for the establishment of partnerships between the public and private sectors.

In practice, public authorities in Bulgaria are reluctant discussing different types of PPP projects that fall outside the range of Concession acts. Instead, corporate structures for the management of public assets have multiplied, placing the decision making for PPPs in the hands of public companies’ boards. Despite state ownership in such companies and the inherent interest in managing public assets, most Bulgarian lawyers tend to exclude them from the concept of “public partner” whenever they establish public-private joint-ventures allowing for the treating PPP agreements as identical to private agreements. This misconception leads to practices in which state-owned companies avoid EU directives in the selection of private partners for their PPP projects. Due to the lack of direct regulation, PPPs are sometimes used as instruments for removing public assets from the public eye by using ad hoc, non-transparent policies that can be manipulated by non-elected boards and executives. Such bad practices of business partnerships in Bulgaria violate EU principles of free competition and transparency. Public debate and radical legal reform are required in order to develop direct regulation for PPPs.

My thesis focuses on the legal instruments required for enhancing the protection of public interest in PPPs in Bulgaria. I examine the administrative legal aspects of PPPs and take the view that it is high time for the “public interest” concept to be taken out of abstract meaning and to be embodied and substantiated in primary legislation and transparent practices. Hence, articulating material requirements for the economic balance of PPPs, as well as standards for safeguarding the public interest can provide a framework for assessing public interest in PPPs. Otherwise public interest assessment would remain only in the hands of partners, who can assume unlimited powers about public interests without any external control or judicial review. Procedural guarantees for fair processes of public interest identification (e.g. access to information and public participation in the preparatory phase of PPPs procedures), compulsory “administrative clauses” in the PPP contract, instruments of administrative control over the conduct of the public partner in the PPPs project, (e.g. minimal standards of public-private joint ventures, compliance certificate of PPP, specialized administrative body, PPP public register etc.) are all essential steps that need to be taken to block the corruption and bad practices of public-private partnerships. ♦
The Vice-Chairman of the Kuwait Economic Society (an NGO), Mr. Al-Sanie, explains in an interview the reasons behind the absence of real partnerships between business, government and nonprofit organisations in Kuwait. He suggests that the absence of partnerships in Kuwait is due to the fact that the government holds complete responsibility for welfare. This derives from the dependency of Kuwait on oil revenues controlled by the government. Hence, the state assumes full control for the redistribution of wealth which does not encourage the involvement of the other sectors of society. In effect, the social roles usually associated with other sectors in developed countries shift to the state that is perceived as responsible for providing support for all its citizens. On one hand the increased dependence on the state and on the other its inability to provide solutions for issues related to health, education, corruption, unemployment, among others, limits the participation of the other two sectors in their participation in the provision of solutions. Mr. Al-Sanie explains below how the economic factor of oil revenues influences the relations between different sectors in Kuwait. Wealth production is not associated usually as a factor that weakens forms of CSR implementation in developed countries; however it appears that in some developing countries this might be the case. Certain prerequisites are needed to have a mature partnership between sectors, and Kuwait seems to lack such prerequisites.

"Since the independence of Kuwait, in the early sixties, the government of the State of Kuwait was keen to expand its welfare subsidy activities for the entire Kuwaiti society, supported by its substantial financial ability, compared to the size and population of the country, which derived from oil revenues.

The State’s constitution allowed for the emergence of nongovernmental organizations and professional associations that contributed to the development of a vibrant civil society, promoting the concept of volunteerism, stimulating youth initiatives and reflecting the interests and concerns of the Kuwaiti society. Given that the largest employer in the country is the government and the provision of basic welfare depends completely on the state, either in the form of heavily subsidised or free services, the emergence of a dynamic and independent civil society is an interesting phenomenon in Kuwait.

With the exception of consumer cooperative societies, the government does not deal with the concepts of partnership with civil society on a systematic basis. It continues however to provide annual grants to civil society organizations as part of the provision for comprehensive care.

Historically, the private sector in Kuwait was proactive and dynamic in its contributions approach to social welfare initiatives. However, due to the oil-supported welfare model in place, companies perceive social contributions to the community in a limited way while they become beneficiaries of large public spending financed by the oil economy. The Kuwaiti private sector is not subject to taxation which provides an additional opportunity to avoid social obligations.

The current economic and welfare policies along with the dominance of state-governed provisions and the absence of a dynamic private sector in its approach to social contributions do not cultivate a supportive environment that would facilitate the development of cross sector social partnerships. In addition, the Kuwaiti society is missing the element of an organised civil society that could exercise organised and systematic pressure that could facilitate changes and put in good use the vigorous political environment and its vibrant civil society."
The Sustainability Consortium: Large Scale Multi-Sector System Innovation in Consumer Packaged Goods

By
David Graham Hyatt
Clinical Assistant Professor, Supply Chain Management, Sam M. Walton College of Business, University of Arkansas

Interview with Jon Johnson, Walton Professor in Sustainability, Department of Management, Sam M. Walton College of Business, University of Arkansas

The Sustainability Consortium formed in 2009 as a multi-sector collaboration seeking to embed social and environmental norms in the global marketplace. Almost two years later, the Consortium lists over 70 members comprised of global businesses (representing at least $1.7 trillion in market capitalization), governments, and NGOs, I spoke with Jon Johnson, University of Arkansas Professor of Management, and Co-Director of the Consortium. His words appear in italics below.

In July 2009, Mike Duke, CEO of Walmart, announced a large-scale multi-sector social collaboration to develop a science-based approach to measuring product sustainability in global supply chains. This effort would require a “...consortium of universities that will collaborate with suppliers, retailers, NGOs and government to develop a global database of information on the lifecycle of products...from raw materials to disposal” (Duke, 2009). Responding to stakeholder pressures to reduce the environmental and social impacts associated with consumer goods, especially in the context of supply chain complexity, diminishing natural resources, increasing population, and human rights issues, the Consortium aims to facilitate reporting of the sustainability performance of consumer products in a consistent, scientifically grounded way.

For the Consortium, measuring product sustainability means collaborating across sectors and supply chains to develop Sustainability Measurement and Reporting Standards (SMRS) that will define, for a particular product type, what should be measured, how to measure it, and how to report it to a common database. It means establishing a system to facilitate exchange of sustainability information between producers, manufacturers, retailers, and eventually consumers, supporting multiple levels of analysis including products, product categories, and supply chains. According to Johnson,

"Consumer products account for a hefty proportion of the overall global impact from human activities. Ultimately, SMRS will allow comparison of existing or future product design characteristics to a market-typical product and support optimization of that product design before it goes to market. SMRS will also support publication of a clear and consistent product sustainability report that can be used for sales and marketing. They will help buyers evaluate how a supplier’s product sustainability information was calculated, and ensure that competitors are using the same assumptions, data sources and verification procedures when they make product claims or declarations.

So for instance, suppliers might seek to differentiate a product’s carbon impact based on common product category rules and life cycle carbon models. They could modify the product’s baseline carbon model with changes in product characteristics seeking demonstrable improvement in product carbon performance. All of this would be based on credible, agreed-upon standards. Similarly, retailers or suppliers who wish to communicate product, product family or category carbon footprints to consumers or other stakeholders can do so in a credible way based on agreed-upon standards, including life cycle carbon models.”

These SMRS thus provide stakeholder groups with information that can be used to integrate sustainability in decision-making processes, at least in the context of product environmental and social impact. As such, they rely on the global market system for implementation. In the absence of global government, multi-sector initiatives such as the Consortium seem necessary to develop global regulatory systems for sustainability.

Further, because no global government mechanism exists to provide the requisite legitimacy and authority, the actors must rely on a collective legitimacy in order to effectively advance the partnership agenda. Bernstein and Cashore refer to these arrangements as non-state market-driven (NSMD) governance systems, because they are
"deliberative and adaptive governance institutions designed to embed social and environmental norms in the global marketplace that derive authority directly from interested audiences, including those they seek to regulate, not from sovereign states" (2007: 348). Participative stakeholder representation in NSMD systems is important for at least two reasons. First, relevant stakeholder groups provide timely and complex knowledge, such as detailed information about carbon. Second, their involvement affords legitimacy to the overall process and regulatory outcomes (Reinicke & Deng, 2000). In this context, the Consortium has continued to expand both membership and stakeholder involvement. A governing board elected in November includes corporate members from PepsiCo, Dell, P&G, Disney, and Walmart. In addition to two university seats, there will be two NGO seats on the governing board. Other significant business members include Monsanto, Cargill, McDonalds, Ahold, Safeway, and Marks & Spencer. NGO and government representation includes WWF, BSR, the UK’s defra, and the US EPA. Outside of the membership and governance structure, the Consortium’s operational structure also provides for stakeholder involvement. The Consortium is organized into two different kinds of working groups. The first includes groups working on projects (such as SMRS) that are relevant to a particular sector: Electronics; Food, Beverage, and Agriculture; Home and Personal Care; Paper; Retail; and Toys. Consortium-wide groups aim to address issues that might span the sector working groups: Assurance; Consumer Science; IT Standards and Tools; Measurement Science; Packaging; and Systems Sciences. These groups draw in other stakeholders as needed to carry out their respective charges. The multi-stakeholder approach is thus a central dimension of a system for measuring product sustainability. According to Johnson, what is innovative about the Consortium is not the idea of developing metrics, but the scale of the effort and the integrative multi-sector approach: "I talk a lot about life cycle assessment, but there are multiple efforts to establish data collection protocols that are right now very fragmented and non-standardized. So the innovation for the consortium is really in developing credible integrated systems for bringing these different pieces together and bringing software development players together and others to actually make this happen. There are all sorts of large scale, global conventions, but nothing in this particular space. ... We’re the only collaboration of our type in the world that aims to provide a scientific foundation for product level reporting."

The aim of the Consortium is to develop integrated systems rendered useful and usable across multiple levels. The purpose is not to create any particular index, but a system which potential user communities, including product designers, purchasing agents, and consumers, could use to inform decision-making: "What we’re hoping the Consortium will do, when our work is implemented, is to inform decisions at every point in the supply chain of a product. ... Right now, it’s very difficult for a company to know if ... suppliers’ claims about their products with respect to sustainability are valid or not. ... Walmart’s original index announcement was that there was going to be a label on a product, and ultimately, the system we’re building will support that, and much more. We won’t do labels ourselves, but the system would support that kind of communication to consumers.”

The Consortium recognizes the interconnectedness of systems that must be enacted on a global scale to be effective. The system ultimately operates in the market, transcending national governments. "If you look at product sustainability, what you find is you have to account for every stage in the life cycle of the product to really make a good decision. And the next realization is that there are very few domestic supply chains. Most products have inputs that are global inputs. And so, building just a US or just a European or just a Latin American system will be virtually impossible. Furthermore, if you imagine a system just for food or just for electronics products or just for clothing, what you find is that there are shared environmental impacts across all those sectors. You need methodologies that are integrated across different sectors that are interpretable, but also scalable. So our vision of functioning system is very much a multi-sector, multi-national system."

For more information please visit:

www.sustainabilityconsortium.org
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Governments & Cross Sector Partnerships: Partnership Portfolio Management & Knowledge Development

By Stella Pfisterer
Research Associate, The Partnership Resource Centre, Rotterdam School of Management Erasmus University

The Partnership Resource Centre (PrC) has defined several projects which focus on knowledge development and sharing related to ‘governments and cross-sector partnerships’. Below I present some of our projects related to governments and cross-sector partnerships, including: government partnership portfolio management, a database on public-private partnerships focusing for public goods provision of International Organizations and knowledge sharing projects.

Government Partnership Portfolio Management

Governments recognize that cross-sector partnerships have the greatest impact when they are strategic – programs become scalable and sustainable when they are integrated into broader strategic initiatives. But how do governments manage their diverse partnership programs? What kind of policies do governments develop to introduce and regulate partnerships in a specific context? These questions are related to partnership portfolio management of governments. Partnership portfolio management is about the strategic approach of the organization towards partnerships. This includes understanding the way partnerships and partnership portfolios emerge, the configuration choices made by the governmental organization concerning the partnership portfolio, how the partnership portfolio is institutionalized and managed within the governmental organization, as well as exploring potential determinants of the organization’s partnership portfolio approach.

The PrC has set up a project to explore whether there are different rationales and management styles for government partnership portfolios and, in addition, to understand how the underlying institutional culture in a country provides explanations of specific partnership portfolios and features of partnerships, such as governance structure. In order to answering the above questions, a sound methodology and strategy for conducting government partnership portfolio analysis will be developed. The empirical part of the project focuses on case studies of different governmental organizations such as:

a) Country governments (incl. national, regional, federal or municipal governments);

b) Governmental donor agencies (incl. national government donor agencies and multilateral donor agencies).

The aim of our partnership portfolio management trajectory is to identify common and/or different patterns in governments’ approaches towards partnership portfolio. In addition we aim to explore which internal/external factors might influence this approach. Potentially, the research could generate ideas on how to develop a coherent partnership (portfolio) strategy and how to optimize government’s partnership portfolios.

Database on PPPs of International Organizations

The aim of this project is to provide a detailed overview of PPPs listed by international organizations like the World Bank and the UN. This detailed overview will contain the most relevant information of identified public-private partnerships including descriptive information such as organizations involved, timeframe, budget, activities and organizational form, but also information on analytical variables will be covered. The collected information is presented in form of a database. This database will contain only information on those partnerships that are truly public-private in nature and hence involve (at least) both governments and firms. In addition, only PPPs aimed at providing public goods will be included. In general, this project supports systematic knowledge generation on specific characteristics of public-private partnerships operating in the realm of public goods, asking questions such as: on which variables do the selected partnerships share similarities, under which circumstances are they distinct from each other? This project aims to broaden our understanding on the nature and functionality of partnerships in...
In Colombia, the PrC and the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Bogotá are working in a joint research project to understand the drivers of partnership success especially in a conflict-ridden environment. Together with a local researcher, PrC researchers have evaluated the effectiveness of seven cross-sector partnerships in the coffee, banana, palm oil, natural gas and electricity sectors. This study will help the Dutch Embassy in Bogota and the PrC to identify opportunities for improving partnership performance, to further develop partnership monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and to stimulate new partnership initiatives.

**PPP Training for Dutch Policy-Makers**

In cooperation with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs the PrC designed and implemented a PPP training initiative for governmental officials from several Dutch Ministries. The 40 participants of the pilot training (who deal with collaborations with the private sector) highlighted that the main challenge in their work is managing the complementarities of roles: the focus on achieving mutual benefit in a manner that enables the partners to meet their own objectives as well as common goals. In this context, important partnering issues related to the management of partnerships were emphasized: relationship management (such as trust, long-term commitment, finding common ground and synergy) and process management (coordination; financial and legal models). Therefore, the interactive training for policy-makers was build up around the following practical lessons:

- Know who you are (or want to be)
- Know the problem (don’t be afraid of complexity)
- Apply the right (strategic) motives
- Understand the other (even if they don’t know themselves); share dilemmas
- Manage a portfolio of partnerships; understand dilemmas and link to identity
- Understand the dynamics of partnering: manage dependencies
- Learn! Be serious on monitoring and evaluation.

Not only the participants benefited from the knowledge exchange during the training but also the training provided the researchers of the PrC with valuable feedback and insights on the needs of policy-makers related to both research and skills development for effective partnership management. ◆

For more detailed information you can contact Stella Pfisterer ([SPfisterer@rsm.nl](mailto:SPfisterer@rsm.nl)).
Connected Conversations

By

Perry Walker

Head of the Democracy and Participation programme at the New Economics Foundation (nef) (until recently); Fellow of nef (currently), London, UK

We face a range of complex problems – from climate change to ageing populations – that require multi-level collaboration. Neither direction from the top nor isolated pockets of activism can create the systemic shifts required to meet these challenges. Dialogue structures must be found that can pool the knowledge, power and legitimacy of all different kinds of institutions and individuals to create actions at many different levels.

Connected conversations are a series of discussions that take place in many different places and are joined together by a single project identity, a shared frame of reference and structures that enable information and insights to be shared. They are facilitated by a project organiser or organisers to encourage the organisation of events, provide information and facilitate the sharing and amalgamation of results.

Rather than bringing all participants together in one place, connected conversations empower them to hold discussions within their existing social networks. These discussions serve as ‘laboratories of public interest’ – spaces where often relatively homogenous and sometimes marginalised groups can consider an issue and determine collectively how they should respond to it. As Cass Sunstein observes, deliberation within groups that share a common interest can lead to an intensification of shared understanding, creating powerful opportunities for mobilisation.

At the same time, however, connected conversations also attempt to ensure that groups have access to information representing a range of positions and interests. The aim is to ensure that processes take advantage of the demonstrated ability of deliberation to make participants more “fact-regarding, future-regarding and other-regarding”.4

Providing such information for connected conversation requires a fresh set of tools. My organisation, nef (the new economics foundation), has been responsible for several. The best established is a ‘conversation kit’ called Democs. To give an example of its use, a version called Decide has been used in many countries across Europe by Eurordis, which described itself as ‘the voice of rare disease patients in Europe’.

Policymakers have been slower in seeing the value of such approaches, but they are getting there, even if this is partly due to the pressure to cut costs. In the UK, for example, the BBSRC (Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council) is taking a ‘connected conversations’ approach to encouraging public dialogue on bioenergy and industrial biotechnology. We hope that this is the first of many.

Much of this article is based on a nef pamphlet of the same name as the article. Perry Walker can be contacted at perry.walker@neweconomics.org

1 For an interesting attempt to understand public engagement as necessary resource pooling, see Stewart K (2007) ‘Write the rules and win: understanding citizen participation game dynamics’ Public Administration Review November-December 2007 pp1067-1076
5 http://www.neweconomics.org/projects/democs
6 http://www.eurordis.org/content/play-decide-games-take
7 http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/connected-conversations
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Ten years ago last year, Jem Bendell published what turned out to be one of the most influential books yet on business-NGO partnerships called *Terms for Endearment: Business, NGOs and Sustainable Development*. To mark the anniversary, the publisher Greenleaf began offering a 50% discount on the book (now less than £10 in paperback) and making a number of the chapters, written by a host of different authors, available free to download. The book appeared at a critical moment in the development of cross-sector partnerships and it’s great for anybody who didn’t catch it first time round to be able to dip into some of the chapters and get a real flavor of the big issues facing partnerships in 2000. Much has changed since then but it’s also quite remarkable how relevant many of the contributions to the book still are.

I’m pleased to say that included in the free chapters is my piece, "Culture clash and mediation: exploring the cultural dynamics of business-NGO collaboration". It’s great to see this and some of the other chapters made freely available. The book itself was a fine collection of articles and it really helped kick start a critical perspective on partnerships. It also helped fire up an engagement from the academic community with the political ramifications of corporate responsibility practice – a theme that I, and a number of other politically-oriented corporate responsibility scholars, have continued to address in our work since that time.

In support of the anniversary, a number of the original contributors, such as Peter Newell, Steve Waddell, Saleem H. Ali, and I wrote pieces reflecting on writing our chapters all those years ago. These were posted on Jem’s consultancy website, Lifeworth.com. My piece was first published on the *Crane and Matten blog*, but for those that missed it, here’s what I had to say… and don’t forget to head over to Greenleaf and download some of the classic chapters. For free, remember. Those are terms definitely worthy of endearment.

"If truth be told, I discovered business-NGO partnerships pretty much by accident. I was trying to complete my PhD, which was about the "amoralization" of corporate greening. That is, how business involvement in sustainability was accompanied by some form of removal of moral framing and content. I’m not just talking the business case, though that was certainly a major part of it. But also how even social mission companies sometimes failed to morally engage their employees in green business. Or how middle managers in companies would try to make environmental issues as normal and unthreatening to their colleagues as possible. "The environment” my respondents basically seemed to be telling me, was “not ethics”.

I ran into the WWF Plus Group, which is the partnership that I examine in the chapter that is included in *Terms for Endearment*, because one of the companies I was writing a case study on was involved in the initiative. The Plus Group (a working group seeking to implement the Forest Stewardship Council accreditation scheme in the UK) seemed to me to be an especially interesting context to explore the kinds of questions that I was interested in. Here, I sensed, the moral complexion of the respective partners might come into sharp relief. Not exactly a “good” NGO facing up to a whole bunch of “bad” companies like some latter day cowboy story. But certainly plenty of potential for a collision of moral worldviews – or more broadly, "culture clash” as the chapter title eventually put it.

So I got deeper and deeper into the initiative, and became invigorated by exploring the cultural dimensions of business-NGO partnerships. A number of researchers had alluded to the potential for culture problems to arise, but no one had investigated them in any real depth. In the end, I got so into it that, like a badly behaved guest, I probably wound up staying longer than I was supposed to. But I also think that the kind of work I was doing was necessary to move our knowledge up a level.

Looking back now, I think that the chapter still holds up well. It shows that there are different ways of thinking about culture with respect to partnerships, which is a point still missed by many people who study the phenomenon. In that respect, I think it’s great that Greenleaf is making the pdf of the chapter freely available. It will help to disseminate the more critical approach to culture that the piece showcases.

And then there are the insights I provide about the role played by ‘cultural mediators’ in managing cultural translations across and within organizations. At the time that I was writing the chapter, more than a decade ago, this seemed fresh and new. It captured a very real and, I think, important dynamic at play in partnerships. In
In fact, I’ve had a number of practitioners over the years that have read the piece saying, ‘yes, that’s exactly what I do!’

So the identification of cultural mediators, and my analysis of the role they play in this complex cultural milieu of partnerships, still rings true. Actually today, it’s much more commonplace for partnering organizations to formally identify such a role: NGOs have partnership managers; companies have stakeholder relationship managers and other similar posts. But if we peer beneath the surface, we’ve still got a long way to go before we really understand what’s going on here.

That said, I’ve been heartened in the last few years to see some interesting studies emerging which really help us to see these deeper cultural dynamics more clearly. May Seitanidi, for instance, explores in her recently published book, The Politics of Partnerships, the dangers posed by seeking partners with too great a cultural fit, and the limits to meaningful change imposed by managing away conflict. Bahar Ali Kazmi, who has recently completed his PhD at the University of Nottingham, has been looking at how cultural mediators operate among different moral logics in the realization of human rights in developing countries. So there’s a lot of great work going on. And I expect that in another 10 years’ time, we’ll be looking back at how the research of these emerging scholars has helped shape the evolving field of business-NGO partnerships.
Trist’s Ghost: The Sustainable Advantage of a Field

By
Dr. John W. Selsky
College of Technology & Innovation, University of South Florida Polytechnic

One of my mentors and unofficial dissertation advisor during my Wharton doctoral days was Eric Trist. He was fond of the ‘figure-ground reversal,’ that is, de-centering your focus from any specific organization in a field of action, and bringing the background context into the foreground so you could examine it explicitly. This old trick from psychology has helped me to understand collaborative strategy in turbulent environments, one of my long-term research programs (see McCann & Selsky 1984; Selsky 1991; Selsky, Goes & Baburoglu 2007). In the latter article, in Organization Studies, we posed a “puzzling proposition” that essentially states that in a turbulent environment the locus of sustainable advantage shifts from the firm to the wider field. I am still puzzling over what that may mean, because in strategic management the action clearly belongs to the firm. Top managers in a company make strategic choices and engage in competitive battles with their rivals and with ‘forces’ in their environments – threats from Porter’s new entrants, suppliers, buyers and substitute products. If the company is successful, it enjoys sustainable (whatever that means!) competitive advantage. Cooperative strategies in strategic management are often at the margin of the main competitive game(s); they help the company cooperate opportunistically with its competitors – and win! (see Hamel et al. 1989).

This conventional strategy model is outdated (and of course caricatured) in several ways, but I want to focus on one way that it is problematic. It doesn’t really embrace turbulent environments, but instead is grounded in what Emery and Trist, in their classic 1965 article on ‘causal textures’ of environments, called disturbed-reactive environments. The latter are your prototypical competitive settings, with reasonably well defined sets of rivals, relatively well accepted ground rules for competing and a relatively stable wider context. But in turbulent environments, disruptions are commonplace – new rivals may appear suddenly, a new technology may render your business model obsolete, new ways of competing (on green criteria, on innovations in CSR) may disrupt your strategy, a tsunami half a world away may disrupt your supply chain. And such events may disrupt your rivals, allies and other stakeholders as well.

The turbulent environment seems to call for a different kind of strategizing. In the OS article we called it ‘socioecological’ (after Emery and Trist) and suggested that competitive strategy needed to take a less dominant role and collaborative strategy a more central role, getting organizations to work more in concert to cope jointly with the more frequent ‘contextual’ disruptions. But the collaborative strategy would have to be something more than the opportunistic partnering we see in competitive strategy. Could commercial firms cooperate with rivals, regulators, distributors, bankers to stabilize a field? A reviewer from a top journal that rejected our paper said our advice would be anti-competitive, illegal. Nonetheless, Porter and Kramer’s (2011) recent article in HBR takes a step in this direction. They do a terrific job of articulating the case for ‘shared value’, where companies should build social benefits into their strategies and routine activities. But I don’t think this idea goes far enough for truly turbulent conditions – it’s still focused on the firm creating value, only within a broader ambit of goals.

So what does it mean for a field to create and capture value, to have ‘sustainable advantage’? Can cross-sector social partnerships, another of my research programs (see Selsky & Parker 2005, 2011), shed any light? Researchers that study partnerships and interorganizational collaboration have a different take on the firm-field dichotomy from their strategy brethren. They see more easily that social issues and problems, rather than firms, have stakeholders and that interactions among stakeholders of an issue help to co-evolve the issue (hopefully making things better over time).
In the work that Barbara Parker and I have done on social partnerships, we believe that cognitive ‘platforms’ underpin how they operate. That is, managers may have a mental model of resource-dependence going into a partnership. Realizing they are dependent on the partner to obtain some beneficial resource, they extract as much as they can from the project before the partner can get it, as in the competitive-strategy model above. Alternatively, managers may have a mental model of collaborating with others to address a social issue they all share, or of jointly exploring new sectoral roles, functions and arrangements that arise from the issue they are working on together (e.g., should businesses design more societal value into their strategies, as Porter and Kramer suggest?).

Using the latter, ‘societal sector’ platform, we can perhaps begin to imagine what it means for a field to have sustainable advantage. That is, the stakeholders of a field such as climate change or community health have the capacity to work together to innovate new practices that transform the field in a direction that is seen as positive or beneficial by many of the field’s members. A cross-sector partnership project, however expansive it may be, would be unlikely to effect such transformation, but it may plant the crucial seed.

I think the connection between collaborative strategy and the role of cross sector social partnerships is well worth exploring, especially in the turbulent environments that are proliferating in our time. Trist’s figure-ground reversal seems to be key to understanding this connection. ♦
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The Rise of XSPs as an Academic Field

By
Dr. Arno Kourula
Postdoctoral Fellow at Stanford University, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering

The field of cross-sector partnerships (or XSPs) is booming. More and more studies are being published on partnerships and interaction between actors from different societal sectors (Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010; Kourula & Laasonen, 2010) and special issues on the topic area have recently come out in the Journal of Business Ethics (Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010), Business & Society (Dahan, Doh & Teegen, 2010a; 2010b), and Business Strategy and the Environment (Bendell, Collins & Roper, 2010). In addition to increasing interest from both the corporate and NGO sector, international organizations, such as the United Nations and World Economic Forum, and a range of national governments are emphasizing the need for government, business, and civil society to work together to solve social and environmental challenges. Even strategy ‘gurus’ such as Michael Porter (Porter & Kramer, 2011) are calling for a reinvention of capitalism with a strong focus on building partnerships between sectors to create shared value. Generally speaking we refer to the blurring of boundaries between sectors (Crane, 2010) and the aim of creating value (Austin, 2010).

In this section recent publications such as peer reviewed articles, books, book chapters, doctoral thesis published in 2010, 2011, or currently in press and working papers in the field of cross-sector partnerships (with a strong emphasis on the business-NGO interface) are listed. The list was compiled through information requests using mailing lists as well as key word searches of databases and should by no means be considered as a comprehensive list. Finally, news related to XSPs is announced, including future events and new research centers.

Three key themes can be seen to emerge in the current state of the art of research on cross-sector partnerships – these are in line with the micro (individual), meso (organizational), and macro (societal) levels of analysis described by Seitanidi and Lindgreen (2010). Firstly, important new theorizing is taking place to understand the cognitive (Lucea, 2010) and relational (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b; Kolk, van Dolen & Vock, 2011) processes related to the individual or micro-level of partnerships. Secondly, on a meso-level, in addition to research on how each party manages the relationship with the other partner, more studies are emerging on how to manage the partnership itself, including perspectives of collaborative strategic management (Clarke & Fuller, 2010), the creation of innovative multi-organizational business models (Dahan, Doh, Oetzel & Yaziji, 2010), and ecosystem management (Heuer, 2011). Thirdly, partnerships are more and more examined in specific contexts, such as the base of the pyramid or low-income communities (Goldsmith, 2011), or geographical contexts where the division of labor or roles of societal sectors differ (Bendell, Collins & Roper, 2010; Kourula, 2010). In addition to developments at all levels of partnerships – the individual, organizational, and societal – other interesting new theoretical avenues for research have been explored. These include utilizing and developing existing theory (Wilson, Bunn & Savage, 2010), applying existing organizational theories to theorize about partnerships (Meyskens, Carsrud & Cardozo, 2010), and mobilizing critical theory (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010c) or actor-network analysis (Bled, 2010). Finally, five exciting new books on cross-sector partnerships (Bendell, 2011; Desivilya & Palgi, 2011; Norris-Tirrell & Clay, 2010; Seitanidi, 2010; Siegel, 2010) offer insights into how theory and practice can be linked and provide a deeper picture into how these partnerships work using a range of examples.

While the field has clearly moved forward in getting a clearer understanding of the complex empirical phenomenon at hand, important questions remain. These include: Is there a need for consensus in terms of the theoretical foundations of partnering for the field to progress? How are cross-sector partnerships linked to other forms of provision of social goods, poverty alleviation, environmental innovation, etc. – what is the interoperability between this “silver bullet” answer and other existing “silver bullet” answers to global and local challenges?

I look forward receiving your forthcoming publications in order to include them in the 2012 Annual Review of Social Partnerships: kourula at stanford.edu
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Doctoral Thesis


This thesis analyses the capacity of partnerships to promote sustainable change in global agricultural commodity chains, and reflects on partnerships from governance and a development perspective. The global coffee, cotton and cocoa chains serve as main fields of application for the empirical analysis. Viewed from a governance perspective, partnerships create and seek to mainstream new practices, which focus on technological change and performance at the production level. While many partnerships promote standards as competitive strategies to safeguard the application of the new practices, other partnerships link up in networks and exchange resources to facilitate sustainable change. However, from a development perspective the capacity of partnerships to promote sustainable change remains limited. Benefits for producers are often uncertain as partnerships largely operate in a business-driven and top-down mode, and do not address certain development concerns, such as the empowerment of producer organizations.
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The environmental movement is a significant force for change in business practices, encompassing at least three societal sectors: civil society, government, and the market. Environmental nongovernmental organizations (ENGOs), which provide mobilizing structures and framing mechanisms to fill governance and social needs unmet by other sectors, remain at the vanguard. However, in response to institutional pressures, businesses are assuming leadership roles to address key concerns, such as climate change and eco-efficiency. The willingness to take up environmental issues has led to cross-sector collaboration between ENGOs and the business sector, such that movement influence tactics have shifted. Environmental groups, sensing the increasing power of the market sector, target business organizations and deemphasize government action. Thus practitioners face several key concerns. How can ENGOs maximize the effectiveness of different influence tactics to induce change in corporate environmental practices and strategies? Are corporate environmental practices and strategies actually influenced by forces in the environmental movement, or are their responses merely symbolic? Using a mixed methods approach, this study reveals that market-friendly ENGOs privilege collaboration as an influencing tactic and that cross-sector collaborations exert an effect on corporate environmental practices.


Abstract: This dissertation is one of the earliest to systematically apply and empirically test the resource-based view (RBV) in the context of nascent social ventures in a large scale study. Social ventures are entrepreneurial ventures organized as nonprofit, for-profit, or hybrid organizations whose primary purpose is to address unmet social needs and create social value. Nascent social ventures face resource gaps and engage in partnerships or alliances as one means to access external resources. These partnerships with different sectors facilitate social venture innovative and earned income strategies, and assist in the development of adequate heterogeneous resource conditions that impact competitive advantage. Competitive advantage in the context of nascent social ventures is achieved through the creation of value and the achievement of venture development activities and launching. The relationships between partnerships, heterogeneous resource conditions, strategies, and competitive advantage are analyzed in the context of nascent social ventures that participated in business plan competitions. A content analysis of 179 social venture business plans and an exploratory follow-up survey of 72 of these ventures are used to analyze these relationships using regression, ANOVA, correlations, t-tests, and non-parametric statistics. The findings suggest a significant positive relationship between competitive advantage and partnership diversity, heterogeneous resource conditions, social innovation, and earned income. Social capital is the type of resource most significantly related to competitive advantage. Founder previous start-up experience, client location, and business plan completeness are also found to be significant in the relationship between partnership diversity and competitive advantage. Finally the findings suggest that hybrid social ventures create a greater competitive advantage than nonprofit or for-profit social ventures. Consequently, this dissertation not only provides academics further insight into the factors that impact nascent social value creation, venture development, and ability to launch, but also offers practitioners guidance on how best to organize certain processes to create a competitive advantage. As a result more insight is gained into the nascent social venture creation process and how these ventures can have a greater impact on society.


Abridged abstract: This dissertation consists of three studies that collectively examine the genesis and dynamics of collaborative cross-sector partnerships between nonprofit and for-profit organizations. The overarching question that frames the papers is how cross-sector partnerships organize across sectoral interfaces to advance social innovation. This thesis makes three contributions: 1) the standpoint of the beneficiaries needs to be explicitly discussed when exploring social innovation in cross-sector partnerships; 2) neither success nor failure are absolute but rather cross-sector partners deliberately and iteratively adjust their roles to sustain momentum towards success or rebound from temporary failure in pursuit of social innovation; and 3) despite largely non-overlapping sectoral frames, social innovation is possible when partners learn how to negotiate and fuse their value frames.

Link: [http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/10](http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/10)


The dissertation examines both collaborative and confrontational business-NGO interactions as mechanisms for corporate social responsibility (CSR). The research reveals that as a consequence of their interaction, both companies and partnering NGOs have developed organisational strategies, policies and structures. In turn, these organisational consequences of business-NGO interactions shape and canalise the interactions, forming more stable patterns and developing standardised rules and procedures. This indicates a gradual institutionalisation of collaborative business-NGO interactions as CSR mechanisms. The dissertation shows that next to collaborative
interactions, confrontational interactions are also capable of shaping and spreading CSR. In fact, collaborative and confrontational approaches complement each other in proliferating CSR. Nevertheless, business-NGO interactions have inherent limitations as well, which implies that when internalisation of CSR into business is the ambition, governments remain crucial actors in the equation.


This doctoral dissertation examines the relationship between corporations and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). The key research question of the dissertation is the following: Why and how do companies engage with nongovernmental organizations to demonstrate corporate responsibility in different institutional contexts? The most important motives for engaging with NGOs include gaining legitimacy and knowledge, managing risk, improving reputation and increasing operational efficiency. The dissertation argues that companies need to understand NGO relations in a more comprehensive and strategic way, adopt a portfolio model to evaluate NGO engagement forms and strategies, improve the assessment of business and societal outcomes of engagement as well as understand the effect of national institutional and civil society base issues on NGO engagement. Company-NGO engagement should not be seen as the primary concern of all companies in the management of operations or investment decisions, but especially large multinational companies have a lot to gain from improved stakeholder management and corporate responsibility programs. The dissertation consists of a summary part and the four published articles grounded in concepts and theories from four related and intertwined academic literatures: those of international business, business and society, management, and civil society. The dissertation has two main contributions: bringing geographic and institutional context to company-NGO engagement research and developing and refining corporate responsibility frameworks. More specifically, key theoretical developments of the thesis and articles are 1) building of a comprehensive framework of company-NGO engagement, 2) development of a new concept (civil society distance), 3) evaluation of a classification of company-NGO engagement strategies (sponsorship, dialogue and partnership), 4) refinement, adaptation and empirical examination of corporate responsibility models (an international CR model, a classification of CR types into philanthropy, integration and innovation and a categorization of socially responsible purchasing strategies), 5) a hypothesis regarding the business and societal outcomes of NGO engagement, and 6) the presentation of theoretical propositions related to company-NGO engagement.


Working Paper Series

The Partnerships Resource Centre at the Rotterdam School of Management (see below for description) has created a Working Paper Series (ISSN: 2211-7318), which will be available for download at: [http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org](http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org).

The following titles are already available in this series:


Partnerships can work, but can they work better? This accessible guidebook distils the author’s key learnings on the advanced strategic planning of cross-sectoral partnerships. *Evolving Partnerships* provides a rich and accessible mix of commentary, boxes for clarification, and 11 exercises to help the reader evolve partnering to achieve a wider level of impact – a level that responds to the scale, depth and urgency of the challenges we face today. 


The purpose of the book is to elucidate the paradoxical nature of partnerships. These alliances on one hand are designed to promote collaboration between individuals, groups and organizations, but on the other hand, the processes of their formation and maintenance entail continuous engagement with competitive orientation, power struggles and conflict. The book intends to integrate theoretical frameworks with praxis, as reflected in a variety of organizational, community and national contexts.


Using a practitioner-oriented style, this book provides guidance on how to collaborate more effectively, with less frustration and better results. The authors articulate an approach that takes advantage of windows of opportunity for real problem solving; brings multi-disciplinary participants to the table to engage more systematically in planning, analysis, decision making, and implementation; breaks down barriers to change; and ultimately, lays the foundation for new thinking and acting. They incorporate knowledge gained from organization and collaboration management research and personal experience to create a fresh approach to collaboration practice.


The widespread partnering phenomenon in the US and the UK spurred a significant amount of literature focusing on its strategic use. *The Politics of Partnerships* diverges by examining if partnerships can deliver benefits that extend beyond the organisational to the societal level resulting from the intentional combined efforts of the partners. The book offers under the chronological stages of formation, implementation, outcomes, a critical examination and proposes a holistic framework for the study of partnerships allowing for observations beyond any single stage.


The most complex social challenges – such as post-secondary access and success for under-represented students, diversification of the workforce, poverty, environmental degradation, and global health – exceed the problem-solving capacity of single organizations or societal sectors. Organizing for Social Partnership provides colleges and universities, corporations, government agencies, nonprofits, and other organizations with a model for how to effectively address these and other pressing social issues through strong, effective collaboration. To bring social partnership to life, this book includes an in-depth field study of the LEAD (Leadership Education and Development) Program in Business – a cross-sector partnership involving twelve top universities, nearly forty corporations, a federal government agency, and a nonprofit organization. The program, focused on creating access and success for underrepresented students, can be applied as an archetype across contexts and settings.


**Book Chapters**


**Reports**

Partnerships Events

Partnership conferences, meetings, seminars take place all around the world to discuss theory and practice. A selection of is presented below:

Cross Sector Partnerships for Social Innovation

2011 Academy of Management Professional Development Workshop (PDW)

The third annual Professional Development Workshop will be held in conjunction with the Academy of Management conference on Friday, August 12, 2011, 8:00AM - 11:30AM at Marriott Riverwalk in Salon C, San Antonio, Texas. The PDW is titled “Cross-Sector Partnerships for Social Innovation: Processes, Perspectives and Positioning.” Building on the two previous PDWs, this year we focus on shaping and disciplining the scholarly conversation about cross-sector partnerships. Our focus is three-fold: we address processes that can engender (more) balanced development of people and products, often through reengineering of markets as well as non-market strategies. We also consider how additional theoretical perspectives can enrich our conceptualization of social innovation, welcoming additional contributions from critical management and positive organizational scholars. Last, we aim for an enlightened platform for scholarly work in cross-sector partnerships by harnessing this discussion to collectively brainstorm about the positioning of this emerging field. As in previous years, this PDW will continue to use real time dynamic interactions between academics and practitioners to ground our conversations. The organizers of this annual PDW are: Marlene J. Le Ber, David Graham Hyatt and Oana Branzei. For more information contact: Marlene at mieber@ivey.uwo.ca.

UK Seminar for PhD students on Cross Sector Social Partnerships
23 September 2011

The Centre for Ethics, Responsibility & Governance (CERG) at the University of Hull Business School (HUBS) is organising on the 23rd September the first Pan-UK seminar for PhD students who work on Cross Sector Social Partnerships (CSSP). The seminar will comprise of academic presentations including: strategies on developing a literature review, approaches for the analysis of qualitative data with an emphasis on NVivo and publishing on partnerships. The aim is to offer CSSP PhD students guidance on some of the most important areas that usually puzzle students. The seminar also offers the opportunity to PhD students not only to present their research and receive feedback from experienced academics, but also to network and develop connections with their peers within the same field. The seminar is organised by Yvonne Ndifor and Shafudin Yatim, PhD students at HUBS. For more information and registration please contact: Y.C.Ngechop at 010.hull.ac.uk.

HAVE YOU ORGANISED A PARTNERSHIP EVENT?
Please send your material (max.220 words) to Jessica Mankowski, Events Editor of the ARSP:
jesica.mankowski@gmail.com
Making a Difference: Enhancing the Impact of Partnerships for the social good

ORGANISED BY:
The Partnership Resource Centre, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

In Collaboration with:
The Centre for Organisational Ethics, Hull University Business School, Hull, UK

OCCASION AND AIM OF THE SYMPOSIUM
Cross sector partnerships is one of the most exciting areas to be engaged in for researchers as well as practitioners as partnerships that bridge different sectors (public, profit, non-profit) are thriving around the world. Austin (2000) labels these alliances as the collaborative paradigm of the 21st century. Cross sector social partnerships are employed as collaborative strategies to address social problems that tend to be complex (wicked), but also as strategies that enhance the effectiveness of organisational objectives. Most of these partnerships have evolved unplanned, while their impact has (yet) been only modestly researched. The latter is due to a lack of available resources, adequate research interest, and interdisciplinary collaborations that are required for assessing this by definition interdisciplinary area. There remain great analytical and methodological difficulties in assessing the impact and effectiveness of partnerships. As cross sector social interactions intensify, the need for impact assessment will increase rapidly. The 3rd International Symposium on Cross Sector Social Interactions (CSSI) takes stock of these issues and tries to stimulate scholars and practitioners to develop not only knowledge and concepts, but also tools and methods. Following the two previous successful symposia, the 3rd CSSI symposium is moving forward by taking the next challenge of partnership research: how to approach the ‘impact’ question. The potential value of partnerships in making a difference to society on one hand is not always realised but more importantly - if value is delivered - it is not monitored, evaluated or adequately reported. The symposium intends to bring together researchers as well as practitioners in a two days encounter in which not only invited speakers can present their latest research but also interactive sessions are organised in which scholars, practitioners and PhD students can meet.

SYMPOSIUM RACKS
1) Theory: Building interdisciplinary theory on cross sector partnerships - do we need a new paradigm?
2) Methods: Assessing the impact of partnerships: methodological issues
3) Skills: Managing the impact of partnerships: tool and skill development
4) Fit: Aligning partnership with social problems: solution to what problems?
5) Implementation: How can the impact of collaborative arrangements increase?

PARTICIPATION TO THE SYMPOSIUM
The symposium welcomes academic and practitioner research on the symposium topic in the form of abstracts and posters. The best papers will be candidates for inclusion in a leading journal and/or a book on the symposium’s topic. More information on the symposium, including registration is available from the midst of June: www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org

November 7, 2011 Submission abstracts (600-1,000 words)
January, 1 2012 Selection of papers and posters
May 3, 2012 Submission of full paper
May 24-25, 2012 Symposium in Rotterdam, Netherlands

Symposium Chair: Prof. Andrew Crane

ORGANISING COMMITTEE
Prof. Rob Van Tulder - Programme Chair 2012
Prof. Andrew Crane - Symposium Chair 2012
Dr. May Seitanidi - Symposium Co-ordinator
Dr. Carlos Rufin - Symposium Co-Chair 2014
Dr. Miguel Rivera-Santos – Symposium Co-Chair 2014

Abstract submissions: rtulder@rsm.nl

ARSP 2011, 6th Issue
Collaboration between the public, private and third/community sectors in the UK and internationally was the focus of an ESRC Seminar Series that took place from 2009-2011, an initiative of the following 5 UK universities and respective representatives: Dr. Paul Williams, Cardiff School of Management, UWIC; Professor Helen Sullivan, University of Birmingham; Dr. Louise Knight, Aston University; Professor Mick Marchington, University of Manchester; Professor Chris Huxham, University of Strathclyde. The description of the Seminar Series, its programme and relevant links are presented below.

Collaboration, variously described and defined, is firmly established within and between the public, private and third/community sectors in the UK and internationally. However, in spite of the continued enthusiasm for collaboration, evidence of its success is thin and contested and opinions are divided about its value.

The current global economic turbulence is likely to prompt public, private and third sector organisations to reconsider their collaborative activity possibly generating new and more specific applications in public policy or commerce. This provides an important opportunity for researchers from very different fields and disciplines to come together in this seminar series to reflect on intra and inter sectoral collaborations and to consider future possibilities for theory, policy and practice based on the following core questions:

What are the new discourses driving collaboration?

What are their likely impacts on collaborative forms and practices?

What are the potential and limits of intra and inter sectoral collaboration?

What can intra and inter sectors collaborations learn from each other?

The ESRC seminar programme:

Performance - 06 April 2011, University of Strathclyde
Innovation - 07 February 2011, London
The workforce - 19 November 2010, Manchester
Governing and regulation - 22 June 2010, Aston University
Leadership, management and boundary spanners - 23 February 2010, University of Birmingham
Collaboration past, present and future - 03 November 2009, Cardiff

For more information contact the coordinators Prof. Helen Sullivan:

Prof. Helen Sullivan: h.c.sullivan at bham.ac.uk
Dr. Paul Williams: pmwilliams at uwic.ac.uk
Lessons & Questions from Practice: Cross Sector Partnerships for Sustainable Development

The second annual professional development workshop titled “Lessons and Questions from Practice: Cross Sector Partnerships for Sustainable Development” was held on August 7, 2010 in conjunction with the annual Academy of Management meeting held in Montreal, Canada. Building on the previous successful session convened in 2009 in Chicago (titled “Lessons from Practice: Cross Sector Partnerships to Solve Social and Environmental Challenges” and featuring the WalMart/EDF partnership), the 2010 PDW was grounded in dialogue between scholars and practitioners focused on the Oxfam/Swiss cross sector partnership.

The PDW provided a dynamic interaction between academics and practitioners interested in cross sector partnerships whose goals are economic development for the disadvantaged and the sustainability of natural resources.

Practitioners presented learnings from partnerships in developing countries. Academics with expertise in cross sector partnership research engaged with the issues presented from their various perspectives. Together, all participants explored and further developed and challenged extant explanatory frameworks for successful collaborative cross-sectoral partnering. The conversations at these PDWs have been summarized and used by the community of scholars to generate streams of research in the field.

The Coordinators of this annual PDW were: Dr. David Graham Hyatt and Dr. Marlene J. Le Ber.

For more information contact: Dr. Marlene J. Le Ber mleber at ivey.uwo.ca
Leading academics from The Netherlands, France, the UK, the US and Canada, discussed at Brunel Business School, on 29th April 2010, how to re-designed social partnerships as global institutions while contributing to the global social good by delivering policies, programmes and impacts and encouraging the collaboration between institutions and citizens.

The 2nd international symposium on Cross Sector Social Partnerships, organised by Brunel Business School’s Research Centre BRESE (Brunel Research on Enterprise, Sustainability, Innovations and Ethics), called for creative approaches to address previous criticisms of cross sector social partnerships. One of the aims was to encourage interaction between academics and practitioners and hence increase the effectiveness of collaborative action.

Prof. Andy Crane, the Symposium chair, remarked at the close “we now know how collaboration works; we even understand what the barriers are to positive results from partnerships. However, in order to increase the positive impact of social partnerships we need to employ simultaneously a wide range of existing tools, including institutional and economic analysis, expertise on contracting and mergers, public management and rational choice theory together with more recent tools such as future visioning, while developing new organizational forms. It seems that new skills are required by leaders of the profit, public and nonprofit sectors and it is essential that academics and practitioners get together as well as representatives from different organizations in providing greater positive impact for society”.

The symposium inaugurated the first academic award for the best poster in social partnership sponsored by one of the leading publishing houses in social science research: Routledge Best Poster Award in Social Partnership. Dr Cheryl Martners, Lecturer in Advertising and Media from The Media School of Bournemouth University, was the first winner of the award, remarked: “Participating in the symposium has increased my keen interest in the growing field of cross sector social partnerships and strengthened my research interest in the HIV/AIDS cross-sector partnerships of MTV, UNAIDS and UNICEF. I would like to thank Routledge for sponsoring the award and encouraging scholars to think of new ways of conceptualizing and communicating academic work”. The Senior Commissioning Editor of Routledge Books, Terry Clague commented: “We are delighted for the opportunity to sponsor the first award on social partnership. Collaborative working is an increasingly important area of research and a populated practitioner field in which we have a keen interest. Following this important symposium that brought together leading academics and practitioners in the field we hope to develop a book with cutting edge suggestions combining theory and practice while increasing the impact of academic work for the UK but also internationally”.

The Symposium Coordinator, Dr. May Seitanidi, remarked in her opening presentation: “collaborative working is today an endemic property of our societies. Hence, it is imperative to incorporate social benefit thinking when designing collaborative working solutions and new organisational forms in order to avoid citizen cynicism and decreasing levels of trust to our institutions”.

The academic speakers who presented at the symposium included Prof. Andrew Crane from the Schulich School of Business, York University Canada, Prof. Ans Kolk from the University Of Amsterdam, Prof. Rob Van Tulder from Erasmus University, Prof. Hellen Sullivan from the University of Birmingham, Prof. Diana Mangalagiu, from the Reims Management School-France and Oxford University John Balmer from Brunel Business School, Dr. Carlos Rufin Assistant Professor at Suffolk University-Boston, Dr. Miguel
Rivera from Babson College-Boston, Dr. Diana Mangalagiu from the University of Oxford, Dr. John Selsky from the USF Politechnique-Florida, Dr Angela Wilkinson from Oxford University, and Dr. May Seitanidi from Brunel University.

Practitioner speakers who presented at the symposium included: Esther Ridsdale Collaborative Working Development Officer at the National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO), Simon Parker from the Institute for Government, Lucian Hudson Senior Adviser to the Chief Executive, Marie Curie Cancer Care; Partner and MD, Cornerstone Global Associates.

Prof. Zahir Irani, Head of Brunel Business School remarked: "The symposium participants had the opportunity to explore ways of re-designing social partnerships that can lead to the creation of self-regulating entities whereby businesses, government and nonprofit organisations can monitor and ensure their adherence to laws but also ethical standards that lead to the improved delivery of policy and impact".◆

For more information contact the Symposium Coordinator: Dr. May Seitanidi: mmayseitanidi at yahoo.com
Pal Neela (2007:4) of the Aspen Institute recently asked “what unique leadership characteristics are required of partnership, and how might management education foster these in their students, given the growing inclination for partnership in the business world?” This section of ARSP, Partnerships and Pedagogy, intends to engage this question by reviewing relevant pedagogical materials and scholarship of teaching and learning resources to assist those teaching about cross sector partnerships (CSPs) both inside and outside the academic classroom. Potential topics include, but are not limited to, issues and opportunities of teaching partnerships around the world, large-scale CSP pedagogical initiatives like the Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME), CSP related experiential exercises, specific CSP modules, or specialized topics such as leadership and collaboration.

This column focuses on the intersection of leadership and collaboration pedagogy resources, specifically the “leaderful leadership” model and the associated teaching activities developed by Dr. Joseph A. Raelin. His alternative leadership model and practice-tested tools can assist our CSP instruction by fostering student learning about a broad range of partnership skills increasingly required by leaders, such as stakeholder dialog and network citizenship behavior.

Dr. Joseph A. Raelin, is considered an international expert on collaborative leadership development and work-based learning. In the last 35 years he has focused his academic and management consulting careers on bridging the theory-practice divide. His work offers a valuable model for CSP practitioners, researchers, and instructors because his collaborative leadership theory and related educational exercises can easily be integrated into either workplace training or the academic classroom environment. Below I provide commentary on two of Raelin’s leadership development books highlighting relevant connections to CSPs.

We begin with Raelin’s recently released work, ‘The Leadership Fieldbook: Strategies and Activities for Developing Leadership in Everyone’ (2010, Paperback, ISBN 978-0-891063-80-3). This practical workbook-style text conceives of leaders as change agents who can promote change at five possible levels: individual, interpersonal, team, organization, and network. Of particular interest to the readers of ARSP is Chapter 5 titled “Network Level Change.” This chapter emphasizes seven specific strategies for enhancing leadership knowledge and skills within a network or inter-organizational context. This review highlights three of these relevant to CSP teaching: Stakeholder Dialog, Network Citizenship Behavior, and the Network Weaver Role.

First, the “Stakeholder Dialog” section of the chapter provides a three part lesson plan designed to help leaders evaluate their network. Raelin created an experiential role-play dialog for the learner to practice a conversation with a key stakeholder in the network, identified through the earlier prep work in the chapter. He offers specific instructions for structuring the role-play itself and a detailed feedback sheet or “how-to guide” for peers offering coaching on the role-play participant’s stakeholder dialog skills. For instance, how well did the dialog participants listen actively or invite...
inquiry? This section provides a module “blueprint” suitable for masters and executive level courses or even consultants providing CSP training.

Second, in the “Network Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire” section of the chapter Raelin offers an instrument specifically designed to assess partnerships. For those new to partnering, his questionnaire identifies a few of the critical citizenship behaviors necessary in a well functioning network. The Likert-style scale questionnaire can also be used by partnership leaders or consultants with all levels of experience to diagnose the strengths and challenges within a partnership, especially as a pre-post survey following network interventions.

Third, in this book Raelin suggests that the network weaver role is a unique combination of collaborative skills fundamental for CSP success and one that needed by leaders across a variety of sectors. Raelin defines a network weaver role as, “establishing connections among people, helping them to build strong trusting relationships… [a] weaver needs to have the capacity to bring people together so that they find value in contributing their time and resources to the network” (2010, 132). In addition to defining this emerging CSP role, Raelin provides readers a three-step reflective exercise on the network weaver role giving instructors a process model for coaching learners new to this complex skill set.

The practical Leadership Fieldbook, described in part above, originates from Raelin’s earlier leadership book Creating Leaderful Organizations: How to Bring Out Leadership in Everyone (2003, ISBN 978-1576752333). Of interest to ARSP readers might be his alternative leadership paradigm. In this book he argues for a re-conceptualization of the entire field of leadership away from the primacy of what he terms —conventional leadership. He broadly conceives of this style as serial, individualistic, controlling, and dispassionate. To his dismay, conventional leadership remains center stage in both our practice and academic leadership models and this book pushes for the inclusion of another perspective which he calls —leaderful leadership.

His approach emphasizes leadership as a concurrent, collective, collaborative, and compassionate process. Concurrent in that there can be more than one leader at the same time; Collective meaning that leadership is decidedly not an individual, but rather a plural phenomena; Collaborative by valuing everyone and their opinions; Compassionate entailing a commitment to democratic process and decision making that takes into consideration the dignity of numerous stakeholders. Raelin’s leaderful leadership concept provides CSP instructors an integrative leadership model built upon numerous leadership studies. Instructors can use this content within traditional leadership courses or professional development trainings in two ways. It can be used either to expose students to emerging leadership practices and contexts like CSPs, or as a model to educate participants within a CSP by showcasing fundamental collaborative leadership competencies.

In concert, Raelin’s two books provide a direct response to Neela’s query about unique leadership characteristics required in partnerships. Creating Leaderful Organizations offers an empirically grounded leadership theory that gives academics and practitioners a robust framework suitable for several instructional contexts; while the companion Leadership Fieldbook imparts well conceived instructional applications appropriate for the traditional classroom or ongoing management development programs.

I welcome receiving your resources related to partnerships teaching and pedagogy at: jeigh4 at naz.edu so that they can be included in the 2012 ARSP. ◆

References:


The 2011 Roy Family Award for Environmental Partnership goes to ...

Refrigerants Naturally!

The Harvard Belfer Center’s Environment and Natural Resources Program presented on 4th May 2011 the prestigious Roy Family Award for Environmental Partnership to Refrigerants, Naturally!, a consortium of organizations including Coca Cola, McDonald’s, Unilever, PepsiCo, Greenpeace and the United Nations Environment Program. The partnership was selected from a group of highly qualified projects from around the world.

The partnership initiative was launched by McDonald’s, Coca Cola and Unilever to encourage manufacturers to produce products using non-HFC gases and to share technology. The soft drink giant began working with Greenpeace after the environmental group lobbied companies during the much advertised “green” 2000 Sydney Olympics that Coca Cola and McDonald’s sponsored. Since 2004, Refrigerants, Naturally! has focused its efforts on overcoming barriers to the use of natural refrigerants including worldwide availability, maintenance, technical challenges and regulation. They actively promote a shift in point-of-sale cooling technology toward safe, reliable, energy-efficient and cost-effective natural refrigerants with low or zero global warming potential and zero ozone depleting potential. The initiative provides a platform and a critical mass in communicating with the refrigeration technology supply chain, with other large companies using similar refrigeration and air conditioning equipment, governments and civil society.

Refrigerants, Naturally! is taking action to combat global warming and climate change by replacing F-gases in refrigeration equipment with climate-friendly natural refrigerants and is successfully promoting the technology amongst other companies around the world. Refrigerants, Naturally! have worked to substitute HFCs with natural refrigerants such as ammonia, carbon dioxide and hydrocarbons and hence have played an important role in raising the profile of this important issue and demonstrating what can be achieved through "shared vision and commitment", said Thomas Lingard, Global External Affairs Director Unilever and Chair of Refrigerants, Naturally!.

Today, it is estimated that hundreds of thousands of tons of greenhouse gas emissions have been prevented from entering the atmosphere due to the partnership. The consortium began with a handful of companies and now has gained the support of 400 more companies who will commit to begin phasing out HFCs. The partnership works to develop technologies that are safe, reliable, affordable, and energy efficient. Coca Cola, is using the natural gases in a growing number of new refrigeration units, but has pledged to ensure that all its new refrigeration equipment will have the natural refrigerants by 2015. ◆

About the Roy Family Award
The Roy Family Award is given out every two years to an outstanding public-private partnership project that enhances environmental quality. The Roy Family Award celebrates an outstanding public-private partnership project that enhances environmental quality through the use of novel and creative approaches. By drawing attention to an exceptional partnership, the award aims to inspire others to replicate or expand upon the success. For more information:

http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/project/43/environment_and_natural_resources.html?page_id=16
The Partnerships Resource Centre (PrC) was set up jointly by a number of Dutch universities, the Dutch government, (international) NGOs and firms in November 2009. All parties are committed to the idea of partnerships across sectoral and national boundaries as a modern means for achieving sustainable development. The administrative seat of the PrC is at the Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam, but most of the PrC is a virtual learning network. The PrC actively searches for additional partners worldwide, provided they are committed to sharing knowledge on cross-sector partnerships. The partners of the Partnerships Resource Centre are divided into three categories:

1. **Lead partners**: these partners participate and contribute in policy setting and determining the research agenda.
2. **Collaborating partners**: these partners collaborate and work together with the centre’s researchers on research projects.
3. **Affiliated organisations**: these partners support the work and philosophy of the centre but do not yet actively engage in its research or other activities.

The PrC is headed by an academic director (Prof. Rob van Tulder) and the team comprises a network of collaborating scholars; consisting of a network coordinator, track coordinators, senior researchers, research associates, resident scholars, actively contributing practitioners and junior researchers.

The Partnerships Resource Centre is an open centre where scholars, practitioners and students can create, retrieve and share knowledge on cross-sector partnerships for sustainable development. The centre conducts fundamental research, develops tools, knowledge sharing protocols and web-based learning modules and offers executive training. Most of these activities are open to the general public and are aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of partnerships around the world. The centre strives to have a high societal impact and to be quoted in the academic as well as popular media. It should be regarded as a source of validated information on cross sector partnerships, a platform for information dissemination and a source of inspiration for practitioners around the world.

The Partnerships Resource Centre has identified the six most promising, but arguably also the most difficult, areas for further progress in partnerships research and management. Each area is translated into a track of research that operates as a learning network, focuses on a particular type of relationship and is related to a specific level of analysis:

- **The General**: Cross-sector partnerships as a new organisational principle.
- **Partnerships portfolio management**: Creating optimal partnership portfolios
- **Mindsets**: A collaborative mindset implies openness towards the participative action of other individuals and organisations.
- **Value Chains**: Making value chains more fair through partnering.
- **Public Goods**: Improved (global) public goods provision through partnering.
- **Issues**: The solution lies in the partnership.

The centre recently developed a valuable report on *The State of the Partnerships Report 2010*. The report suggests that corporations are increasingly searching for partnerships with organisations that do not belong to their normal ‘habitat’. Nowadays no large firm seems to do without a healthy portfolio of ‘cross sector partnerships’. In fact, the State of Partnerships Report 2010 shows that 96% of the 100 largest corporations in the world engage in any form of cross sector collaboration. This report provides the first exploratory study of the cross sector partnering strategies of the largest companies in the world, focusing on their types of collaboration, form of engagement, issue addressed by the partnership, and area of implementation.

Other reports developed by the PrC include an overview of the main discussions and outputs of the United Nations World Summit in September 2010 regarding partnerships. For more information, please visit the PrC website: [www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org](http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org)
Utrecht-Nijmegen Programme on Partnerships

UNPOP, the Utrecht Nijmegen Programme on Partnerships, is a joint research programme of Utrecht University (Copernicus Institute for Sustainable Development and Innovation, Research school SENSE) and Radboud University Nijmegen (Nijmegen School of Management, Department of Political Sciences of the Environment, Research school NETHUR) on the topic of Partnerships for sustainable development that started in 2005. Below we present an interview with Prof. Pieter Glasbergen, Chair of the UNPOP.

Interview with Prof. Pieter Glasbergen Co-Chair of UNPOP, Prof. of Environmental Studies, Policy and Management at Utrecht University and the Netherlands Open University

Recently you published a paper on the ladder of partnership activity as an attempt to understand partnerships analytically (Environmental Policy and Governance, 21(1), 1-13). Could you please sketch the rationale behind this paper?

It grew out of two shortcomings of the literature. The first one stems from the recognition that there is a disconnect between the research in partnerships within three literatures: business administration, policy studies and political science. The paper’s aim was to bring these perspectives closer together.

The second shortcoming refers to the persistent pattern within the literature suggesting similar criteria for the success of partnerships such as: setting realistic targets; being explicit about the roles of the partners; considering who the partners should be; formalising the agreement; setting up a monitoring system and so forth. Hence I aimed at digging a little bit deeper and instead focusing on the mechanisms that bring partnerships forward: trust building, collaborative advantage, contracting, creating external legitimacy, and creating institutional change through social power.

Can you share with us what the new partnership projects that your students are working on?

We have two new PhD students, Greetje Schouten, who is working on legitimacy issues of the Roundtables as a specific form of partnership and Luli Pesqueira, who uses action research in order to study Oxfam-Novib’s attempts to institutionalize the rights-based approach in multi-sector partnerships.

What are the directions of cutting edge partnership research in your opinion?

Ah, this is a challenging question. I think to better understand the role of partnerships in different issue areas and commodity chains we need to use mapping technologies, which is something that we extensively use at unpop. An important area is focusing upon the transition from single partnerships to multiple partnerships around a central social issue that in effect will create networks of partnerships. The concept of meta-governance, in my view, will become a very important. With the proliferation of partnerships and their inevitable connection to governmental policies we face an orchestration problem of entire social issue areas that require mapping. We are currently working on the meta-governance role of Business-NGO partnerships; I expect that at the RIO+ conference, next year, will address meta-governance as a central part of the discussions regarding the continuation of the UN partnerships. I would also say that comparative research is challenging but much needed. Here are some examples of comparative research: the comparison between policy-oriented versus market-oriented partnerships or comparing partnerships within different issue areas or across commodity chains. Finally, a question that will remain central is what makes partnerships more or less successful and what the mechanisms that determine success or failure across different socio-economic contexts are.

For more information on the Utrecht-Nijmegen Programme on Partnerships please visit: http://www.unpop.nl
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A warm welcome to all of the new members of the NonProfit-Business Partnerships Yahoo Group! Since last year 55 new members were added to the group, bringing the total to 371 academics and practitioners interested in partnerships. Below you will find brief introductions of new members who work on partnerships. If you would like to join the group contact any of the members for collaboration, research or information in their area of expertise, please visit the databases section by following the link:

http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/NPO-BUSPartnerships/database?method=reportRows&tbl=1

**Dr. Dorothea Baur**  
Post-doctoral researcher, Institute for Social Innovation, ESADE, Spain

Dorothea Baur (PhD in Political Science) completed her thesis on “NGOs as legitimate partners of corporations – a political conceptualization” in February 2009 at the University of St. Gallen (Switzerland). Currently, she further extends her research on questions of NGO accountability, the political theory of the firm, democratic theory and business ethics as a post-doctoral researcher at the Institute for Social Innovation at ESADE University in Barcelona. Previous to her PhD she worked as a project manager for analyzing the reputation of a transnational corporation at the University of Zurich.

**Dr. Arno Kourula**  
Postdoctoral Fellow at Stanford University, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, US

Arno Kourula (D.Sc. Econ) is a Postdoctoral Fellow at Stanford University’s Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering. He defended his doctoral dissertation in the field of international business at the Helsinki School of Economics (currently known as Aalto University School of Economics) in 2009. Kourula’s primary research interests are corporate responsibility and cross-sector partnerships. More specifically his research projects have focused on corporate management of stakeholder relations with nongovernmental organizations, strategies for business development at the base of the pyramid, voluntary programs for building eco-efficiency, and sustainability outcomes of global infrastructure projects. Kourula’s work has appeared in journals such as Journal of World Business, Business & Society, and Corporate Governance. He has taught courses and lectured on corporate responsibility at the doctoral, master’s and bachelor’s levels as well executive education.

**Helena Knight**  
PhD Student, Cardiff University, UK

Helena is a PhD student at Cardiff Business School and holds a 3+1 ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council, UK) PhD Studentship. Last year, I successfully completed my Masters in Social Science Research Methods with distinction, as the first stage of my doctoral programme. My dissertation entitled “Corporate Giving to the Performing Arts in Wales: Why Do Businesses Give?” looked into the management practices employed in corporate arts giving in Wales, by investigating the relative balance between business and societal motivations of corporate art supporters. This exploratory study forms an initial part of my doctoral research, where I am looking to investigate tripartite cross-sector social collaborations in the UK’s arts context. I hold MSc Marketing (distinction) from Glamorgan University, UK. My research interests include: Business Ethics, Corporate Social Responsibility, CSR and Sustainability, Corporate Philanthropy, Corporate Sponsorship, Cross Sector Social Partnerships, Stakeholder Theory, Non Profit and Arts Marketing.
Martin Kunze  
PhD Student, Martin Luther University, Halle, Wittenberg, Germany  
Currently I am working as a research assistant in the research project ‘Professionalization and Organizational Development in Debt Counseling’ at the Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg in Germany. The main focus of my project is to analyze the role of companies in the welfare production. In this research project we analyze a case study. We have the possibility to observe a cooperation of an energy company and a nonprofit debt counseling organization for the period of two years. Although this is a project situated in Germany I want to get in touch with colleagues and project’s working on this issue in other countries. I am working in this topic for the last 3 years on this topic and now want to start writing my Ph.D. on companies’ contribution to social welfare production in an international comparative perspective.

Dr. Marlene J. Le Ber  
Postdoctoral Fellow, Erb Institute for Global Sustainable Enterprise, University of Michigan, US  
Marlene’s program of research is centered on the processes of social innovation that address the social, environmental and economic sustainability challenges facing society. She is interested in how social systems change and how market forces can address these sustainability challenges. Marlene is particularly intrigued by the processes that pattern the creation, capture, conversion and distribution of value in new forms of hybrid organizing. She examines these processes using longitudinal data, primarily in the health and social services context. There are two very promising new arenas that she has been studying: cross-sector partnerships between nonprofit and for profit organizations and hybrid organizations that are market-oriented yet have a common good social-mission. Her work has been published in Business & Society, Organization and Journal of Business Ethics. Marlene completed her PhD in Business Administration (Strategy) in August 2010 at the Richard Ivey School of Business, The University of Western Ontario and is a SSHRC-supported (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council in Canada) postdoctoral fellow at Erb. Marlene came to the PhD program with a wealth of experience as a leader and change agent in the Canadian health care system. Her interest in social innovation stems from her earlier roots in health care/health research management and in mental health and community nursing. Marlene holds degrees in MScN(A) and BScN from The University of Western Ontario.

Dr. David Graham Hyatt  
Clinical Assistant Professor of Supply Chain Management, Sam M. Walton College of Business at the University of Arkansas, USA  
David Hyatt (D.M.) is a Clinical Assistant Professor of Supply Chain Management at the University of Arkansas’ Sam M. Walton College of Business. He recently completed his thesis, “A Multi-Method Exploration of the Role of Legitimacy in Cross-Sector Partnerships for The Natural Environment” at Case Western Reserve University. Hyatt’s primary research and practical interests concern sustainability in global supply chains, specifically the effects of cross-sector partnerships on corporate environmental strategies. He teaches Cross-Sector Partnerships for Sustainability at the masters’ level and Data Analysis at the undergraduate level. In collaboration with the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences, he was instrumental in developing a cross-college certificate program in cross-sector partnerships. Also, in collaboration with many others, he has organized a series of professional development workshops (PDWs) on cross-sector partnerships at the Academy of Management. Prior to his current appointment, Hyatt served as Senior Assistant Dean at the Walton College where he was responsible for its overall financial and administrative management.
Francesca Cerletti
PhD student with Coventry University, Business Environment and Society Faculty

Francesca Cerletti is PhD student with Coventry University in her second year. Her research interest focuses on corporate engagement in complex environments. The aim of her PhD research is to understand how the partnership between Total S.A. (Total) and Collaborative Learning Projects (also known as CDA), a USA based NPO, has impacted on Total’s way of working in Myanmar. The relationship between Total and CDA can loosely be defined as a partnership. The two organisations are in fact part of a collaborative learning project, led by CDA: the Corporate Engagement Project (CEP). This project involves companies and practitioners and draws on practical experiences made by project participants to synthesise lessons learnt, which are also shared with others. The focus on Myanmar, enables to observe a 10 year process of change (2002-2012) in a complex environment which demands particular sensitivity in relationship building and towards the conflict dynamics present in the country. Francesca is also a skilled consultant with experience of working on, organisational development, leadership, conflict issues, knowledge and change management. She has worked for both private and public sector organisations as well as NGOs. Her regional knowledge extends to Asia, Europe and Latin America.

Christos Anagnostopoulos
Lecturer, Sport & Event Management Department & Member of Centre for International Business Sport (CIBS), Coventry University Business School, UK

Christos Anagnostopoulos is a lecturer within the Sport and Event Management Department at Coventry Business School, Coventry University and a member of the Centre for the International Business of Sport. Christos’ key teaching research interests lie in corporate social responsibility in and through sport. He is also at the final stages of a doctoral research project that looks at the development and implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility in English football where it became evident that the actual implementation of CSR-related programmes draws on - if not depends on - cross-sector partnerships. Given the ever-increasing commercial focus, along with the increased pressure from a growing number of stakeholders (i.e. governments, local councils, media, sponsors, fans) - particularly in contemporary football - there are many examples where sport organisations undertake CSR activities through various forms of partnerships. Considering, therefore, the growing propensity of sport organisations to engage with partners to deliver CSR, Christos believes that an examination of this type of stakeholder management may be of significant interest for both parties involved and the sport scholar community alike. Christos can be contacted at c.anagnostopoulos@coventry.ac.uk (see also: www.canagnostopoulos.eu)

Do you work or research Cross Sector Social Partnerships?
Visit: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/NPO-BUSPartnerships/

THE PURPOSE OF THE NONPROFIT-BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS YAHOO GROUP:
The NPO-BUS Partnerships Yahoo Group was founded in December 2005 with the aim to connect people interested in cross-sector social interactions in business, non-profit organisations, local and central governments, and academia.

The aim is to encourage exchange of information specific to social partnerships between practitioners and academics. Corporate social responsibility, sustainability, and business ethics encourage and facilitate the increase of cross-sector social interactions. However, the group aims to provide focused content rather than discuss general issues within the above broad areas.

Do you want to promote an event, positions, books, or announce papers related to partnerships?
Please send your material for the next issue. Deadline: 15 February 2012