



Kent Academic Repository

Seitanidi, M. May (2014) *Crossing over together*. Annual Review of Social Partnerships (9). pp. 8-11. ISSN 2059-4291.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/115156/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

https://www.routledge.com/rsc/downloads/ARSP_2014_issue_9.pdf

This document version

Publisher pdf

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal**, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).



**From the SelectedWorks of Maria May
Seitanidi**

September 2014

Annual Review of Social Partnerships Issue 9

Contact
Author

Start Your Own
SelectedWorks

Notify Me
of New Work

Available at: http://works.bepress.com/may_seitanidi/40

ANNUAL REVIEW *of* SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS

An International Annual Edition on Cross Sector Social Partnerships

SEPTEMBER 2014 | ISSUE 9

27 Pedagogy Section

CSP skills for
21st century managers

J. Haertle

42 Thought Gallery

Trickle effects

A. Kolk

79 Community Section

Researchers' goals vs
practitioner needs

S. Waddell

Henry Mintzberg

Societies, Sectors, Citizens:
The case for rebalancing society

A·R·S·P

8

Advisor
Board
Members

30,000
Recipients

16

Editors

4,000
Downloads

25
Contributions

ANNUAL REVIEW *of* SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS

Notice of Use of Material, September 2014

The material in the Annual Review of Social Partnerships may be used as assigned course material in academic institutions or corporate learning and training materials in businesses, as long as they reference fully and appropriately all the material by attributing the appropriate author(s). The content may be used in electronic reserves, electronic course packs, syllabi links or by any other means of incorporating the content into course resources.

Indicative Reference : Kourula, A. 2014. Perspectives, reviews and the path forward. Annual Review of Social Partnerships, Publication Section, Issue 9.

In case of any questions about the Annual Review of Social Partnerships please contact mmayseitanidi@yahoo.com.

A·R·S·P

ANNUAL REVIEW *of* SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS

SEPTEMBER 2014 | ISSUE 9 | LONDON, UK

Editorial Team

EDITOR IN CHIEF:

M. May Seitanidi / mmayseitanidi (at) yahoo.com

EDITOR :

M. May Seitanidi / mmayseitanidi (at) yahoo.com

CREATIVE ART DIRECTOR:

Yiannis Sigouros

SENIOR EDITORS:

Arno Kourula / A.E.Kourula (at) uva.nl

Jenifer S. A. Leigh / jleigh4 (at) zimbra.naz.edu

SECTION EDITORS:

Arno Kourula / Publications Section / A.E.Kourula (at) uva.nl

Jenifer S. A. Leigh / Pedagogy Section / jleigh4 (at) zimbra.naz.edu

Amelia Clarke / Sustainability Section / amelia.clarke (at) uwaterloo.ca

Jessica Mankowski / Praxis Section / jessica.mankowski (at) gmail.com

Verena Bitzer / Community Section / v.bitzer (at) gmail.com

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

José Carlos Marques / Publications Section

Salla Laasonen / Publications Section

David Hyatt / Pedagogy Section

Adriane Macdonald / Pedagogy Section

Pieter Glasbergen / Sustainability Section

Adolf Acquaye / Sustainability Section

Julia Diaz / Praxis Section

Lamberto Zollo / Praxis Section

Adriana Reynaga Morales / Community Section

CONTRIBUTORS 9TH ISSUE:

Estelle Cloete / estelle (at) wcedp.co.za

Angharad Evan

Ralph Hamann / ralph.hamann (at) gsb.uct.ac.za

Judith Irwin / Judith.Irwin (at) networkrail.co.uk

Ans Kolk / akolk (at) uva.nl

Haiying Lin

Stella Pfisterer / spfisterer (at) rsm.nl

Stuart Reid / stuart.reid (at) thepartneringinitiative.org

Greetje Schouten

Lea Stadtler / lea.stadtler (at) unige.ch

Disclaimer: The opinions expressed in this publication represent only the opinion of each individual contributor.



1. THOMAS DONALDSON is the Mark O. Winkelman Professor at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. He has written broadly in the area of business ethics, values, and corporate governance. He was Chairman of the Social Issues in Management Division of the Academy of Management (2007-2008) and Associate Editor of the Academy of Management Review from 2002-2007. He has consulted and lectured at many organizations, including the Business Roundtable, Goldman Sachs, the United Nations, Johnson & Johnson, KPMG, Ernst & Young, IBM, and BP.

2. R. EDWARD FREEMAN is University Professor, Elis and Signe Olsson Professor, Academic Director of the Business Roundtable Institute for Corporate Ethics, the Institute for Business in Society, and Senior Fellow of the Olsson Center for Applied Ethics at the University of Virginia Darden School of Business. His latest book *Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art* follows from Freeman's award-winning book *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, in which he suggests that businesses build their strategy around their relationships with key stakeholders.

3. BARBARA GRAY is Professor and Executive Programs Faculty Fellow Emerita in the Smeal College of Business at Penn State University where she was also Director of the Center for Research in Conflict and Negotiation. She has three books and over 95 articles on organizational and environmental conflict, sense making and institutional processes in collaborative

partnerships published in such journals such as *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Organization Science* and *JABS*.

4. ANS KOLK is a Full Professor at the University of Amsterdam Business School, the Netherlands. Her research has focused on corporate responsibility and sustainability in relation to international business firms, and their interactions with local, national, and international stakeholders. She has published numerous articles in international journals, as well as book chapters, and also books. In 2009, she received the Aspen Institute Faculty Pioneer European Award (Lifetime Achievement Award).


5. PETER NEERGAARD is professor emeritus in CSR, Copenhagen Business School. He has extensively surveyed cross sector partnerships in a Danish context seen from the point of view of NGOs. He has been a pro bono adviser to NGOs in forming partnerships. His other research interests are communication of CSR and CSR in global supply chains.

6. MATTHEW TAYLOR has been Chief Executive of the RSA (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce) in the United Kingdom since 2006. Prior to this appointment, he was Chief Adviser on Political Strategy to the Prime Minister, and Director of the Institute for Public Policy Research between 1999 and 2003. He has extensive experience in politics, public policy and organisational leadership. He championed and helped design

a major national engagement process in 2003/4 (the Big Conversation) and has long standing interest in civic interaction, social networks and citizen-centred public service reform.

7. SANDRA WADDOCK is Galligan Chair of Strategy, Carroll School Scholar of Corporate Responsibility, and Professor of Management at Boston College's Carroll School of Management. Author of more than 100 papers and ten books, she received the 2004 Sumner Marcus Award for Distinguished Service (Social Issues in Management, Academy of Management), the 2005 Faculty Pioneer Award for External Impact (Aspen Institute), and in 2011 the David L. Bradford Outstanding Educator Award (Organizational Behavior Teaching Society).

8. SIMON ZADEK is Senior Fellow at the Global Green Growth Institute and the International Institute for Sustainable Development, Visiting Scholar, Tsinghua School of Economics and Management, and Distinguished Senior Fellow, Academy of Business in Society. He was founder and chief executive of AccountAbility and is the author of the award winning book, *«The Civil Corporation»*, and the widely used Harvard Business Review article, *«Pathways to Corporate Responsibility»*. He has written extensively on partnerships, notably his work on collaborative governance and partnership accountability, as well as contributing practically to numerous cross-sector partnership dealing with ethical trade, internet privacy, human rights and mining, and green finance and green growth planning.



1. ADOLF ACQUAYE is a Lecturer in Sustainability at the Kent Business School, University of Kent in the United Kingdom. He has published on Green Supply Chain Management and on Sustainability Research in leading international journals. Dr. Acquaye is a Lead Author for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fifth Assessment Report-AR5 (Chapter 10- Industry in Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change).

2. VERENA BITZER holds a PhD from Utrecht University in the Netherlands and is a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Cape Town's Graduate School of Business, South Africa. Her research focuses on cross-sector collaboration and social innovation to understand how businesses and other organisations can jointly develop innovative responses to complex social and environmental challenges.

3. AMELIA CLARKE is an Assistant Professor in the School of Environment, Enterprise and Development (SEED) at the University of Waterloo, where she is also Director of the Master of Environment and Business (MEB) executive-education online program. Her main research focuses are related to strategies for sustainable development, and include a half-million dollar team project on structuring cross-sector social partnerships to more effectively

achieve local sustainability and climate action goals and other desired partner outcomes.

4. PIETER GLASBERGEN is Honorary Professor at Maastricht University and Emeritus Professor at Utrecht University and the Netherlands Open University. His main research and teaching is on Governance for Sustainable Development. Prof. Glasbergen chairs the Maastricht-Utrecht-Nijmegen research program on partnerships (www.munpop.nl), a collaboration of researchers of three Dutch universities.

5. DAVID G. HYATT (D.M.) is a Clinical Assistant Professor of Supply Chain Management at the University of Arkansas' Sam M. Walton College of Business. Hyatt's primary research and teaching interests concern collaboration and sustainability in global supply chains. He has recently developed a masters class on this topic and has coauthored a series of teaching cases about Walmart's sustainability journey, including two cases on multi-stakeholder collaboration for defining sustainable products. The cases were published at <http://sustainabilitycases.uark.edu/>.

6. ARNO KOURULA is an Assistant Professor of Strategy at the University of Amsterdam Business School in the Netherlands and a Docent at Aalto University in Finland. His primary research and

teaching interests are cross-sector interactions and corporate responsibility. His articles have appeared in such journals as *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *Business & Society*, *Energy Policy*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Journal of World Business*, and *Research Policy*.

7. SALLA LAASONEN is an Assistant Professor at Rotterdam School of Management (RSM) at Erasmus University, the Netherlands. Before starting at RSM, she was a visiting scholar at Stanford University, USA, and a postdoctoral researcher at Turku School of Economics at the University of Turku, Finland. Her research interests focus on corporate responsibility, cross-sector interactions, and stakeholder participation processes. Her teaching focuses especially on multidisciplinary methods on sustainable development and responsible business. Her work has been published in *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Business & Society*, and *Corporate Governance*.

8. JENNIFER S. A. LEIGH is an associate professor of management at Nazareth College in Rochester, NY, USA. Her research addresses responsibility management education, cross-sector partnerships, and scholarship of engagement. She is an editorial board member of the *Academy of Management Learning & Education (AMLE)* and an Associate Editor for the *Journal of Management Education (JME)*.



9. ADRIANE MACDONALD is a PhD Candidate in the Environment and Resources Studies Department at the University of Waterloo. Her studies focus on large cross-sector social partnerships designed to implement community sustainability plans. As an instructor at the University of Waterloo, Adriane has taught courses that focus on topics related to environment, business, and strategy. Outside of academia, Adriane has worked as a consultant for a design firm and as a business analyst for the Government of Canada.

10. JESSICA MANKOWSKI (M.E.S) is the Acting Manager, Knowledge Translation Strategy with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Over the past ten years she has worked primarily in fields of environment and health to build capacity for evidence-based decision making and interest in the opportunities presented by cross-sector partnerships. Her research has focused on the drivers and enablers of cross-sector partnerships and the use of complex systems theory to explore these fascinating relationships.

11. JOSÉ CARLOS MARQUES is a PhD Candidate (Strategy and Organization) at the Desautels Faculty of Management, McGill

University. His thesis (in progress) examines the competitive and collaborative organizational field dynamics of private regulatory governance in global industries. Prior to pursuing a PhD, he was a researcher at the UN Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) and held various management positions within the IT and aviation industries.

12. JULIA HELENA DÍAZ RAMÍREZ holds a bachelor's degree in computer science and a master's degree in industrial engineering. She is currently a Ph.D student of Management at Universidad de los Andes in Colombia. Her research examines the reasons of small businesses to collaborate with non-profit organizations. She has worked in the public sector in education and also in e-government.

13. ADRIANA REYNAGA M. holds a PhD in Political and Social Sciences at National University of Mexico (UNAM). She is Associate Professor of Strategic Communication at Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (ITESM), both in Mexico City. She has focused her research in communication network formation between sectors through different forms of institutional agreements and also in the role that social capital plays to

promote cross-sector partnerships.

14. M. MAY SEITANIDI (FRSA) is Associate Professor of Strategy at Kent Business School, University of Kent. She is also a Visiting Fellow at the International Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility (ICCSR) at Nottingham University Business School, University of Nottingham and a Visiting Professor at LUISS Business School, Rome, Italy. She has published extensively on cross-sector social partnerships in academic journals as well as popular press. Her work for over 20 years, as a practitioner and academic, focused on all types of cross-sector social interactions, previously on philanthropy and socio-sponsorship and for the last years on social partnerships.

15. LAMBERTO ZOLLO is a second year PhD Student in Management and Business Administration at the University of Florence, Pisa and Siena (Tuscany, Italy) and he has just finished a visiting period at Kent Business School (UK). His research interests are in management, strategy, CSR, business ethics and cross-sector social partnerships in the healthcare field. Outside of academia, he currently works as an intern at a certified public accountant studio in Florence.

TABLE *of* CONTENTS



ARSP Editorial.....	8
---------------------	---

PUBLICATIONS SECTION

Looking through the Academic Glass.....	13
Partnership Publications.....	19
Interview: New Book.....	29

PEDAGOGY SECTION

Pedagogy Editorial.....	33
Thought Leader Interview.....	35
Partnership Concepts through Cases.....	39
Teaching Innovation Resources.....	43

THOUGHT GALLERY SECTION

Spread the word!	
Trickle effects of Partnerships.....	48

SUSTAINABILITY

PARTNERSHIP SECTION

Sustainability Partnerships Section Editorial....	54
Featured Research Project.....	56
Featured Sustainability Partnerships.....	59

PRAXIS SECTION

Praxis Editorial.....	63
Practitioner Contributions.....	64
Events.....	73

COMMUNITY SECTION

Community Editorial.....	90
Community Interviews.....	92
New Members.....	96

DISTRIBUTION PARTNERS SECTION

Universities.....	100
Institutes, Initiatives, Social Enterprises & blogs	102



by Dr. M. May Setanidi
(FRSA)

*Senior Lecturer in Strategy, Kent Business School, University of Kent-UK
& Visiting Fellow International Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility (ICCSR), Nottingham University Business School, UK*

Crossing Over Together

We knew that moving the ARSP to the next level was not going to be easy. We knew we had to work hard at every aspect. We are confronted with challenging decisions and face dilemmas as this is not a "traveled road". Our decision to push forward was based on our bottom line: crossing over together. The next 10th ARSP celebratory issue will count close to 20 editorial members with the team spirit being stronger than ever. As our network of collaborators and international partners increases exponentially and the readership downloads are reaching new heights we hope to provide a hub that welcomes academic and practitioner views and communicates important new developments from the cross-sector collaboration spectrum. Sharing a vision that is embraced by many is a great privilege and honour, but it also comes with a great responsibility. We hope to continue improving the content, clarifying the role of the ARSP, as it evolves, serving PhD students, academics and practitioners in our field and bringing them together. One of the central aims of the ARSP is to bridge the theory-practice divide in our field. What follows explains how the ARSP pursues this aim.

A widely accepted reality discussed by academics and practitioners is the research-practice divide. Recommendations on how to increase research utilisation¹, knowledge creation and transfer between practitioners and academics² aim either to advance established ways of communication across the two groups, such as improving the 'implications for practice' sections in academic journals, or propose new ways, decreasing the gap by encouraging, for example, 'a relational scholarship of integration'³, referring to cultivating relations at the individual and collective level across the two groups.



© M. Seltanid 2014

Although highly desirable, such instances of systematic open socialisation across academics and practitioners seem to be relatively rare, given that members of each sphere of reality are bound by the assumptions, conventions and expectations of their own domain, as is, for example the case with publishing⁴; yet interacting with the 'other' side is considered highly beneficial⁵ for both. Practitioners, for example, who support a strategy with relevant research findings, are likely to present a more convincing argument. Similarly, academics engaging with the 'field' are more likely to have access to important and stimulating insights from practice⁶.

Academics and practitioners in the field of cross-sector social partnerships not only have complementary forms of knowledge, as in other fields⁷, but they also share a strong interest in the research or practice-driven impact of partnerships⁸. Unlike other fields, our phenomenon-driven study of partnerships is deeply interconnected with partnership praxis, taking place almost in real time⁹, hence it holds a higher potential in developing relevant and useful theory for practice, despite the fact that theory

development is in its early stages. The question therefore is how to increase in cross-sector research the knowledge creation and transfer from theory to practice and vice versa, as it is likely to benefit both spheres. The problem, however, persists, also in our field, of symptomatic rather than systematic instances of open socialisation, as neither 'side', for example, reads each other's reports and publications or fully understands the 'other's' perspective.

The ARSP provides an answer to the above problem by facilitating a continuous open dialogue between *explicit* (formalised knowledge widely available in words, numbers and other forms that can be easily communicated) and *tacit* knowledge¹⁰ (experience-based intuitive knowledge not widely available) across practitioners and academics in order to increase understanding, trust and utilisation of partnership knowledge on an individual but also collective level. The ARSP provides explicit and tacit knowledge in social partnerships in order to avoid the "parallel processing" associated with confines such as theory/practice, national contexts and social problem domains. For example, the ARSP Publications Section provides annually a database of partnership publications¹¹, a type of explicit knowledge, curating pre-existing knowledge production in a meaningful and effective way for those already in the field, but more importantly allowing easy 'access' to practitioners and PhD students who are entering the field by providing links to the original publications.

In addition, the Publications Section provides a combination of explicit/tacit knowledge in cross-sector collaboration by compiling three reviews that each represents a different perspective: the business by Dr. Arno Kourula¹², the *public sector* by José Carlos Marques¹³ and the *civil society* perspective by Dr. Salla Laasonen¹⁴; the first focusing on the business-NGO, the second on government-business and the third on NGO-government partnerships. As they all include in their reviews tripartite collaborations (all three sectors working together) the section covers all types of partnerships. They point also to recent conceptual and methodological issues of existing knowledge allowing tacit perspectives of each editor to highlight emerging themes and important collections of articles in special issues.

In a similar way the Pedagogy Section de-codifies how experienced educators teach abstract constructs related to commons dilemmas and collaboration, such as collaborative fisheries governance, making explicit the tacit knowledge that is associated with years of teaching experience as explained in this issue by Dr. David Hyatt¹⁵. The challenges that Dr. Lea Stadler¹⁶ experienced in developing a partnership MOOC, a cutting edge large scale educational tool, provide a very interesting example of tacit knowledge for academics interested to develop a similar resource but, also for practitioners who might be interested to enrol.

Interviews are another way that explicit/tacit knowledge is curated in the ARSP. In this issue the Publications Section secured an interview with one of the most influential management gurus in the world¹⁷, Prof. Henry Mintzberg¹⁸, a leading scholar known for his ability to question fundamental assumptions in management. The interview profiles his new open access publication, while sharing with ARSP readers the deeper meaning of his work and insights on partnerships, sectors and societal renewal. An interview with the head of the PRME Secretariat (UN Principles for Responsible Management Education), Jonas Haertle, makes explicit the reasons behind the use of cross-sector partnerships as its organising approach and the cross-sector partnership skills that will be key to all future managers. Two further interviews in our Community Section address the theory-practice divide by offering insights from a practitioner Dr. Steve Waddell and an academic Dr. Miguel Riveras-Santos.

We view the articulation of tacit partnership knowledge of both academics and practitioners as a 'mobilization' process integral to the new knowledge creation¹⁹ in our field. The research insights and challenges that a leading partnership academic, Prof. Ans Kolk²⁰, was invited to share in our new 'Thought Gallery' Section, articulate research challenges, usually eliminated in journal publications. In addition, Prof. Kolk unpacks the power of individual interactions in the 'Trickle Effects' article and explains the potential of increasing the impact of partnerships.

The ARSP provides an open forum that spans organisational, country and social problem boundaries by

presenting practitioner perspectives from all over the world. For example, in the Praxis Section the Senior Ethics Officer of Network Rail in the UK, Judith Irwin²¹, explains how to tackle railway suicides through partnering with the Samaritans; and the Programme Facilitator at the Western Cape Economic Development Partnership of Cape Town in South Africa, Estelle Cloete²², shares deep-practice based insights on how to create safe in-between spaces for creativity, experimentation and innovation for economic transition within a collaborative intermediary organisation. Such insights provide opportunity for reflection and potential collaboration between academics and practitioners, which we hope will be developed as a result of this systematic international theory-practice open-dialogue.

A good example of relational partnership scholarship, where the tacit/tacit partnership knowledge, originally shared between a highly practice-oriented academic and a practitioner, resulted in knowledge externalisation through the ARSP is by Dr. Stuart Reid and Stella Pfisterer²³ explaining how to improve partnerships by improving partnership agreements.

Our new Sustainability Partnerships Section presents funded research projects, allowing practitioners to understand the process and challenges of research, but importantly provides them with privileged access to early findings, which traditionally would take years before they would be able to access emerging new evidence²⁴.

Although many discussed how practitioners can learn from academic research by emphasising relevance we see *interdependence* as the fundamental principal that calls for a publication that addresses the needs of both audiences simultaneously, enhancing mutual trust, continuous dialogue, experimentation and collaboration. The key for this call for synergistic creation of knowledge is the co-creation of partnership knowledge by individuals, organisations and collectively our community. Our aim is following Nonaka's dynamic theory of knowledge creation is that of "... building a truly 'humanistic' knowledge society beyond the limitations of mere 'economic rationality'"²⁵ through the continuous dialogue of tacit and explicit knowledge.



ARSP Editorial Team: 10 out of the 18 members in attendance of the Annual ARSP meeting in Boston. From left to right: Jose Carlos Marques, Salla Laasonen, Arno Kourula, Jennifer Leigh, Amelia Clarke, Lea Stadler, May Seitanidi, Lamberto Zollo, Verena Bitzer, Adriane Macdonald.

In this issue we welcome two new editors: Dr. Verena Bitzer, who leads the Community Section and Dr. Amelia Clarke the Sustainability Partnerships Section editor who is also joined by two associate editors Prof. Pieter Glasbergen and Dr. Adolf Acquaye. We extend our welcome to Simon Zadek, an international early pioneer of partnership research and practice, who joins our advisory board.

The ARSP functions as a forum of the cross-sector international community aspiring to facilitate the development of practice oriented scholars and research informed practitioners all over the world. By addressing academic and practitioner audiences within the same publication we hope to increase the scale and speed of partnership knowledge creation for the social good. In this way we hope to bring closer not only our declarative knowledge, but also our procedural knowledge²⁶ of how as academics and practitioners, we research and implement partnerships in order to support each other in our efforts providing solutions to social problems through cross-sector collaboration.

Crossing over together makes us stronger! | ARSP |

We look forward to your contributions, emails, views, contributions by email to mmayseitanidi (at) yahoo.com. You can also share your views at the ARSP's Facebook page.

You will find a multitude of hyperlinks throughout the ARSP if you hover over the names of individuals, organisations and initiatives.

References

- ¹Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. 1982. The utilization process: A conceptual framework and synthesis of empirical findings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27: 591-622.
- ²Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J. M., & Daft, R. L. 2001. Across the great divide: Knowledge creation and transfer between practitioners and academics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2001, 44(2): 340-355.
- ³Bartunek, J. M., 2007. Academic-practitioner collaboration need not require joint or relevant research: Toward a relational scholarship of integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6): 1323-1333
- ⁴Cohen, D., 2007. The Very Separate Worlds of Academic and Practitioner Publications in Human Resource Management: Reasons for the divide and Concrete Solutions for Bridging the Gap. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 5, 1013-1019.
- ⁵JM Bartunek, SL Rynes, RD Ireland, 2006. What makes management research interesting, and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal*. 49 (1), 9-15.
- ⁶Op.cit. note ii.
- ⁷Op. cit. note iii.
- ⁸Van Tulder, R., Seitanidi, M. M., Crane, A. & Brammer, S., (forthcoming). Editorial. Enhancing the Impact of Cross Sector Partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- ⁹Branzei, O. & Janzen Le Ber, 2014. Theory-Method Interfaces in Cross-Sector Partnership Research. In: Seitanidi, M. M. & Crane, A. (Eds). *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 229-266.
- ¹⁰Nonaka, I., 1994. A Dynamic theory of Organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1): 14-37; Polanyi, M., 1966. *The Tacit Dimension*. Loutledge & Kegan Paul.
- ¹¹For details of the methodology for collecting the publications see p. 16.
- ¹²Kourula, A., 2014. See p. 10 ARSP this issue.
- ¹³Marques, J.C., 2014. See p. 12 ARSP this issue.
- ¹⁴Laasonen, S., 2014. See p. 14 ARSP this issue.
- ¹⁵Hyatt, D., 2014. See p. 36 ARSP this issue.
- ¹⁶Stadler, L., 2014. See p. 40 ARSP this issue.
- ¹⁷According to Thinkers50 2011
- ¹⁸Mintzberg, H., 2014. See p. 26 ARSP this issue.
- ¹⁹Nonaka, I., 1994. A Dynamic theory of Organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, Vol. 5, No1, 14-37.
- ²⁰Kolk, A. 2014. See p. 45 ARSP this issue.
- ²¹Irwin, J., 2014. See p. 67 ARSP this issue.
- ²²Cloete, E., 2014. See p. 64 this ARSP issue.
- ²³Reid, S. & Pfisterer, S., 2014. See p. 61 ARSP this issue.
- ²⁴Lin, H. & Branzei, 2014. See p. 53 ARSP this issue.
- ²⁵Op. cit. see note 19.
- ²⁶Anderson, J. R. 1983. *The Architecture of Cognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

PUBLICATIONS

SECTION



Looking through the Academic Glass..... 13

Partnership Publications..... 19

Interview: New Book 29



by Dr. Arno Kourula

*Assistant Professor of Strategy, University
of Amsterdam Business School.*

Perspectives, Reviews and the Path Forward

The publications section of the ARSP serves the community by providing a selective up-to-date review of recent literature on cross-sector partnerships, including commentary from the editorial team. The section is compiled by posting requests for contributions to mailing lists, using key word searches of databases and more systematic reviews of specific journals. While we strive to include all types of perspectives and fields, the list of articles, books, book chapters and dissertations published in 2013 and 2014 (up to May, 2014) or currently in press, should not be considered by any means as a complete account of recent research. In this year's ARSP Publications Section editorials, we offer commentary on recent research on the business perspective, focusing on business-NGO partnerships, José Carlos Marques provides the public sector perspective concentrating on government-business partnerships, and Salla Laasonen concludes with the an overview of the recent literature from the civil society perspective, highlighting NGO-government partnerships.

In addition we have the honor and privilege to host an interview with the world renowned thought leader in strategic management Professor Henry Mintzberg, Cleghorn Professor of Management Studies at the Desautels Faculty of Management, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. Prof. Mintzberg shared his views on cross-sector partnerships (see end of publications section) and provided his reflection following the publication of the recent e-pamphlet *Rebalancing Society: Radical renewal beyond left, right and center*. Professor Mintzberg offers a powerful diagnosis of societal problems and suggestions for action. The key idea of his pamphlet is that societal sectors – the public, private and plural sectors – are out of balance and action needs to be taken to rebalance society.

In reviewing recent publications on cross-sector partnerships, last year I highlighted new theoretical developments, dynamism, complexity, and contextuality as emerging themes. The year before, I explored how studies began to address all levels – individual, organizational and societal – of partnerships. This time around, I would like to highlight a few new perspectives and two latest reviews.



In terms of perspectives, the NGO point of view in business-NGO partnerships has recently been explored further. O'Connor and Schumate analyze the effect of NGO characteristics on forming partnerships¹ with businesses; Wadham and Warren² explore ethnographically how a cross-sector partnership changes each party's perception of the partnership but also the social problem addressed over time; Schiller and Almog-Bar³ provide the NGO perspective from a case study of a partnership with a pharmaceutical company. All three are welcome additions complementing the NGO perspective on partnerships. Three recent studies also offer new insights on partnerships at the company and the partnership levels. Ritvala et al.⁴ explore managerial sense-making and bricolage in a network related to the Baltic Sea; Rueede and Kreutzer⁵ analyze legitimization work in a partnership between Deutsche Post DHL and United Nations OCHA; and den Hond et al.⁶ use a large survey to determine Dutch firm views on cross-sector partnerships using the resource-based view.

In addition to the above studies going deeper into both sides of the coin of business-NGO partnerships, two reviews have recently been compiled. In the past two ARSPs we have mentioned reviews by Branzei and Jansen Le Ber⁷ and Laasonen et al.⁸ A comprehensive practitioner-oriented review of cross-sector partnerships was conducted for Network for Business Sustainability by Barbara Gray and Jenna P. Stites⁹. This report reviews more than 275 articles on cross-sector partnerships to understand drivers, motivations, partner characteristics and process issues, as well as provide managerial suggestions. The report, its models and its appendices is a treasure trove of insights into partnerships and I would urge ARSP readers to read it. It complements well recent reviews published in academic journals¹⁰. In another excellent review, Wassmer et al.¹¹ analyze the literature on environmental collaborations suggesting to scholars to explore partnerships by grounding their work in organizational theory, and continuous rigorous methodological development. The authors provide a detailed agenda for future research based on their conceptual map of antecedents, consequences, and contingencies of environmental collaborations.

Every now and again, there comes a time for an academic research field or community to ask itself whether it is running out of steam. Based on the most recent reviews, it seems that we are far away from reaching this stage. This type of retrospective mirror-gazing should be combined with a forward looking agenda providing us with ample work ahead that needs to be done! | ARSP |

Please keep sending us your recent publications on all types of cross-sector social interactions to a.e.kourula at uva.nl.



Every now and again, there comes a time for an academic research field or community to ask itself whether it is running out of steam. Based on the most recent reviews, it seems that we are far away from reaching this stage.

References

(full references in publications list)

- ¹O'Connor & Schumate, 2014
- ²Wadham & Warren, 2013
- ³Schiller & Almog-Bar, 2013
- ⁴Ritvala et al., 2014
- ⁵Rueede & Kreutzer, 2014
- ⁶den Hond et al., 2013
- ⁷Branzei, O., & Jansen Le Ber, M. 2014. Theory-method interfaces in cross-sector partnership research. In Seitanidi, M. & A. Crane (Eds.), Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook. Routledge.
- ⁸Laasonen, S., Fougère, M. & Kourula, A. 2012. Dominant articulations in academic business and society discourse on NGO-business relations: a critical assessment. Journal of Business Ethics, 109(4), 521-545.
- ⁹Gray & Stites, 2013
- ¹⁰See e.g. Austin, J.E. & Seitanidi, M.M. 2012. Collaborative value creation: A review of partnering between nonprofits and businesses. Part 2: Partnership processes and outcomes. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41(6): 929-968.
- ¹¹Wassmer et al., 2014



by José Carlos Marques

*PhD Candidate in Strategy & Organization,
Desautels Faculty of Management,
McGill University.*



Partnerships: Essential Pieces of a Larger Governance Puzzle

Recent research emphasizing the State's role in collaborative governance is characterized by ever more macro, dynamic and nuanced perspectives. Partnerships are increasingly understood as pieces of a larger puzzle, rather than as comprehensive, stand-alone approaches.

Methodologically, researchers are increasingly drawing upon the growing pool of cases and datasets available for analysis. Noteworthy examples include Auld et al.'s¹ study of 165 initiatives promoting low-carbon technologies, Visseren-Hamakers² analysis of 24 international biodiversity partnerships, Utting's³ synthesis of analyses of 20 multi-stakeholder governance initiatives, and the examination of 27 university-driven sustainability partnerships by Trencher et al.⁴. Drawing on even larger datasets, Andonova⁵ studies 231 partnerships adopted during the 2002 UN Johannesburg Summit, and D'Hollander and Marx⁶ examine data from 426 initiatives in the Ecolabel Index database. Conclusions drawn by these authors echo growing calls for a more multi-faceted perspective on cross-sector partnerships that avoids their promotion as panaceas and substitutes for government action⁷. Such schemes are often subject to considerable limitations resulting from a number of factors, including interest and power asymmetries. These authors determine



that partnerships may be effective under specific conditions but need to be approached in an incremental fashion and integrated into the broader context.

Understanding this larger context is the driving motive for recent conceptual efforts exploring the proliferation of transnational governance schemes. A number of recent journal special issues grapple with the contours of this larger puzzle and develop conceptual tools intended to align research efforts. Particularly noteworthy are special issues in *Regulation & Governance*⁸ and *Business and Politics*⁹. Along with several other contributions¹⁰, they provide a must-read collection of articles that summarize the state of the art, offer fresh conceptual insight, and suggest promising research paths for the collaborative governance literature.

Two other significant trends focus upon key, but often overlooked, pieces of the puzzle – states and local actors, particularly those from developing countries. Regarding the former, a number of papers examine public actors' interaction with private certification schemes¹¹. These contributions identify what appears to be a growing assertiveness and influence of governments, including cases where the state appears to be constricting and displacing private certification systems¹². Regarding the role of local actors, a sizeable number of articles focus upon the patterns, consequences and possible correctives concerning the exclusion of local actors in development partnerships. Particular emphasis is placed upon the manner by which standardization processes, experts, and professional managers, reduce accountability to local stakeholders and marginalize their voices¹³. These articles, and various others, propose various realignment measures, including intermediary-organization network design¹⁴, the creation of national advocacy networks (NANs)¹⁵ and partnership design and implementation approaches that place development issues and their socio-political context, front and center¹⁶.

Lastly, a number of articles examine various aspects of public-private partnerships (PPPs) relating to infrastructure projects. These include the critical success factors and risk profile of projects¹⁷ and proposals for dealing with uncertainties via the concept of contract flexibility¹⁸ and holistic approaches to critical infrastructure protection¹⁹.

In sum, the most recent literature highlighting the role of the State in cross-sector partnerships points the way to promising research opportunities within the broader governance context. As Djelic and den Hond²⁰ suggest: "In most industries, fields and arenas, we find multiple standards and standard setting coalitions. Even so, scholars have only barely started to explore this multiplicity and plurality". Clearly, many pieces of the governance puzzle remain unexplored. | A·R·S·P |

Partnerships are increasingly understood as pieces of a larger puzzle, rather than as comprehensive, stand-alone approaches.

References (full references in publications list)

- ¹Auld et al., 2014
- ²Visseren-Hamakers, 2013
- ³Utting, 2014
- ⁴Trencher et al., 2013
- ⁵Andonova, 2013
- ⁶D'Hollander & Marx, 2014
- ⁷Kolk, 2013
- ⁸Eberlein et al., 2013
- ⁹Djelic & den Hond, 2014
- ¹⁰De Burca et al., 2014; Parker, 2013
- ¹¹Andonova, 2013; D'Hollander & Marx, 2014; Dentoni & Ross 2013; Kolk & Lenfant, 2013
- ¹²Bartley, 2014
- ¹³Bitzer et al., 2013; Koenig-Archibugi & Macdonald, 2013; Ponte & Cheyns, 2013; Richey & Ponte, 2014; Søreide & Truex, 2013
- ¹⁴Hamann & Kurt, 2013; Manning & Roessler, 2013
- ¹⁵Kraemer et al., 2013
- ¹⁶Kolk & Lenfant, 2013
- ¹⁷Hwang et al., 2013
- ¹⁸Cruz & Marques, 2013
- ¹⁹Givens, 2013
- ²⁰Djelic & den Hond, 2014



by Dr. Salla Laasonen

Assistant Professor, Rotterdam School of
Management, Erasmus University.

NGO-business partnerships serving the social good: contextual insights vs. conceptual confusion

Last but not least, the focus of this review is on partnerships from the perspective of civil society, emphasizing especially NGO-government partnerships. The literature reviewed on NGO-government is characterized by a focus on different national contexts. This is, of course, self-evident since NGO-government partnerships are typically situated in specific geographical contexts: either nations or communities. NGOs have traditionally been partners in providing social goods, and this is also visible in the recent literature¹. Another aspect I would like to highlight is the overlapping nature of the conceptual field. A good example of this are PPPs, public-private-partnerships, which generally comprise a partnership between government and private actors, and take the form of infrastructure projects such as roads and railways. However, PPPs can also involve partnerships with government and nonprofit actors, in the form of producing different types of social goods. For example, Mullins and Acheson² examine third sector housing in Ireland, and the hybridization of third sector organizations. NGO-government partnerships also come very close to collaborative governance in which, as defined by Gray and Stites³, the “government may engage in partnerships with civil society and NGOs in what has been termed *collaborative governance*”. Thus, both these examples (PPP and collaborative governance) illustrate the overlap in terminology, and the difficulty to identify specifically NGO-government partnerships; many are tripartite in nature, as already discussed by José Carlos in the previous editorial.

In terms of the national contexts, Furneaux and Ryan⁴ examine NGO-government relations in an Australian context. Using funding structures as a focal point, the authors map a continuum of NGO-government relationships ranging from conflict to collaboration. One conclusion the authors have is the need for updating the typology on NGO-



business relations together with empirical investigations. Hanada⁵ studies NGO-government relations in the Japanese context, where the number and role of NGOs has risen rapidly since the legislator reform in 1998. They examine the role of face-to-face engagement between government and NGO representatives, and positive impact on political activity. Chaney⁶ offers a view of the UK third sector policy by examining welfare pluralism in UK Westminster party manifestos from 1945 to 2011. Similarly in the UK, Milbourne and Cushman⁷ examine the negative characteristics of NGO-government relations and their policy environment. They argue that both a command and control approach and market cultures have had a damaging effect on innovative cross-sector collaboration and third sector trust. Rikmann and Keedus⁸ and Dill⁹ offer perspectives from Central and Eastern Europe by providing a comparative analysis of civil society in altogether 7 countries. These two articles provide an overview of the recent developments of civil society in the post-socialist countries.

In addition to social service, (international) development is an area where NGOs and governments meet. An example of this is the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD)¹⁰. Launched in 2008, the objective is to engage civil society and local communities in participatory planning. While the UN-REDD programme can be seen as an NGO-government initiative, it also has trisector and governance characteristics through engaging with the private sector as well. Staying with forests, Ball et al.¹¹ examine community-based natural resource management, and how NGOs implement a forest restoration project. In addition to environmental conservation, Dupuy et al.¹² examine foreign funded NGOs in Ethiopia, and highlight the controversial pull between international funders and local governments.

In sum, NGO-government partnerships are fewer in number and more difficult to identify in an exclusive manner than business-NGO and business-government related studies. Conceptually, the theme centers on policy implementation and participatory governance in general. While the contextual and comparative perspective on the phenomenon is well represented, there is a need conceptual clarity of different strands of literature, and as Furneaux and Ryan¹³ call for, there is need for an empirical update on NGO-government relations in general. The work done on NGO-business relations in the past years could work well and complement this agenda for a comprehensive view on cross-sector partnerships. Therefore, I echo Arno's¹⁴ conclusion: that our field is still far from running out of steam. | ARSP |

NGO-government partnerships are fewer in number and more difficult to identify in an exclusive manner than business-NGO and business-government related studies.



References (full references in publications list)

- ¹e.g. **Never & de Leon**, 2014
- ²**Mullins & Acheson**, 2013
- ³**Gray & Stites**, 2013, 18
- ⁴**Furneaux & Ryan**, 2014
- ⁵**Hanada**, 2013
- ⁶**Chaney**, 2013
- ⁷**Milbourne & Cushman**, 2013
- ⁸**Rikmann & Keedus**, 2013
- ⁹**Dill**, 2014
- ¹⁰**Mustalahti**, 2014
- ¹¹**Ball et al.**, 2014
- ¹²**Dupuy et al.**, 2014
- ¹³**Furneaux & Ryan**, 2014
- ¹⁴**Kourula, A.** 2014. Perspectives, reviews and the path forward. Annual Review of Social Partnerships, Publication Section, Issue 9.



by Dr. Arno Kourula

*Assistant Professor of Strategy,
University of Amsterdam
Business School.*

by Dr. Salla Laasonen

*Postdoctoral Researcher in
Marketing and International
Business, University of Turku.*

by José Carlos Marques

*PhD Candidate in Strategy
& Organization, Desautels Faculty
of Management, McGill University.*

Publications Overview 2013-2014

In this review, we list various types of publications on cross-sector social interactions from 2013 and 2014 by type. We include publications that explicitly deal with the interaction between two or all of the three societal sectors – public, corporate and civil society – and emphasize partnerships formed to solve social or environmental problems. The section is compiled by posting requests for contributions to mailing lists, using key word searches of databases and more systematic reviews of specific journals. While we strive to include all types of perspectives and fields, the list of articles, books, book chapters and dissertations published in 2013 and 2014 (up to May, 2014) or currently in press, should not be considered by any means as a complete account of recent research.

As Figure 1 indicates, over two thirds of the publications we list are peer-reviewed articles. In addition to articles, we also include relevant articles published within the four special issues that appeared in this period, reports, book chapters, books and dissertations. The 71 articles published in peer-reviewed journals appeared in 45 different journals, representing a variety of academic disciplines.




Figure 1. Publications per type

Table 2 shows the number of articles per journal used as common outlets. The journals listed are the ones with more than one relevant publication during the observation period of January 2013 to May 2014. As Table 2 indicates, the journals with the most articles on cross-sector interactions are in the field of nonprofit research, business ethics and social and environmental issues, public policy, and project management.




Table 2. Journals with most articles profiles

Below we list the 101 titles of publications grouped by type. | [ARSP](#) |



● Journal articles

AL-TABBAA, O. F., LEACH, D., & MARCH, J. 2013. Collaboration between nonprofit and business sectors: A framework to guide strategy development for nonprofit organizations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(3): 657-678. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2F11266-013-9357-6>

ANDONOVA, L. B. 2013. Boomerangs to partnerships? Explaining state participation in transnational partnerships for sustainability. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(3): 481-515. **Link:** <http://cps.sagepub.com/content/47/3/481.abstract?rss=1>

ANSARI, S., WIJEN, F., & GRAY, B. 2013. Constructing a climate change logic: An institutional perspective on the "Tragedy of the Commons." *Organization Science*, 24(4): 1014-1040. **Link:** http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2153988

ARENAS, D., SANCHEZ, P., & MURPHY, M. 2013. Different paths to collaboration between businesses and civil society and the role of third parties. *Journal of Business Ethics*, DOI 10.1007/s10551-013-1829-5. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-013-1829-5#>

AULD, G., MALLET, A., BURLICA, B., NOLAN-POUPART, F., & SLATER, R. 2014. Evaluating the effects of policy innovations: Lessons from a systematic review of policies promoting low-carbon technology. *Global Environmental Change*, forthcoming. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378014000399>

BALL, A. A., GOUZERH, A. & BRANCALION, P. H. S. 2014. Multi-scalar governance for restoring the Brazilian Atlantic forest: A case study on small landholdings in protected areas of sustainable development. *Forests*, 5(4), 599-619. **Link:** <http://www.mdpi.com/1999-4907/5/4/599>

BARTLEY, T. 2014. Transnational governance and the re-centered state: Sustainability or legality? *Regulation &*

Governance, 8(1): 93-109. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/rego.12051/abstract>

BITZER, V., GLASBERGEN, P., & ARTS, B. 2013. Exploring the potential of intersectoral partnerships to improve the position of farmers in global agrifood chains: Findings from the coffee sector in Peru. *Agriculture & Human Values*, 30: 5-20. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10460-012-9372-z#>

CHANEY, P. 2013. Multi-level systems and the electoral politics of welfare pluralism: Exploring third-sector policy in UK Westminster and regional elections 1945-2011. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, DOI: 10.1007/s11266-013-9354-9. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266-013-9354-9>

CHUANG, E., MCBEATH, B., COLLINS-CAMARGO, C., & ARMSTRONG, M. I. 2013. Strengthening public-private partnerships in state child welfare systems: Results of a multi-state strategic planning process. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 8(1): 1-24. **Link:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2013.852152>

COLLINS-CAMARGO, C., ARMSTRONG, M. I., MCBEATH, B., & CHUANG, E. 2013. Promoting cross-sector partnerships in child welfare: Qualitative results from a five-state strategic planning process. *Child Welfare*, 92(1). **Link:** <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23984485>

CONCHA, M. 2014. Exploring collaboration, its antecedents, and perceived outcomes in service partnerships of community-based organizations in South Florida. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 37(1), 44-52. **Link:** <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01900692.2013.809591#>. U2poTf150So

CRUZ, C. O., & MARQUES, R. C. 2013. Flexible contracts to cope with uncertainty in public-private partnerships. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(3): 473-483. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263786312001202>

DE BAKKER, F. G. A., DEN HOND, F., KING, B. G., & WEBER, K. 2013. Social movements, civil society and corporations: Taking stock and looking ahead. *Organization Studies*, 34(5/6): 573-593. **Link:** <http://oss.sagepub.com/content/34/5-6/573.short>

DE BURCA, G., KEOHANE, R. O., & SABEL, C. F. 2014. Global experimentalist governance. *British Journal of Political Science*, forthcoming. **Link:** <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9260510>

DEN HOND, F., DE BAKKER, F. G. A., & DOH, J. P. 2013. What prompts companies to collaborate with NGOs? Recent evidence from The Netherlands. *Business & Society*, doi: 10.1177/0007650312439549. **Link:** <http://bas.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/06/06/0007650312439549.abstract>

DENTONI, D., & ROSS, B. 2013. Towards a theory of managing wicked problems through multi-stakeholder engagements: Evidence from the agribusiness sector. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 16(A): 1-10. **Link:** [http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/155140/2/\(1\)%20Intro.pdf](http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/155140/2/(1)%20Intro.pdf)

D'HOLLANDER, D., & MARX, A. 2014. Strengthening private certification systems through public regulation: The case of sustainable public procurement. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 5(1): 2-21. **Link:** <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=17104634>

DJELIC, M. L., & DEN HOND, F. 2014. Introduction: Multiplicity and plurality in the world of standards. *Business and Politics*, 16(1), 67-77. **Link:** <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/bap.2014.16.issue-1/bap-2013-0034/bap-2013-0034.xml>

DILL, A. P. 2014. Health care and disability NGOs in Croatia: State relations, privatization, and professionalism in an emerging field. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, DOI: 10.1007/s11266-014-9440-7. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266-014-9440-7>



DUPUY, K. E. RON, J. & PRAKASH, A. 2014. Whosurvived?Ethiopia'sregulatory crackdown on foreign-funded NGOs. *Review of International Political Economy*, DOI: 10.1080/09692290.2014.903854. **Link:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2014.903854>

EBERLEIN, B., ABBOTT, K. W., BLACK, J., MEIDINGER, E. E., & WOOD, S. 2013. Transnational business governance interactions: Conceptualization and framework for analysis. *Regulation & Governance*, forthcoming. **Link:** [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1748-5991](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1748-5991)

ERAKOVICH, R., & ANDERSON, T. 2013. Cross-sector collaboration: Management decision and change model. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(2): 163-173. **Link:** <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=17084020&show=abstract>

FURNEAUX, C. & RYAN, N. 2014. Modelling NPO–government relations: Australian case studies. *Public Management Review*, online first, DOI:10.1080/14719037.2014.895030. **Link:** <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14719037.2014.895030#.U2lkfl5O5o>

GIVENS, A. D., & BUSCH, N.E. 2013. Realizing the promise of public-private partnerships in U.S. critical infrastructure protection. *International Journal of Critical Infrastructure Protection*, 6(1): 39–50. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187454821300005X>

GLASBERGEN, P. 2013. Legitimation of certifying partnerships in the global market place. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 23: 354-367. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/eet.1625/abstract>

GULBRANDSEN, L.H. 2013. Dynamic governance interactions: Evolutionary effects of state responses to non-state certification programs. *Regulation & Governance*. doi: 10.1111/rego.12005. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/rego.12005/full>

HAMANN, R., & APRIL, K. 2013. On the role and capabilities of collaborative intermediary organisations in urban sustainability transitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 50: 12-21. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652612006087>

HANADA, N. 2013. Face-to-face interaction with government officials and its effects on the political attitudes on the civil society organizational members: The study from Japan. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 24(3), 733-756. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266-012-9284-y>

HWANG, B., ZHAO, X., & GAY, M.J.S. 2013. Public private partnership projects in Singapore: Factors, critical risks and preferred risk allocation from the perspective of contractors. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(3): 424-433. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263786312000944>

KIHL, L. TAINSKY, S. BABIAK, K., & HYEJIN, B. 2014. Evaluation of a cross-sector community initiative partnership: Delivering a local sport program. *Evaluation & Program Planning*, 44: 36-47. **Link:** <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24530863>

KOENIG-ARCHIBUGI, M., & MACDONALD, K. 2013. Accountability-by-proxy in transnational non-state governance. *Governance*, 26(3), 499-522. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2012.01609.x/full>

KOLK, A., & LENFANT, F. 2013. Multinationals, CSR and partnerships in Central African conflict countries. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 20(1): 43-54. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/csr.1277/full>

KOLK, A., VOCK, M. & VAN DOLEN, W. 2014. Microfoundations of partnerships: Exploring the role of employees in trickle effects. *Journal of Business Ethics*, in press. **Link:** http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2304890

KOSCHMANN, M. 2013. The communicative constitution of collective identity in interorganizational collaboration. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 27(1): 61-89. **Link:** <http://mcq.sagepub.com/content/27/1/61.short>

KRAEMER, R., WHITEMAN, G., & BANERJEE, B. 2013. Conflict and astroturfing in Niyamgiri: The importance of national advocacy networks in anti-corporate social movements. *Organization Studies*, 34(5-6): 823-852. **Link:** <http://oss.sagepub.com/content/34/5-6/823.short>

LIN, H., & DARNALL, N. 2014. Strategic alliance formation and structural configuration. *Journal of Business Ethics*, doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2053-7. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10551-014-2053-7>

LIN, H. 2014. Resource dependent view of public-private partnership formation for environmental improvements. *Organization and Environment*, forthcoming. **Link:** <http://oae.sagepub.com/>

MANNING, S., & ROESSLER, D. 2013. The formation of cross-sector development partnerships: How bridging agents shape project agendas and longer-term alliances. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Article in Press. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-013-1853-5#>

MILBOURNE, L. & CUSHMAN, M. 2013. From the third sector to the big society: How changing UK government policies have eroded third sector trust. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, (24)2, 485-508. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266-012-9302-0>

MORROW, S., & ROBINSON, L. 2014. The FTSE-British Olympic Association Initiative: A resource dependence perspective. *Sport Management Review*, 16: 413-423. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S144135231300003X>

MULLINS, D. & ACHESON, N. 2013. Competing drivers of hybridity: Third-sector



housing organisations in Northern Ireland. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266-013-9423-0>

MUSTALAHTI, I. 2014. REDD+ and empowered deliberative democracy: Learning from Tanzania. *World Development*, 59, 199-211. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X14000230>

NEVER, B. & DELEON, E. 2014. The effect of government contracting on nonprofit human service organizations: Impacts of an evolving relationship. *Human Service Organizations Management, Leadership & Governance*. Online first, DOI:10.1080/23303131.2014.896300. **Link:** http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/23303131.2014.896300#.U2pt-_l50so

NISAR, T.M. 2013. Implementation constraints in social enterprise and community Public Private Partnerships. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(4): 638-651. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263786312000956>

O'CONNOR, A., & SHUMATE, M. 2014. Differences among NGOs in the business-NGO cooperative network. *Business & Society*, 53(1): 105-133. **Link:** <http://bas.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/09/06/0007650311418195.full.pdf>

PARKER, C. 2013. Twenty years of responsive regulation: An appreciation and appraisal. *Regulation & Governance*, 7(1): 2-13. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/rego.12006/abstract>

PONTE, S., & CHEYNS, E. 2013. Voluntary standards, expert knowledge and the governance of sustainability networks. *Global Networks*, 13(4): 459-477. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/glob.12011/abstract>

PESQUEIRA, L., & GLASBERGEN, P. 2013. Playing the politics of scale: Oxfam's intervention in the roundtable on sustainable palm oil. *Geoforum*, 45: 296-304. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718512002631>

RASCHE, A., DE BAKKER, F.G.A., & MOON, J. 2013. Complete and partial organizing in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, DOI 10.1007/s10551-013-1824-x **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-013-1824-x#>

RENUKAPPA, S., AKINTOYE, A., EGBU, C., & GOULDING, J. 2013. Carbon emission reduction strategies in the UK industrial sectors: An empirical study. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 5(3): 304-323. **Link:** <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=17092414>

RICHEY, L. A., & PONTE, S. 2014. New actors and alliances in development. *Third World Quarterly*, 35(1): 1-21. **Link:** <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01436597.2014.868979>

RIKMANN, E. & KEEDUS, L. 2013. Civic Sectors in transformation and beyond: Preliminaries for a comparison of six Central and Eastern European societies. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 24(1), 149-166. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266-012-9305-x>

RITVALA, T., SALMI, A., & ANDERSSON, P. 2014. MNCs and local cross-sector partnerships: The case of a smarter Baltic Sea. *International Business Review*, Article in Press. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0969593114000250>

RUEEDE, D. & KREUTZER, K. 2014. Legitimation work within a cross-sector social partnership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, forthcoming. **Link:** <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-014-2072-4>

SAXENA, G. 2014. Cross-sector regeneration partnership strategies and tourism. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 11(1): 86-105. **Link:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2013.839473>

SCHILLER, R. S., & ALMOG-BAR, M. 2013. Revisiting collaborations between nonprofits and businesses: An NPO-

centric view and typology. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(5): 942-962. **Link:** <http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/43/2/293.abstract>

SCHUSTER, T., & HOLTBRÜGGE, D. 2013. Benefits of cross-sector partnerships in markets at the base of the pyramid. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Article in Press. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bse.1780/full>

SØREIDE, T., & TRUEX, R. 2013. Multi-stakeholder groups for better sector performance: A key to fighting corruption in natural-resource governance? *Development Policy Review*, 31(2), 203-217. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/dpr.12003/abstract>

TRENCHER, G.P., YARIME, M., & KHARRAZI, A. 2013. Co-creating sustainability: Cross-sector university collaborations for driving sustainable urban transformations. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 50(1): 40-55. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652612006415>

VAN WIJK, J., STAM, W., ELFRING, T., & ZIETSM A, C. 2013. Activists and incumbents structuring change: the interplay of agency, culture, and networks in field evolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 358-86. **Link:** <http://amj.aom.org/content/56/2/358.Short>

VANGEN, S., HAYES, J. P., & CORNFORTH, C. 2014. Governing cross-sector, inter-organizational collaborations. *Public Management Review*, online first, DOI:10.1080/14719037.2014.903658 **Link:** <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14719037.2014.903658>

VELLEMAA, S., & VAN WIJKB, J. 2014. Partnerships intervening in global food chains: the emergence of co-creation in standard-setting and certification. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **Link:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652614003230>

VERSCHUERE, B., & DE CORTE, J. 2014. The impact of public resource dependence on the autonomy of NPOs in their strategic



decision making. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2): pp. 293-313. **Link:** <http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/10/11/0899764012462072>

VISSEREN-HAMAKERS, I. J. 2013. Partnerships and sustainable development: the lessons learned from international biodiversity governance. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 23(3): 145-160 **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/eet.1612/abstract>

VOCK, M., VAN DOLEN, W., & KOLK, A. 2013. Changing behaviour through business nonprofit collaboration? Consumer responses to social alliances. *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(9). **Link:** <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=17095653>

VOCK, M., VAN DOLEN, W., & KOLK, A. 2013. Micro-level interactions in business nonprofit partnerships. *Business & Society*, doi: 10.1177/0007650313476030. **Link:** <http://bas.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/02/06/0007650313476030.abstract>

WADHAM, H., & WARREN, R. 2013. Inspiring action, building understanding: How cross-sector partnership engages business in addressing global challenges. *Business Ethics: European Review*, 22(1): 47-63. **Link:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/beer.12006/full>

WASSMER, U., PAQUIN, R., & SHARMA, S. 2014. The engagement of firms in environmental collaborations: Existing contributions and future directions. *Business & Society*, forthcoming. **Link:** <http://bas.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/03/26/0007650312439865.abstract>

WILSON, C. E. 2013. Collaboration of nonprofit organizations with local government for immigrant language acquisition. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(5): 963-984. **Link:** <http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/42/5/963.abstract>

YAZIJI, M., & DOH, J.P. 2013. The role of ideological radicalism and resource homogeneity in social movement organization campaigns against corporations. *Organization Studies*, 34(5-6): 755-780. **Link:** <http://oss.sagepub.com/content/34/5-6/755.short>

• Special issues

INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRIBUSINESS MANAGEMENT REVIEW, Special Issue Editors Dentoni, D., Hospes, O., & Ross, R.B.: «*Managing Wicked Problems in Agribusiness: The Role of Multi-Stakeholder Engagements in Value Creation*» (2013, Volume 16, Issue A). **Link:** http://www.ifama.org/files/v16ia_SpecialIssue.pdf

ORGANIZATION STUDIES, Special Issue Editors de Bakker, F.G.A., den Hond, F., King, B., & Weber, K.: «*Social Movements, Civil Society and Corporations*» (May 2013, 34(5-6)). **Link:** <http://oss.sagepub.com/content/34/5-6.toc>

JOURNAL OF CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP, Special Issue Editors Rahbek Gjerdrum Pedersen, E., & Thusgaard Pedersen, J.: «*Business-NGO Partnerships*» (September 2013, Issue 50). **Link:** <http://www.greenleaf-publishing.com/productdetail.kmod?productid=3868>

REGULATION & GOVERNANCE, Special Issue Editors Eberlein, B., Abbott, K.W., Black, J., Meidinger, E., & Wood, S.: «*Transnational Business Governance Interactions*» (March 2014, Volume 8, Issue 1). **Link:** [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1748-5991](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1748-5991)

BUSINESS AND POLITICS. Special Issue Editors Djelic, M.-L. & den Hond, F.: «*Multiplicity and Plurality in the World of Standards*» (2014, Volume 16, Issue 1). **Link:** <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/bap.2014.16.issue-1/issue-files/bap.2014.16.issue-1.xml>

• Reports

GRAY, B., & STITES, J. 2013. *Sustainability through Partnerships. Network for Business Sustainability.* **Link:** <http://nbs.net/knowledge/partnerships/systematic-review/>

PARTNERSHIPS RESOURCE CENTER. 2013. *How to make cross-sector partnerships work? Critical success factors for partnering.* Rotterdam: Partnerships Resource Center. **Link:** <http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org/publication/csf>

PAYANDEH, N. 2013. *Collective identity in cross sector partnerships: A research brief.* Rotterdam: Partnerships Resource Centre. **Link:** <http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org/publication/collective-identity>

PFISTERER, S. 2013. *Development partnerships with the private sector at work. Insights from partnerships with the private sector facilitated by the Dutch Embassy in Colombia.* Rotterdam: Partnerships Resource Centre. **Link:** <http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org/publication/reports/development-partnerships>

PFISTERER, S. 2013. *Partnerships for international sustainable development.* Leiden: University of Applied Sciences Leiden. **Link:** <http://www.hsleiden.nl/aems/isd/ISDPartnershipsCompendium.pdf>



• Book chapters

CLARKE, A. 2014. *Designing social partnerships for local sustainability strategy implementation* (pp. 79-102). Seitanidi, M. & Crane, A. (Eds.) *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook*. London: Routledge. **Link:** <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415678636/>

CRANE, A. & SEITANIDI, M. M., 2014. *Social partnerships and responsible business: what, why and how?* (pp. 1-12). In: Seitanidi, M. & Crane, A. (Eds.) *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook*. London: Routledge. **Link:** <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415678636/>

FINDLAY-BROOKS, R., VISSER, W., & WRIGH T, T. 2013. *Cross-sector partnership as an approach, to inclusive development*. In Utting, P. & Marques, J.C. (Eds.), *Corporate Social Responsibility and Regulatory Governance: Towards Inclusive Development?* (International Political Economy Classic Series Edition). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan **Link:** <http://www.palgrave.com/products/title.aspx?pid=693678>

GRAY, B. 2014. *Collaborative design as a joint signification process*. In C. Ansell & J. Torfing (Eds.), *Public Innovation Through Collaboration and Design*. London: Routledge, forthcoming. **Link:** <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415858595/>

GRAY, B. & PURDY, J. 2014. *Conflict and Negotiation in Cross-Sectoral Partnerships*. In Seitanidi, M. & Crane, A. (Eds.), *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business*. London: Routledge: 205-225. **Link:** <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415678636/>

GRAY, B. & WONDOLLECK, J. 2013. *Environmental Negotiations: Past, present and future prospects*. In Olekanski, M. & Adair, W. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Negotiations*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar: 445-472. **Link:** http://www.e-elgar.co.uk/bookentry_main.lasso?id=14942

HOQUE, A., CLARKE, A. & MACDONALD, A. 2014. *Implementing a Developing Country's Global Environmental Commitments: Industry Perspectives on Potential Pollution Prevention Programs in Bangladesh* (pp. 149-175). Vazquez-Brust, D., Sarkis, J. & Cordeiro, J. (Eds.) *Collaboration for Sustainability and Innovation in the Global South: A Role for South Driven Sustainability?* NY: Springer. **Link:** http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-7633-3_8

KOLK, A. 2014. *Partnerships as a panacea for addressing global problems? On rationale, context, impact and limitations*. In Seitanidi, M. & Crane, A. (Eds.), *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook*. London: Routledge **Link:** http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2089577

MCDERMOTT, G. A. 2014. *Public-private institutions as social and knowledge bridges*. In Jacoby, W., Hall, P. A., Levy, J., & Meunier, S. (Eds.), *The Politics of Representation in the Global Age: Identification, Mobilization, and Adjudication*. Cambridge University Press: 100-124. **Link:** <http://www.cambridge.org/us/academic/subjects/politics-international-relations/comparative-politics/politics-representation-global-age-identification-mobilization-and-adjudication>

SCHOUTEN, G., SIETZE V., & VAN WIJK, J. 2014. *Multinational enterprises and sustainability standards: Using a partnering-intensity continuum to classify their interactions*. In Tulder, R., Verbeke, A., & Strange, R. (Eds.), *International Business and Sustainable Development*, Progress In International Business Research 8: 117 - 139. **Link:** <http://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/wurpubs/448543>

SEITANIDI, M. M. & CRANE, A. 2014. *Conclusion: re-imagining the future of social partnerships and responsible business*. (pp. 388-407). In: Seitanidi, M. & Crane, A. (Eds.) *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research*

Handbook. London: Routledge. **Link:** <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415678636/>

UTTING, P. 2014. *Multistakeholder regulation of business: Assessing the pros and cons*. In van Tulder, R., Verbeke, A. & Strange, R. (Eds.), *Progress In International Business Research - Volume 8, Part IV: New Public Policies and Governance Challenges for Sustainable Development*. Emerald: 425 - 446. **Link:** http://books.emeraldinsight.com/display.asp?K=9781781909898&sf1=series&st1=Progress%20in%20International%20Business%20Research&sort=sort_date/d&m=1&dc=8&cur=EUR



● Dissertations

AL-TABBAA, O. F. 2013. *From beggar to partner: Nonprofit-business collaboration as a strategic option for nonprofit organizations.* University of Leeds.

Abstract: Nonprofit-Business collaboration (NBC) has been widely investigated, being regarded as a value creation mechanism for society (by providing solutions to its complex problems) and business (by generating economic gains when applied as part of responsibility programs). However, NBC from the perspective of 'creating value' to nonprofit organizations (NPOs) has been overlooked. In particular, how NPOs can become proactive and consider the NBC as a strategic choice, rather than being reactive to what businesses might offer. This is a timely issue because NBC can bring advantages to NPOs such as resources and learning opportunities necessary to main their viability in the current economic climate. The study has been carried out in two phases. The first concerns the conceptualization of a theoretical framework, being underpinned by stakeholder theory, cross-sector collaboration and the nonprofit literature. In the second phase, the framework has been assessed using primary and secondary data obtained from 26 'active in collaboration' NPOs. In general, findings indicate that the framework captures the foundations of effective NBC strategy. Moreover, a process model that integrates the factors together in chronological relationships has been developed. Finally, the thesis discusses why such inter-organizational relationship should not be conceived as 'risk-free' by the NPOs.

ARROYAVE, V. 2013. *Networks in the disaster response and global health domain: A case study of the partnership for quality medical donation's response to the 2010 Haitian earthquake.* Virginia Tech Institute For Policy and Governance.

Abstract: This case study documents and interprets the efforts of one network of cross-sectoral humanitarian actors affiliated with The Partnership for Quality Medical Donations (PQMD) and their response to the 2010 Haitian earthquake. This research synthesizes information from diverse sources: PQMD member organization interviews, personal observations, and survey data from INGO field staff, headquarters personnel, and corporate donor representatives. Specifically, this inquiry explores what the disaster coordination-related challenges are for network members and then examines whether and in what ways PQMD's cross-sectoral network was able to effectively mitigate or overcome those obstacles. This study contributes to the body of disaster coordination and cross-sector network scholarship in two ways. First, the analysis reviews prevailing trends within these realms concerning the multifaceted requisites and challenges of humanitarian coordination. Second, the study augments our current understanding of the complexity of mobilizing and coordinating multi-sectoral humanitarian action. This research strongly suggests that efforts to develop such networks prior to disaster events can build communication, collaboration and coordination pathways that leverage and ultimately enhance coordinated INGO-business disaster response. In particular, the study highlights the importance of incorporating cross-sector networks (i.e., INGO and corporate actors) into broad humanitarian preparedness and planning in the disaster relief domain.

GURN, A. M. 2014. *Courting corporate sports partners in education: Ethnographic case study of corporate philanthropy in urban public schools.* ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, Boston College, Lynch School of Education.

Abstract: This dissertation addresses the implications of the rise of corporate philanthropy within the context of economic austerity in public education. Through ethnographic methodology, the study examined the nature of the longstanding cross-sector relationship between a public school district and a corporate-owned team franchise in the National Basketball Association (NBA). It found that while this collaboration was often talked about as a partnership, in practice, it advanced a charitable and promotional relationship that was characterized by mutual affinities but not mutually agreed upon goals. This philanthropic connection to a powerful national sporting institution provided benefits to local public schools through incentives for perfect student attendance, motivational assemblies with professional athletes, and periodic, one-time donations in much needed technology. However, this relationship also raises key questions related to the mechanisms for social accountability in leadership decision-making, the effective and equitable use of school and corporate resources, and the indirect and inadvertent consequences when schools rely on commercialism and sports stardom to sell the meritocratic value of getting an education to a generation of students.

SCHOUTEN, G. 2013. *Tabling sustainable commodities through private governance: processes of legitimization in the roundtables on sustainable palm oil and responsible soy.* Utrecht: Gildeprint Drukkerijen. Utrecht University, dissertation. ISBN 978-94-6108-495-8.

Abstract: The proliferation of private governance arrangements has given rise to extensive academic and political debates on what constitutes legitimate private governance. The vast majority of the academic literature focuses thereby on democratic legitimacy. This type of approach is limited for several reasons. It is quite normative, originally state-oriented, and rather static. This dissertation therefore suggests an additional approach, which conceptualizes legitimacy as relational and relative and studies the processes through which legitimacy comes about. The dissertation contains four empirical analyses, which focus on two arrangements in particular - the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil and the Roundtable on Responsible Soy - , and each shed light on a different aspect of their legitimization processes. Roundtables are global multi-stakeholder platforms that emerged in the early 2000s and aim to make an entire agricultural commodity chain more sustainable. Their decision-making processes include business actors and NGOs; state actors are formally excluded. Roundtables use certification as main instrument to ensure compliance. Based on the findings in the empirical chapters, the dissertation provides an enhanced conceptualization of legitimization processes of private governance arrangements.



● Books



AUSTIN, J. E., & SEITANIDI, M. M. 2014. *Creating value in nonprofit-business collaborations: New thinking and practice.* Jossey-Bass: 320 pages.

"Creating Value in Nonprofit-Business Collaborations: New Thinking & Practice provides breakthrough thinking about how to conceptualize and realize collaborative value. With over a hundred case examples from around the globe and hundreds of literature references, the book reveals how collaboration between businesses and nonprofit organizations can most effectively co-create significant economic, social, and environmental value for society, organizations, and individuals. This essential resource features the ground-breaking Collaborative Value Creation framework that can be used for analyzing the sources, forms, and processes of value creation in partnerships between businesses and nonprofits. The book is a step-by-step guide for business managers and non-profit practitioners for achieving successful cross-sector partnerships. It examines the key dimensions of the Collaborative Mindset that shape each partner's collaborative efforts. It analyzes the drivers of partnership evolution along the Collaboration Continuum, and sets forth the key pathways in the Collaboration Process Value Chain. The book concludes by offering Twelve Smart Practices of Collaborative Value Creation for the design and management of cross sector partnerships. The book will empower organizations to strategically increase the potential for value creation both for the partners and society."


Link: <http://eu.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-1118531132.html>



BURTCH, B. 2013. *Win-win for the greater good.* Bruce Burtch.

"Win-Win for the Greater Good provides the «how to» blueprint for organizations of any size and from any sector to build highly productive partnerships. It reveals the true essence of success - focusing on the business objectives of your partner, while striving together to create a greater good.» Casey Sheahan, CEO, Patagonia, Inc. «Win-Win lucidly captures Bruce Burtch's decades of practitioner wisdom on cross-sector partnerships. The book is filled with rich examples and insightful practical guidance on how to build powerful partnerships. Read it and learn from a master!" James E. Austin, Eliot I. Snider and Family Professor of Business Administration, Emeritus, Harvard.


Link: <http://www.amazon.com/Win-Win-Greater-Good-Bruce-Burtch/dp/0989774104>



LAWTON, T. C., DOH, J. P. & RAJWANI, T. 2014. *Aligning for advantage: Competitive strategies for the political and social arenas.* Oxford University Press: 256 pages.

"In today's multipolar world economy, strategic alignment is a key determinant of competitive advantage. This important book: 1) Argues that to build and sustain corporate success, companies must synchronize business objectives and market positions with political and regulatory activism and social and environmental engagement. 2) Advances an argument and logic for aligning nonmarket and market strategies to deliver competitive advantage. 3) Develops a conceptual framework and managerial process for designing and delivering successful nonmarket strategies."


Link: <http://aligningforadvantage.com/>



LEM, M., VAN TULDER, R., & GELEYNSE, K. 2013. *Doing business in Africa: A strategic guide for entrepreneurs.* Utrecht: Berenschot: 257.

"First ever systematic management book on Dutch entrepreneurship in Africa launched with major contribution of RSM professor. Doing business in Africa – a strategic guide for entrepreneurs - is a joint production of Berenschot, the Partnerships Resource Centre at RSM Erasmus University Rotterdam and the Netherlands African Business Council. The book will be launched Thursday 18 January in a meeting with the Minister of International Trade and Development Lilianne Ploumen in a festive meeting at the headquarters of Heineken in Amsterdam. Prof. Rob van Tulder of the PrC and the Department of Business-Society Management is one of the lead authors of the book. The book, in his words, brings together 'business practice, academia and policy for the first time to present a broad perspective on Dutch entrepreneurship in Africa. The book continues where others stop, not only pointing to macroeconomic opportunities and challenges, but showing how to actually do business and reap a sustainable competitive advantage in Africa."

Link: <http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org/publication/doing-business-in-africa>



MINTZBERG, H. 2014. *Rebalancing society: radical renewal beyond left, right, and center.* Common access on www.mintzberg.org.

"I am a citizen concerned about the trends that I see around me: degradation of environment, demise of democracy, denigration of ourselves. Economies of free enterprise have become societies of free enterprises. This has to change, ultimately for the sake of balance, immediately for the sake of survival."


Link: www.mintzberg.org



MITCHELL, S. 2014. *Partnerships and coalitions.* Authorhouse: 432

"The highly individualistic people of North America have always had common experiences that united them. From the Boston Commons to Banff National Park, the people in these accounts sought support and renewal in these shared places and events. Ceremonies support partnerships today as they have in the past. The music partnership where the orchestra plays the 1812 Overture and the cannon on the hill in Kingston, Ontario is fired is discussed in Chapter 6. The musical celebrations represent the achievements of a dedicated group maintaining a partnership of musicians and teachers. Other partnerships reach across boundaries to achieve what would never have been expected before founding the new partnerships."


Link: <http://www.authorhouse.co.uk/Bookstore/BookDetail.aspx?BookId=SKU-000680520>



MOOK, L. 2013. *Accounting for social value.* University of Toronto Press.

"Accounting for Social Value offers academics, accountants, policy-developers, and members of nonprofit, co-operative, and for-profit organizations tools and insights to explore the connections between economic, social, and environmental dimensions. The lessons learned are valuable not only for other social economy organizations, but also for organizations in the public and for-profit sectors."

Link: <http://www.utppublishing.com/Accounting-for-Social-Value.html>



SEITANIDI, M. M., & CRANE, A. 2014. *Social partnerships and responsible business – A research handbook*. Routledge: 432 pages.

"Cross-sector partnerships are widely hailed as a critical means for addressing a wide array of social challenges such as climate change, poverty, education, corruption, and health. Amid all the positive rhetoric of cross-sector partnerships though, critical voices point to the limited success of various initiatives in delivering genuine social change and in providing for real citizen participation. This collection critically examines the motivations for, processes within and expected and actual outcomes of cross-sector partnerships. In opening up new theoretical, methodological, and practical perspectives on cross-sector social interactions, this book re-imagines partnerships in order to explore the potential to contribute to the social good. A trans-disciplinary perspective on partnerships adds serious value to the debate in a range of fields including management, politics, public management, sociology, development studies, and international relations. Contributors to the volume reflect many of these diverse perspectives, enabling the book to provide an account of partnerships that is theoretically rich and methodologically varied. With critical contributions from leading academics such as Barbara Gray, Ans Kolk, John Selsky and Sandra Waddock, this book is a comprehensive resource which will increase understanding of this vital issue."

Link: <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415678636/>



VAN TULDER, R., VAN TILBURG, R., FRANCKEN, M., & DA ROSA, A. 2013. *Managing the Transition to a Sustainable Enterprise. Lessons from Frontrunner Companies*. Routledge: 288 pages.

"In combining practice and theory, this textbook provides a management perspective on the 'business case' for sustainability. Drawing on examples from 20 frontrunner companies located in the Netherlands, it builds upon a unique research project in which CEOs and middle-managers gave access not only to their decision-making process, but also revealed how their perceptions shaped the transition process. This book identifies four different archetypes of business cases and related business models that business students and managers can use to identify phases and related attitudes towards sustainability."

Link: <http://www.partnershipsresourcecentre.org/publication/managing-the-transition>



VERBEKE, A., VAN TULDER, R., & STRANGE, R. 2014. *International business and sustainable development. Progress in International Business Research series v. 8*. Emerald: 450 pages.

"Sustainable development is one of the key challenges of our time. It has social, ecological and economic dimensions, which makes it also a multi-faceted and complex problem. International Business scholars have stressed that the Multinational Enterprise should be considered the most important vehicle through which sustainable development occurs in developing countries. However, actual study of the topic remains fraught with theoretical and empirical caveats. This eighth volume in the Progress in International Business Research series includes new texts from a number of leading scholars and opinion leaders in the area. Contributors develop new levels of analysis (in particular global value chains or the partnership strategies of firms) that present promising areas for new theoretical and empirical insights. Whilst authors from leading international institutes are brought together in this volume, younger scholars with innovative ideas also offer valuable insights."

Link: http://books.emeraldinsight.com/display.asp?K=9781781909898&sf1=series&st1=Progress%20in%20International%20Business%20Research&sort=sort_date/d&m=1&dc=8&cur=EUR



WIRTENBERG, J. 2014. *Building a culture for sustainability: People, planet, and profits in a new green economy*. ABC-CLIO.

"This practical, easy-to-understand book sets a path to successfully building a culture for sustainability in today's global marketplace, providing «best practice» case studies from industries and sectors including manufacturing, business-to-business, hospitality, consumer products, telecommunications, and professional services."

Link: <https://www.jeanawirtenberg.com/building-a-culture-for-sustainability.html>



by Dr. Arno Kourula

Assistant Professor of Strategy, University of Amsterdam Business School.



© Owen Egan

Henry Mintzberg

Cleghorn Professor of Management Studies
at the Desautels Faculty of Management, McGill
University, Montreal, Canada.

Societies, Sectors, Citizens: The case for rebalancing society

World renowned thought leader in strategic management, Professor Henry Mintzberg, shared his views on cross-sector partnerships reflecting on his recently published e-pamphlet titled *Rebalancing Society: Radical renewal beyond left, right and center*. Professor Mintzberg has inspired many through his over 150 articles and 16 books. Now he puts forward a powerful diagnosis of societal problems and a call for action. The key idea of his pamphlet is that societal sectors – the public, private and what he calls the plural sectors – are out of balance and action needs to be taken to rebalance society.



AK: Professor Mintzberg, thank you for taking the time to discuss your new e-pamphlet with the ARSP. In your work, you discuss how societies are out of balance, both between societal sectors as well as between and across generations. These thoughts are of central importance to the ARSP readership. You chose to use an e-pamphlet format, combining a traditional form of political polemic with modern electronic distribution. Would you recommend this format to other scholars and practitioners?

HM: Sure, but only in a limited way. In this case it fits for me, but not much else of my work. Open source is important, since it is a way to get certain writings to people. I will never again do a paper to go into a book collection, because in that format it is inaccessible to all but the buyers, compared with most journals. I am also doing a book based on the pamphlet, but I am not taking the pamphlet off the website—indeed, it is being posted there too.

AK: Our community uses various terms such as nongovernmental organization, non-profit and civil society. You choose to use the term *plural* to denote the formal organizations and informal formations outside the realm of government and private business. These include cooperatives, non-owned organizations, mass movements and social initiatives. Moreover you discuss the idea of public-private-plural partnerships or PPPPs and thus add the plural sector to public-private-partnerships commonly discussed in public sector literature. Can you tell us more about your view on PPPPs and provide some illustrative examples?

HM: The vocabulary is one of PPPs or public-private-partnerships. It is another illustration of the marginalization of the plural sector, since it often gets left out. It is not that PPPs necessarily exclude the plural sector, but the language excludes it. I raise the idea of public-private-plural-partnerships or PPPPs. The examples I give in the pamphlet are in Denmark and Brazil. For instance, Denmark has one of the highest levels of renewable energy use in the world and this has been done through engagement between business, government and the plural sector. In Brazil, the way the Brazilian people attacked the HIV/AIDS issue was a wonderful example where the government and pharmaceutical companies were deeply involved and there was a particularly engaging plural sector representing a wide variety of

perspectives such as hemophiliacs, prostitutes, gay people, etc. However, our lay person vocabulary has not caught up with these developments. Most people would say we need government because of legitimacy and authority and business because of funding, but not necessarily that we need the plural sector because it is more engaging.

AK: In you e-pamphlet, you focus on the United States, Canada and Brazil and you added Denmark as an example. Are there other societies that offer interesting stories of partnership balance or lack of it?

HM: The Brazilian case is indeed fascinating, but I am considering others as well. I am preparing the pamphlet in book form and it will have a new line of argument about inclusive versus exclusive populism. I was struck by the fact that four countries have been experiencing very similar political situations although they are on different continents: Egypt under Morsi, Thailand, Venezuela, and perhaps Ukraine in certain respects. Governments were elected and then ignored all but their own supporters, so other people took to the streets. Conversely Brazil has had two populist governments, which have been more inclusive in their behavior. There are three ways for societies to go out of balance: state despotism, predatory capitalism, and exclusive populism. Any one of them will do! Balance comes by combining inclusive pluralism, responsible enterprise, and engaging democracy. All of them have to be present.

AK: In your pamphlet you discuss the individual level and its link to the societal level. You suggest that we should firstly look in the mirror and examine our own behavior. Can you expand on how you see individual responsibilities rebalancing society?

HM: The United States became the model of democracy, but it was a very particular form of democracy. The country instituted checks and balances to constrain government, but it did not have corresponding checks and balances to constrain individuals and associations. My whole argument is that the above model has carried on through history and began to fall apart in 1989, as individualism, especially in the form of corporations as “persons” in the law, run out of control. De Tocqueville saw the power of America is as “self-interest rightly understood”. Now it is self-interest fatefully misunderstood. A healthy democracy finds balance between collective, communal,



and individual needs. We all have needs for protection, affiliation, and consumption. While communism did not fulfill need for consumption, the form of capitalism that we have is not fulfilling needs for protection.

AK: What kind of skills do managers need to radically renew society?

HM: I am very suspicious about leadership and I see communityship as being much more important. Leadership and management are important, but they need to be embedded in communityship. I prefer not to see some sort of management as leading radical renewal, unless you want to argue that anyone who takes the initiative position is a manager and a leader.

I love the story of Nokia that I describe in the pamphlet. The company was lobbying for less taxes in Finland, arguing that this would lead to increased business activity. What ends up happening is that every government then lowers taxes and every government gets squeezed. This leads to government services suffering everywhere. The actions of the company were self-serving and were not serving the country. It shows the fallacy of this win-win nonsense. In addition, many U.S. companies are hardly paying income taxes these days. General Electric has been collecting more in U.S. government subsidies than paying federal income taxes, yet almost half its employment and business is in the United States. It's scandalous. The same goes for many trade pacts that allow companies to sue sovereign governments for loss of profits, for example because they enacted social or environmental legislation. Courts should be striking these down as assaults on citizen rights.

AK: What can we as educators do to support radical societal renewal? What is the role of academics?


HM: In the pamphlet I talk about lofty ideals and lowly deals. The divide between these two reminds me of the line in a song by Tom Lehrer about the battle against the Spanish dictator Franco: "Though he may have won all the battles, we had all the good songs!" Good songs are not

enough. Sure that's what I try to do, but others in the spirit of Saul Alinsky create an ingenious ways to confound the exploiters. Academics are often more acutely aware of what's going on. It is not our role as academics to get active, it's our role as citizens to do so.

AK: What is next for you and do you have any suggestions for research topics to scholars?

HM: I am getting more interested in activist forms of intervention. I would like to see research highlighting people who are finding ways to initiate social change and confronting the worst kinds of behaviors. I would like to see stories of how you stop the big bureaucracies and the backroom deals.

In terms of lay people, the two comments I get all the time are firstly "I didn't know what was going on" and second "what can I do about it?" Essentially, radical renewal will have to involve an immediate reversal of practices that can no longer be tolerated, a widespread regeneration by concerned citizens to replace these with more constructive practices, and consequential reforms by responsive governments and responsible business.



AK: Finally, do you have any message for the Annual Review of Social Partnerships readership?

You are on the right track and we need a great deal more research on these cross-sector issues. The more recognition of how important these issues are the better. Please do send my greetings to the ARSP readership.

AK: Thank you very much for your time, Professor Mintzberg. We are delighted to have had the opportunity to discuss your recent e-pamphlet and we look forward to your future work. Your thoughts and greetings to the ARSP community will certainly inspire our international community of academics and practitioners all around the world. | ARSP |

To download the e-pamphlet for free and for further information about the work of Professor Mintzberg, please see: www.mintzberg.org.

PEDAGOGY

SECTION



Pedagogy Editorial	33
Thought Leader Interview	35
Partnership Concepts through Cases	39
Teaching Innovation Resources.....	43



by Dr. Jennifer S. A. Leigh,

*Associate Professor of Management,
Nazareth College, School of Management,
Rochester, NY, USA.*

Cross-Sector Partnership Teaching

This spring 10 students from my school attended the Clinton Global Initiative University (CGI-U). This higher education initiative engages the next generation of leaders on college campuses around the world in order to take action on global challenges. CGI-U fosters unusual collaboration across the typical higher education silos as faculty, civic engagement staff, and community agencies work with students to formulate their change initiatives. A recent blog post from CGI-U sums up our biggest opportunity as cross-sector partnership (CSP) educators: *"To really make headway on the most urgent global challenges, leaders need to form cross-sector partnerships that allow the pooling of their diverse skills and abilities"*. So what else is happening in higher education and beyond to prepare the next generation of managers and practitioners?

This year we have several resources that address this question and support your CSP pedagogy. First, we are very fortunate to have a *"Thought Leader Interview"* with Mr. Jonas Haertle, Head, PRME Secretariat. The Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) is the largest management education reform movement which explicitly uses cross-sector partnerships as its organizing approach. Second, in Dr. David Hyatt's *"Partnership Concepts Through Cases"* column he provides a twist on cases with the innovative Fishbanks simulation as a companion tool to traditional case analysis. Third, the *"Teaching Innovations Column"* spotlights a solicited contribution from Dr. Lea Stadtler (University of Geneva) about on-line learning which reflects on her and Dr. Gilbert Probst's experiences with teaching a CSP module within a MOOC course. Lastly, we welcome to our growing team, Adriane MacDonald, who is a PhD student at the University of Waterloo. She has recently joined the ARSP and together with Dr. Lea Stadtler will be involved in the pedagogy section for the 10th edition.



To really make headway on the most urgent global challenges, leaders need to form cross-sector partnerships that allow the pooling of their diverse skills and abilities.

As a reminder to our regular readers and those new to the publication, the core aim of this section is 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. Our specific goals are:

- To identify teaching and learning resources relevant for the academic classroom and resources tailored specifically to practitioners;
- To highlight the wisdom of cross-sectoral thought-leaders as it relates to teaching & learning;
- To share innovative pedagogy, curriculum, course design, assessments, and exercises.

The global challenges are at our collective doorsteps as seen in recent climate change reports² and as a community of CSP researchers and practitioners now is the time to innovative and communicate best practices for training and education. | [ARSP](#) |

As we approach our 10th edition, readers should send me your teaching and learning innovations jelegh4@naz.edu.

References

- Harrison, B.** (2013 December 23). Why Cross-Sector Partnerships Are Increasingly Essential to Creating Positive Change [Blog post].
See IPCC: International Panel on Climate Change & U.S. Global Change Research Program (2014). National Climate Assessment.



by Dr. Jennifer S. A. Leigh,

*Associate Professor of Management, Nazareth College,
School of Management, Rochester, NY, USA.*



Jonas Haertle

Head, PRME Secretariat,
UN Global Compact Office

Working with the UN-supported Principles for Responsible Management Education: The Role of Cross-Sector Partnerships

In this edition we are fortunate to hear from Mr. Jonas Haertle, who is the Head, PRME Secretariat at the UN Global Compact Office located in New York City and a doctoral student at Nottingham Trent University. PRME (pronounced prime) stands for the Principles for Responsible Management Education and is a voluntary global initiative for management education innovation and reform. In this interview Jonas shares examples of how PRME is fostering large scale cross sector partnerships (CSPs) across the globe through their voluntary and collaborative practices. He details the “movement” and how CSPs are embedded in PRME’s fundamental organizing and working structure. We hear his views about the CSP skills needed for today’s managers based on his experiences working with hundreds of organizations in the last several years, which include 500+ higher education institutions, accrediting associations, CSR-driven corporations, and numerous NGOs. Through this interview readers can learn more about the numerous interdisciplinary teaching and learning resources generated by PRME and Jonas’ thoughts, as a research informed practitioner, about how to foster more of the much needed CSP pedagogy for the future.



The resources discussed in this interview provide up-to-date guidance and inspiration for responsible management educators, regardless of affiliation status. The cross-sector model combined with the continuous learning and co-production of responsible education knowledge provides a distinctive model for transforming business and management education which is very much needed given the increasing critiques and debates over the last decade.

(JL): Can you briefly explain the UN Global Compact (UNGC) and the Principles for Responsible Management Education?

Jonas Haertle (JH): The UN Global Compact is a strategic policy initiative for businesses that are committed to aligning their operations and strategies with ten

universally accepted principles in the areas of human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption. By doing so, business, as a primary driver of globalization, can help ensure that markets, commerce, technology and finance advance in ways that benefit economies and societies everywhere. As social, political and economic challenges (and opportunities) — whether occurring at home or in other regions — affect business more than ever before, many companies recognize the need to collaborate and partner with governments, civil society, labour and the United Nations.

The Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) is a United Nations Global Compact sponsored initiative with the mission to inspire and champion responsible management education, research and thought leadership globally. The Six Principles of PRME

PRME PRINCIPLES FOR RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

As institutions of higher education involved in the development of current and future managers we declare our willingness to progress in the implementation, within our institution, of the following Principles, starting with those that are more relevant to our capacities and mission. We will report on progress to all our stakeholders and exchange effective practices related to these principles with other academic institutions:



PRINCIPLE 1 / PURPOSE

We will develop the capabilities of students to be future generators of sustainable value for business and society at large and to work for an inclusive and sustainable global economy.



PRINCIPLE 4 / RESEARCH

We will engage in conceptual and empirical research that advances our understanding about the role, dynamics, and impact of corporations in the creation of sustainable social, environmental and economic value.



PRINCIPLE 2 / VALUES

We will incorporate into our academic activities and curricula the values of global social responsibility as portrayed in international initiatives such as the United Nations Global Compact.



PRINCIPLE 5 / PARTNERSHIP

We will interact with managers of business corporations to extend our knowledge of their challenges in meeting social and environmental responsibilities and to explore jointly effective approaches to meeting these challenges.



PRINCIPLE 3 / METHOD

We will create educational frameworks, materials, processes and environments that enable effective learning experiences for responsible leadership.



PRINCIPLE 6 / DIALOGUE

We will facilitate and support dialogue and debate among educators, students, business, government, consumers, media, civil society organisations and other interested groups and stakeholders on critical issues related to global social responsibility and sustainability.

We understand that our own organisational practices should serve as an example of the values and attitudes we convey to our students.



are inspired by internationally accepted values, such as the principles of the Global Compact. They seek to establish a process of continuous improvement among institutions of management education in order to develop a new generation of business leaders capable of managing the complex challenges faced by business and society in the 21st century. Over 550 signatories have joined PRME representing 80 countries. PRME's Steering Committee is comprised of global and specialised associations.

JL: PRME Principles 5 and 6 are partnerships and dialog respectively. Why are cross-sector partnerships (CSPs) so important to PRME's design?

JH: Implementation of PRME at a higher education institution is more than a one-time experience. It can better be understood as a continuous progress or a continuous cycle of planning, doing, checking and acting. The incremental change in academic institutions can also be understood as an organizational learning process. This process is influenced both by the internal stakeholders (i.e. Deans, senior leadership, faculty and others) and external stakeholders (i.e. accreditations, rankings, media & corporate partners), as well as by the national and international context. Changes to the all these factors require collective action, hence Principles 5 and 6.

JL: How has PRME utilized CSPs to accomplish their goals?

JH: The best example is the PRME Working Groups. Based on a call from the business sector, the PRME Secretariat supports the setup and running of PRME Working Groups by:

- Supporting internal partnering as an "intra network facilitator" in the creation and enlargement of a Working Group, ensuring that new institutions entering PRME are directed to the different Working Groups and ensuring a balanced international composition.
- Supporting external partnering as an "extra network facilitator" by putting the Working Group in contact with other synergic activities, such as students' networks, corporate and academic networks working on similar areas.

The PRME Chapters are another example of the CSP structure. These groups are organized in partnership with the Global Compact Local Networks of GC signatory companies.

JL: What CSP skills do you think 21st century managers and leaders need?

JH: Soft skills like communication and listening, initial and ongoing negotiation sensibilities, and a commitment to continuous learning. Being able to listen and incorporate the other side's point of view is critical. Because all

CSP SKILLS

- Communication
- Listening
- Feedback
- Negotiation & Renegotiation
- Continuous Learning

partnerships are voluntary, CSP managers need to make "win-win-win" relationships and meet each partner's needs to receive value added by identifying the partner's benefits and the organization's benefits. Then managers need to keep the partnership running and continue delivering value on each side. The ongoing skills needed to "get your way through" are to solicit continuous feedback, because sometimes value propositions change and you need to incorporate those shifts. I contributed recently to an article on inter-organizational learning which best describes that approach (see below). Recently the UNGC has worked on this skill with The Partnering Initiative (TPI) who provided trainings for the UNGC country networks. These were well received and are expected to be implemented on an annual basis for the Global Compact Local Networks.

JL: What have you used as CSP resources in your own career? Who are your "go to" authors?

JH: A book I recommend that's focused on practitioners and academics is Steve Waddell's (2011): *Global Action Networks – Creating our Future Together*.



JL: This is akin to choosing favorites, but what disciplinary fields and PRME affiliated schools/institutes do you see as notable in preparing graduates as responsible leaders who can succeed in a world with increasingly blurring sector boundaries?

JH: This is difficult to answer because there are so many. I'd say some of the best practices from PRME signatory schools are highlighted in the PRME Inspirational Guides 1 and 2 and weekly on the PRMETIME blog. What unites these innovations, whether curricular or co-curricular, is that the faculty has agreed with business that responsible management skills are valuable and need to be taught and that their students are reflecting on whether that's being developed through the learning experiences. These can include, but are not limited to new degrees, interdisciplinary courses, or orientation week events.

JL: What should educators do to support RME and CSP?

JH: Learning in a social context is important. For example, experimenting with new types of pedagogy that require students to do a partnership project; basically bringing groups of students to do a project with a partner and through that learning via experience. The role of faculty is to help students reflect and guide them on what they could do better: faculty facilitate, students do the project. The incentive system (i.e. the grades) need to

Really if you want to address any global topic of significance it warrants partnering with each other across disciplines and across sectors.

reflect practical and academic value added. It can't just be on academic merits, but on others qualities: Is it done on time? Have they been listening to project partner? Is it useful or effective from the practitioner view? Does it have practical relevance?

JL: For those wanting to make a change, what's the business case you would make to encourage those teaching "traditional" disciplinary courses to integrate CSP into their areas?

JH: I have three ideas from business, student, and UN perspectives. First, the findings from the UN Global Compact's annual surveys consistently show that companies committed to the UN Global Compact – the world's largest corporate sustainability initiative – are moving from good intentions to significant actions. Companies indicate that they see the big picture of how addressing sustainability issues – from human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption, to broader societal goals such as education, poverty and health – are good both for business and the societies in which they have a presence. So the business case comes directly from companies who see corporate sustainability as a strategic issue which is here to stay. Second, as the 2013 PRME MBA Student Survey has shown, there is an increased interest from students in these topics. Lastly, whenever the UN wants to cover the big issues the standard second sentence in dignitary speeches state the following: "[Insert topic] is a very complex issue and this requires us to bring together people from different sectors, different countries, and different perspectives to tackle it." Really, if you want to address any global topic of significance it warrants partnering with each other across disciplines and across sectors. | [ARSP](#) |

References:

- Waddell, S.** 2011. *Global Action Networks – Creating our future together*. Palgrave.
- Waddell, S., Greijn, H., Faber, K., Haertle, J., & Mauro, A.** 2013. *Inter-organizational learning: A new frontier*. Capacity. 46: 3-6.



by Dr. David Hyatt

Clinical Assistant Professor of Supply Chain Management, University of Arkansas.

Game On! Teaching Commons Dilemmas & Collaboration with Simulation & Case Analysis

An April 2014 Harvard Business Review article on cross-sector collaboration—"The Collaboration Imperative"—reminds us of some chronic tensions in sustainability partnerships, particularly the difficulty of achieving systems-level solutions to commons problems given corporate and individual self-interest¹. This column describes a multi-dimensional strategy for teaching these topics through the use of gaming simulation, reflective writing, and case studies in a fisheries context. Fisheries are a relevant setting because, despite the seriousness of the problem, society has mostly failed to collectively halt the massive overfishing of the world's fisheries. For instance, scientists estimate that the Pacific Bluefin tuna is currently being overfished and that stocks have declined by over 95 percent between 1952 and 2011². After first discussing some of the underlying theory on commons and public goods, we will explore how to run a simulation and debrief it in this context. Then we will consider options for following up on this experience with reflective writing and analyzing cases.

Commons and Common Pool Resources

For our purposes a commons is an unbounded resource, a public good, which all can freely enjoy; you can't effectively limit access and one person's use does not detract from another's. Peace and moonlight are examples, sustainability writ large is another. A common pool resource (CPR) is a



kind of open access commons where one person's use does subtract a finite amount from the pool available for another's potential use. Examples include fisheries, forests, lakes and rivers, watersheds, and the atmosphere³. These resources can also be thought of as depletable but renewable. Because of these attributes, the sustainability of a CPR often has more to do with private governance (negotiated among the actors, often through multi-stakeholder collaboration) and less to do with public governance (laws and treaties). While many non-renewable resources, like minerals, enjoy public protection and property rights, thus avoiding their depletion, many renewable CPRs lack these safeguards and have in many cases become scarce or even extinct. Deep ocean fisheries are a particularly good example because there is no supranational public governance mechanism.

A common pool resource (CPR) is a kind of open access commons where one person's use does subtract a finite amount from the pool available for another's potential use. Examples include fisheries, forests, lakes and rivers, watersheds, and the atmosphere.

Tragedy of the Commons

The overfishing problem in a CPR, where individual actors inadvertently undermine their long-term collective interests by maximizing their own short-term interests, is known as a "tragedy of the commons"—a phrase popularized in a classic 1968 article by Garrett Hardin⁴. This trap is pernicious because each actor, which in the fishery case includes consumers, the fishing industry, even national governments, has incentives to increase their use of the CPR despite their long-term collective interests of a sustainable fishery. A rational fishing company would continue adding ships to its fleet to increase or just maintain its relative market share. That's because the benefits from adding each additional ship accrue to that company while the costs are borne by the commons and eventually all the fishers as a whole.

No one company would voluntarily decrease its fishing activity to preserve the commons because that company would bear all of the cost (lost market share) but capture only part of the benefit (a sustainable commons). This barrier to action is called the "volunteer's dilemma" to solving commons problems (which usually refer to CPRs)⁵. (See also Aesop's Fables, "Belling the Cat," for a simple example.)

The Teaching & Learning Model

The problem for teachers of collaboration for sustainability is how to best convey these abstract topics and make the lessons relevant for collaborative cross-sector governance of a common pool resource. Having students first experience these phenomena in a simulation setting brings the affective aspects to the forefront which is very powerful—students remember the lessons. The instructor can draw upon and build upon these lessons in later class meetings with case discussions. Accordingly, this column outlines learning experiences that combine a simulation in the fisheries context, reflective writing and discussion, and at least one additional case study on collaborative fisheries governance. While the simulation can be used in multiple settings, even K-12, the overall sequence presented here applies mainly to undergraduate and graduate coursework.

Summarizing up to this point, the teaching objective is to prepare students for understanding chronic tensions underlying cross-sector partnerships for sustaining CPRs, in particular the tradeoffs faced by the various stakeholders. The Fishbanks Ltd. simulation developed by Dennis Meadows⁶ in 2001 was designed to teach commons problems from a systems dynamics perspective, but can be adapted to also explore barriers to collaboration in CPRs. The simulation uses a game board and sets of wooden chips to represent shipping fleets, but Meadows and John Sterman also developed an online version available on the MIT web⁷. Both of these sources offer extensive resources for running the game as well as debriefing slides. An internet search will also reveal additional games and materials, including asynchronous versions.

Simulation Facilitation & Debriefing

The simulation takes three hours—two hours for the game and one hour for debriefing. For the board game



version, the class is formed into competing teams of fishing companies. Players decide how many ships to deploy and where in the fishery to deploy them. No instructions are given to students on how they are to conduct themselves, only that the team with the most assets at the end of the game wins. The eventual outcome, in almost all cases, is that teams deplete the commons—their shared fishery. The next hour is spent debriefing which under this approach includes exploring four major questions. The first step is to ask student groups to quickly prepare a short press release to justify their actions to their home community and then have a several groups read them aloud. This reflection provides, but is not necessary for, a basis for the first major debriefing question—“What happened?” Most of the answers will be descriptive (it’s good to get a lot of students talking during this question) and the instructor should search for more analytical answers with a second

Why didn’t you collaborate with others to stop the collapse?

major question—“Why did the system collapse?” Students are likely to produce a variety of reasons for system collapse, including greed. Here is it important to distinguish between greed and acting within an economic system that rewards behavior that might contribute to system collapse. Over the course of the discussion of this question, the instructor should aim to help students discover the following three reasons for the collapse of the commons. First, the presence of competitive markets compels students to “beat” other teams, a behavior encouraged by the instructor. Note that governance and property rights in the fishery are conspicuously absent. Second, because the fisheries are a CPR for all the teams, each team has the incentive to extract as much of the resource as possible before other teams do so for the reasons already described above. Third, students misinterpret the signals from the ecosystem, which responds to overfishing by producing more fish until it hits a tipping point and crashes. Students believe the fishery is boundless even as it is failing. This later dimension will not be evident to students; it is emphasized in the debrief materials provided by Meadows and Sterman. When all three points have been raised and discussed, it is time for

the third major question, essentially—“Why didn’t you collaborate with others to stop the collapse?”

To manage this question effectively, the instructor must be attentive to team discussions during each round, observing that some students are usually alert to the problem from the beginning, sometimes suggesting to their team members that they collaborate with other teams or that they limit their own fishing activity. These initiatives rarely get traction, and it is important to explore those student’s retrospective accounts of why not. Usually it emerges that there seems hardly any way to win by pursuing those strategies. This introduces the volunteer’s dilemma as a barrier to collective action—even if they could establish a collaborative agreement to limit fish extraction, the potential for just one other group’s defection is a sufficient barrier to prevent collaboration. With these concepts established, the instructor can challenge students to imagine a system where they could collaborate, asking the fourth major question—“What kinds of rules would you need to make fisheries collaboration work?” The instructor can record all of the students’ ideas on the board, reconciling differences, such that what emerges is a framework of collaborative governance such as Elinor Ostrom’s design principles for governing sustainable resources⁸.

Reflective Writing

This follow-up assignment provides students an opportunity to reflect on their own key learnings from the simulation. Example reflective prompts include: “How has your understanding regarding sustainability of the commons changed as a result of this simulation? Why does this learning matter? Why is it important, to you personally or in the bigger picture? How would you assess the potential for collaborative governance regimes for CPRs? Take what you learned in this simulation and compare or contrast it to another resource pool.”

Case Connections

With a deep appreciation for the tragedy of the commons and the volunteer’s dilemma, the class is ready to examine a case that explores collaboration in CPRs. To continue to explore the fisheries problem, the instructor could use *Marine Stewardship Council (A): Is a Joint Venture Possible Between “Suits and Sandals”*⁹ or other Marine Stewardship



Council (MSC) cases, each requiring 60-90 minutes. To explore collaboration in a forestry setting, the instructor could use the more complex *Forest Stewardship Council*¹⁰ case, which requires about two hours. The MSC case is instructive not only because it continues the fisheries theme, but also because it chronicles the early days of the MSC and describes the many stakeholders to be accounted for in starting such an initiative. Students can assess the difficulties in reconciling stakeholders' divergent interests, building trust, and creating shared purpose. In addition to the questions included in the case teaching note, students should be able to bring their knowledge of commons problems to bear on deeper analytical questions, either as part of facilitating the case discussion or in a reflective writing assignment. In the simulation, students had imagined what a solution negotiated among fishermen might look like, but a certification regime as a market-based solution to the commons problem is likely different. "How exactly is it different? What is the likelihood that fishermen or governments would eventually endorse a regime that limits fish extraction? Why or why not? Where are the incentives for each? What are the tradeoffs? What are the strengths and weaknesses of a certification scheme as a solution to the commons problem?"

Depending on learning objectives, after this class session, students can be asked to do independent work to research where the MSC is today and the challenges it faces or alternately work the FSC case, which explores the challenges of growing the certification brand and responding to challengers. Instructors can also follow up with cases from the corporate perspective on whether to take up or expand use of a certification scheme to create a more sustainable supply chain. One example is the case of Wal-Mart and its decision in 2006 to adopt the MSC certification¹¹ and another is the case of Unilever expanding a certification partnership with Rainforest Alliance to its tea operations in India¹².

As a whole, these experiences take the students from familiarization with the main concepts to participation through simulation to reflection and sharing the lessons learned. While students might leave the simulation wondering "what possibly can be done?" they learn in subsequent activities that through innovation and a willingness to tackle these tough problems, solutions are imaginable. In this particular setting, it is that markets can be structured such that public goods, such as sustainability of the fishery, can be provisioned along with the private good. | ARSP |



References

- ¹Nidumolu, R., Ellison, J., Whalen, J., & Billman, E. 2014. The collaboration imperative. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(4): 76-84.
- ²ISC. 2014. Stock Assessment of Pacific Bluefin Tuna: 19.
- ³Ostrom, E. 2008. The challenge of common-pool resources. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 50(4): 8-21.
- ⁴Hardin, G. 1968. The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3858): 1243-1248.
- ⁵Diekmann, A. 1985. Volunteer's dilemma. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 29(4): 605-610.
- ⁶Meadows, D. L. 2001. *FishBanks*, Ltd. Durham, NH.
- ⁷Meadows, D. L., & Sterman, J. 2012. *Fishbanks: A Renewable Resource Management Simulation*. Cambridge, MA.
- ⁸Ostrom, op. cit.
- ⁹Steger, U., & Rädler, G. 2002. *Marine Stewardship Council (A): Is a Joint Venture Possible Between «Suits and Sandals»*, IMD case study 2-0080. Lausanne: International Institute for Management Development.
- ¹⁰Austin, J. E., & Reficco, E. 2006. *Forest Stewardship Council*, Harvard case study 303047: Harvard Business School.
- ¹¹Hyatt, D. G. 2012. Walmart's sustainability journey: Peter Redmond and the search for sustainable seafood.
- ¹²Henderson, R., & Nellesmann, F. 2012. *Sustainable Tea at Unilever*, Harvard case study 712438: Harvard Business School.

You can send your comments or your favorite cases to dhyatt at uark.edu.



by Dr. Lea Stadtler

Research Fellow, University of Geneva.

Blazing a New Trail: MOOCs on Cross-Sector Partnerships

In 2013 Prof. Gilbert Probst (University of Geneva) and I were invited to teach a module on *Public-Private Partnerships* within the MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) entitled International Organizations Management that was offered at the Coursera Platform. MOOCs are (mostly) free online courses that provide learning opportunities to virtually anyone, anytime, and anywhere with internet access. Diverse online platforms, including Coursera, offer an increasing range of MOOCs and additional tools¹. Based on our Public-Private Partnerships MOOC experience, this article begins by chronicling our main design intentions, challenges, and constraints and ends with a discussion of lessons learned and future directions for the development of cross-sector partnership MOOCs.

The Design

We agreed to design a MOOC that would provide participants with an overview of key themes related to managing public-private partnerships, that is, a specific type of cross-sector partnerships, and would encourage them to critically reflect on the benefits, challenges, and risks that these partnerships entail. In line with our syllabus (available at <http://ppp.unige.ch/index.php/teaching/coursera>), we developed four 15-20-minute videos that focused on “guiding questions” (see Table 1) and included short quizzes in-between to increase participants’ attention.



However, we were also aware of the challenges that this education medium presents. For example, how could we avoid long monologues? Furthermore, how

could the participants be encouraged to interact despite the anonymity and physical distance that technology implies? Since using videos doesn't allow

LECTURE	TOPICS
(1) Why and how do international organizations engage in public-private partnerships?	• Definitions and historical background • Drivers and risks of public-private partnerships • Partnership types and examples
(2) What are the challenges and opportunities of public-private partnerships?	• Organizational interests and sectoral differences • Sources of obstacles • Building relationships and trust
(3) How to design and manage a public-private partnership?	• The partnership life cycle • Designing the governance and operational structure • Stakeholder involvement and evaluation models
(4) What does partnering in public-private partnerships imply for the international organization?	• Building organizational capacities • Broker organizations and individual partnership champions

Table 1: The main topics addressed in our MOOC



for audience interactions, how could we convey the many topics and frameworks related to public-private partnerships that are ambiguous, multifaceted, and allow for/call for different interpretations and viewpoints?

Lessons Learned

We agreed to use two speakers to make the videos more dynamic. However – and this was one of our main lessons – it required not only good preparation to ensure a coordinated approach, but also a relaxed attitude, despite the intimidating camera, to enable authentic interaction. To make the overall topic more accessible

Third, the participants seemed to prefer discussions in which they could introduce themselves and highlight their own experience. And, here, the beauty of having an international group came into play: We had 17,000 active participants from all over the world, especially from the US, Spain, Brazil, India, and Mexico. About 44,000 people registered for the course whereof 17,000 were active and 3,080 completed the five modules. Consequently, with 18% or 7% (see Haber, 2013 for calculation methods), the completion rate ranges close to the Coursera average. To build on this diversity, we asked them to send us a one-pager in which they briefly describe a public-private partnership of their choice. While this exercise was purely voluntary, we were delighted to receive many insightful

SELECTED VIDEO CLIPS	URL LINK
Logistics Emergency Teams	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ILwWfjQ7vPU#t=17
GAIN - Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0muPPXCZze4
GAVI Alliance – Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ufiu9jbf-Es

Table 2: Practical Examples

and avoid long monologues, we included short video clips of practical examples (see Table 2), and showed where the participants could access practical tools, theoretical reviews, and articles on specific questions and partnering dimensions.

Our second lesson was that, although most of our attention was directed at preparing the videos, this was just one aspect of the educational tool; the course's value largely depends on participant interaction. Consequently, we asked questions regarding the participants' experience to encourage their engagement in the forums. The questions that triggered the most vibrant discussions included: "What are your views on public-private partnerships?"; "Why do you think international organizations are often well-suited to initiate public-private partnerships and bring together important stakeholders?" and "When is a public-private partnership a bad idea?"

examples that we integrated into an overview of the about 80 most cited partnership examples. This list is available at <http://ppp.unige.ch/index.php/teaching/coursera>.

The (Future) Opportunity

In view of their affordability and their "anytime, anywhere" nature, MOOCs can change the game for higher education and employee development. I believe that they also offer important opportunities in the context of cross-sector partnerships. As Sandra Waddock (1988) outlined, partnership success ultimately rests on the shoulders of those involved in the implementation work. However, many of these strongly engaged employees or middle managers have not specialized in partnerships and do not have the time to enroll in physical courses. In our course, employees and middle managers made up to 49% of the course participants.



Just as the ARSP seeks to bridge academic theory and practice with ideas about promoting the social good, MOOCs on cross-sector partnerships may help reach practitioners and overcome the common assumption that “there is nothing out there in terms of theoretical frameworks.”

Just as the ARSP seeks to bridge academic theory and practice with ideas about promoting the social good, MOOCs on cross-sector partnerships may help reach practitioners and overcome the common assumption that “there is nothing out there” in terms of theoretical frameworks to assist the partnering practice. The second main opportunity relates to the diversity of course participants: MOOCs may bring together participants with different sector backgrounds, enabling fruitful discussions in which they can share their own practical, often country-specific, experiences and their various interpretations of theoretical concepts.

Overall, I believe that MOOCs may help integrate the discourse on partnerships worldwide and disseminate tools for improving the partnership practice. To this end, it would be great to see more partnership MOOCs that also cross boundaries to related topics such as corporate social responsibility, global governance, social innovation, leadership, and managing complexity. Illustrative examples listed at www.mooc-list.com, such as “*Analyzing Global Trends for Business and Society*” (Coursera); “*CSR & Value Creation*” (Audencia); “*New Models of Business in Society*” (Coursera); and “*Leadership for Global Responsibility*” (GIZ’s Academy for International Cooperation), could provide a good starting point for such endeavors.

There are challenges and also criticism linked to using MOOCs as a pedagogical tool. However, if they connect theory with practice by providing frameworks as explained above and manage to leverage the participant diversity for animated discussions, MOOCs can meet the purpose of promoting a theoretical understanding of a certain topic and make the participants critically reflect on the managerial questions involved.

| ARSP |

References

- ¹Ryan, 2013, Wood, 2014.
Haber, J. 2013. MOOC Attrition Rates --- Running the Numbers. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jonathan-haber/mooc-attrition-rates-runn_b_4325299.html
Ryan, L. 2013. MOOCs are on the Move: A Snapshot of the Rapid Growth of MOOCs.
Waddock, S. A. 1988. Building Successful Social Partnerships. *Sloan Management Review*, 29(4), 17-23.
Wood, M. 2014. The Mounting Momentum of MOOCs - An Update on the Rapid Growth of MOOCs.

THOUGHT GALLERY

SECTION



Spread the word!
Trickle effects of Partnerships 48



by Prof. dr. Ans Kolk

*Professor, University of Amsterdam
Business School, The Netherlands.*

Spread the Word! Trickle Effects of Partnerships

The ARSP invited **Prof. Ans Kolk** to share a key idea that derived from her partnership research and has the potential for significant impact in organisations around the world. The trickle effects of cross sector social interactions is a challenging concept that is worth exploring and discussing further.

Ans Kolk is full professor at the University of Amsterdam Business School, The Netherlands. Her areas are in corporate social responsibility and sustainability, especially in relation to international business firms and their interactions with stakeholders and society. Specific topics have included poverty and development; bottom of the pyramid and subsistence markets; partnerships; codes of conduct and non-financial reporting; stakeholders and governance; climate change and energy. She has published numerous articles in a range of international journals as well as book chapters and books. Professor Kolk is a regular reviewer for international journals, serves as editorial board member for major journals in her field, and (co-)edited several special issues. She has participated in many international projects in her areas of expertise, in cooperation with different private, public and/or societal organisations. In 2009, Professor Kolk received the prestigious EABIS/Aspen Institute Faculty Pioneer European Award (Lifetime Achievement Award), which recognises exceptional faculty who are leaders in integrating environmental and social issues into their research and teaching both on- and off-campus.



Triggered by the many actual partnership activities by organisations in the past fifteen years, both researchers and practitioners have accumulated much knowledge. Most of the shared insights have focused on the partnering organisations and on the societal dimensions of partnerships, the so-called meso and macro levels. Much less attention has been paid to the individuals involved in the partnerships (the micro level), how their actions and interactions can help ‘spread the word’ about cross-sector collaboration, and how this ‘trickles’ from one person to the other, inside and/or outside the partnering organisations.¹ As shown in Figure 1, social interactions about partnerships may take place between managers, employees and peers in one organisation, and/or with colleagues in the partner organisation,

as advocates of organisations’ partnership initiatives highlights the importance of the role of individual involvement in improving relations internally and externally, towards a range of stakeholders. Interestingly, marketing research has shown employees’ positive work-related views to spill over to customers, and we found similar indications for specifically partnerships in our own studies. Such trickle effects vis-à-vis customers may in turn lead to reputation benefits, higher loyalty or even willingness to pay, and thus profit the partnering organisation(s).

The value of trickle effects

The example shows that these individual interactions are potentially very powerful ways of realising further ‘impact’ of partnerships, which organisations may seek




Figure 1. Micro-level interactions in the context of partnering organisations

as well as with customers and others external to the partnering organisations – including family, friends and acquaintances.

‘Spreading the word’ can be literal, by telling enthusiastically about the partnerships to somebody else, but also more implicitly/indirectly. For example, if employees learn specific skills by volunteering, feel better about themselves, their work or the organisation as a result of their activities or the partnership, or if job satisfaction increases (or absenteeism decreases), these effects may also filter through to others. Recognising employees

to influence to a maximum effect. However, we need to first understand better to what extent and how trickle effects occur, for them to be subsequently shaped and used in a positive way for organisations and society. The quest for more insight into the phenomenon has inspired our research, and also the plea in this piece. Our studies on consumers have thus far been field experiments that we want to extend to actual organisations and their employees, managers and/or customers. Especially larger-scale surveys but also interviews further our understanding and thus add real value for both the practice and theory of cross-sector collaboration. This is

therefore an open invitation to organisations interested in participating in research on partnership activities and trickle effects. I will give an example of a recent case study below, and subsequently offer reflections on the partnership 'field' and possible areas for further research, discussing the link to and relevance for practice.

The case-study drew on interviews with employees from three multinational companies in different sectors that have been very active with partnerships.² It aimed to obtain more insight into different types of trickle effects: from managers to employees, from employees to managers, between employees, and from employees to people outside the organisation, including customers, family or friends. Our findings suggest that the likelihood that the word about partnerships is spread through these trickle effects depends on the specific characteristics of the activity. The *support structure*, the *scope of employee engagement* and the *level of fit with core business* seem particularly important in this regard. While this needs further investigation in more organisations with larger number of respondents, our exploratory study already has practical implications allowing managers to carefully plan their partnership activities in alignment with the desired effects, which I will briefly indicate next.

First, while we did not find that employees need to be motivated by higher management to participate in partnership activities, they expect organisational resources and support structures. These are aspects that organisations should be able to arrange before starting their cross-sector collaboration, by providing financial and managerial backing, and ensuring good communication and integration into 'regular' work. Similarly, the higher the level of employees' involvement in the partnership, the more likely they seem to act as a reputational shield vis-à-vis peers. To realise this potential, the facilitation of information provision and own employee initiatives, the organisation of specific internal partnership-related activities with opportunities for participation, and designated time allocation are recommended. Finally, a high level of fit between the company's core business and the (non-profit) cause and, likewise, congruence with employees' skills/knowledge, increases the willingness of customer-facing employees to advocate the partnership among clients. This is an extra argument for ensuring that fit between partners is taken into account when concluding a partnership.³

Dilemmas of partnerships in practice – and implications for research

However, 'fit' appears to be a little more complex than often assumed. Our interviewees mentioned that customers often attach more value to other issues than those covered by a specific partnership. For example, corporate clients may have their own environmental and/or social priorities and expect concomitant things from their suppliers in tenders. Thus, fit as perceived by and within a partnering organisation may not be the same as what is expected or seen as such by others. For trickle effects to be realised externally, for example towards customers, their fit perspective should be taken into account as well, which may not be so easy, also because of the multitude of stakeholders that have a range of perceptions, expectations and interests.

Relatedly, there is also the question of what to communicate exactly about partnerships, if at all, to external stakeholders. Respondents in our study expressed very different views. Some mentioned the value of good communication about a specific partnership as this could be a real differentiation vis-à-vis competitors, breed loyalty, help improve the corporate image and thus benefit relationships and eventually even performance. Others, however, emphasised that it was better to do things first, rather than talk about them, avoid boasting as that could easily backfire, and pointed at the risk of being accused of 'greenwashing' (or 'bluwashing'). This latter consideration had incited several organisations to adopt a policy of not communicating (widely) about their partnerships. The interviews underlined that quite some organisations are struggling with this issue as well.

One of the factors contributing to the complexity is that organisations usually have more than one partnership and also carry out other types of CSR activities that aim to contribute to the social good. Already in my own research on partnerships in different realms (e.g. those addressing climate change, various dimensions of poverty, human rights issues) and in a variety of institutional contexts (developing-emerging-least developed countries, and fragile states) I have come across many organisations with a rather full portfolio altogether. Even when taking just one country and social issues only, we found organisations that had different

types of partnerships, ranging from philanthropic to transformative, let alone when including all topics and locations in which they operate.⁴ The multitude of collaborative activities complicates matters considerably: not only for practitioners but also for researchers.

Studies often do not draw a clear line between a specific organisation, its partner organisation in one specific partnership, its activities in the framework of this partnership, and other activities or even the full portfolio of an organisation. This makes it difficult to assess (perceived) effects of a partnership as stakeholders may have been confronted with an organisation in very different ways, from different perspectives (e.g. as consumer, employee, citizen, shareholder) and regarding more than one partnership or CSR activity. And if we consider, for example, fit, value creation, outcomes, drivers or boundary conditions, which unit should be the exact focus? Does e.g. internal value creation⁵ cover only one organisation or also the partner organisation(s) in one partnership, or all of them? Depending on the entity, conclusions may be very different.

Without pretending to 'solve' the problem this way, it may be useful to distinguish the different entities involved in the partnership realm as suggested in Table 1, with, for each, applicable types and examples of topics of study (further explanation is available on request; I also refer to my publications referenced in the endnotes to this piece). Distinguishing four entities and their separate dimensions might help further research as well as the practice of partnerships, given the specific attention to the focal organisation and its perspective.

From practice to research and from research to practice

In my view, partnership research has been phenomenon-driven, with its emergence inspired by the occurrence of cross-sector collaboration in practice. This means that not theory gaps as such have pushed its development, but rather the desire to understand and explain the 'real-world' phenomenon through theorisation, thus generating insights leading to new theoretical work while also informing the practice of partnering. For

Table 1. Possible units of analysis in the partnership field

Entity	Types/categorizations	Examples of topics of study
One focal organization	• Actor: Firm, NGO, community-based organization, government agency • Degree to which collaboration is strategic/linked to core activities: donation/resource transfer; transaction-focused, integrated	• Value creation for the organization (most often the firm given focus of business research) • (Inter)actions of individuals within the focal organization
One partnership (in which focal organization participates)	• Based on partnership type: philanthropic, transactional, engagement, or transformative • Based on actor composition: business-nonprofit, business-government, tripartite, or quadripartite partnership	• (Inter)actions with individuals in the other organization • Degree of fit between partners on the range of dimensions
Multiple partnerships (in which focal organization participates)	• Based on issue covered: e.g. climate change, health, poverty; or with social, environmental and/or economic focus	• Portfolio of partnerships and networks of partners of focal organization • Individuals' perceptions of focal organization in relation to portfolio
"Society" (external to partner organization(s)/ partnership)	• Distinguishing different countries of operation /activity • Different types of countries/institutions: developing, emerging, least-developed countries; or based on institutional peculiarities (e.g. income, equality, fragility, human development) • Different geographical levels: local, national, regional, international	• Implications for those outside the partnering organizations/partnerships: • Outcome (for individuals) • Output (for groups of beneficiaries or other organizations) • Impact (economy/society-wide, democracy, governance etc.) • Determinants of effectiveness

such a mechanism to function optimally, however, good data about organisations and partnerships are needed, not only from external, public sources but also from internal ones. Good insight into trickle effects, for example, can only be obtained through information provided by organisations themselves and/or access to customers and their perceptions. Over the years we have met many practitioners highly interested in participating in our trickle research to help generate or collect these types of information, but organisations frequently had difficulty committing in the end for various reasons.

For example, at the start of our research project, we obtained full collaboration to study a new business-nonprofit partnership and all its dimensions longitudinally. However, despite the firm's signature on the contract with the NGO, only the payment worked out, nothing else did. On the basis of our exchanges with them, a disconnect between the firm's US headquarters and its European location seemed to have been a major barrier in the partnership's actual implementation – and this impeded a promising study. In subsequent years, several other organisations expressed their willingness to collaborate in partnership surveys (including employees and even customers), sometimes even as input for their own reviews. So far this has not worked out for various reasons, often very plausible given reorganisations and job losses in the context of the economic recession, new owners after take-overs and sometimes a change of course by the organisation. We have also had situations in which the CSR manager (or HR department) committed to participation without sufficient organisational support, or lack of resources was mentioned (even though we did not ask for that at all).

Still, in quite some cases interviews were possible, but then anonymity was asked for. Not only, understandably, by individuals who spoke openly about managers and colleagues, but also for the firm itself. We found that somewhat remarkable as organisations engaged in partnerships to show pro-activeness and societal engagement, and findings were not 'negative' in any sense but merely exposed complexities that would be very helpful for other organisations as well. Although anonymity can be guaranteed, it is a pity to some extent, as it then becomes less easy to share full organisation-specific factors and the contextualisation that are crucial for furthering our understanding. The more insight that can be obtained into these factors, the better it can inform both the theory and practice of partnerships. Needless to say perhaps that reviewers sometimes had difficulty appreciating the limitations that we faced as researchers. While not fully unique to the partnership field, these are issues that deserve more attention as there seems to be a mismatch here that impinges on our ability to produce impactful output in highly-ranked journals with clear relevance to practice. | ARSP |

References

- ¹For more details and a generic overview on partnerships, see **Kolk, A.** (2014). Partnerships as panacea for addressing global problems? On rationale, context, actors, impact and limitations. In M. Seitanidi & A. Crane (Eds.), *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 15-43, from which Figure 1 is derived. Our work on trickle effects is reported in more detail in the following publications: **Kolk, A., Van Dolen, W. & Vock, M.** (2010). Trickle effects of cross-sector social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, (Supplement 1), 123-137; **Kolk, A., Vock, M. & Van Dolen, W.** (forthcoming). Microfoundations of partnerships: Exploring the role of employees in trickle effects. *Journal of Business Ethics*; **Vock, M., Van Dolen, W. & Kolk, A.** (2013). Changing behaviour through business-nonprofit collaboration? Consumer responses to social alliances. *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(9), 1476-1503; **Vock, M., Van Dolen, W. & Kolk, A.** (2014). Micro-level interactions in business-nonprofit partnerships. *Business & Society*, 53(4), 517-550.
- ²**Kolk et al.** (forthcoming), op.cit. Available online at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2304890 and http://www.researchgate.net/publication/253644554_Microfoundations_of_partnerships_Exploring_the_role_of_employees_in_trickle_effects?ev=prf_pub
- ³For an early piece on the importance of fit to prevent predictable problems in partnerships, see **I.E. Berger, P.H. Cunningham & M.E. Drumwright** (2004). Social alliances: Company/nonprofit collaboration. *California Management Review*, 47(1), 58-90.
- ⁴**A. Kolk & F. Lenfant** (2012). Business-NGO collaboration in a conflict setting: Partnership activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *Business & Society*, 51(3), 478-511. See also **A. Kolk** (2014). High-stakes partnerships: Lessons from difficult settings, Though leaders piece, Network for Business Sustainability, <http://nbs.net/high-stakes-partnerships-lessons-from-difficult-settings/>
- ⁵As used, e.g., in **J. Austin & M. Seitanidi** (2012). Collaborative value creation: A review of partnering between nonprofits and business. Part 2: Partnership processes and outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(6), 929-968.

SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIPS

SECTION



Sustainability Partnerships Section Editorial	54
Featured Research Project.....	56
Featured Sustainability Partnerships.....	59



by Dr. Pieter Glasbergen

Honorary Professor, Governance for Sustainable Development, Maastricht University-ICIS; Emeritus Professor, Environmental Policy, Utrecht University and Open University.



by Dr. Amelia Clarke

Assistant Professor of Sustainability Strategies, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development, University of Waterloo.



by Dr. Adolf Acquaye

Lecturer in Sustainability, Kent Business School, University of Kent.

Sustainability Partnerships as Change Agents for Systemic Change

The Sustainability Partnerships Section is a new addition to ARSP. Our intent is to feature innovative research projects about sustainability partnerships and highlight specific cross-sector sustainability partnerships. In this issue, we present a large research project on complex environmental issues with Dr. Haiying Lin as the Principal Investigator. Dr. Greetje Schouten provides an update on The Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, and Angharad Evans gives a company perspective on a cross-sector project on sustainable supply chains. Since this is our first editorial, we also want to start by presenting our views on the partnership paradigm as a solution to unsustainable development.

In the last 20 years the partnership paradigm¹ has been institutionalized with organisations seeking promising arrangements that can advance the process of progressive change, such as meeting sustainable development goals. It is now accepted that businesses and NGOs can fruitfully collaborate to improve corporate sustainability efforts. Indeed, in the contemporary business environment, almost all multinationals organisations are involved in partnerships. It has also been accepted that governments and international organizations can improve their work for the common good by making alliances with businesses and NGOs. For instance, almost all



United Nations institutions have partnership incorporated in the implementation of their programs. Moreover, partnerships between Northern and Southern civil societies and business actors have become an essential part of the development aid process.


Research on social partnerships has reflected on and contributed to this change. Attention has been given to the factors that improve the ability of partners from different spheres of society to collaborate. Consultancy research has produced numerous lists with advice on what to do or not to do. Academic research has also informed us on a higher level of abstraction. The role of trust, collaborative advantage, leadership, structure, and their interrelationships are good examples of these issues. Attention has also been given to partnerships as tools in the process of societal change; for example research on factors influencing the impacts of partnerships and what makes them successful as agents of societal change.

However, most research is still focused on single partnerships or several similar partnerships in an issue area. In our view, a next step should focus on the partnership phenomena as an agent for systemic change. This approach connects to the worries that are also expressed about the institutionalization of the partnership paradigm. Partnerships seem to be an expression of the neo-liberal trend in the world, which means that they are developed in an ad hoc manner. As such, they do not address the systemic factors underlying unsustainable development, and thus realize mainly incremental improvements. A systemic approach could identify the desired sustainability goal and look at partnerships as only one factor in a process of change. Partnerships will not change the world, but they can act as the mechanism to help bring about positive improvements in combination with other approaches, be it commercial activities, educational efforts or government policies. It is interesting to note that such a systemic approach to change is already taken up in practice.

Researchers could look to systemic efforts - such as large community-wide sustainability partnerships, the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement, the ISEAL Alliance (the global association for sustainability standards), or the UN Forum on Sustainability Standards (an initiative to review voluntary sustainability standards as tools for achieving sustainable development goals)- to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the partnership paradigm as a means of helping transition society to function within ecological limits. | ARSP |



A Platform of International Dialogue
on Voluntary Sustainability Standards



In our view,
a next step
should
focus on the
partnership
phenomena
as an agent
for systemic
change.

References

- ¹ **Clarke, A., & Erfan, A.** 2007. Regional Sustainability Strategies: A Comparison of Eight Canadian Approaches. Plan Canada, 47(3), 15-18.
- Glasbergen, P.** 2007. Setting the Scene: the Partnership Paradigm in the Making. In **P. Glasbergen, F. Biermann & A. P. J. Mol (Eds.),** Partnerships, Governance and Sustainable Development. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar



by Dr. Haiying Lin

Principle Investigator and Research Team Leader; Assistant Professor, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development, University of Waterloo.

Cross-sector Solutions to Complex Environmental Issues

Funding Source and Duration

Funding: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Government of Canada

Duration: 2012-2017

Funding Received:

\$424,014

In this section, we feature an on-going, large, 5-year, international and externally funded academic research project on the emergence, evolution, characteristics and processes of cross-sector partnerships in Canada and the U.S.

Since the 1990s, firms have increasingly collaborated with governments, non-government organizations (NGOs), and universities to tackle a myriad of complex social, economic and environmental issues. Notable examples include climate change, energy and natural resource conservation, and supply chain management. Such partnerships work at the intersection of markets and regulations and bring about social and environmental changes not achievable by either partner working alone.



Research Foci

This SSHRC grant allows us to enhance the theoretical understanding of, and generate practical solutions for, pressing environmental issues by investigating:

- The configurational, temporal and geographical characteristics of cross-sector partnerships used to address complex environmental issues;
- The emergence and evolution of cross-sector partnerships in response to such issues (including determinants and dynamics, both in Canada and the US);
- The processes by which cross-sector partnerships adapt and partners morph as the issues they came together to address change over time.

Research Design

Phase 1 of this research began with a retrospective longitudinal research design that combined thirty years of data on management of environmental issues by large firms, with archival sources on cross-sector alliances formed during this time frame. During Phase 1, Dr. Lin trained six research assistants in the summer of 2012 to specifically collect archival data from five key

databases: Thomson SDC Platinum, The National Bureau of Economic Research database, Compustat, KLD, and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office database. The research team has completed the first-stage archival data collection and has derived a sample of 900 U.S. firms' participation in 1161 environmental alliances from 1985 to 2013. In addition, the team is finalizing the collection of social-mission related alliance data in the US and Canada.

Phase 2 of this project started in the Fall of 2013 and focused on exploring how cross-sector alliances emerge and evolve (i.e., determinants and dynamics). The team will complete six in-depth case studies (three in Canada and three in the US). The unique dataset of 6 cross-sector alliances and the longitudinal dataset we have built will allow us to explore the dynamics and evolution of cross-sector partnerships. While Phase 2 proceeds, we have combined our efforts with other global research teams that share similar research interests. Dr. Lin and Dr. Doh are sitting in the Environmental NGO-Corporate Partnership Taskforce funded by the Pacific Basin Research Center in the U.S. We aim to work together with the taskforce to disseminate critical research findings and design more in-depth researches tailoring to the needs of the practitioners.

Early Findings

The research builds on the dissertation work of the principal investigator Dr. Lin. Since obtaining the grant



CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:

Dr. Oana Branzei

*Associate Professor,
Western University.*



TEAM MEMBER:

Dr. Jonathan Doh

*Associate Professor,
University of Villanova.*



TEAM MEMBER:

Dr. Miguel Rivera-Santos

*Associate Professor,
Babson College.*



TEAM MEMBER:

Dr. David Graham Hyatt

*Clinical Assistant
Professor, University
of Arkansas.*



TEAM MEMBER:

Bob Oliver

*Chief Executive Officer
at Pollution Probe.*



in 2012, Dr. Lin has published four journal papers and one book associated with this project. These projects investigated why firms form environmental partnerships, which sectors are involved, and what are the partnership outcomes. Recent team output is related to the Large N archival data compilation in Phase 1. The strong longitudinal database we built has allowed the team to develop four conference papers (abstracts) and three manuscripts targeting top management outlets. These papers explain partnership (especially cross-sector partnership) as a change vehicle that brings unprecedented social value and impactful environmental outcomes. During Phase 2, Dr. Branzei led a cross-sector partnership case study on “WWF’s Living Planet @ Work: Championed by HP” (IVEY publishing). She presented it at Administrative Science Association of Canada (ASAC), led a practitioner outreach session in Toronto, Canada and organized a Professional Development Workshop at Academy of Management to enhance practitioner outreach.



Challenges and Opportunities

Since the SDC alliance database has limited cross-sector partnership coverage, the team has had to conduct an additional web-based archival search to collect more information about cross-sector partnerships. Extant partnership studies tend to use a qualitative case study method, while quantitative studies with a large N sample are rare. Our use of mixed method research that combines the benefits of large N studies with those of rich case studies can overcome some of the methodological obstacles. Our goal at this stage is to collaborate with distinguished scholars in the field to build a global team for impactful partnership research.

Outcomes and Impacts

We build theory from qualitative data and test grounded propositions using secondary data and longitudinal designs. We ask how cross-sector partnerships can create social value that either partner alone could not achieve; when these cross-sector partnerships may fail to create social value; and explore configurational, temporal and geographical contingencies to social value creation. | ARSP |

For More Information <https://uwaterloo.ca/school-environment-enterprise-development/research-at-seed/social-innovation/cross-sector-solutions-complex-environmental-issues>

References

- Antadze, N., Lin, H., & Branzei, O.** 2014. A Process Model of Convening for Social Change: How ENGOS (Re)build Civic Capital. Presented at the 2014 Cross-Sector Social Interactions Symposium, Boston. Winner: Routledge Best Paper Award in Social Partnerships.
- Branzei, O., Lin, H., & Chakravarty, D.** 2014. WWF’s Living Planet @ WORK: Championed by HP. IVEY teaching case
- Lin, H.** 2014. Resource Dependent View of Public-Private Partnership Formation for Environmental Improvements. *Organization and Environment*, forthcoming
- Lin, H., & Darnall, N.** 2014. Strategic Alliance Formation and Structural Configuration. *Journal of Business Ethics*. doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2053-7
- Lin, H. & Stadtler, L.** 2014. Partnerships as a Vehicle for Systemic Change. ASAC-Administrative Sciences Association of Canada 2014 Best Paper Proceedings.
- Lin, H.** 2013. Strategic Alliances for Environmental Improvements. Scholars’ Press. Saarbrücken, Germany
- Lin, H.** 2012a. Cross-sector Alliances for Corporate Social Responsibility: Partner Heterogeneity Moderates Environmental Strategy Outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110, 219-229. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1423-2
- Lin, H.** 2012b. Strategic Alliances for Environmental Improvements. *Business & Society*, 51, 335-348.



by Dr. Greetje Schouten

Postdoctoral Researcher, Knowledge Technology & Innovation Group and Public Administration & Policy Group, Wageningen University.

RSPO

Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil

The Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)

To address the severe sustainability issues in the palm oil industry, WWF-Switzerland started in the early 2000s to explore the possibility of a private sector partnership for setting a standard for sustainable palm oil. In 2002, a group of retailers, food manufacturers, palm oil processors and traders, financial institutions and WWF-Switzerland came together in London and agreed on the objective of promoting sustainable palm oil, which led to the establishment of RSPO (www.rspo.org).

Motivation for the Partnership

Through a series of multi-stakeholder working groups based on consensus, members of the RSPO spent several years designing Principles and Criteria (P&C) for sustainable palm oil production, a verification and certification process, and mechanisms for supply chain traceability and tradable credits. In 2005, the P&C were ratified by the RSPO members. The first certified sustainable palm oil became available in November 2008. The main aim of the RSPO is to 'transform markets to make sustainable palm oil the norm'.

Working Structure of the Partnership

The RSPO currently counts over 1000 members and represents approximately 40% of global palm oil production and the majority of upstream food manufacturers in the supply chain. Currently 17% of global palm oil production is certified under RSPO. RSPO members are divided into several membership categories: Oil Palm Growers; Palm Oil Processors and/or Traders; Consumer Goods Manufacturers; Retailers; Banks and Investors; Environmental/Nature Conservation NGOs; Social/Developmental NGOs; and Affiliate members. This last category of affiliate members does not have decision-making power or voting rights within the RSPO. The General Assembly is the highest decision-making body of the RSPO, where all members have one vote and decision-making occurs by majority voting.

Challenges

Throughout the history of the RSPO the organization has faced opposition, mainly by environmental NGOs, including Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth. In 2008 an NGO published the 'International Declaration Against the 'Greenwashing' of Palm Oil by the Roundtable on



Throughout the history of the RSPO the organization has faced opposition, mainly by environmental NGOs, including Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth.

Sustainable Palm Oil, which was signed by over 250 organizations worldwide. During the course of the partnering process the opposition against the RSPO decreased, mainly because the opposition clearly influenced the RSPO process. While Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth are still not members of the RSPO, they do visit RSPO conferences and are sometimes involved in the process on an ad hoc basis.

Although the RSPO presents a sophisticated governance arrangement, it is extremely challenging for this partnership to transform a whole sector in the context of a 'free' market. There are many markets that do not demand certified products, for example those of major importing countries like Pakistan and China. Moreover, the RSPO is a Western initiative and is conceived by some audiences as a neo-colonialist attempts to exert influence in producing countries. Consequently, the RSPO has triggered new developments in the issue field. Both the Indonesian and Malaysian governments have now formulated their own national standards for sustainable palm oil. These standards are based on national laws and regulations related to the production and are, in contrast to RSPO certification, mandatory. | [ARSP](#) |



by Angharad Evans

*Transformation Lead – Project SCALE,
DHL Agri-Food, UK.*

Project SCALE - Innovation in Sustainable Supply Chains

SCALE (www.projectscales.eu) is Step Change in Agri-food Logistics Ecosystems, a project focused on creating an environment that optimises economic competitiveness, whilst reducing negative environmental and social impacts. It is a three-year part funded project from 2013-2015 that brings together the expertise of five different organisations from the food & drink and supply chain industries to deliver research and pilots on sustainable supply chains in North West Europe. The project is partially funded by INTERREG IWB, providing funding as part of the European Commission's Social Cohesion Policy.



SCALE consists of three Universities: Artois (France), Cranfield (UK) and Wageningen (Netherlands), and two private companies: European Food and Farming Partnership (EFFP) and DHL Supply Chain. The project was originally thought of in several parts, with the various individuals wanting to do something different, such as work with other businesses to achieve goals around sustainability, innovation and collaboration. Through a collaborative network between the partners and the project - both researching pertinent topics and testing the outcomes in three live pilots across Europe - a successful joint project was developed.

While it is more common for academic institutions to apply for funding, for DHL and EFFP it was the opportunity to work with thought leaders from top institutions and try a new approach towards product development.

Motivation for the Partnership

While it is more common for academic institutions to apply for funding, for DHL and EFFP it was the opportunity to work with thought leaders from top institutions and try a new approach towards product development. For both organisations, sustainability and collaboration are driving the needs of our customer base and it is important to not only be informed, but be part of that process that defines a way through the complex nature of these needs.

Working Structure

The structural side of SCALE has Cranfield as the Project Lead and DHL, EFFP, Artois and Wageningen as partners. However, in reality the partnership is less hierarchical and more focused on specific work streams in which

the areas of expertise come to the fore. The partnership will deliver a set of tools and frameworks for the food sector to enable them to make changes to operational practices in order to improve the efficiency, visibility and sustainability of food logistics. Bringing an innovative approach to measure food and drink supply chain performance, combined with a collaborative framework to drive behaviours and an ICT platform, we are piloting SCALE's outputs with organisations across North West Europe to enable a transformation to take place.

Challenges

Learning to work together has been a journey. There are different pressures from the academic and research teams to customer priorities and Pan-European locations; all of which made alignment at the beginning a challenge. The partners have learned to embrace the differences, utilise technology, and value the opportunities to see different methods of working and different methods of working and communicating.

Over the course of 2014 the project will test the tools and frameworks that are being developed. The project hopes to deliver opportunities for businesses to adopt a collaborative approach in their supply chain and optimise their social and environmental business practices so that they can benefit from synergies that will drive better business performance across the triple bottom line. We understand that businesses need tools to help them make the decisions that balance financial drivers with environmental and social considerations. Through this collaborative effort, the partnership aims to make this process and the journey to sustainability easier. While SCALE has created a formal relationship between the five organisations, the value of each partner is immense and there is no doubt that the partners will seek to continue working together on customer projects long after the funding. | [A.R.S.P](#) |



PRAXIS

SECTION



Praxis Editorial	63
Practitioner Contributions	64
Events	73



by Jessica Mankowski

Acting Manager, Knowledge Translation Strategy, Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Bridging the theory-practice divide

A warm welcome to all our readers in the new ARSP Praxis Section! This is not just a name change of our previous Events Section. It is much more: broadening significantly the section's scope and allowing the incorporation of a range of initiatives and activities to help bridge the theory-practice divide in the field of cross sector social interactions. The section will identify opportunities to build capacity for evidence-informed practice through innovative practitioner contributions and interviews, as well as highlighting events and providing reports on CSSI conferences and partnership related sessions.

We also welcome the new associate editors that have joined the ARSP Praxis Section: Julia Diaz (Universidad de los Andes School of Management-Bogotá, Colombia), Lamberto Zollo (University of Florence-Italy) and Adriana Reynaga (Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales UNAM-Mexico), previously associate editor with the ARSP Community Section. They enable the section to cover a wider geographic area to bring you improved content from across the world. With our ARSP colleagues we have collected a number of upcoming events and reviews of past events to offer you reviews of past events that offer participant insights. You'll note the wide variety of themes, fields and priorities, including some events focused on children's rights, cybernetics and systems thinking, and the environmental health of cities. I am consistently amazed by the variety of places where cross-sector partnerships are emerging as a new, or renewed, focus. Working with non-traditional partners to tackle the challenges that matter in our world continues to present many complications and opportunities, as demonstrated by the increasing attention to the theory and practice of cross-sector partnerships.

In addition to the name change, the Praxis Section presents a new sub-section on 'Lessons from Partnership Practice' from the partnership world. In this edition we hear from Dr. Stuart Reid of the 'The Partnering Initiative' (TPI) and Stella Pfisterer of 'The Partnerships Resource Centre'; Estelle Cloete of the Western Cape Economic Development Partnership; and Ms. Judith Irwin, Senior Ethics Officer at Network Rail. As an international publication, their contributions support our efforts to hear from partnership managers, brokers, and facilitators from around the world. In addition, we present a participant account of the 2013 Business of Social and Environmental Innovation Conference (BSEI), South Africa's international recurring conference with a strong emphasis on the role of cross sector collaboration.

By the time this edition goes to publication, the 4th International Cross-Sector Social Interactions Symposium (CSSI) will have wrapped up. CSSI is a biennial conference connected to the ARSP and its readership. At the end of the section you will find an overview, along with plenty of pictures, from this year's event in Boston to provide a sense of what was discussed, who was there, and to entice you to participate in the 2016 CSSI in Toronto, Canada..

If you would like to let us know of a collaboration focused event for next year's ARSP, or write a brief review of an event you plan on attending, your contributions would be most welcome. We strongly encourage practitioners and partnership organizers to share their experiences "from the field" with the international readership of the ARSP. Please send upcoming event announcements, calls for papers, practitioner contributions ideas, or requests related to submitting or suggesting a review to me at jessica.mankowski@gmail.com | [ARSP](#) |



by Dr. Stuart Reid

Board Trustee, The Partnering Initiative.



by Stella Pfisterer

Research Associate, The Partnerships Resource Centre.

Better Partnerships through Better Agreements: the Partnering Agreement Scorecard

At some point in virtually every cross-sector partnership the partners will write and sign an agreement. This might be a very simple letter of intent stating their mutual commitment to work together; it might be a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) articulating the vision and aspirations of the partnership; it might be a more detailed contractual document setting out the terms of the collaboration and the procedures by which it will operate. Little focused study has been made to date either of the nature of partnership agreements or of their impact on the subsequent functioning of the partnership itself. Yet our knowledge of partnership good practice and the experience of practitioners¹ suggest the hypothesis that the quality of a partnership agreement will have an impact on the quality of the subsequent collaboration.



Support for this hypothesis emerges from practice-based observation as well as theoretical analysis. Consultancy work by The Partnering Initiative with a range of international bodies² has revealed that organisations often engage in partnerships without any systematic approach to creating partnership agreements. The result is a proliferation of agreements which lack an overall guiding logic and which may or may not be appropriate for the partnerships they govern. This realisation has prompted a number of exercises designed to analyse organisations' partnerships in terms of the nature and function of the agreements created to define them³. At the same time work by The Partnerships Resource Centre has demonstrated the value of mapping the type of partnerships in which organisations engage,

The result is a proliferation of agreements which lack an overall guiding logic and which may or may not be appropriate for the partnerships they govern.

producing a partnership portfolio analysis⁴. Bringing together these approaches highlights the need for a much more analytical, systematic and strategic approach to the creation and use of partnership agreements: the content of an agreement should reflect and enable the objectives of the partnership.

Consequently, the authors have collaborated on a study of the range of potential issues that can be covered by partnership agreements. By linking insights from contract theory in the context of business alliances⁵ with current knowledge on design features of cross-sector partnerships from theory⁶ and practice⁷ a tool has been produced that can be used either to guide the creation of new partnership agreements or to review existing agreements and enhance their relevance and value. The resulting tool is the *Partnering Agreement Scorecard* (PAS) which will be launched by The Partnering Initiative and The Partnerships Resource Centre in Autumn 2014.

Central to our approach has been the assumption that partnership agreements should reflect the transformational dimension of cross-sector interaction as well as the transactional elements covered in a conventional contract. Successful partnerships go well beyond the transactional exchange of resources and create value through the complementarity of the partners and their willingness to use that complementarity to generate innovative solutions to shared problems. Partnership agreements can not only express this transformational potential but can also be a valuable mechanism through which that potential is realised. The PAS has been produced to provide a framework within which partners can create agreements which articulate the full range of aspirations, goals and interactions envisaged by the partners.

Adopting a more ambitious approach to partnership agreements is long overdue in the field of cross-sector collaboration. One of the authors used a pilot version of the PAS to analyse agreements of 23 partnership projects facilitated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. The partnerships under review presented a complex set of partnering documents including grant agreements and collaborative agreements such as partnership MoUs⁸. Analysis showed that even the more collaborative agreements hardly mentioned relational elements such as whether the partnership developed a relationship management protocol, decided on what happens when the partnership was finalized or whether a review procedure on the relationship was incorporated in the partnership. This example reinforces the value that practitioner experience from the field can contribute by offering new insights: too few organizations are producing agreements which become a supportive framework for navigating productive collaborative interactions between partners.

The two main uses of the PAS are developmental and evaluative. As a developmental tool the PAS offers partners an extensive guide to topics that they might wish to include in any agreement. It comprises seven main categories of essential elements. These categories are further split in 28 sub-categories, each including prompting questions which allow partners to reflect on whether (and to what extent) these specific partnership



principles need to be present in their agreement. When partners work together to create an initial agreement the PAS will help to raise issues that might otherwise be overlooked; it will enable partners to articulate their aspirations for the collaboration and clarify the nature of their commitment; it will require partners to consider some of the more difficult challenges – such as what to do when conflict arises.

The output of the scoring system is twofold: it provides an indication of the balance of the agreement in terms of the attention devoted to different elements; it produces an overall score so that different agreements can be compared or changes in an agreement can be reviewed over time.

As an evaluative tool the PAS allows organisations – separately or jointly with their partners – to review existing agreements and to assess whether those agreements are fit-for-purpose: whether they cover the full range of issues relevant to the partnership and, in doing so, provide a clear framework for the collaboration. Using the main and subsidiary categories users can assign a score to each element based on the level of specificity with which each element is addressed in the agreement. The output of the scoring system is twofold: it provides an indication of the balance of the agreement in terms of the attention devoted to different elements; it produces an overall score so that different agreements can be compared or changes in an agreement can be reviewed over time.

The PAS tool is the tangible outcome of collaboration between academic theory and practitioner observation. The hope is that it will become widely used by organisations across all sectors in the preparation and review of their partnership agreements and that it will bring a higher degree of reflection and analysis into the preparation of partnership agreements, which should result in better agreements and better partnerships. Use of the PAS in real-life situations will test its practicality and could highlight aspects of the tool that might be revised and improved. The authors welcome opportunities to work with practitioner organisations and with other researchers to further explore the relevance and application of the PAS. | ARSP |

References

- ¹**Evans, B., McMohan, J. & Caplan, K.** 2004. *Structuring Partnership Agreements in Water and Sanitation in Low Income Communities*. Building Partnerships for Development: London.
- ²Including **UN World Food Programme (WFP); The Better Cotton Initiative(BCI); and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).**
- ³**World Food Programme 2012.** *From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Working in Partnership: A Strategic Evaluation*. The World Food Programme: Rome.
- ⁴**The Partnerships Resource Centre** 2011b. *The State of Partnerships Report NGOs 2011*. Partnerships Resource Centre: Rotterdam.
- ⁵**Schepker et al.** 2014; **Mellewight et al.** 2012.
- ⁶**Bryson, J.M., Crosby, B.C. & Middleton Stone, M.** 2006. *The design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature*. *Public Administration Review*, 66: Issue Supplement, 44-55.
- ⁷**Evans et al.** 2004; **Tennyson** 2012.
- ⁸**Pfisterer, S.** Cross-sector partnership agreements – a functional perspective. Unpublished manuscript.
- Austin, J.E., Seitanidi, M.M.** 2012. Collaborative value Creation: A Review of Partnering between Nonprofits and Businesses. Part 2: Partnership Processes and Outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41:6, 929-968.
- Brinkerhoff, J.M.** 2002. *Partnership for International Development. Rhetoric or Result?* Lynne Rienner Publishers: London.
- Mellewight, T., Decker, J.D.C. & Eckhard, B.** 2012. What drives contract design in alliances? Taking stock and how to proceed. *Zeitschrift fuer Betriebswirtschaft*, 82:7, 120-140.
- Schepker, D.J., Oh, W., Martynov, A. & Poppo, L.** 2014. The Many Futures of Contracts: Moving Beyond Structure and Safeguarding to Coordination and Adaptation. *Journal of Management*, 40:1, 193-225.
- Tennyson, R.** 2009. *The Partnering Toolkit*. 2nd Edition. The Partnering Initiative: Oxford.
- The Partnerships Resource Centre** 2011a. *The State of Partnerships Report 2010*. Partnerships Resource Centre: Rotterdam.



by Estelle Cloete

*Programme Facilitator at the Western
Cape Economic Development
Partnership, Cape Town, South Africa.*

The Western Cape Economic Development Partnership: A Collaborative Intermediary Organisation

The Western Cape Economic Development Partnership (EDP) was established in 2012 to facilitate cross-sector (government, private sector, civil society) partnerships in order to strengthen the regional economic development system. The Western Cape is a province in South Africa with Cape Town as its regional capital.

Although funded by all three spheres of government in South Africa, the EDP is purposefully not set up as a traditional government economic development agency, but rather as an independent collaborative intermediary organisation. This is based on the need to create safe in-between spaces for the creativity, experimentation and innovation necessary to steer and guide a difficult economic transition. The EDP's mandate therefore is to create and sustain partnerships between economic stakeholders in the Western Cape economic development system to foster a more competitive, inclusive and resilient regional economy. The EDP builds various types of partnerships, including transversal (across silos), inter-governmental, cross-boundary and cross-sector partnerships, aimed particularly at where there is a possible collaboration deficit in the regional economic system. The EDP facilitates dialogue and leadership partnerships as well as implementation partnerships, often in a hybrid format.



A collaborative approach to economic development

As Greg Clark of *The Business of Cities* points out, unlike other traditional functions of government (such as representation, regulation, and service delivery), economic development is a vision-driven activity that seeks to 'assess comparative and competitive strengths and opportunities, define a path into the future and shape the behaviour of other actors, most of whom are not in the control of governments and public bodies'. It is highly desirable therefore that 'economic development is orchestrated as a partnership activity between public, private, and institutional sectors, with substantial vertical and horizontal collaboration on the public sector side'. Hence a partnership approach is potentially useful in the following ways:

sector resources; it is about juxtaposing different and even competing ideas and institutional cultures, beyond a conventional consultation and participation process, in order to co-create and co-implement solutions. Moreover, structured partnerships (as opposed to ad-hoc or symbolic encounters) are necessary to create sustainable platforms for dialogue, trust building and joint action.

In fact, a partnership approach has the potential to build higher levels of (mutual) accountability and moves away from simplistic models of privatisation vs. state control. In this way, it seeks to assist stakeholders to progress beyond a binary thinking mode (in which only two, opposing, solutions to any problem are seen). Partnering is about co-design and co-ownership of solutions. It steers a path between organisations' preconceived notions of the problem and its solutions. In complex situations, such as



Left: EDP Team Right: Our EDP logo as a backdrop behind our CEO, Andrew Boraine (right), who is talking to Alan Winde (left), the Provincial Government Minister for Economic Opportunity

The scale and complexity of the economic challenges we face (as a neighborhood, community, city, region, nation, world) are beyond the ability of any single sector, discipline or sphere to manage or resolve. There is a need for a whole-of-society approach rather than just that of a capable state or an efficient private sector. No one organisation or part of society has all the resources or ideas necessary to solve persistent problems that require going beyond 'business as usual'. Hence, partnering for economic development is not just about mobilising non-government resources to supplement limited public-

in a developmental state, partnerships can be thought of as a prerequisite for success.

A partnership can take many forms, beyond simple formal public-private partnerships. It can exist for dialogue purposes to establish a shared vision and common agenda, and as a vehicle for project implementation, or both. In light of the above a collaborative intermediary organisation is useful in providing an independent or neutral platform to guide and stimulate partnership formation, which however, comes with its own challenges.



Challenges

The EDP has been in operation for little over two years, and is the first economic development organisation of its kind in South Africa. However, the EDP has been able to draw on the lessons of the Cape Town Partnership, an inner city urban regeneration partnership established in 1999, which incubated the EDP.

Four multi-faceted challenges with which the EDP has had to grapple are presented below to alert similar organisations of what might lie ahead and hence plan in advance how best to tackle such issues:

1. The arena of economic development referring to a/ interaction among the traditional economic stakeholders in South Africa, namely government, private sector and labour, is historically adversarial and b/ the relatively disorganised partners – corporate interests tend to dominate the private sector agenda, while civil society is fairly fragmented and tends to be excluded from national debates.

2. Mandate and roles with regards to a/ the assumptions of some of our public sector partners which are still those more suited to treating the EDP as a service provider or consultant, i.e. a ‘what can you deliver for me’ approach, rather than exploring how the EDP can improve the system and b/ the perception of competing and overlapping mandates can lead to role confusion and institutional territorialism.

3. Demonstrating value as: 1/ there is relatively little public or media interest in the theory of collaboration or partnership. People and organisations want to see immediate, tangible results, such as how many jobs have been created, or by how many percentage points GDP has increased. Causality in this respect is not easy to establish or prove. Also, b/ the role of a collaborative intermediary organisation involves changing the way in which a development system functions, in order to meet the stated economic transition goals. This is inherently a relatively long-term process. Short-term return on investment of stakeholder time, energy and funds in partnership building needs constantly to be demonstrated to sustain longer-term participation.

4. Funding of a collaborative intermediary organization is a real challenge: a/ seed funding for the EDP came from one sector, the public sector. As a neutral organisation, our mandate has to extend beyond the interests and needs of just one set of funders. This can be operationally challenging, given government reporting requirements with other project-driven development agencies. Moreover b/ it is more challenging to fund processes as opposed to projects with concrete deliverables. However, a collaborative intermediary organisation does not typically deliver projects, or even consulting services. Thus the sourcing of funding, including the broadening of the funding base, beyond a start-up phase, remains challenging.

Sharing Deep Practice-Based Insights

The EDP has focused, for the past six months, on embedding organisational processes and resources. There are three key lessons that have been learned, over the period of our existence, on which we need to capitalise as we move into the next stage of our organisational development:

- The value of partnership and collaboration needs to be explicitly illustrated and made visible. To ensure organisational longevity, measurable and tangible results in the start-up phase are just as important as the long-term objective of improving the regional economic development system.
- Focusing on the mandate and learning to say ‘no’ are critical. As a start-up organisation, it has taken time to clarify our role to our stakeholders and to refine our mandate. In order to justify and illustrate the role of a new kind of organisation, it is tempting to try and be all things to all people.
- Tap into global expertise, of both practitioners and academics. Build a community of practice and support.

We believe that sharing experiences, challenges and lessons allows for collective learning. | ARSP |

We would welcome any comments, questions, or sharing of experiences which can be directed to Estelle Cloete via email Estelle@wcedp.co.za



by Judith Irwin

Senior Ethics Officer, Network Rail, UK.

Tackling suicides through partnership

In 2010 Network Rail entered into a pioneering £5million five year partnership with Samaritans on behalf of the rail industry to tackle the complex issue of suicides on the railways. Network Rail, which operates the majority of Britain's rail infrastructure, had struggled to find a way of combating suicides across its network. Samaritans, a caring charity that provides support for people experiencing feelings of emotional distress or despair, were approached by Network Rail with a potential partnership deal. In return for becoming a partner, the charity would use its knowledge of suicide prevention to address this priority area for the company.

Scale and impact

Suicide is a human tragedy and a major public health issue. The World Health Organisation estimates that around one million people die each year by suicide, more than those killed by homicide or war. On average in the UK one person attempts to take their life on the railway each day and notably male suicide rates are three times higher than those for females. Every incident can have serious consequences for drivers, station staff, passengers, witnesses, emergency service personnel and all those who rely on our railway infrastructure. There may also be a traumatic impact on family and friends of the individual. Aside from the social and emotive implications, suicide on the railways results in many hours of delay, and millions of pounds in costs for the industry. Over the course of 2009-2014 there have been, on average, 246 suicides per annum at a total cost to the industry of around £225m and 1.96m delay minutes for which Network Rail is held responsible for and fined. The financial impact is even wider however. Other incidental costs incurred by Network Rail and





the train/freight operating companies include: site clean-up, replacement train crews, train cleaning and repairs and sick pay for the train driver. This results in a total financial cost of approximately £157,000 per incident. This figure doesn't begin to include the emotional price that many of those involved have had to pay.

Key elements of the partnership

In 2009 Samaritans were approached by Network Rail to help it, and the industry, reduce suicides on the rail network. This had been a growing problem since the turn of the century and the industry's expertise around prevention was limited. The partnership began with a few people working on this issue alongside their day jobs and has increased dramatically across Network Rail and the industry as a whole.

The six key objectives of the partnership have been:

- The identification of priority rail locations,
- The provision of campaign materials that encourage people to seek help such as the posters, which you may have seen around stations, show that there is an alternative to suicide,
- The training of railway personnel and industry partners,
- Media management and encouraging the responsible reporting of railway suicides,
- Supporting vulnerable people, staff and customers who may find themselves contemplating suicide or involved in the aftermath of such an event,
- Providing guidance to the industry around suicide prevention.

The partnership combines the core business of Network Rail and that of Samaritans, providing a solution to both the company's business problems and Samaritans' mission to reduce the number of people that die by suicide.

The objectives have not always been easy to deliver but with the introduction of a dedicated small programme team within Network Rail, led by Ian Stevens, and a growing need for routes and train operators to address the issue, we are seeing an increasing amount of support. Ola Rzepczynska from Samaritans said that: "Our work with the industry is just part of the response to this issue,

one that is deep seated in society and regrettably on the increase across the UK as a whole. We do believe though, that the exposure gained from our relationship with the industry is actually making vulnerable people turn to us as an alternative to taking their lives on the railway. Equally our training is helping front line people appreciate that suicides can be prevented and that it is people just like them that are preventing them".


Benefits

Since the partnership began in 2009, Network Rail people have approached and potentially saved the lives of more than 200 vulnerable people at railway locations many of these are a result of attending Samaritans courses.

Prior to the partnership, there had been no national strategy in place to reduce railway suicide; it was something which had always been in the 'too difficult box'. It has been widely recognised that there has been a gradual change in perception on railway suicides within the industry since the partnership began and it has been the recipient of numerous awards, both within the rail industry and the third sector, e.g. the Transport Team/ Partnership of the Year award at the National Transport Awards in 2011 and the Charity Partnership award at the Third Sector Business Charity Awards in 2012.

The long-term impact of over 5,000 rail staff being trained is already clear. In 2013/14, there were around 600 interventions in suicides - 135 were made by rail personnel. The impact of their actions is huge in terms of the trauma they have prevented, the financial savings they have made for the industry (£36m) and delays they have saved to customers (180,000 minutes). For Network Rail and the rail industry, this could not have been achieved without the expertise and insight of Samaritans.

Recent figures released by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) show that the UK suicide rate remains the highest in a decade, with male suicides rates recorded as being over three times higher than those of women, and men in their mid years most vulnerable. This group of males are most at risk of suicide, especially those from poorer socio-economic backgrounds, due to a combination of factors which include social and cultural changes that have particularly impacted on their lives. This increase is significant especially as the most at risk demographic



matches the one most at risk of railway suicides, which remains over 80% male. Given the scale of the problem, the programme has been facing an increasing challenge to keep the railway suicide rate down. Samaritans campaign materials are being placed across the network to influence these groups to seek support, along with a suite of prevention measures.

The partnership between Samaritans and Network Rail is tackling both the human and the financial costs of suicides on the railway. As a responsible company Network Rail recognises that every suicide is a tragic event with far reaching implications and will continue to do what it can to reduce this tragic toll.

What's next?

Attitudes towards suicide prevention within the rail industry have changed dramatically in recent years but there's still work to be done. Our work with Samaritans to reduce suicides on the railways will continue until at least 2020. The global rail industry is taking notice of our achievements. There's been interest in our suicide prevention programme from Holland, Denmark, France, America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

Here are just some of our plans for the future:

- Adding to our existing suite of learning materials and developing a new Learning Tool awareness DVD to increase understanding of suicide prevention and the support available to those affected by them across the entire rail industry.
- Training for non-front line personnel so that they can help prevent suicides.
- Working to establish links with community health and mental health services so we can communicate with vulnerable people before they reach the railway.
- Commissioning new research for greater insight into why people choose to take their lives on the railway. These findings will help shape future programme activity.

The collaboration between Network Rail and Samaritans on the social issue of suicides contributes further evidence of how social partnerships benefit the organisations directly involved but more importantly benefit society at large¹. | ARSP |

References

- ¹Austin, J. & Seitanidi, M.M., 2014. Creating Value in Nonprofit-Business Collaborations. New Thinking and Practice. Jossey-Bass.



7th CONVERGENCES WORLD FORUM

SEPTEMBER 8-10TH, 2014, PARIS, FRANCE

This will be the 7th edition of the Convergences World Forum. The Convergences World Forum Convergences is a European-based platform that aims at building new convergences between public, private, and solidarity-based actors to promote the Millennium Development Goals and to alleviate poverty and privation in developed and developing countries. Over 200 organizations work with Convergences to tackle the challenges of cross-sector partnerships, international cooperation, microfinance, sustainable development and social entrepreneurship. Co-creation is an important component of the organization's methodology, and participants were invited help develop the conference by proposing topics.

This year's forum is focused on "Building tomorrow's world together", and includes three major pillars:

- A global partnership for sustainable consumption and production
- Sustainable Development: new practices and new financing
- New technologies

The pillar on global partnerships will provide a number of opportunities for stakeholders from different sectors to engage in discussion on how international partnerships can support a significant change in the way we produce and consume goods and services. Our increasing exploitation of natural resources, growing global population, and the emergence of new economic and industrial powers present critical challenges and opportunities that need to be tackled on a global, cross-sector scale. The Forum will gather citizens, consumers, companies, local authorities, media and solidarity-based actors who can support the creation of an international partnerships for the necessary paradigm shift.

Presentation of the Convergences Awards will also take place during the forum. These awards recognize projects with a high environmental or social impact that involves a partnership with a public or private sector organization.

<http://www.convergences2015.org/en/Article?id=1407&theme=InternationalCooperation>

Email: [judith.jakubowicz AT convergences2015.org](mailto:judith.jakubowicz@convergences2015.org)

CITIES BIODIVERSITY SUMMIT

OCTOBER 12 - 14, 2014
PYEONGCHANG, KOREA (SOUTH)

The Cities Biodiversity Summit will be co-hosted by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat, ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability, and Gangwon Province, the Republic of Korea. It will take place during the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 12) to the CBD. Participants will include international delegates covering nearly every major region of the world, biodiversity experts, scientists and non-profit organizations.

The Summit will review progress since the last Cities Biodiversity Summit at the COP 11 in Hyderabad, India. It will also explore the latest tools, initiatives and networks to illustrate the value of bringing



nature back to cities. Finally, the Summit's goals include identifying further concrete actions for national, and local governments, international development organizations and the scientific community for implementing the Plan of Action. Understanding how these partners can work together effectively will be crucial to implementing the changes necessary to increase and benefit from biodiversity in cities around the world.

<http://asiapacificsd.iisd.org/events/cities-biodiversity-summit/>

<http://cbc.iclei.org/events-recent>

Email: [biodiversity AT iclei.org](mailto:biodiversity@iclei.org)

THE WORLD ORGANIZATION OF SYSTEMS AND CYBERNETICS (WOSC), 16th CONGRESS. OUR SELF-ORGANISING WORLD: FROM DISRUPTION TO REPARATION


OCTOBER 15-17, 2014
UNIVERSIDAD DE IBAGUÉ, IBAGUÉ-TOLIMA, COLOMBIA

The purpose of WOSC is to influence policy-making and to support social transformation through collaboration between the fields of cybernetics and systems thinking. The Congress was conceived as a conversational space with the aim of strengthening holistic and trans-disciplinary work with an epistemological approach. During the event people from a wide range of professional and academic backgrounds will have a chance to discuss issues such as: ecology, social interactions, energy, education, management, and climate change. The Congress will facilitate these interactions to build bridges between participants from different sectors and disciplines, and support new professional and creative partnerships to advance thinking and practice in policy making, art, design and technology. Over 15 topics will be considered over the course of the Congress, including:

- Information modelling of business ecosystems.
- Trans-disciplinary modelling and decision processes.
- Decision-making, politics and power, Disruption to reparation.
- Networks of influence: systems dynamics.
- Design and Control of Self-organizing Systems.

Website: <http://wosc-congress.unibague.edu.co/>

Email: [wosc.org AT gmail.com](mailto:wosc.org@gmail.com)



17th TCI GLOBAL CONFERENCE

NOVEMBER 10-13TH, 2014
MONTERREY, MEXICO

TCI is an international network for practitioners, policy makers, researchers, and business leaders who are working toward improving competitiveness and innovation through the use of clusters.

The Conference will provide an opportunity for cluster practitioners, policy-makers, researchers, business executives and academics to share their experiences and develop new partnerships. Participants will explore how to use clusters to create shared value and long-term sustainability, and the potential of clusters to promote innovation. The event will include magisterial lectures, parallel sessions,

panel discussions, workshops, and papers to be published in the conference. The goal of the Conference is to advance the use of clusters on a global level by stimulating joint projects, collaboration, and the triple helix synergies.

Nuevo Leon, the state where Monterrey is located, has developed a policy to encourage clusters. The policy outlines their importance in achieving economic development goals and supporting technological innovation, human capital, investment attraction, the creation of new businesses, and internationalization. The organizers are looking forward to sharing their experience with local cluster development and learning from cluster practitioners from all over the world to advance this innovative development model.

Website: <http://www.tci2014.org/speakers.php>
Email: info@tci2014.org



SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS ON CHILD AND ADOLESCENT RIGHTS

NOVEMBER 12 – 14, 2014
PUEBLA, MÉXICO

This year, the Sixth World Congress for the Rights of Children and Adolescents coincides with the celebration of the XXV anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (20 November 1989). Compliance with this international agreement, developed by the United Nations, is mandatory for all signatory countries.

The Spanish Association for the Defense of the Rights of Children and Adolescents (ADDIA) World Congress organizers invited Mexico to host the VI World Congress for the Rights of Children and Adolescents in 2014. The System for Integral Family Development of the State of Puebla (Puebla SEDIF), the Puebla Institute of Family Law (IPOSEF) and the Network for the Rights of Children in Mexico (REDIM) will organize and host the Congress for Mexico.

The objectives of the Congress are:

- To become a meeting place for organized networks of children and teenagers.
- To contribute to the development of citizenship in childhood and adolescence, and treat it as an indicator of the quality of democratic societies.
- Encourage the participation of children and adolescents in discussions and analysis on human rights.
- Ensuring the development of innovative mechanisms of child and adolescent participation in various countries through information and communication technologies (ICTs)

Participants are encouraged to reflect and discuss the three themes of the Sixth World Congress for the rights of children and adolescents:

- Day 1: The right to live without violence
- Day 2: Internet as a human right and social networks
- Day 3: Child Migration and the right to family life

Website: <http://vicongresomundialdeinfancia.org/>
Email: vicongresomundialdeinfancia@gmail.com



THE 6th ANNUAL GLOBAL SOCIAL BUSINESS SUMMIT AND 2nd GSBS RESEARCH CONFERENCE

NOVEMBER 25-26, 27-28 2014
MEXICO CITY

The 2nd Global Social Business Summit (GSBS) Research Conference on Social Business welcomes all researchers working on social business and related areas. Registration for the Research Conference is for university associates only and must be made through the conference website. The aims of the Conference are to:

- Stimulate an inter-disciplinary and international research community around the area of social business.
- Improve research in social business.

This year, the Research Conference will coincide with the 6th annual Global Social Business Summit. Through the first four summits, the Research Conference has evolved from a meeting of academics to the establishment of a two day Research Conference. The organizers are looking forward to contributions from a variety of areas of scientific enquiry related to social business

The GSBS is an international forum for social business that seeks to spread awareness of the importance and potential of social businesses, enable discussion and partnerships between practitioners and stakeholders, and encourage awareness and uptake of best practices. It aims to gather experts from private sectors, civil society, governments and academia through engaging focus groups, forums and workshops.

The Summit is organized by Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Professor Muhammad Yunus and his Creative Advisor Hans Reitz. They state that: "The Global Social Business Summit is a platform where we can create our own space of inspiration and determination, create new value in the face of generational and structural shifts and leverage far-reaching advances in science and technology for our communities."

Website:

<http://www.gsb2013.com/program/research-conference.html>

Email: summit@gsbs2013.com



STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT SOCIETY-SANTIAGO DE CHILE SPECIAL CONFERENCE

MARCH 19-21, 2015
SANTIAGO, CHILE

This two-day conference will bring together stakeholders from the academic and private realms to discuss research and experience related to the broad issue of competitive advantage. Recently, a stream of strategy research has examined how institutional voids pose fundamental challenges for industrial development in emerging markets, which bring detrimental effects to the competitiveness of local firms. Yet, in many countries, policymakers have adopted an agenda to foster local firms through the provision of public resources, such as investments in infrastructure, specialized industrial policies, as well as knowledge-generation systems. At the same time, firms have pursued collective synergies that individual firms would be unable to attain. In sum, strategies embedded in the local environment may promote rather than limit competitive advantage.

The conference will explore collective action by multiple players, either coordinated through central governments or through bottom-up indigenous institutional systems, and the relationship between these actions and the attainment of sustained competitive advantages. Themes in this area of research include the availability of resources in surrounding environments, the emergence of communal and public resources, the promotion of vibrant entrepreneurial ecosystems, and the design of indigenous institutional systems to coordinate investments in joint sources of competitive advantage.

In addition to pre-conference workshops, plenary panels, and formal presentations, the conference will include an off-site dinner event, and meetings will be held at the world-class facilities of the School of Management of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (PUC).

Website:

http://santiago.strategicmanagement.net/call_for_proposals.php

Email: sms@strategicmanagement.net



by Dr. Verena Bitzer

*Postdoctoral Research Fellow & BSEI 2013
Conference Chair, Graduate School of Business
(GSB), University of Cape Town, South Africa.*

by Prof. Ralph Hamann

*Professor & Research Director, Graduate School of Business
(GSB), University of Cape Town, South Africa
Founder of the BSEI Conference Series.*



3rd Annual GSB conference on the Business of Social and Environmental Innovation (BSEI 2013), Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town, 25-26 November 2013.

Defining success in partnerships for wicked problems

This report offers a reflection on the 3rd conference on 'Business of Social and Environmental Innovation' (BSEI 2013), hosted by the University of Cape Town's Graduate School of Business (GSB) on 25-26 November 2013. Finding new ways of successfully approaching 'wicked problems', particularly through cross-sector partnerships, was the key objective of this conference.

Societal problems, whether it'd be climate change, poverty, food insecurity or biodiversity loss, are characterised by complexity and scientific uncertainty, are continuously evolving and are affected by multiple stakeholders and power imbalances. These social problems are so challenging, so tangled up in value-laden conflicts, and so difficult to make sense of that they are downright 'wicked'. Each wicked problem contains multiple factors and considerations, which cannot be understood and solved by a single organisation. Dealing with wicked problems requires a new approach that generates wider systemic transformations, comprising complementary technological, organisational and institutional innovations that emerge through joint efforts by different stakeholders and are co-ordinated across different levels and sectors.

Considering that wicked problems not only trouble our societies in general, but affect each and every one of us, we decided to focus the BSEI 2013 conference on wicked problems that cannot just be 'fixed' through single sector once-off solutions, but rather demand continuous attention from all sectors in order to be addressed or mitigated. This is why we did not only invite scholars and academics to



*From left to right:
Verena Bitzer, May Seitanidi,
Oana Branzei, Marlene Le Ber
and Ralph Hamann*

the conference, but encouraged the participation of practitioners from business, government and civil society. We wanted to achieve the maximum interaction among people that wouldn't normally speak to each other and examine if we could gain fresh insights into our most challenging problems.

From the practitioner side, keynote speakers included South Africa's Honourable Trevor Manuel (then Minister and Chair of the National Planning Commission, in charge of the country's National Development Plan) and Bulelwa Makalima-Ngewana (CEO of the Cape Town Partnership – a prominent urban development initiative). From academia, we invited our international colleagues Dr. May Seitanidi, Dr. Marlene Le Ber and Dr. Oana Branzei to be our keynote speakers and share with us their expertise and insights into cross-sector collaboration. To put theory and practice into use, we not only had 'traditional' paper presentations, but spent a lot of time debating in roundtables and offered two practitioner workshops to explore new avenues in responding to wicked problems.

Not surprisingly, one of the key themes that emerged out of our discussions was the need for and the challenge of effective collaboration – yet, the vigour and the intensity with which this theme arose was indeed exceptional. At the outset, Minister Trevor Manuel confirmed that traditional approaches through governmental and intergovernmental action alone – “last century's way of doing things” – do not match the complexity and

urgency of many wicked problems. Multi-stakeholder partnerships are critical to prompt deeper change, learning and practical action, not least because such problems cut across different spatial, temporal and sectoral scales. Yet, if collaboration was easy, we wouldn't have the continuous gridlocks among actors in times when action is imperative, as Manuel added. Particularly when collaborators have vastly different agendas and needs, collaboration is inherently difficult. In other words, not only is the problem itself wicked, but so is any attempt of trying to deal with it.

So, how best to define 'success' in cross-sector partnerships for addressing wicked problems?

Firstly – and this may sound surprising in light of the many failed attempts at collaboration – the importance of conflict and confrontation for 'successful' partnerships was emphasised by May Seitanidi. She suggested that one of the reasons why global processes addressing wicked problems often fail is precisely because the focus on collaboration ignores the importance of confrontation as a source of co-innovation. She emphasised that while the partnership literature often highlights conflict avoidance or conflict management, it overlooks that conflict can be a vital ingredient for a healthy and 'successful' partnership seeking to bring about positive change. Evidence from her research demonstrates that a lack of confrontation can lead to lack of change, as the avoidance of functional conflict may breed complacency, poor group thinking, apathy and stagnation.



The BSEI 2013 word cloud

A certain amount of conflict can be constructive, suggested Seitanidi, referring to what she termed ‘overt functional conflict’– in essence, structured conflict that brings with it stimulation, adaptation, innovation and better decision-making due to allowing divergent opinions instead of silencing them.

A second vital component for ‘successful’ and effective partnerships is making sure that all parties involved are given an opportunity to be properly included, said Marlene Le Ber. Yet often the power imbalances between collaborating parties are significant, and this makes equal representation and participation difficult to achieve, agreed Bulelwa Makalime-Ngewana from the Cape Town Partnership. Makalime-Ngewana said that getting the emotional investment required from all parties is key to the success of a partnership and this can only happen if people are given an equal opportunity to participate in and contribute to the process. Story-telling, either via face-to-face communication or (social) media has proven to be an effective mechanism of engaging people and creating ownership of change processes. “It is a question of voice,” said Le Ber. “How do marginalised and vulnerable segments faced with wicked problems

choose to engage in processes that focus on addressing their needs?” She cautioned that many collaborations try – and fail – to solve this issue by attempting to create a spokesperson for a group, someone who literally takes on the voice for the cohort. But this can result in those views that are not aligned to the official ‘voice’ being misframed or misconstrued, which deepens dependence on the self-appointed voice of the group and leads to conflict down the line.

The third pre-requisite for successful partnerships in the context of wicked problems, Oana Branzei argued, is hope. “Positive transformation requires the best in us and helps draw out and build the best in us and each other,” she said. “What we are talking about is the future – a better, broader, richer future.” Branzei mentioned that she never ceases to be amazed by the human ability to mobilise in the face of challenges and to make solutions possible through collaboration that people believed previously impossible. She continued saying that believing that somehow the future will be better is a vital component of successful change. However, Branzei emphasised that hope is a lot of hard work and the world could take inspiration from the likes of the late Nelson Mandela and other such leaders, whose actions have helped to inspire hope and to animate change processes as a result. She concluded suggesting that time and time again human agency has turned scarcity and vulnerability into strength.

Constraints and barriers are inescapable in cross-sector partnerships addressing wicked problems. Yet, the clarion call emerging from the BSEI 2013 conference was a sense that the world needs to move away from seeing wicked problems as overwhelming and unsolvable, and closer to being ‘great opportunities for change’ by welcoming functional conflict, allowing for inclusiveness and cultivating hope which will help make a difference. Above all, the conference not only underlined the importance of working together to create innovative responses to social problems, it has also called attention to cross-sector collaboration as a balancing act: How can we reconceptualise and reshape cross-sector partnerships to make better use of conflicting views and objectives, to ensure inclusiveness of voices and interests, and to combine inspired vision with action-oriented pragmatism? | ARSP |



by Lamberto Zollo

*Doctoral Candidate,
University of Florence, Italy.*

4th International Symposium on Cross Sector Social Interactions

*Sponsors of the
4th International CSSI
Symposium:*

The fourth International Symposium on Cross Sector Social Interactions (CSSI) hosted by the Sawyer Business School at Suffolk University was titled: "Innovative Collaboration for a Complex World: Reaching across Institutional Divides". For the first time the CSSI Symposium was preceded by the CSSI Doctoral Consortium, sponsored by the Annual Review of Social Partnerships (ARSP). The CSSI Doctoral Symposium was co-chaired by Professors Sandra Waddock (Boston College) and Rob van Tulder (Erasmus University-Academic Director of the Partnerships Resource Centre, Rotterdam School of Management). The full day of presentations and discussions with PhD students was a unique opportunity to improve their research proposal quality, share their ideas and receive feedback from esteemed scholars while extending their network.




PETER B. GUSTAVSON
School of Business
Centre for Social and
Sustainable Innovation

The world looks different from here.



The first day of the CSSI Symposium started with Professor Arnold Kamis (Suffolk University-Center for Innovation and Change Leadership) who officially opened the symposium highlighting how cross-sector interactions foster innovative thinking, particularly required in the current global economic situation to inspire new practice. The CSSI Symposia founder and co-ordinator, Dr. M. May Seitanidi (University of Kent) followed with a presentation on the concept of “the social good”. She referred to the X-S-C Generation (Cross Sector Collaboration Generation) as “the advanced party of practitioners and academics who can fully appreciate the differences across the sectors, who have experienced the frustrations, the dilemmas and the messiness of difference, but who are able to see clearly and sense deeply that beyond the differences there are unique polymorphic patterns that emerge when true cross sector collaborations take place.” Dr. Seitanidi emphasised that these *unique polymorphic patterns* share the same DNA: “they do not capture the value produced for the benefit of the few, but externalise it and share it with the many, for the social good”. She explained that the CSSI Symposium logo “the Social Good tree” employs the tree image symbolically: As trees use resources, transform them, and contribute with their flowers and fruits, but more importantly produce oxygen so cross sector collaboration must act as a tree externalise and return the value to society.



This year’s Co-Programme Chairs Miguel Rivera-Santos (Babson College) and Carlos Rufin (Suffolk University), followed elaborating the link of CSSI with innovation. They stated that cross-sector social interactions constitute one of the most innovative sources of innovation including the bottom of the pyramid (BOP)¹ initiatives, referring to innovative ways of doing business with people in the poorest socio-economic areas of the world. In this way, enterprises have the opportunities to collaborate with local producers of extremely disadvantaged geographic areas. Hence, CSSI implementation is characterized by an innovative organizational structure itself that requires a new ways of organising in order to be effective.

Professor V. Kasturi Rangan (Harvard Business School), this symposium’s keynote speaker, was introduced by symposium Chair Professor Andrew Crane (York University), who spoke about the role of social enterprises as vehicles for innovation for BOP. The poorest of the poor and disadvantaged communities of the world represent significant market opportunities for enterprises as they are home to potential producers and consumers. Professor Rangan provided new perspectives on the theory of renowned Professor C. K. Prahalad. He argued that modern enterprises need to take advantage of the opportunities deriving from the so-called “MOP”, which is the middle of the pyramid where bulk of the informal economy in developing countries reside, highlighting that:

- Modern enterprises need to consider new business dimensions, such as demand aggregation, community involvement, cross-subsidized pricing and an economic ecosystem orientation;
- Managers need to be authentic in their approach—lip service to these business dimensions is no longer enough to be successful or sustainable; it has to go beyond CSR;
- Modern business enterprises have to seek strategic collaborations with local people in poor areas, benefiting from both their unique knowledge of the territory and community, and their status as a member of the community to indirectly promote business activity.

Professor Rangan observed that businesses, in general, find it hard to lower cost as they invest in poor and disadvantaged communities, as such their profit



Suffolk University, Boston, MA, USA May 28-30, 2014



The new generation of Cross Sector Social Interactions Scholars at the Doctoral Symposium of the 4th International CSSI Symposium



The Key-note speaker of the 4th Intl. CSSI Symposium: Harvard Business School's V. Kasturi Rangan, Malcolm P. McNair Professor of Marketing.



Prof. James Austin and Dr. M. May Seitanidi at the book launch 'Creating Value in Nonprofit-Business Collaborations. New Thinking and Practice' published by Jossey-Bass.



Prof. Peter Neergaard Professor by Copenhagen Business School and representative of the 6th International CSSI Symposium 2018 that will be organised at Copenhagen Business School.



From left to right Dr. Carlos Rufin, Dr. Marlene Le Ber, Prof. Andrew Crane and Dr. Amelia Clarke at the book launch of 'Social Partnerships and Responsible Business. A Research Handbook' published by Routledge. Prof. Crane and Dr. Clarke are co-organising the 5th International CSSI Symposium which will take place in 2016 in Toronto.



margins are low or non-existent. The crucial aspect is to collaborate with committed local people who will share business costs in order to engage in micro-entrepreneurial activity themselves. These communities already represent a well-established and balanced eco-system, characterized by sufficient levels of trust, and cultural and social equilibrium, which promotes a conducive business climate that benefit the community, added Rangan.

The most important message from Professor Rangan was related to the idea that CSSI can support the creation of social benefits in the most disadvantaged areas of the world: innovative collaboration between enterprises, local communities and local governments allow the achievements of transformational societal change. CSSI enable the local community to become the main social actor, demonstrating leadership and becoming actively involved in commercial and social activities.

Following Professor Rangan's dynamic lecture, the afternoon theory-practice panel discussion entitled "From Institutional Divides to Collaboration Connectors in the Extractive Industries," members Mark Camp (Deputy Executive Director, Cultural Survival), Prof. Ans Kolk (U. of Amsterdam), Steve Waddell (Ecosystems Labs, representative from Teck Resources Limited), and Valerie Pascale (CSR manager at Goldcorp) discussed on how CSSI can result in innovative partnerships for collaborative social enhancement. In the late afternoon, Dr. Oana Branzei (Richard Ivey School of Business) led a special session of the Symposium entitled "That's Cross", reviewing the advances in the field of CSSI. Dr. Jennifer Leigh (Nazareth College) organized an interactive session titled, "Pedagogy for Cross-Sector Partnerships" where she briefly summarized the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning related to the CSSI domain and participants self-organized into different teaching topics such as CSP skills and cases. The final session was the book launch for 'Creating Value in Nonprofit-Business Collaboration. New Thinking & Practice' by Professor James Austin (Harvard Business School) and Dr. M. May Seitanidi (Kent Business School). They shared the main contributions of their book as well as its evolution from previous publications.

The CSSI Symposium has established two awards. In the evening of the first day the presentation of the 2014 'Life-Time Achievement (LTA) Award in Collaboration

Research', sponsored by the Partnerships Resource Centre (PrC), RSM, Erasmus University (see interview with Professor van Tulder in this section about the award) was presented to Prof. Sandra Waddock who was this year LTA Award recipient as "a true pioneer in cross-sector partnership research" (Professor Crane) that has "made exceptional contribution to the advancement of knowledge on cross-sector collaborations for the social good in general and sustainable development specifically" (Professor van Tulder). To read more about her accomplishments see the *press release* from CSRWire, the official media sponsor of the CSSI Symposium. In the evening of the second day, Routledge sponsored, for the third time, the 'Routledge Best Paper Award in Social Partnership'. This year's winning paper was: "A process model of convening for social change: How ENGOs (re)build civic social capital", written by PhD candidate Nino Antadze (University of Waterloo), Dr. Haiying Lin (University of Waterloo) and Dr. Oana Branzei (Richard Ivey School of Business).

In the second day two morning and one afternoon paper sessions were followed by a presentation-invitation for collaboration by Prof. Rob Van Tulder for "Engagement in Partnership Action Research" and an innovative book launch presenting key insights about partnership research from some of the authors who partnered in producing the book: 'Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook' and which was edited by M. May Seitanidi (University of Kent) and Andrew Crane (York University). The presenters on this last panel of the CSSI Symposium were: Prof. Andrew Crane (York University), Carlos Rufin (Suffolk University), Amelia Clarke (Waterloo University), Marlene Le Ber (Western University) and Steve Waddell (Networking Action).

The symposium benefitted from generous local, national, and international sponsors including the Sawyer Business School at Suffolk University; the University of Victoria Peter B. Gustavson School of Business; The Partnerships Resource Centre, RSM, Erasmus University, Routledge; ARSP; and CSRWire. The 5th International Symposium on Cross Sector Social Interactions will be held in Toronto, Canada Spring 2016. | [ARSP](#) |

Reference

¹**Prahalad, C.K. and S.L. Hart,** (2002) "The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid", *Strategy + Business*, Vol. 26, p. 1-14.



by Dr. M. May Seitanidi (FRSA)

Senior Lecturer in Strategy, Kent Business School, University of Kent-UK.



Prof. Rob van Tulder

Professor of International Business-Society Management,
Director of the Partnerships Resource Centre,
Rotterdam School of Management (RSM)
Erasmus University, The Netherlands

The Partnerships Resource Centre & the LTA Award in Collaboration Research

The Partnerships Resource Centre (PrC) is the leading European Centre for the study of Cross Sector Social Partnerships. The PrC is the sponsor of the Life Time Achievement Award (LTA) in Collaboration Research, the first award of its kind in the world. The Director of PrC, Prof. Rob van Tulder, explains the reasons they decided to sponsor the LTA Award in Collaboration research and its significance for the partnership community around the world.

M. May Seitanidi (MMS): What was the motivation behind your decision Prof. van Tulder for the PrC to continue sponsoring the LTA Award in Collaboration Research for the 4th International CSSI Symposium in Boston?

Rob van Tulder (RT): The LTA Award in collaboration research gives two messages, in my view: (1) the importance of collaboration as a necessary means to solve complex societal issues – and thus also the importance of interdisciplinary research to actually study the antecedents of various types of collaboration; (2) consequently, the importance



The LTA Award acknowledges those scholars that have served both goals over a longer period of time. The PrC wants to create a bridge between fundamental research and applied (action) research, between theory and practice. The LTA Award makes it possible for us to show what we mean by that.

of spending more than a PhD thesis and a few scientific articles on these topics, in fact a life time effort is needed to grasp the multi-dimensional intricacies of the collaborative approach. The LTA hopefully provides not only recognition for the latter, but is aimed at stimulating younger scholars to consider who they see as role models and discover what kind of decisions as a scholar you have to take in order to have impact in the longer run. Sponsoring the LTA Award for a longer period of time, thus, seems logical: only with long term commitment from our side, we can hope to stimulate others to engage in a comparable commitment.

MMS: How does the LTA Award connect with the aims of the PrC?

RT: The Partnerships Resource Centre (PrC) is aimed at creating and sharing knowledge on collaborative solutions to wicked problems (in particular related to sustainable development). The LTA Award acknowledges those scholars that have served both goals over a longer period of time. The PrC wants to create a bridge between fundamental research and applied (action) research, between theory and practice. The LTA Award makes it possible for us to show what we mean by that. At this time in history, we see thousands of partnerships initiated, but many of them being created without the proper intellectual foundation. Their failure might discredit the whole idea of collaboration; in case this is due to lack of intellectual sophistication of the approach, we partly might reproach ourselves as scholars for not having been able to provide the proper insights, tools,



Prof. Rob van Tulder with the recipients of LTA Award in Collaboration Research Prof. James Austin (2012) and Prof. Sandra Waddock (2014).

concepts and theories to make collaborations work. The present two laureates (Austin and Waddock) - in my view - present excellent role models for the type of bridge building activities required for the area to mature. The PrC is strongly dedicated to stimulate this trend. The LTA is but one of many ways to do this.

MMS: What are the plans of the PrC for the next few years in further research and practice in social partnerships?

RT: The plans for the next five years include a long list of action research projects in which there are a number of constants and a number of variables

(depending on the willingness of others around the world to participate in our programmes). Constants are that we:

- Depart from wicked problems (in particular related to sustainable/inclusive development, but not exclusively),
- Will co-develop monitoring and evaluation protocols to enhance the impact of partnerships (in particular on the actual issue),
- Develop protocols for brokers and action research (in the form of wicked problems plazas and other negotiation tools);
- Build up a network of business schools and other partners that provide platforms for research and action in collaborative endeavours;
- Action research: we initiated a PPPLab for food and water problems. The main objective of the PPPLab is to extract and co-create knowledge and methodological lessons from and on PPPs to help improve both policy and implementation. It will (at this stage) focus on partnerships funded in the first rounds of the Sustainable Water Fund (FDW) and Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Food Security Fund (FDOV). PPPLab is funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS);
- We will continue to publish 'state of the partnership reports' in which basic empirical information is given on the strategies of NGOs, firms and governments.

Variables are the levels of analysis that we engage in:

- National and global level: where we focus on a number of countries with which we will create intense collaborative ties;
- Global value chains: where we focus on partnership approaches to making the whole value chain more inclusive and sustainable;
- Organizational level: where we will look at partnership portfolio management.

This activity will include also consultancy and joint action research with partners that we do not yet work with.

So, an important means to achieve these ambitions is to link up with other business schools and scholars to set

up joint learning, teaching and research environment. Many of the projects we have started are open for participation. On The Partnerships Resource Centre website you will find partnership related material such as latest books, papers, reports and recent outcomes of new projects. Also many of the databases we are developing will be provided on open source as an invitation to interested colleagues around the world to collaborate and participate in our projects! We look forward sharing with our worldwide community on cross sector partnerships and the readers of the ARSP our future exciting plans! | [ARSP](#) |



Prof. Waddock the Recipient of the 2014 LTA Award in Collaboration Research.



SEVENTH LATIN-AMERICAN MEETING OF ENTERPRISE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

APRIL 7 – 10, 2014
MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
SUMMARIZED BY DR. ADRIANA REYNAGA, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS POLÍTICAS Y SOCIALES UNAM-MEXICO



Enterprises, practitioners, academics and scholars convened in April 2014 for the seventh annual Latin-American Meeting of Enterprise Social Responsibility. The event was organized by the three largest networks for corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Central and South America: CEMEFI (Mexican Center for Philanthropy), AliaRSE (Enterprise Social Responsibility Alliance) and Forum Empresa (Enterprise Social Responsibility for Americas).

Over 4,500 attendants from the business, academic and social sectors participated in four days of conferences, lectures, workshops, discussion and leaders forums and award ceremonies. Among the prominent speakers were Michael Hopkins from MHC International Ltd Corporate and Social Research, Viktor Nylund from UNICEF and Italo Pizzolante, a well-recognized speaker on CSR issues within Latin America. On Thursday, April 10th, for the first time in the history of the meeting, there was a discussion forum on cross-sector partnerships that included practitioners –Adrian Camacho from Mondeléz International, Luz María Pizá from Educación Ambiental A.C. and Gabriela Rodríguez from VERDMX. Academic participants included Mauricio Guerrero from CMS Consulting and Adriana Reynaga from the National University of Mexico. Attendees learned about the different stages of cross-sector partnerships as well as the obstacles and ways to overcome them. Finally, they discussed ways in which different forms of collaboration between companies and civil society organizations contribute to the generation of useful social capital to wider networks.

CEMEFI is a nonprofit institution founded in 1988. Their mission is “to promote and coordinate philanthropic, socially responsible and committed citizens, organizations and businesses, to share and achieve a more equitable, compassionate and prosperous society”. The institution brings together nearly 1500 members, including donors, operational - civil society organizations, companies and people. Each year they give the ESR (Enterprise Social Responsibility) award to private organizations that meet the parameters of social engagement, sustainability and quality of life within their company. AliaRSE is an enterprise network created in 2001 to promote CSR in Mexico. The organization’s mandate is “to promote compliance with the CSR between companies and Mexican entrepreneurs, leveraging, coordinating and facilitating the synergy of various efforts of organizations to benefit the country”. The network’s members are important business networks and foundations dedicated to the promotion of CSR. This group developed the regional definition of CSR and the current model of corporate social responsibility in Mexico. Forum Empresa is a network that brings together the major organizations of Corporate Responsibility and Sustainability in the region of Latin America. It has a presence in fifteen countries in the Americas; its members work with about 3,500 companies of every size and sector. In addition to documenting good business practices in CSR within the region, it researches, analyzes and disseminates tools, practices and trends in order to strengthen CSR networks.



SIXTH SESSION OF THE TEAM OF SPECIALISTS ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

23-24 JUNE 2014
GENEVA, SWITZERLAND
SUMMARIZED BY DR. LEA STADTLER, UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA

In June 2014, about 150 international experts representing government agencies, the private sector, academic institutions, and international organizations met for the yearly “Team of Specialists on Public-Private Partnerships (TOS PPP)” session. This year’s meeting was focused on discussing the development and implementation of PPP core standards to ensure the effective delivery of projects in order to achieve the post 2015 Sustainable Development Goals.

The comprehensive program included keynote speakers, for

example, from the UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe), Transparency International Switzerland, and the World Economic Forum, who shared their viewpoints on the need for and challenge of PPP standards. During the two-day session, the discussions particularly highlighted a current lack of procedures guiding the successful integration of PPPs in health policy and significant problems that systemic corruption posed to PPPs. From this discussion, three projects proposing the creation of PPP standards in the area of health policy and corruption were approved by the TOS PPP. The detailed program, including a summary, is available [here](#).

UNECE International PPP Center of Excellence, which seeks to promote governments’ PPP capacity, organizes this event annually. The Center has a roster of about 300 PPP experts and offers several PPP best practice guides, training modules, video case studies, and readiness assessments. For more information, please visit the UNECE website.



14th EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT (EURAM)

VALENCIA, SPAIN
4-7 JUNE, 2014

The title of this year’s edition of EURAM was “Waves and Winds of Strategic Leadership for Sustainable Competitiveness.” Innovative governance for social transformation was the key element of the conference. Incoming President Professor Luca Gnan (University of Tor Vergata) introduced the main conference topics. These included the role of governmental institutions and non-profit organizations in the governance of modern economic and financial environments and their relational and behavioural management functions with both internal and external stakeholders. In the pre-conference, a Doctoral Colloquium (DC) brought 50 students and 10 mentors together to discuss PhD students’ progress and research. During the DC, keynote speaker Professor Julienne Brabet (Université Paris-Est Créteil) encouraged the Doctoral Colloquium audience to drive research on developing new business theories to support modern vehicles of social and environmental change, focusing on transformational benefits that are possible thanks to innovative management strategies. Significantly, among the EURAM “Strategic Interest Groups” (SIGs), Social Entrepreneurship is becoming more popular among PhD students and practitioners: this emerging theme is clear from the increasing number of papers submitted to the specific Social Entrepreneurship SIG. The new enterprise forms discussed in papers and sessions included social enterprises, green entrepreneurship and hybrid organizations trying to combine social and commercial attitudes in the same core governance structure.

EURAM in Valencia linked in many ways with the CSSI Symposium in Boston. During day two, one particularly noticeable similarity was the EURAM special session on “Social innovation through cross-sector partnerships” organized by Professor Filippo Giordano (Bocconi University) and Professor Marco Meneguzzo (University of Tor Vergata). The session focused on collaborative management, which has been described as a new way of addressing social problems that cannot be solved by a single organization. Professor Reto Steiner (Bern University) chaired this session, highlighting how cross-sector partnerships are modern vehicles for combining strategic resources and capabilities among different sectors, thus creating social value. Many panellists, including professors Stephen Osborne (University of Edinburgh Business School), Ricardo Altimira Vega (IE Business School) and Sharam Alijani (Neoma Business School), stressed the necessity of addressing social issues through an innovative approach such as inter-organizational arrangements and cross-sectoral networks between businesses, public entities, and civil society.

Following from the CSSI and EURAM meetings a new research focus is developing within the cross sector space i.e. creating social good in social actors’ eco-systems. This may also include how managers can best adapt or develop strategic decision-making process and cross-sector governance models to tackle new societal and environmental challenges. Focusing on the conceptualization of innovative economic arrangements and governance models through new types of cross sector social interactions seems to be a promising area for future research.

6th ANNUAL ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT CROSS-SECTOR SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP: LIVING PLANET @ WORK: BOLD WALKS AND TALKS FOR BETTERING OUR WORLD

AUGUST 2, 2014
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA
SUMMARIZED BY ADRIANE MACDONALD,
UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

The sixth annual cross-sector social partnership professional development workshop (PDW) at the Academy of Management brought together researchers and practitioners for another discussion this time about a partnership between the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Hewlett-Packard (HP).

Dr. Barbara Gray, a pioneer in the collaboration field, opened the

discussion with a review of the last 20 years of innovations in cross-sector social partnerships. Dr. Gray discussed the trend of increasing complexity and scale, as exemplified by the Living Planet @ Work partnership between WWF and HP.

Representing the two partners, Frances Edmonds (HP) and Adrienne Lo (WWF) discussed the inception, successes and challenges, and future of their partnership, Living Planet @ Work. This six-year partnership is positioned to create positive environmental change through pro-environmental employee behavior at work. For instance, Living Planet @ Work empowers front-line employees with a passion for sustainability by providing them with free access to ideas and tools and celebrating their sustainability successes.

Concluding the session, attendees discussed the new generation of transformational partnerships that parallel the structure and objectives of Living Planet @ Work. Emerging from this discussion was the notion that scaling up impact from the grassroots was important, but not without top-down support to ensure partnership sustainability.



Researchers and practitioners once again energized by the possibility of cross-sector social partnerships for sustainability.



References

Gray, B. & Stites, J. Sustainability through partnerships. 1-110 (Network for Business Sustainability, 2013). at <http://nbs.net/knowledge>

Branzei, O., Lin, H. & Chakravarty, D. WWF's Living Planet @ Work: Championed by HP. 1-16 (Richard Ivey School of Business Foundation, 2014). at <https://www.iveycases.com/ProductView.aspx?id=64603>

COMMUNITY

SECTION



Community Editorial.....	90
Community Interviews.....	92
New Members.....	96



by Dr. Verena Bitzer

*Postdoctoral research fellow at the
Graduate School of Business,
University of Cape Town, S. Africa.*

Welcome to the Community Section of the ARSP!

What does it mean to be a community of practitioners and researchers dealing with cross-sector social partnerships? This is what I asked myself when I took up my new role as the ARSP Community Section Editor. I would like to think that communities are about being part and taking part. This begs the question of how we can actually practice being a community. Exchanging information and keeping each other up-to-date is certainly one important aspect. Beyond this, engaging with each other through debate is another way of making use of our collective human capital, offering further opportunities to understand differing perspectives, gain inspiration and perhaps even create a sense of empowerment to advance our everyday activities.

Conferences play a key role and this year's International Symposium on Cross Sector Social Interactions (CSSI) in Boston vividly brought to light the virtue of coming together as a community, empowering us with fresh insights, new thoughts and enhanced motivation. On top of such events, we can also engage in debates here in the ARSP and through our NPO-BUS Partnerships Yahoo Group.

Debates are interesting when they present colorful contrasts on issues that resonate with us. What would be more appropriate in a journal seeking to link theory and practice than to start the debate with exactly this link – or gap, as some would say? Surely this is



something that concerns most, if not all of us. Who, from the academic community, hasn't received the question of "so, what difference does your research make"? Who, from the practitioner community, hasn't been puzzled by the enthusiasm with which academics speak of "research questions", "theories" or "constructs" that seem overly complicated, decontextualized and abstract?

The theory-practice gap is usually portrayed and reproduced as a dichotomy, an either/or question that requires us to choose sides. This despite various concepts having been proposed to bridge this gap, such as engaged¹ scholarship or relational scholarship of integration², which call for more collaborative research to utilize the complementary knowledge of researchers and practitioners. Perhaps it is more fruitful to think of the theory-practice divide as a "paradox", as Bansal and colleagues³ recently suggested, as two sides of the same coin, which requires building relationships, networking and collaboration to be fully embraced. Not as a social activity, but as a core task of both academics and practitioners.

Let's see what Steve Waddell (Principal at NetworkingAction) and Miguel Rivera-Santos (Associate Professor at Babson College) think about this topic, whom we invited to critically answer a few questions from their respective professional viewpoints – Steve as a practice-oriented change agent (though with strong academic roots) and Miguel as one of our most established partnership scholars.

As you'll see in the interviews below, the perspectives on the theory-practice divide can differ quite substantially, depending to a large extent on one's understanding of the role of researchers and the purpose of research. Is it to help practice by providing clear and context-specific insights that require little further translation ("relevance") or is it to better understand practice by developing conceptually sound frameworks and theories ("rigour")?

I hope that this is the beginning of a lively debate within the ARSP to strengthen our community. | [ARSP](#) |

If you have any comments or suggestions, please send them to v.bitzer@gmail.com. You may also want to check out our Facebook and LinkedIn groups.


References

- ¹**Van de Ven, A.H. and Johnson, P.E.**, 2006. Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4), 802–821.
- ²**Bartunek, J.M.**, 2007. Academic-practitioner collaboration need not require joint or relevant research: toward a relational scholarship of integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1223–1333.
- ³**Bansal, P., Bertels, S., Ewart, T., MacConnachie, P. and O'Brien, J.**, 2012. Bridging the Research–Practice Gap. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(1), 73–92.



by Dr. Verena Bitzer

*Postdoctoral research fellow at the Graduate School of Business,
University of Cape Town, S. Africa.*



Steve Waddell

Principal at NetworkingAction

There is a huge problem in the way we develop knowledge

Can you briefly describe the type of work that you are engaged in and for which organization you work?

Steve Waddell: These are complicated questions for me! I describe my work as focusing on large, complex change challenges where “large” refers to spatial (usually global) and to my focus on “transformation”, which I contrast with “reform” and “incremental” change. My identity in this work is as a “community organizer”, which means I go deep into understanding current emerging structures and relationships to find ways to support them while addressing the complexity of global challenges. However, I also identify as an “action researcher” – actively doing the work in a consulting/education/research function, which carries with it that I also regularly publish in academic journals.

Although I have my organization “NetworkingAction” (www.networkingaction.net) to do this work, I often work in partnership with other organizations. For example, I have led the development of the GOLDEN Ecosystems Labs as a group of leading change practitioners and academic networks to advance development of the field of complex change knowledge, tools/methods and action. While this way of working is not without its challenges (finding people to work with, developing projects, raising the necessary resources, etc.), I’ve been committed to collaboration and developing human capacity for over thirty years now.



VB: What are your thoughts on this statement? “Research on cross-sector collaboration often has little relevance for cross-sector collaboration practice.”

SW: Hmm. I think that there is a huge problem in the way we develop knowledge, because much research is not useable by practitioners. It is left in unfriendly language and is not developed in an embedded co-production process, which means that it often serves researchers’ distinct goals and responds poorly to practitioners’ needs. Having said that, I always emphasize the value of taking a disciplined research approach guided by theory... it can be enormously helpful in clarifying confusion and building on knowledge – if the discipline includes reviewing the current state of knowledge (which is often omitted by researchers, I find).

Action research approaches are necessary, but academic institutions (and publications) consider these to be fringe.

VB: How does your practitioner work relate to theory and how do you aim to further bridge theory and practice?

SW: Theory in a practitioner’s language is all about strategy. Why one course of action is elected in contrast to another is a strategic choice that should be guided by theory – the most popular example today in my work is “theories of change” that describes actions to realize change in the context of assumptions and causal pathways. However, creating the type of processes necessary to continually reflect on theory is enormously challenging since practitioners are usually very action-oriented. This means creative ways to develop conversations and reflection are required. For example, I was hired to do an “evaluation” for a global change network, but gradually convinced them of the value to think of an “assessment” – rather than input-output thinking which is inappropriate in complex change work, to look at their progress in terms of development as a global change network and the changes in the field they’re working in. This required using tables and frameworks from my academic publications. The Executive Director commented that the assessment: “...generated results far beyond our expectations. We started by anticipating an ordinary evaluation in which

projected results and actual achievements would be compared and analyzed. We ended up engaging in a radical collective reflection on who we are, what brings us together, what is our comparative advantage, and how to position the International Land Coalition in the future.”

VB: What is your opinion on and perhaps experience with working jointly with academics on practical (and urgent) challenges of cross-sector partnerships?

SW: I must admit that often there are challenges with bringing academic colleagues into the planning and work, but I have practice-savvy academic colleagues who are particularly good at writing and analyzing. I believe academics must be really embedded in the communities, working closely with practitioners, and not that many academics can/want to do this. As a result, I tend more often to work with others who have an action research *modus operandi* similar to mine with similar questions and who operate outside of academia.

VB: What is the role of students in bridging the theory-practice gap in cross-sector collaboration?

SW: I delight in working with graduate students, who often have a lot of energy for the questions I have and are very much interested in co-learning and connecting with practitioners. I find they really like the action research environment, even if their academic training has not equipped them for it. For example, I have to introduce them to the ideas of “embedding knowledge” with those whom we’re working with, and increasing their comfort levels with changing research strategies as data arises rather than doggedly waiting until “the end” of a research project to make changes in a research program. There are a lot more ambiguities and “entrepreneurialness” in the way I work than most graduate students are trained for.

VB: What are your ideas on how research on cross-sector collaboration can be more relevant to practice?

SW: For me it is quite obvious that action research approaches are necessary, but academic institutions (and publications) consider these to be fringe. If the primary goal is publication of concepts with questions determined by academics, as opposed to co-identified questions with practitioners demonstrating use as well as knowledge generation, the situation won’t change. | ARSP |



by Dr. Verena Bitzer

*Postdoctoral research fellow at the Graduate School of Business,
University of Cape Town, S. Africa.*



Miguel Rivera-Santos

Associate Professor at Babson College, Boston, MA, USA

The 'lack' of relevance of researchers for practice stems from a misunderstanding of this role

Can you briefly describe the type of work that you are engaged in and for which organization you work?

Miguel Riviera - Santos: I am interested in understanding how organizations can practically bridge institutional divides, which I study both at the organizational and at the environmental levels. At the organizational level, my research explores the governance implications of collaborating across sectors, trying to understand which mechanisms, both formal and informal, can be used to effectively govern collaborations in spite of deep differences between cross-sector partners. At the environmental level, I am interested in understanding which mechanisms firms and NGOs can use to govern and protect their transactions in non-traditional institutional environments, in particular in sub-Saharan African subsistence communities, in which formal mechanisms are typically very weak, while ethnic or local identities are strong. I have pursued this research line for several years jointly with Carlos Rufin (Suffolk U.), and with several co-authors, such as Ans Kolk (U. of Amsterdam) or Matt Murphy (U. of Victoria), among others. I currently have a joint appointment between EMLYON Business School (France) and Babson College (US).



VB: What are your thoughts on this statement? “Research on cross-sector collaboration often has little relevance for cross-sector collaboration practice.”

MRS: I would strongly disagree with this statement! I think that the idea that research has little relevance for practice comes from a misunderstanding of the role of researchers. I believe our role is to develop rigorous and conceptually sound frameworks that can help to better understand the practical challenges faced by people working in the cross-sector collaborations. In a sense, our role is to take time to develop and test theory,

Academic relevance stems from researchers striving to develop insights that resonate with, and can help, practice, while grounding these insights in theory and sound empirical strategies.

frameworks, and practical insights, thus emphasizing rigor over speed. In that manner, the insights that are developed can be trusted because they have been rigorously tested. In other terms, I believe that academic relevance stems from researchers striving to develop insights that resonate with, and can help, practice, while grounding these insights in theory and sound empirical strategies.

VB: How does your research relate to practice and/or how do you aim to further bridge theory and practice?

MRS: My research is naturally connected to practice, given its focus on practical governance mechanisms and on the options that are available for firms, NGOs, and other actors, to govern their collaborations. To give an example, I have seen how my work with Carlos Rufin and Ans Kolk on institutional interactions in subsistence markets, which may seem very abstract, resonates with

NGO members, who find that it helps them understand the practical difficulties they face on the ground and why some projects work in some environments and not in others. My current projects follow the same pattern of trying to link academic rigor with insights that relates to, with, and can help, practitioners.

VB: What is your opinion on and perhaps experience with conducting research jointly with practitioners?

MRS: I do not personally have experience in conducting research jointly with practitioners. I believe it can be very useful and lead to important insights, but I also think it is important to remember that the role of researchers is to ensure academic rigor, which typically takes a lot of time and which can sometimes be difficult to fit in the timeframes of practitioners. In other terms, I think that collaborations between researchers and practitioners can be useful and should be encouraged for practical research questions, but may be less adapted to more complex research questions, which also need to be pursued.

VB: What is the role of students in bridging the theory-practice gap in cross-sector collaboration?

MRS: Students play an important role in bringing insights from research into practice, as they learn approaches grounded in academic research and have these frameworks at their disposal when they start working. After graduation, their feedback as practitioners is also invaluable for researchers to recognize the needs of practice in terms of what research can bring. In this sense, they represent an important conduit for the conversation between research and practice.

VB: What are your ideas on how research on cross-sector collaboration can be more relevant to practice?

MRS: I believe that more conversations between research and practice should be encouraged, as they can help researchers get a better sense of the type of insights that is needed by practitioners, and practitioners better understand the role of academically rigorous frameworks for practice. | [A·R·S·P](#) |



by Dr. Verena Bitzer

*Postdoctoral research fellow at the Graduate School of Business,
University of Cape Town, S. Africa.*

A warm welcome to all the new members of our community! If you would like to be profiled in this section in the next ARSP, please make sure that you sign up as a member of our NPO-BUS Partnerships Yahoo Group by following this [link](#).



SONIA TELLO ROZAS is Professor at the School of Management, University of Québec in Montreal (UQAM), Canada. Her research examines issues related to the third sector, particularly how social actors overcome state and market failures, using both quantitative (mainly econometric analysis) and qualitative methods. She has an excellent knowledge of the Latin American context where she studied several cases. One of her current projects deals with multi-sector social driven collaborations and complex platforms where multiple and hybrid collaborations co-exist and where civil society plays a central role. Her research provides lessons and guidance for public policy decision-making processes and for social actors seeking to launch development projects involving local communities.



ALAN FOWLER is Professor emeritus (living in South Africa) at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) of Erasmus University Rotterdam, with a cross-cutting disciplinary background in development studies, international aid, international relations and governance. His research deals with civic agency and cross-institutional innovation, applying theories from political science, institutional ecology as well as non-profit management and organization. Accordingly, he attaches great importance to interdisciplinary research approaches, with strong emphasis on participatory and mixed methods for co-production of “knowledges”. Such co-production partly bridges the academic-practitioner divide and fits well with the mission of the ISS, which is a center for and encourages, applied social sciences. More practically, Alan’s advisory work with a variety of organizations is informed by his theoretical work and vice versa.



GREETJE SCHOUTEN is a postdoctoral researcher at Wageningen University, the Netherlands, in the Public Administration and Policy Group/Knowledge Technology and Innovation Group. Her research focuses on partnerships between NGOs and businesses in the field of sustainable food and agriculture. Within this field, she analyzes how and with what implications partnerships use certification as the main instrument to enforce their regulation. Furthermore, she studies partnership arrangements within the broader governance system of which they form part to analyze their interactions with public regulatory strategies. Her empirical focus is on the soy, palm oil, and shrimp industries. She studies these partnerships using a variety of theoretical perspectives and analytical frameworks, including global value chain analysis, legitimacy, complex sovereignty, deliberative capacity, proto-institutions, institutional fit, etc. She mainly applies qualitative research methods, and most of her research projects have an action research component.



ALIREZA AHMADSIMAB is a PhD candidate in strategy at the management department of ESSEC Business School, France. His research lies at the intersection of strategy, organizational theory and international business. In his dissertation, he utilizes an inductive, comparative case study approach to investigate three NPO-BUS partnerships which address social issues such as education, improving working conditions of the workforce, reducing infant mortality and alleviating poverty in developing countries. He is particularly interested in how organizations belonging to different organizational spheres manage to achieve stable partnerships over time. Alireza also teaches courses in strategic management, international business, business ethics and sustainable development at ESSEC Business School and NEOMA Business School.



JILL BOGIE is a PhD candidate at the University of Stellenbosch Business School, South Africa, and holds an MPhil in Future Studies, also from Stellenbosch. The topic of her research is "Cross-sector Collaborations for a Sustainable World", focusing on a collaborative network working towards responsible sourcing of seafood in the supply chain of a South African retailer. The research explores the lived experiences of key individuals who consider both their personal and organizational perspectives. From a methodological point of view Jill is exploring a new way of combining interpretative phenomenological analysis with narrative inquiry. Her research was inspired by the practical challenge for South African listed companies to act as good corporate citizens and to demonstrate how collaborative interactions might contribute to improving practice standards in relation to their social and environmental responsibilities.



PETAR BACHEV is a doctoral researcher in management studies at the University of Hull, UK. His research topic is "Strategies for Cross-Sector Partnerships (CSPs)". The purpose of his PhD research is to explore CSPs from a processual-discursive approach. As such the study aims to develop a more critical understanding of the ways in which CSPs are constructed and legitimized by assessing the "unitary" yet contradictory "meanings" in the narrative accounts describing CSPs. His study is based on a qualitative approach with semi-structured interviews as the main method for data collection and applies a deconstructive analytical framework for the analysis. The study provides an alternative post-modern process view which explores CSPs as dynamic, emergent and complex discursive processes of organizing rather than static "entity-like" states. This theoretical and empirical conceptualization will help researchers and practitioners to develop a better understanding of CSPs at different organizational and managerial levels.




ADELE WIMAN is a researcher at the Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria. She previously served as the first NGO-business partnership broker in Lithuania working at the United Nations Development Programme. Within the national programme for CSR advancement she brokered and consulted 28 NGO-business partnerships over two years. Later she finalized her MPP degree focusing on how cross-sector partnerships set up inclusive businesses in post-communist contexts (Eastern Europe and Central Asia), finding many differences in the partners involved and the roles they fulfill when compared to other regions. She currently runs a multi-stakeholder expert platform within GLOBAL VALUE (www.global-value.eu), one of the largest EU-funded research projects dealing with the impacts of business on development. The project aims at creating a framework and tool to measure and manage business impacts on development. Adele remains active in consulting NGO-business partnerships in Lithuania as a member of the CSR advisors' network.



ADRIANA VALENTINA ANDRONACHE (picture: right) and **LAURA KREILING** (picture: left) are graduates of the Erasmus Mundus Master of Science in Strategic Project Management (European). During their master studies – which brought them to live and study in Scotland, Italy and Sweden – they found to share a passion for issues around the intersection of society and business. Consequently, they have been involved in the international Erasmus Mundus Project on the Integration of the Social Economy in Higher Education, led by York St. John University.

In their joint thesis research, they focused on the topic of project management in the formation of cross-sector social partnerships. By means of a multi-method qualitative study, they compared four partnerships between private and third sector organizations in Romania, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Germany. The research showed that project management is deployed differently in the formation of cross-sector social partnerships, depending on contextual elements and the intention with which they were formed. This is reflected in the interaction of partners, the level of trust between them, the way knowledge is shared and ultimately in the level of formality in which project management is deployed. They built on existing theory by proposing the expansion of an established collaboration continuum.

Since the successful completion of their Master degree at the beginning of 2014, Adriana has been working with the research community of Umea University on business model innovation in Sweden and Laura became Project Content Developer for the above mentioned Social Economy project and is Business Associate at Glasgow Strathclyde University in a Knowledge Transfer Partnership. They kindly invite you to view their work at <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?searchId=1&pid=diva2:688713>.



ÖZGÜ KARAKULAK holds a BA degree in economics from the Sabanci University Turkey and has been awarded an MA degree in Development Studies from the University of Manchester in 2009. On completion of her MA, she worked for several NGOs focused on education and women's empowerment in Turkey. In 2012 she started studying MRes in Management Science at the ESADE Business School, Spain. Since January 2014, Özgü is working as a teaching assistant and a PhD student at the University of Geneva, Switzerland. Her research interests are related to Public-Private Partnerships and Cross-Sector Social Partnerships. Özgü also volunteers for the ARSP in its promotional efforts.

DISTRIBUTION PARTNERS

SECTION



Universities..... 100

Institutes, Initiatives, Social Enterprises
& blogs..... 102




by Dr. Arno Kourula

*Assistant Professor of Strategy, University
of Amsterdam Business School.*


ARSP Distribution Partners

The Annual Review of Social Partnerships (ARSP) is grateful to all our distribution partners who support the ARSP by sharing it as an open access resource, created by volunteer partnership academics and practitioners and distributed all over the world promoting cross -sector collaboration for the social good. We are extremely proud to be associated with leading Universities around the globe who serve through their dedicated departments the social good. We provide all the relevant links below for you to explore further their programmes. We invite you to visit the websites of the diverse independent institutes, initiatives, social enterprises and blogs that support the ARSP to learn, share and engage by clicking on the names of each department.!

Universities



Aalto University School of Business,
Corporate Environmental and Social
Responsibility Research, Aalto University



Amsterdam Business School,
University of Amsterdam



**Copenhagen
Business School**
HANDELSHØJSKOLEN

Copenhagen Business School,
Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility
&

Copenhagen Business School,
Governing Responsible Business Research Environment



**HARVARD
BUSINESS SCHOOL**

Harvard Business School,
Social Enterprise

DISTRIBUTION PARTNERS SECTION



A·R·S·P



Kadir Has University

Kent
Business School

Kent Business School,
University of Kent



Nottingham University
Business School

Nottingham University Business School,
International Centre for Corporate
Social Responsibility

Geneva
PPP Research
Center

Geneva PPP Research Center,
University of Geneva



Partnerships Resource Centre,
Rotterdam School of Business,
Erasmus University



Suffolk University
Sawyer Business School

Suffolk University,
Sawyer Business School



WAGENINGEN **UR**
For quality of life

Global Center for Food Systems Innovation,
Wageningen University



UNIVERSITY OF
WATERLOO

School of Environment,
Enterprise and Development,
University of Waterloo

Institutes, Initiatives, Social Enterprises & blogs

Crane and Matten blog

Crane and Matten blog



CSR International



Hubert Project



Intersector Project



Türkiye
Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk
Derneği

CSR Turkey



The Partnering Initiative

In addition to the above the ARSP is distributed all over the world on open access to over 30,000 academics and practitioners using dedicated mail lists and social media. | [ARSP](#) |

If you wish to make available the ARSP to your stakeholders and join our distribution partners please get in touch with Dr. Arno Kourula, ARSP Senior Editor on A.E.Kourula@uva.nl

The content of the ARSP is the result of the collective efforts of many individuals representing a wide range of organisations. Each individual is responsible only for his/her own opinion expressed in the ARSP and which does not represent the opinion of their organisations. The ARSP distribution partners are not responsible in any way for the content of the publication and do not necessarily share the views expressed within the publication.

ANNUAL REVIEW *of* SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS

Deadline for submission of material for the next ARSP issue:
15th March 2015 to the relevant ARSP Editor.