. . .IDR Reports: A Continuing Series of Occasional Papers . . .

Promoting Corporate Citizenship in the Global South

Towards a Model of Empowered Civil Society Collaboration with Business

by Darcy Ashman

Volume 16, Number 3
2000

Institute for Development Research
44 Farnsworth Street Boston, Massachusetts 02210
Tel: 617-422-0422 Fax: 617-482-0617
Email: idr@jsi.com
www.jsi.com/idr

Acknowledgments

This paper was supported by funding from the Ford Foundation. The initial study was designed and initiated by Steve Waddell. Research at the national level in Brazil was carried out under the supervision of Rosa Maria Fischer, Andres Falconer, and Luciana Jacques Faria of the Center for Third Sector Management Studies of the University of Sao Paulo; in India by the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) in Delhi; and in South Africa, by MBM Change Agents of Johannesburg. Presentation of preliminary findings at conferences of CIVICUS in the Philippines and ARNOVA in the US helped a great deal in identifying critical issues for civil society organizations. Individuals who have contributed to the development of ideas presented in this paper include Jane Covey and David Brown of IDR, Dinky Soliman and Dan Songco of CODE-NGO in the Philippines, leaders of the Philippine Business for Social Progress, Atreeyee Cordiero of PRIA, and Rosa Maria Fischer and Andres Falconer of CEATS-USP.

IDR Reports Vol.16 No.3

Promoting Corporate Citizenship in the Global South: Towards a Model of Empowered Civil Society Collaboration with Business

by Darcy Ashman

Acknowledgments I

Abstract 1

Introduction 1

Strategic Partnerships 2

Methodology And Cases 3

Comparative Analysis 5

Discussion: Towards A Model Of Empowered Civil Society Collaboration With Business 17

Conclusions And Implications For The Field 19

Attachment I: Summary Of Country Case Studies 20

References 23

Promoting Corporate Citizenship in the Global South: Towards a Model of Empowered Civil Society Collaboration with Business

by Darcy Ashman

Abstract

Strategic partnerships between civil society organizations (CSOs) and businesses are widely promoted as the cornerstone of new strategies to encourage corporate citizenship in the global South. This study tested these claims by examining ten cases of collaboration between civil society organizations and businesses in Brazil, India, and South Africa. Findings suggest a more sobering view of the benefits that civil society organizations and their constituencies can expect from collaboration. Development impacts may be more likely in sectors like education and employment generation. Aspirations to build human and material capacity are more likely to be satisfied than empowerment agendas. CSOs and businesses reap mutual benefits from collaboration, but CSOs appear to shoulder more of the costs. Unless the resources brought by CSOs are mutually valued, businesses tend to dominate collaborative decision-making, with negative results for sustainability. The paper offers several propositions to guide further research and inform on-going efforts to collaborate across the sectors for development. An alternative conceptual framework to strategic partnerships, empowered civil society collaboration with business, is suggested as the basis of a more appropriate model for the development community.

Introduction

Global leaders in civil society and business are promoting collaboration between civil society and the market as an important new strategy for sustainable development. Key international organizations like CIVICUS, The World Bank, The Prince of Wales Business Forum, and the United Nations Development Program are convening forums, initiating action learning projects, and recommending approaches to collaboration. After a decade or more of neo-liberal policy governance in most countries around the world, several trends have converged to prompt attention within civil society to the idea of collaboration with business. Development-oriented civil society organizations (CSOs) are facing increasing uncertainty and reductions in financial resource flows from international donors and national governments. Simultaneously, demands for services are growing as large numbers of people suffer from decreased government services and economic dislocations that are associated with global financial shifts. Since governments are no longer viewed as having the legitimacy or capacity to provide basic services and social safety nets, private actors in civil society and the market are called on to address social demands.

The idea that increased levels of cooperation between civil society organizations and businesses will bring significant benefits for sustainable development in the global South needs further exploration. If collaboration with business is warranted as a major new strategy for civil society-based development organizations, it should produce significant impacts and be widely replicable across the global South. This paper assesses the empirical data from ten cases of civil society-business partnerships in Brazil, South Africa, and India. It identifies the benefits of civil society-business collaboration and examines factors associated with the relatively more successful cases. The analysis suggests a more sobering view of the benefits of civil society-business collaboration than many expect. Corporate citizenship is not likely to produce significant development results unless civil society organizations are empowered partners in their collaborative ventures.

Strategic Partnerships

One of the most widely promoted approaches to civil society-business collaboration is that of strategic partnerships (Pinney, 1999; Twose & Blakely, 1999; Waddell, 1997). In most definitions, a partnership is strategic when it involves the core business or program activities of both partners. Strategic partnerships are said to differ from past forms of relationships between the sectors. They are neither philanthropic relationships in which businesses simply donate funds to CSOs, nor adversarial relationships based on CSO protest of corporate behavior. In businesses, strategic partnerships with CSOs include internal functions beyond community relations, like production, marketing, and recruitment. Civil society organizations look to strategic business partners to jointly create programs in which business capacities are critical to solving development problems. Strategic partnerships are "win-win" relationships based on mutual gain to the partners in areas of their strategic interests (Waddell, 1999).

Proponents argue that strategic partnerships create greater benefits for the partners and society than philanthropic relationships. Because they are more central to the partners' core businesses and programs, partners are more likely to invest significant resources in them. Partnerships between businesses and civil society organizations combine the complementary strengths associated with their sectoral identities, e.g. the productive capacity of business and the social organizing capacity of civil society (Pinney, 1999; Twose & Blakely, 1999; Waddell and Brown, 1997). Intersectoral partnerships are thought to be particularly well-suited to addressing large, complex social problems that cannot be solved by single sectors and organizations acting alone (Waddell and Brown, 1997). Some proponents are so convinced of the value of strategic partnerships that they urge civil society organizations to stop criticizing corporate behavior and start collaborating with businesses; others encourage CSOs to learn business language and adopt business-like management principles (Buzzard, 1998; Waddell, 1997).

Strategic partnerships are considered to contain inherent incentives that motivate prospective partners to collaborate, especially in situations where they face complex problems that they cannot solve alone (Pinney, 1999; Waddell, 1997). Since many civil society organizations and businesses are separated by sectoral, social, or political differences, the literature emphasizes the importance of intermediary actors which can link prospective partners (Pinney, 1999; Waddell, 1999). Civil society organizations and businesses may realize that they can benefit from collaboration across sectors yet fail to know any potential partners, so actors with linkages to both sectors are necessary to facilitate collaborative ventures. Advocates of strategic partnerships have given less attention to precipitating factors in the social, economic, and political environment of the actors than other researchers of collaboration (Astley and Fombrun, 1983; Trist, 1983; Gray, 1989; Saxton, 1997; Ashman, 1999).

Inter-organizational relationships and coordination mechanisms that ensure mutual influence and shared control are a major factor in the success of most kinds of interorganizational collaboration (Alter and Hage, 1993; Brown & Ashman, 1996; Brown, 1998; Ashman, 1999). Partners may not be equal in size, resources, or expertise, but results appear to be more significant when decision-making about the direction and management of joint activities is shared (Saxton, 1997). Since businesses tend to have more financial resources, they are seen as the more powerful partner in most civil society-business relationships. More study of the ways in which inter-organizational arrangements balance experienced power differences between civil society and business organizations is needed before endorsing the idea of collaboration as a means to development.

The arguments for strategic partnerships between civil society organizations and businesses can be summarized in the following four propositions. These propositions guide the comparative analysis of ten cases of civil society-business collaboration in Brazil, India, and South Africa.

P1: Strategic partnerships between civil society and business organizations lead to more significant development impacts than other forms of collaboration.

P2: Strategic partnerships yield mutual benefits for partner organizations.

P3: Inherent incentives and intermediary actors foster the emergence of collaboration.

P4: Shared control of partnership decision-making is associated with successful collaboration.

Methodology And Cases

Steve Waddell of the Institute for Development Research (IDR) designed the study to be a comparative and collaborative action research project. By working with national research partners and practitioners engaged in collaborations in selected countries, the study would produce findings relevant to a broad global constituency and improving practice within the countries. The research approach was geared to producing data that would build theory and improve managerial knowledge for practitioners.

The Ford Foundation provided support for carrying out the study in three countries, Brazil, India, and South Africa. Waddell selected the research partners in the three countries and provided a common conceptual outline to guide data collection and analysis. The outline was informed by the theory of collaboration and strategic intersectoral partnerships discussed above. Researchers collected primary and secondary data to address the key points in the conceptual outline. This is an approach that enables researchers to capture the rich details of each case in its specific context, and identify common patterns across the cases that can be generalized to build theory and improve practice (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 1994).

The research partners in the three countries completed a total of thirteen case profiles and three analyses of the national environment influencing collaboration. The selection criteria included: mutual benefit to core operational activities of both partners, presence of both civil society and market organizations, a history of collaboration for at least three years, variety of types of collaboration, and evidence of outcomes, preferably more substantial ones. The completed environmental reports and case profiles were analyzed in an iterative process in which matrices of key dimensions were compared to identify the most salient factors and patterns (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

A few limitations to the study have emerged during the comparative analysis of the cases and environmental reports. A total of ten cases proved to be fully comparable and serve as the data for this paper (see Table 1 and Appendix 1, attached). The research partners in the three countries interpreted the intersectoral collaboration and strategic partnership models in slightly different ways. Some of the cases do not appear to be strategic partnerships at all, and other cases conceptualize corporate foundations as embodying strategic partnerships between the sectors. Similarly, the three research partners emphasized different aspects of collaborations, perhaps in ways consistent with their own programmatic approaches. The university-based center for third sector research in Brazil sought to study a diverse group of cases, and emphasized the experience of the organizational partners. The NGO support organization in India devoted significant attention to the qualitative impacts on the individuals and communities who participated in the joint projects.

Despite these limitations, the partners produced three country-level environmental analyses and ten cases fully comparable across key dimensions that provide relevant empirical data to the theoretical and practical issues motivating this paper. It is doubtful that external researchers could have had similar access to the partnerships or ability to analyze them as meaningfully within their national contexts.

Table 1: Collaboration Cases and Lead Partners By Country

Collaboration Cases	Lead Partners
Brazil Education Improvement Project *New curriculum & training materials were produced to improve the quality of public education in Brazil.*	Civil Society: Professional NGO Market: National bank
Brazil Education Management Improvement *Total quality management & training were provided to improve public education in the city of Timoteo.*	Civil Society/Market*: Corporate foundation State: Municipal education department
Brazil Day Care Centers *Eight new day care centers for community residents and employees were established on company premises in the city of Diadema.*	Civil Society: Local NGO Market:Local construction company
Brazil Vocational Education Institute *A vocational education institute was restructured to operate on a more financially sustainable basis.*	Civil Society: Vocational education institute Civil Society/Market*: Corporate foundation
South Africa Housing Improvement Project *A squatter community on a tract of private land in Cape Town gained title & improved housing.*	Civil Society: Local NGO State: Government (central & local) Market: Private developer
South Africa Education Resource Center *A center was established to provide resources to improve the quality of education in a poor rural black district.*	State: Local chemical industry Market: District education department
South Africa Retiree Service Project *Retirees were involved in a national project to make toys, clothing and other items for poor children.*	Civil Society: Umbrella of retiree associations Market: National insurance company
India Bakery Training Project *A slum-based women's microenterprise received training to improve their baking skills.*	Civil Society: Local NGO Market: Branch of large hotel chain
India Watch Training & Repair Center *A new center was created to train & employ poor disabled individuals.*	Civil Society: Local NGO Market: Large watch manufacturer
India Watch Strapping Unit *A new unit was created in an existing company to employ poor disabled youth.*	Civil Society: Local NGO Market: Large watch manufacturer

*Corporate foundations are classified as joint civil society/market partners because of their dual identities and ambiguous control. They can be considered hybrid organizations which are more closely associated with either civil society or the market sector, depending on the criteria used to assign sectoral identity.

The rest of the paper is organized in two sections. The first analyzes the case-based evidence relevant to each of the four propositions and revises them to guide further research and collaboration. The second section discusses the implications of the analysis for re-framing current approaches to civil society-business collaboration. Core elements of a model of collaboration in which civil society organizations are empowered partners are put forward.

Comparative Analysis

P1: Strategic partnerships between civil society and business organizations lead to more significant development impacts than other forms of collaboration.

Although proponents predict that strategic partnerships bring relatively greater development benefits than other forms of collaboration, in these cases strategic partnerships were no more successful than traditional resource-based partnerships. Business philanthropy appears to be a viable model for collaboration, under certain circumstances. This section explores and examines the associations between the form of collaboration and impacts on development among the ten cases.

Form of Collaboration Only four of the ten cases can be considered strategic partnerships, and then only if a broad interpretation of the concept is applied. Table 2 shows the form of partnership and primary motivations of the partners for each case. The South Africa housing project is the best example because it involved a private land developer and housing NGO in a collaborative housing project. The Brazil day care centers does not involve the core business of the participating companies, but the day care sites are on company premises with company involvement. The two Indian watch units are not central to the watch manufacturing operations of the businesses, but they are part of their overall business operations. The NGOs involved were able to provide livelihood opportunities for their constituencies that they had otherwise been unable to manage.

In the resource-based partnerships, companies provided resources like expertise, time, materials, and funds, while the civil society organizations provided resources such as expertise, time, program resources and reach to communities and vulnerable groups. In some partnerships, the companies provided resources to support existing programs of civil society organizations (and governments). In others, new programs were jointly devised to address common concerns.

Development Impacts The social and economic results of the projects and ventures described in the cases are difficult to assess, since they spanned such a wide range of activities. It is not easy to compare public education projects with those in a private housing project or job training and employment. As noted above, the case approach varied among the three countries. Important impacts documented in some cases, e.g. the qualitative dimensions of the India cases, were not included in others. However, it is possible to see some broad patterns in the types of development sector and approach to social change embedded in the projects. Two indicators of development impact are useful for assessing these cases, extent of its reach and resources for sustainability. Extent of reach refers to the numbers of people or institutions that benefited from the project (Brown and Ashman, 1996). Resources for sustainability can be expected to sustain the benefits beyond the end of the project, like widely recognized value and actors who will continue to support it. Of course, actual sustainability can only be verified over time (Brown and Ashman, 1996; Edwards, 1999).

Table 2: Form of Partnership & Primary Motivations for Collaboration By Country

Collaboration Cases	Form of Partnership & Primary Motivations
Brazil Education Improvement Project *New curriculum & training*	*Resource-based*: CSO: resource mobilization Business: resource donation in social responsibility program
Brazil Education Management Improvement *Total quality management & training*	*Resource-based*: Corporate foundation: project initiated & resources provided as social arm of privatized company Government: resource mobilization
Brazil Day Care Centers *Company site day care centers open to communities*	*Strategic:* CSO: resource mobilization & program innovation Business: increase employee retention
Brazil Vocational Education Institute *Restructured institute to operate like business*	*Resource-based:* CSO: resource mobilization & survival Corporate foundation: resources invested & CSO re-structured consistent with social responsibility mission
South Africa Housing Improvement Project *Squatters gain title & improved housing on private land, some land freed for private use*	*Strategic*: CSO: address housing problem of target group Business: solve problem of squatters on private land National government: implement political mandate Local government: protect white community's interests
South Africa Education Resource Center *Educational resources for poor rural black district*	*Resource-based:* CSO/GO: resource mobilization to expand education services in poor black rural district Business: social responsibility
South Africa Retiree Service Project *Retirees involved in making items for poor children*	*Resource-based*: CSO: resource mobilization to expand services to retirees Business: social responsibility
India Bakery Training Project *Skills training for slum-based women's microenterprise*	*Resource-based*: CSO: resource mobilization for target group Business: social responsibility
India Watch Training & Repair Center *New center to train & employ poor disabled individuals*	*Strategic:* CSO: new livelihood program for target group Business: social responsibility
India Watch Strapping Unit *New unit to employ poor disabled youth*	*Strategic:* CSO: new livelihood program for target group Business: social responsibility

Development sector and approach. The projects can be clustered into three related development sectors, education and training (5), training and employment (2), and private social services (3). Three of the education projects involved public school systems, two in Brazil and one in South Africa. Two others were in private vocational education, one in Brazil and one in India. The two training and employment projects were business-based ventures in India. One of the social service projects involved retirees in South Africa, another provided day care centers to company employees and community members in Brazil, and the third provided title and improved housing to poor black South Africans who had been squatters on private land.

The development approaches in all but the housing project can be broadly considered as types of capacity-building (Edwards, 1999). These were not traditional relief or welfare projects which relieve suffering but contribute little to assisting people to change their life opportunities. They provided people and institutions with opportunities to better integrate themselves into existing social and economic arrangements through education, employment, and organizational management improvement. The housing case was an exception in that it involved change in the existing structure of land ownership and redistribution of assets.

What can be concluded from these broad patterns of development sector and approach? Although they were not selected to be representative cases in these respects, the cases may well represent the kinds of sectors and projects in which businesses are likely to take an interest. Many of the projects have counterparts in other countries, such as the public-private education partnerships and the collaborative employment programs. Business owners with longer-term perspectives can see their interests in an educated workforce and income-earning population, as in the major investments by corporate foundations in the Philippines. Development CSOs involved in capacity building projects in these sectors may be the most appropriate partners for collaborative projects with businesses. There is less evidence that businesses are interested in projects associated with other common CSO approaches like social mobilization, advocacy, or good governance.

Development reach and resources for sustainability. Relative measures were developed to identify categories of impact within the cases. To measure reach, the number of people and institutions that benefited from the project were grouped in two categories. Cases reaching more than 1000 people were ranked as wide, while those reaching less were ranked as narrow. Similarly, resources for sustainability (commitment, skills, and other kinds of resources invested in the project results by key stakeholders) were assessed as either high, with evidence of many resources or questionable, with little evidence.

The reach of five cases can be ranked as wide, and five as narrow. Four of the cases reached 19,000 people or more (Brazil and South Africa education improvements and the South Africa retiree project). Although the fifth case, South Africa housing, does not indicate the exact number of people involved, we can assume that upwards to a thousand must have been reached in the 200 ha of new housing provided. The five cases ranked as narrow reached either a few hundred people (Brazil day care centers and vocational education center) or about twenty (the three Indian cases).

Resources for sustainability in four of the cases may be ranked as high, the two Brazil education improvement projects, the Brazil day care center case, and the South Africa housing case. In each of these cases, project improvement have become institutionalized, multiple partners remain committed to the project, and project outcomes are valued by the recipients and key stakeholders in the larger society.

Table 3: Form of Collaboration and Development Impacts
By Significance of Impact

Cases & Form of Collaboration	Development Reach	Resources for Sustainability
Brazil Education Improvement Project *Resource-based Partnership*	*Wide*: 36,000 schools & 1 university with 1000 students	*High:* Widespread voluntary adoption of curriculum, value recognized in external awards
Brazil Education Management Improvement *Resource-based Partnership*	*Wide:* 21 schools with 19,000 students	*High:* City-wide involvement of schools, communities and parents
South Africa Housing Improvement Project *Strategic Partnership*	*Wide:* 200 ha of private land developed for squatters	*High:* Squatters have title, new community organization created, developer remains committed to approach
South Africa Education Resource Center *Resource-based Partnership*	*Wide*: 232 schools with 66,000 students	*Questionable*: Demand for services high, but education department and NGOs dissatisfied, NGOs considering exit
South Africa Retiree Service Project *Resource-based Partnership*	*Wide:* 40,000 retirees	*Questionable:* CSO partner exited project, future benefits uncertain
Brazil Day Care Centers *Strategic Partnership*	*Narrow:* 8 day cares with 288 children	*High:* Model is being replicated, businesses & NGO see mutual benefits to constituencies
Brazil Vocational Education Institute *Resource-based Partnership*	*Narrow:* Restructured institute with several hundred students	*Questionable:* Ambiguous legal status as hybrid company & NGO, dependent on single market
India Bakery Training Project *Resource-based Partnership*	*Narrow:* 20 poor women trained	*Questionable:* Women & NGO need more technical assistance
India Watch Training & Repair Center *Strategic Partnership*	*Narrow:* 23 poor disabled individuals trained & employed	*Questionable:* Repair center dependent on parent company, cannot respond to increases in demand
India Watch Strapping Unit *Strategic Partnership*	*Narrow:* 20 poor disabled youth trained & employed	*Questionable:* Unit is part of industry & vulnerable to downturns

Significant questions about the sustainability of the outcomes were documented in six of the cases. In all four of the cases that integrate business management practices with civil society organization programs, questions about future sustainability plague the CSOs. The restructured Brazilian vocational education center is dependent on a single purchaser (the government) and has an ambiguous legal status. The two Indian watch business ventures are dependent on the watch companies and industry for success, and the women bakers do not feel confident of expanding their business as needed. In the two other cases (South African retiree and education), the dissatisfaction of civil society and government partners either has led to withdrawal of the partners, or may do so in the future.

Given these rankings, the cases fall into three groups, cases in which the impacts were relatively high, cases in which they were mixed, and cases in which they were relatively low (see Table 3). The relatively low ranking does not mean that the cases were not highly meaningful and satisfying to those who benefited from the projects, just that there were relatively fewer people involved and more questions about how long the benefits would continue. These categories are largely descriptive. They are useful for classifying the types of collaborative projects. No major constellations of factors can be identified to explain why some cases had relatively higher impact than others (Brown and Ashman, 1996). However, a number of interesting patterns in the data do emerge that disconfirm one of the major assumptions of the study and indicate promising directions for further research.

First, in direct contrast to current thinking about civil society-business collaboration, there is no relationship between the form of partnership and higher impact. Three of the four strategic partnerships were associated with a narrow reach and questionable resources for sustainability, while many of the resource-based partnerships achieved more significant impacts on these dimensions.

Second, reaching a wide number of people and institutions is associated with the institutional capacity of the partners. All of the five cases with a wide reach involved either a government body with geographical authority such as a school district, or a civil society organization representing a large number of member organizations. One case also involved the branch offices of a large corporation in carrying out the joint projects (South Africa Retirees). In contrast, cases with a narrow reach tended to leave out the government as a partner, and involve local CSOs with local companies or single branches of large corporations.

Finally, in contrast to much current wisdom encouraging CSOs to adopt business management principles in the interests of financial sustainability, there were remaining questions about sustainability plaguing all of the four cases in which CSOs integrated their service with a business (the three Indian cases) or restructured themselves to operate like a business (the Brazil vocational institute). The key problem of over-dependence on a single source of income remains. The long-term success of these hybrid organizations may well require commitments to on-going learning and problem-solving as they gain experience and adapt to dynamic environments.

In general, the types of impacts achieved by these cases are not as significant as others noted in the development field (Brown & Ashman, 1996; Uphoff, Esman & Krishna, 1998; Uvin, 1995). However, they are not wholly insignificant either. Sustainable improvements in education and housing were achieved in situations where they may not have been attained by other means. Even mixed and questionable cases were very meaningful for those involved, like the Indian bakery and watch manufacturing cases. They may indicate the potential for the kinds of impacts, if not the impacts themselves. Based on these findings, revised propositions relating to form of collaboration and types of development impacts are suggested.

P1: Both resource-based and strategic partnerships between Southern civil society organizations and businesses can lead to valuable development impacts.

> P1a: A wider reach of impacts can be achieved by involving partners with the institutional capacity to cover large geographical areas and include large numbers of socially isolated groups.
>
> P1b: In collaborations bringing business management principles to civil society projects and partners, a longer time frame and opportunities for joint learning are more likely to produce financially sustainable results.

P2: Strategic partnerships yield mutual benefits for partner organizations.

A central tenet of collaboration theory is that collaborating partners achieve mutual benefits (Gray, 1989; Pinney, 1999; Waddell, 1997)). The transaction costs associated with collaboration are compensated for by benefits that otherwise would be difficult to attain (Jarillo, 1988; Williamson, 1980). The evidence from these cases suggests that too little attention has been paid to the extent to which the costs, as well as the benefits, are mutually borne by the partners. All of the partners in these cases did receive benefits from collaboration, but most of the costs and significant challenges were borne by the civil society and government partners. The net gains were not mutual; it appears to be a bigger risk for civil society organizations and governments to collaborate with business than vice versa.

Benefits to Partners Four kinds of benefits accrued to partner organizations: business or program innovation, positive public relations, net gains in financial and material resources, and organizational capacity-building. Two of the business partners solved business problems by innovative cooperation with CSOs. The South African land developer was able to develop his land by inventing solutions together with the NGO and the government. The Brazilian construction company was able to retain employees in the down season by problem-solving with a corporate foundation and the NGO day-care provider. In three of the cases CSO partners were able to solve development problems, the South African housing NGO and the Indian NGOs searching for livelihood opportunities for their constituencies.

Business involvement in socially responsible activities can be a source of skepticism to civil society observers who argue that the benefits to the corporation's image outweigh or even whitewash destructive practices. These cases confirm that the companies' public images improved. It is likely that the increased image translated into increased market support. For some companies with formal commitments to and programs in social responsibility, collaboration with the CSOs brought resources that they would otherwise lack. In some cases, like the Brazilian education improvement project, the scale and quality of the impacts translated into significant visibility for the company, which was demonstrated in awards from the national chamber of commerce and UNICEF.

However, the CSOs also increased their external images and relations in ways that led to increased opportunities for resource mobilization. In six of the cases, the CSOs increased their experience with and visibility in corporate communities. In turn, these led to increased contacts with other companies and donors which translated into new projects (Brazil education improvement, Brazil day care, Brazil vocational education, India bakery and watch strapping unit, and South Africa retirees). Two cases illustrate the benefits. The Brazilian professional education NGO leveraged the initial funds from the bank to diversify its funding sources. The South African retiree association became dissatisfied with its original insurance company partner. They left the partnership and on the basis of what they had learned, identified a more compatible partner for collaboration in a new project.

Of course, the primary financial and material resource transfer is from the companies to the CSO and government partners. They were able to extend the reach and improve the quality of their programs with the input of corporate resources. Important resources in addition to funds included materials and business expertise. This does not mean that the companies never gained as well. The Indian watch companies saved the cost of building or contracting out ancillary or repair units by collaborating with the NGOs. The South African developer was able to develop the land that became vacant with squatter resettlement.

Organizations and employees gained by cross-sectoral collaboration. Both CSOs and businesses added new physical and structural capacity. In the Indian cases, the watch manufacturers added new units and the NGOs in all the cases created new departments or gained new expertise in business-like management. The Brazilian on-site day care centers were jointly 'owned' by the businesses and the NGO. Partners in all the sectors learned new skills associated with coordinating joint activities, communicating with very different organizational cultures, and negotiating differences. In all the cases, the projects were a first-time experience for at least one, if not more, of the partners. Their capacity for future collaboration was strengthened when they learned from the partnership experiences. Finally, in several cases, business employees felt personally enriched by their experiences with the CSOs and community members (Brazil day care, India bakery and watch strapping unit). At times, these benefits translated into increased team spirit and motivation in the workplace.

Costs and Challenges The cases suggest three primary costs associated with collaboration, the time and energy invested in learning to relate to the partner, adapting organizations to meet demands of collaboration, and reduced effectiveness resulting from the lack of influence in the partnership. The first, experienced by partners in both sectors, are associated with the transaction costs of collaborating across the sector. Leadership and operational styles often differ in business and civil society organizations. Collaboration requires learning to deal with the other's style, whether businesses develop patience to negotiate with NGOs or NGOs adapt to business demands for measurable short-term outputs.

The second and third types of costs appeared to be borne disproportionately by the CSOs. Some CSOs adapted their personnel and structures in response to demands from business for more concrete and quantifiable outcomes, shorter time frames, and quick responses to their concerns and issues. In two CSOs, staff left the organization in frustration over conflicts in the collaboration (South Africa housing and India Watch Strapping Unit). One of the corporate foundations restructured itself to be more acceptable to its business funders. One CSO gave up its autonomy and closed one of its social programs that was not financially sound (Brazil vocational institute). The loss of one program may have been the price of survival, but to the extent that the program met a social need, it can be counted as a loss to the CSO's mission. Many of these changes are challenges to be managed as much as costs to the organizations, but they are clearly the consequence of collaborating with business. A long-term strategy of collaboration with business would make investments in such adaptations more cost-effective.

Finally, and most significantly, civil society organizations (and governments) appear to be vulnerable to losing influence to corporate (and corporate foundation) partners. One of the key reasons why resources for sustainability are ranked as questionable is that civil society and government partners were not very committed to or confident about the project. CSOs and government partners expressed dissatisfaction with the project, had exited, or could not influence business to take up their interests.

In some cases, the relatively greater influence of the business partners in the collaboration appears to be unintentional. Business may become the d*efacto* dominant partner as a result of the interaction of the two sectors. Business managerial approaches are usually perceived as more directive and less consultative than approaches used in the civil society sector. Both business and civil society organizations can fall into the trap of the donor-recipient behavior, in which the financial resource-providing partner is expected to shape the terms of cooperation.

Two of the Brazilian corporate foundations learned to transform their dominating behavior through their interactions with civil society. They changed because of the pressure on corporate foundations to demonstrate their legitimacy as vehicles for corporate social responsibility. One foundation evolved from taking the lead role in its projects to playing a more catalytic role, using its cross-sectoral networks to link potential partners with each other (Brazil education management improvement). The other evolved from taking over the management of the CSO that approached it for assistance to letting it go and manage itself autonomously (Brazil vocational education institute).

To summarize, civil society organizations can benefit from collaboration with business, but they also face costs and challenges. Civil society-business collaboration can bring gains to CSOs such as new opportunities to diversify resources, expand existing programs and create new ones. Expanded organizational capacity to collaborate with business is only a benefit if a CSO has chosen to pursue such collaboration as a strategy. Otherwise, engaging with business requires investing a fair amount of time and resources in learning to speak business language and operate more on business-like terms. When CSOs exert less influence than corporate partners, they face not only increased dissatisfaction, but lost resources invested in joint projects and credibility with their constituencies. Governments appear to be as vulnerable to *defacto* corporate domination as CSOs.

> P2: Civil society-business collaboration yields several kinds of mutual benefits, e.g. business or program innovation, improved public relations, financial and material resource gains, and organizational capacity-building.
>
> > P2a: The costs and challenges of intersectoral collaboration are disproportionately borne by the civil society partners, e.g. organizational adaptation and excessive business influence of joint projects.
> >
> > P2b: Insufficient influence by CSOs is a cost for business partners because it can reduce chances for project sustainability.
> >
> > P2c: Civil society organizations are more likely to achieve net benefits from collaboration with business when they adopt such collaboration as a long-term strategy.

P3: Inherent incentives and intermediary actors foster the emergence of collaboration.

Arguments for strategic partnerships as vehicles for development in the global South have been made on the basis of experiences in the relatively industrialized North (Pinney, 1999; Waddell, 1997) and in international domains like environmental protection (Bendell and Murphy, 1997). Too little consideration has been given to the distinctive social, political, and economic contexts of collaboration in the South. These cases suggest that inherent incentives and intermediaries are not sufficient to foster collaboration. More often, collaboration is a response to contextual pressures in policy environments, government regulations and social pressures. Incentives to collaborate are created by environmental conditions, and intermediary actors are only one “bridge” fostering collaboration.

A list of factors influencing the emergence of collaboration in South Africa, Brazil and India was mined from the cases (see Table 4). Two sets of factors were located in the international environment and two at the national level. Not surprisingly, the most common trend influencing these cases was the world-wide influence of the neo-liberal paradigm promoting market-oriented policies. In all three countries, national governments have responded to international pressures to liberalize economic policies and reduce their roles in service-provision. The public education improvement cases were directly linked to the publicly-recognized limitations of the state in Brazil and South Africa.

A second factor in the international environment was the shift in donor funding priorities. In Brazil and South Africa, international donors had reduced the level of their commitments to civil society organizations, so they were virtually forced to look to business as a potential new resource. In India, an international donor with new priorities of promoting civil society-business collaboration supported the intermediary CSO that played absolutely critical roles in brokering the partnerships in all of the cases.

At the national level, two key environmental factors influenced the ways in which generally neo-liberal policies were implemented. One key factor was the type of regime and associated political forces behind the ruling government. The other was the type of social trends emerging related to public perceptions of corporate social responsibility. All three countries were governed by democratic regimes, two of which were newly-elected, Brazil and South Africa. In Brazil, the authoritarian regime had previously restricted CSOs and the society at large from voicing criticisms of corporations, while the new democratic government allowed the political space for criticism to enter the public domain. As a consequence, the Brazilian and South African companies and their foundations were under pressure to demonstrate social responsibility and in the South African case, comply with the law.

Table 4: Environmental Factors Influencing Civil Society-Business Collaboration

Environmental Factors	**Brazil**	**South Africa**	**India**
International influence on national context:			
Neo-liberal economic policies	-liberalization -privatization	-liberalization	-liberalization -privatization
Donor funding priorities	-reduced funding to CSOs	-reduced funding to CSOs	-promote CS-B collaboration
National:			
Regime type	-new democratic regime & space for CSOs	-new democratic regime & space for CSOs	-established democratic regime
Legislation	-pro-social responsibility legislation	-pro-social responsibility legislation	
Social environment	-increasing pressure for corporate social responsibility	-increasing pressure for corporate social responsibility	-little social pressure for corporate social responsibility
Intermediaries	-corporate foundations, pre-existing ties	-no intermediary actors	- CSO intermediary

The Indian cases did not report significant social pressure on the companies to demonstrate their social responsibility. The business in one case (Taj Hotel) entered a collaboration in response to pressure from one community group, but that pressure was not sufficient to encourage collaboration beyond the one project. The other two businesses collaborated with the NGOs because of company or individual interests in social responsibility. It is interesting to consider the relatively small scale and questionable impact of the Indian cases as compared to most of the Brazilian and South African ones. The difference may be a result of the selection process of the study rather than the role of the legal and social environment. However, it is clear that the external pressure on companies in Brazil and South Africa helped them to see the value of collaborating with civil society organizations in ways that produced relatively more significant development impacts.

Intermediaries proved instrumental in Brazil and India. They helped the partners to develop shared goals and mutual understanding. With their understanding of both sectors, they were in a good position to translate and shape emerging ideas. The construction company owner consulted with a local corporate foundation in Brazil about how to create a day care for his employees. The foundation convinced him to collaborate with an existing NGO rather than start a new program. As a result, the new services benefited community members as well as employees.

However, intermediaries were not present in South Africa, nor in all the Brazilian cases. There are two other ways by which partners can link up directly. Partners may find each other by force of government regulations or the resources of social capital. In South Africa, government legislation and social pressure to reach out to poor blacks brought NGOs, businesses, and government together. The legislation and social pressures led the parties to understand that they shared common problems that had to be resolved by collaborating with each other. Social capital was a factor in one of the Brazilian cases, where the founder of a professional education NGO was a relative of the leader of the Bank that was their first corporate partner. The shared family background created mutual trust and shared standards of quality across the sectoral boundaries.

In summary, there were a number of important factors exerting strong pressures on civil society organizations and businesses to collaborate. It may be surprising to some proponents of strategic partnerships to consider that more favorable conditions for collaboration may occur when CSOs and companies are virtually forced to collaborate. The strategic partnership paradigm is based on the potential for intrinsic rewards, but in most of these cases, the organizations were driven to cooperate: CSOs by the search for financial and other resources and companies under pressure to comply with legal regulations and social demands. In only two cases were the business partners primarily motivated by the intrinsic benefits of socially responsible involvement and free from external social or legal pressures. These findings are consistent with research on civil society-business partnerships in the environmental domain which argues that strategic partnerships are only possible after the terms of engagement between the sectors has changed the environment for cooperation (Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Hoffman, 1999).

P3: The emergence of collaboration is strongly influenced by pressures in the policy, legal, and social environments of civil society and business actors.

P3a: In the absence of legislation fostering collaboration, intermediary functions can be performed by specialized organizations and pre-existing social ties.

P4: Shared control of partnership decision-making is associated with successful collaboration.

The cases confirm the consensus that more effective interorganizational arrangements for decision-making promote shared control, and provide new insight into how unequal parties can have mutual influence. All three of the projects that achieved higher development impacts were characterized by shared control or an evolution to shared control. Of the others, only one of those ranked as mixed and none of those ranked as questionable were managed through mechanisms of balanced control (Table 5).

To restate the issue discussed above, excessive corporate influence is a problem for the effectiveness of collaborative projects because it is associated with dissatisfaction, exit, and reduced quality of the project. When civil society organizations don't influence project design and implementation, they fail to shape projects to benefit constituencies. The South African retiree project is a good example of a case where unequal control by the business partner led to the skewing of benefits to the more well-off retirees and the increasing dissatisfaction of the retirees with the project.

Table 5: Balance of Control, Mechanism and Development Impacts By Significance of Impacts

Case	Balance of Control & Mechanism	Development Impacts
Brazil Education Improvement Project	Shared: Contract	*High:* Wide/High
Brazil Education Management Improvement Project	Evolved to shared: Corporate foundation managed	*High:* Wide/High
South Africa Housing Improvement Project	Shared: Formed a new CSO	*High:* Wide/High
South Africa Education Resource Center	Evolved to business control: Management committee & business-appointed director of the center	*Mixed:* Wide/Questionable
South Africa Retiree Service Project	Evolved to business control: Informal arrangement, new business personnel excluded CSO	*Mixed*: Wide/Questionable
Brazil Day Care Centers	Shared: Informal, corporate foundation brokered initial arrangement	*Mixed:* Narrow/High
Brazil Vocational Education Institute	Evolved to CSO autonomy (business model): Corporate foundation took over CSO management, then released	*Questionable:* Narrow/Questionable
India Bakery Training Project	Evolved to business control: Initially brokered by intermediary, but business has greater control over future	*Questionable:* Narrow/Questionable
India Watch Training & Repair Center	Evolved to business control: Initially brokered by intermediary, but business has greater control over future	*Questionable:* Narrow/Questionable
India Watch Strapping Unit	Evolved to business control: Initially brokered by intermediary, but business has greater control over future	*Questionable*: Narrow/Questionable

How can collaborative ventures ensure shared control? This is a critical issue for all kinds of collaboration. The arrangements in the cases where control was shared ran the gamut from informal relationships to formal contracts and management committees. In between are the intermediaries that brokered the relationships or managed the projects (although the latter are not typically considered inter-organizational collaborations). Yet these kinds of arrangements were also present in the cases where business dominated. So the key factor is not the presence of good interpersonal relationships (e.g. a change in personnel can disrupt the entire partnership), a knowledgeable intermediary (e.g. control over the partners is limited), nor the presence of a flat coordinating structure (e.g. it may be undermined by other personnel).

A critical factor that does seem to be associated with shared control as compared to business domination is the valuing of the resources brought by the civil society (or government) partners to the partnership. In general, CSOs have a relative advantage over business in program expertise and relationships with communities and vulnerable groups. Businesses and CSOs that recognize and value the distinctive competence of the CSOs are more likely to ensure that CSOs are involved in control processes. Similarly, when partnerships are based on complementary resources, effective functional roles are more likely to be developed. When the partners value the resources and expertise of CSOs, they are more likely to engage in the joint learning necessary to problem-solve and keep collaborative ventures on track. It is not that the business partner's resources are less important, they just don't tend to get ignored.

The three high impact cases demonstrate three different paths to the mutual recognition of the value of CSO resources. The bank executive in the Brazilian education improvement case initiated a search for a highly reputable CSO in the education field for a joint project. He recognized the need for complementary expertise from the beginning. The Brazilian corporate foundation in the education management improvement project, however, evolved its style from dominating to collaborative because it learned to value the perspectives and capabilities of its civil society clients. It may have been forced to change by feedback, but it articulated its own evolution as a series of shifts in attitude towards CSO partners. Finally, the South African developer valued the NGO and government partners because he had no other option if he wanted to develop his land. He participated with the others in a five-year negotiation process to design and complete the housing project.

In civil society-business collaborations, like others, shared control is key to success. Yet it can not be assumed that the right arrangement can be designed to ensure success. Given the tendency of so much current literature to encourage CSOs to learn business language and act more like businesses, it is critically important to emphasize the problem of shared control and the central value of CSOs' expertise and knowledge of communities. Again, their role is not more important than business, it is just more easily overshadowed by traditional donor-recipient mindsets and the predominance of market-oriented approaches to development.

P4: Shared control is strongly associated with successful collaboration.

P4a: Control is more likely to be shared when both civil society and business partners value the resources contributed by civil society partners, e.g. expertise and reach to communities.

P4b: Shared control is associated with joint learning, which improves the likelihood of correcting problems and achieving mutually desired impacts.

Discussion: Towards A Model Of Empowered Civil Society Collaboration With Business

The experiences of civil society-business collaboration in Brazil, India and South Africa suggest a more sobering view of the potential for strategic partnerships to be a major new development strategy for the global South. It proved to be difficult to find strategic partnerships. Those selected were no more productive than resource-based partnerships, and sometime less so. The development impacts are not insignificant, but neither are they highly impressive in comparison to other kinds of collaborative strategies or the aspirations of many development CSOs for ending poverty and social injustice. In many cases, collaboration with business brought significant costs and challenges to civil society partners. Some benefits of collaboration with business are of doubtful value unless part of a long-term strategy of engagement with business and the market sector. Although partnerships are usually intended to be joint projects with shared control, it is easy for business to dominate civil society (and government) partners.

Yet neither should the idea of civil society-business collaboration be discarded by Southern development CSOs. The range of projects and types of impacts indicate the potential for more significant impacts in certain domains, if strategies and arrangements for collaboration can be improved. A more realistic and constructive model may be developed out of the ashes of the strategic partnership paradigm. When civil society institutions draw on their own resources and take an empowered approach to collaboration, the results are more likely to produce desired development impacts and strengthen institutional capacity. The propositions generated above are hypotheses that require further testing. To the extent that they are valid, they suggest some elements of a more appropriate model for guiding successful collaboration than most others currently promoted.

A model of empowered civil society engagement with business would include at least four elements: the fundamental purpose of collaboration, criteria for analyzing the environment and choosing strategies of engagement, options for designing the form of collaboration, and approaches to ensure civil society influence in the control of joint projects and ventures. Each of these elements is discussed briefly in order to identify key principles of a more useful model for Southern CSOs and businesses.

Civil Society - Business Collaboration for Sustainable Development At sector levels of civil society, nationally and globally, further discussion and conceptualization of collaboration with business needs to be re-framed to that of influencing businesses to participate in civil society development agendas. This is not the same as encouraging business to be more socially responsible, although that is a valuable strategy in some situations. Corporate social responsibility is typically framed from a corporate perspective rather than from civil society. In many Southern countries, civil society development organizations have evolved sophisticated and effective approaches to social change. Although they will continue to evolve in this new arena of development practice, CSO development models need to be at the center of strategies for engagement. Increased dialogue and debate at the sector level that tests the emerging experiences of collaboration against well-accepted approaches to development will create a more favorable institutional environment for CSOs and businesses engaged in collaboration.

Scan and Influence the Environment A first step for any given CSO is to scan the environment to assess which of two strategies for engagement is more likely to produce satisfactory results, advocacy or collaboration in joint projects or ventures. For many CSOs, advocacy, broadly conceived of as joining with others in campaigns for social mobilization, legal reform, and protest, would be the preferred strategy when there is little government regulation or social pressure to influence business practices as they affect development concerns. As these cases have demonstrated along with research in the environmental domain (Murphy & Bendell, 1997), businesses become more willing to collaborate as legal and social pressures make it valuable for them to do so.

Advocacy and social mobilizing are common core competencies of many CSOs, and increasingly recognized as tools of development work, so an advocacy strategy does not represent a departure from existing practice. Adaptations and innovations appropriate to national and social contexts will be necessary, but a wide range of models already exist, from the anti-apartheid victory in South Africa to the successful corporate boycotts of Nestle and Nike, to the recent protests of World Trade Organization policies.

Collaboration in joint development projects is more likely to be a satisfactory route when CSOs operate in democratic environments that protect their rights to pursue their missions and programs. Similarly, government legislation and social trends pressuring and promoting corporate social responsibility will help to bring business to CSO development agendas. Collaboration may be more likely in highly contested domains like the environment or in less threatening domains where business can see its interest, like education and employment training. Given the projected continuing decline of state capacity in public sectors like education, health, and social services, these may become more important domains for CSO work and business a more likely source of resources to support it.

In contexts where environmental factors are mixed, e.g. a partially democratic system or minimal social pressure on business, intermediaries become more valuable agents to link up prospective partners. Intermediaries can assist civil society organizations by encouraging businesses to understand CSO resources and working with CSOs to understand the market-oriented values that accompany business resources). Once intermediaries link partners and help shape mutually satisfactory goals, their role shifts to one of fostering shared control and joint learning.

Design Optimal Forms of Collaboration Strategic partnerships are not the only form of collaboration. Valuable partnerships may be based on the transfer of surplus resources by businesses to on-going CSO programs. CSOs can approach any collaboration as an exchange, or joint investing of resources in a common project or venture. CSOs and businesses may have different motivations for collaborating across the sectors and it is likely that successful collaboration will meet different kinds of goals in CSOs than in businesses. Yet both parties are investing valuable resources in a joint activity which has shared goals. It appears to make little difference in contexts like those in the ten cases whether the joint activities involve core competencies of the partners. The more significant factor is that CSOs avoid a resource-dependent approach to resource mobilization from the corporate sector (and businesses avoid a resource-dominant approach). This may sound paradoxical, but the key idea for CSOs is to approach collaboration as a means of augmenting and expanding their own ideas, methodologies, and programs. This is difficult when resources are scarce and demands are high. CSOs don't have control over business attitudes. Yet if the CSOs themselves don't assert the value of their own resources, they have little chance of influencing design and management of joint projects. Successful Southern NGO experience with developing more influence in donor relationships would be usefully applied to civil society-business collaboration.

Collaboration with businesses may bring the greatest benefits to civil society organizations in the longer-term. There are significant investments required to learn to relate to business and adapt organizational procedures and systems to business expectations. Those investments make the most sense if they pay off in long-term joint projects and programs that expand the reach and sustainability of CSO development programs. Short-term, one-time collaboration ventures may not be worth the costs.

Ensure Civil Society Influence in Collaborative Decision-Making Again, it is important that both business and civil society partners influence control of joint activities. However, given the tendency for many civil society organizations and their development approaches (consultative, process-oriented, long-term) to be eclipsed by business styles and market-oriented approaches (directive, results-oriented, short-term, risk-averse), special attention to the issue of maintaining shared control is necessary. Some kind of formal agreement may be better than informal, if only because of the impact of personnel turnover. Beyond that, various mechanisms can work if they are accepted by the partners and tuned to the dual concerns of shared control and effectiveness. Other research on collaboration has shown that mechanisms for joint learning can foster both shared control and effective outcomes (Ashman & Muyoya, 1999; Brown & Ashman, 1996). A crucial component of the learning process is fostering shared awareness of the value of civil society partners.

Conclusions And Implications For The Field

Empowered civil society collaboration with business has the potential to be a major development strategy – for some CSOs, under some environmental conditions, and in some development sectors. Advocacy campaigns at the sectoral level may increase the scope and scale of collaborative potential, but many questions and issues remain to be addressed before a high degree of confidence is warranted. Three are articulated here to suggest next steps in that direction.

First is the issue of sample: it is necessary to identify the relevant categories within civil society and business, globally and nationally, that differentiate models of civil society-business collaboration. South Africa, India, and Brazil are quite different from the US and Canada, but they are also not representative of all Southern countries. Each has a relatively well-off national business class, which may prove to be a prerequisite for some kinds of collaboration, e.g. providing surplus financial resources to CSOs. Further research is necessary to classify these kinds of social and economic factors and their influence on options for collaboration.

Second, a crucial remaining question is that of the appropriate development model(s) that could accompany a collaborative strategy with business. Several of the more well-known and successful civil society-led development models (Freire, 1973; Korten, 1990) are not directly relevant, either because they are lodged in public sector services typically the province of government or because they involve business management and enterprise activities. The corporate social responsibility models are less relevant because they tend to be corporate-centered. Most policy-level economic models are too macro for the kinds of applications desired. A more extensive search of the literature and leading initiatives in this area is necessary to further identify appropriate development change models. A longer-term research agenda on this topic may be necessary.

Finally, any further research agenda should be closely tied to experimentation by civil society organizations and businesses. All of these cases were first-time ventures for at least one of the partners, and they involved a great deal of problem-solving, negotiating, and learning. They were initiated to solve problems or take advantage of opportunities, rather than strategically cooperate with the other sector. Linking on-going experiments with forums of facilitated learning has the potential to advance the field more rapidly. Continued learning is necessary within countries and sectors to develop and spread knowledge of the kinds of projects, coordinating arrangements, and learning processes most relevant to strengthening civil society engagement with business for development.

Appendix I

Summary of Country Case Studies

Country: Brazil
Researcher: Rosa Maria Fischer, Andres Falconer, Luciana Jacques Faria, Centro de Estudos em Administracao do Terceiro Setor da Universidade de Sao Paulo

Cases:

1. Education Improvement Project

This is a case of collaboration between CENPEC, a research NGO focused on education, and Banco Itau, the second largest private bank in Brazil, to improve the quality of public education in Brazil by developing a curriculum and producing and distributing materials for training primary school teachers. The collaboration has resulted in training materials that were developed and distributed to 6,000 public schools through municipal education departments and the bank's branches. The curriculum is being used by the University of Sao Paulo to train 1,000 education coordinators and specialists in the municipal department of education.

2. Education Management Improvement Project

This is a case of collaboration between Fundacao Acesita, a corporate foundation, and Timoteo's municipal department of education to improve the quality of education in 21 public schools in the municipality. The parties involved developed a training program and used it to train teachers in participating schools. Outcomes include improvements in the management of schools and mobilization of parents and school children to maintain the quality of school facilities.

3. Day Care Centers Project

This is a case of collaboration between Communidade Inamar, a local NGO working with slum dwellers on issues of health, employment and education for children, and VRB, a construction company, to establish day care centers on private company premises in the municipality of Diadema. The project has successfully established 8 day care centers so far and has received support from the private companies in the form of physical space and equipment for the centers, among others. The labor force in the construction company is also kept employed during the off-peak season through activities related to the day care centers.

4. Vocational Education Institute

This project is a collaboration between Fundacao Odebrecht, a corporate foundation and Liceu de Artes e Oficios, a vocational education institute which has restructured the institute to operate like a business. The Liceu, founded in 1872, face institutional extinction as other public-funded and more modern institutions arose in the mid 1900s. The vocational education institute is now operating as a social enterprise, providing educational resources to schools in Bahia state and training apprentices. The formal partnership between the foundation and education institute ended in 1995, but informal connections between the two institutions persist.

Country: South Africa
Researcher: Ms. Nozipho January-Bardill, MBM Change Agents

Cases:

1. Housing Improvement Project

This is a case of collaboration between a local NGO called the Development Action Group, a private developer, and central and local government agencies. The project sought to provide formal housing to an informal settlement in a suburb of Cape Town. As a result of the collaboration, the squatters have been relocated to permanent housing with electricity and running water facilities. The initiative has also catalyzed energy to replicate the project in other municipalities as all parties involved feel that they have gained from it.

2. Education Resource Center Project

This is a case of collaboration between Sasol, a local chemical industry corporation, and the Sasolburg district department of education. Its aim was to improve the quality of education in the district, by setting up a resource center that provides training and educational materials to teachers, offers career guidance, and provides supportive facilities to schools. The Boitjhorisong Resource Center (BRC) is accessible to 74 schools and 158 farm schools, reaching 66,000 children and more than 2,000 teachers. It has also fostered a new culture of learning in schools and sensitized white South Africans to the capabilities of black South Africans and the problems of disadvantaged communities. Other districts in the Orange Free State region are interested in initiating similar partnerships and activities but are unable to do so for lack of resources. T he BRC will be expanded once resources become available.

3. Retiree Service Project

This project is based on collaboration between the South African National Council of the Aged (SANCA), an umbrella organization of retiree associations and Sanlam, a national insurance company. It sought to involve retirees in making gift items for poor children. The project has enabled retirees to feel like contributing citizens instead of burdens on society, and more concretely, provided children with toys, clothing and other material benefits. The collaboration between Sanlam and SANCA has ended, but SANCA has embarked on a similar partnership with another insurance company, Hollard Insurance.

Country: India
Researcher: Atreyee Cordeiro, Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA)

Cases:

1. Bakery Training Project

This is a one time collaboration between a local NGO, Katha, and the Taj Group of Hotels, which is a chain of five-star hotels. Katha works with women slum dwellers in New Delhi around income generation and empowerment of women. The collaboration with Taj aimed at training women in one of the Delhi slums to set up a baking unit, and thereby empowering them to participate in credit and savings and literacy programs. The women who participated in this project have gone on to start their own businesses, are earning more income, and have gained a sense of economic empowerment.

2. Watch Training and Repair Center Project

The collaboration between HMT, a watch manufacturing company, and Amarjyoti, an NGO working with orthopaedically challenged children from disadvantaged communities, was focused on providing livelihood options to the disabled and promoting self-reliance. Specifically, the project set up a training-cum-repair center for mechanical and quartz watches. 23 individuals from the target group have been trained so far in watch repair. Some of them have been employed by the center, while others have found employment elsewhere or set up their own businesses.

3. Watch Strapping Unit Project

This case is a collaboration between Titan Industries, a branch of the Tata Group of Industries, and Integrated Rural Development Trust (IRDT), an NGO based in Tamil Nadu that works in the areas of health, education, economic development and capacity building in the most backward districts. The watch strapping unit was set up to provide employment opportunities to the rural poor and disabled youth to improve their economic conditions and encourage self-reliance. Outcomes of the collaboration include employment, increased income, and an increased sense of economic and social empowerment among the participating group. Titan and IRDT have a formal agreement to continue the collaboration for the next four years at least.

References

Alter, C. & Hage, J. (1993). Organizations Working Together. (Vol. 191). Newbury Park: Sage.

Ashman, D. (1996). Managing Strategic Alliances. Boston, MA: Executive Development Roundtable of Boston University.

Ashman, D. (1999). The Organization of Joint Action by Nongovernmental Organization Networks. Unpublished Dissertation, Boston University, Boston.

Ashman, D. & Muyoya, T. (1999, June, 1999). Strengthening North-South Cooperation Conference Report. Paper presented at the Strengthening North-South Cooperation, Nairobi, Kenya.

Astley, W.G. & Fombrun, C. J. (1983). Collective Strategy: Social Ecology of Organizational Environments. Academy of Management Review. 4(4) 576-587.

Brown, L. D. & Ashman, D. (1996). Participation, Social Capital, and Intersectoral Problem-Solving: African and Asian Cases. IDR Reports.

Buzzard, Shirley. (1999). Partnerships with Business: A Practical Guide for Nonprofit Organizations. Washington D.C.: USAID.

Doz, Y. & Hamel, G. (1998). Alliance Advantage. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Fischer, R.M. & Falconer, A. (1999). Building Intersectoral Cooperation. Sao Paulo: University of Sao Paulo.

Freire, P. (1973). The Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

Gray, B. (1989). Collaborating. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Helgesen, S. (1995). The Web of Inclusion. New York: Currency/Doubleday.

Hoffman, Andrew. (1999). Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the US Chemical Industry, Academy of Management Journal, 42(4), 351-371.

Jarillo, J. C. (1988). On Strategic Networks. Strategic Management Journal 9, 31-41.

Korten, D. (1990). Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian.

Limerick, D. & Cunnington, B. (1993). Managing the New Organization. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

MBM Change Agents (1999). Building Civil Society Collaboration with Business and Government in South Africa. Johannesburg: MBM Change Agents.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded sourcebook, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murphy, D. F. & Bendell, J. (1997). In the Company of Partners. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Oliver, C. (1990). Determinants of Interorganizational Relationships: Integration and Future Directions. Academy of Management Review, 15(2), 241-265.

Pinney, C. (1999). Business and Civil Society Organizations: Toward a New Partnership. In L. Regelbrugge (Ed.), Promoting Corporate Citizenship. Washington, DC: CIVICUS.

Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither Market Nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization. Research in Organizational Behavior, 12, 295-336.

PRIA (1999). Civil Society-Business Partnership. New Delhi: PRIA.

Ring, P. S. & Van De Ven, A. (1994). Developmental Processes of Cooperative Interorganizational Relationships. Academy of Management Review, 19(1), 90-118.

Saxton, T. (1997). The Effects of Partner and Relationship Characteristics on Alliance Outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 40(2), 443-461.

Trist, E. (1983). Referent Organizations and the Development of Interorganizational Domains. Human Relations, 36(3), 269-284.

Twose, N. & Blakely, A. (1999). Business Partners for Development: Vision, History and Potential. In L. Regelbrugge (Ed.), Promoting Corporate Engagement with Civil Society. Washington, DC: CIVICUS.

Uphoff, N., Esman, M. J., and Krishna, A. (1998). Reasons for Success. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Uvin, P. (1995). Fighting Hunger at the Grassroots: Paths to Scaling Up. World Development, 23(6), 927-939.

Waddell, S. (1997). Market-Civil Society Partnership Formation: A Global Status Report on Activity, Strategies, and Tools, (13(5)). Boston, MA: IDR.

Williamson, O. E. (1979). Transaction-Cost economics: The governance of contractual relations. The Journal of Law and Economics, XXII(October), 233-261.

Williamson, W. G. (1980). Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clans. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 129-141.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.