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Abstract

The last couple of decades have marked an increasing interest in what are now widely called cross sector partnerships (CSPs) between businesses, governments and not-for-profits. The extant literature generally refers to these partnerships as mechanisms for addressing social and environmental challenges. Indeed, CSPs are often depicted as ‘instruments’ that help societies fight various societal problems such as poverty, pollution, and homelessness.

The existing literature offers a variety of explanations on what motivates and shapes the dynamics of CSPs. In this respect, the main goal is to categorise the specific factors that shape the scope and nature of CSPs. Yet, despite the valuable insights which the existing body of knowledge provides, little is still known about the relational processual emergence of CSPs; in particular, their relational interconnectedness within the wider organisational practices of the partnering organisations. As such, there is an urgent need to develop more processual understandings of the becoming nature of CSPs as social processes.

In this regard, the following study sets out to develop a specific process approach, based on what is widely known as process thinking, in order to build a more dynamic understanding of the emergence of CSPs. To this end, the study draws on key process thinking concepts and deploys a theoretical framework to guide the research process. Accordingly, the study also develops a specific qualitative process-based research methodology which helps identify and explore the bundles of ongoing processes that construct and sustain CSP workings over time.

The empirical material for the study was generated through semi-structured interviews and secondary sources. Both well-established as well as specifically developed analytical techniques were applied to construct the key themes of the research outcomes.

The outcomes of the analysis attempt to shed light on the relational social dynamics that shape the emergence of CSPs. Furthermore, the findings also reflect upon the power dynamics in
CSP workings and reveal how various narratives seek to legitimise or de-legitimise particular CSP activities.

The study, thus, contributes to both theory and practice of CSPs by providing insights into the complex, dynamic and non-linear social complexities characterising the emergence of CSPs. Theoretically, it provides a different understanding from the mainstream conceptualisations of CSPs. At a practical level, the thesis provides rich insights into the unexpected events and contextual dynamics which influence the organisation and management of CSPs, thus offering valuable guidance for practitioners. In short, the overall main contribution of the thesis lies in its processually-informed empirical analysis of CSPs which not only invites us to explore the social dynamic emergence of CSP processes but also asks us to acknowledge the degree of novelty inherent in these processes.
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Chapter One: Opening

In the last three decades, cross sector partnerships (CSPs) between businesses, non-governmental and governmental organisations have considerably increased in number (Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Berlie, 2010; Graf & Rothlauf, 2011; den Hond et al., 2012; Selsky & Parker, 2016) and are expected to increase at an even greater pace in the coming years (Valor & Diego, 2009; Wadham & Warren, 2013). It is now widely argued that CSPs can provide new means for addressing societal and environmental challenges (Waddock & Post, 1995; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Lin, 2012) while also helping organisations achieve their individual ambitions and goals (Waddock, 1991; Wymer & Samu, 2003). As a result of this widespread conviction that CSPs can provide alternative solutions to societal issues, writers and commentators have often depicted these phenomena as ‘tools’ (Murray & Haynes, 2010) that can help societies find panaceas to societal problems such as unemployment, poverty, and homelessness (Murphy & Bendell, 1997).

CSPs have also attracted much research attention in recent years. Extensive research studies have been conducted to explain the factors that motivate and shape CSPs (Waddock, 1991; Wymer & Samu, 2003; Siegel, 2010; Lee, 2011; Monacell, 2015). The extant research has developed various explanations on the underlying causes shaping the emergence of CSPs. Generally, research studies reveal that developing CSPs is a complex process full of obstacles (Sharma & Kearins, 2010) because organisations are driven by different ideological, organisational and institutional logics (Huxham, 1996) which more often than not lead to conflicts and consequently to collaborative inertia (Huxham et al., 2006) or dissolution of partnerships (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). According to Rivera-Santos and Rufin (2011), the majority of partnerships do not succeed because of conflicts, distrust and/or cultural
differences. Moreover, research has also indicated that only a small number of partnerships continue to operate for more than a year (Simpson et al., 2011). Hence, despite their popularity and the belief in their potential to bring social change, the majority of CSPs are unlikely to be become long-tern partnerships and hence solutions to societal issues (Austin, 2000a).

Attempting to explain why this might be the case, recent studies have sought to explore and analyse how specific issues and challenges lead to success or failure in partnership workings. Different perspectives have been used to conceptualise how different barriers and enablers shape the emergence and dynamics of CSPs. Yet, despite the abundance of research on these issues, we still know little about the micro-dynamic processes which enact and sustain partnership workings (Kolk et al., 2015) and even less about how CSP processes emerge from and are shaped by the wider organisational processes and practices of partners (Kruckenberg, 2015). Thus, there still seems to be scarce research on the processual becoming nature of CSP processes that explores how CSP processes emerge from, are related to and are embedded within the wider practices of the partnering organisations. A more processual theoretical outlook, thus, is needed to attempt to capture and explain how CSP processes emerge from, are related to and influenced by the wider social processes of the partnering organisations (Kolk et al., 2015). The main focus of this thesis is to examine the dynamic processual becoming nature of CSP processes as social organising processes. In particular, it develops a process perspective and an empirical analysis that captures and explains the social dynamics shaping the emergence of partnership workings.

Responding to the calls by Osborn and Hagedoorn (1997), Kruckenberg (2015) and Kolk et al. (2015), who argue that there is a need to develop more processually-based analyses of
CSPs if we are to understand how these social phenomena emerge and perish, this thesis develops an approach that advances our understanding of the processual emergence of CSPs. Building upon key concepts and ideas of what is widely known as process thinking (Langley, 2007), the thesis sheds light on the dynamic heterogeneous processes which enact and sustain partnership workings over time. The need for processual analyses of CSPs has also been recognised by Lowndes and Sletcher (1998) who argue that process research can help us capture the ‘micro’ ongoing dynamics of CSPs.

By developing a process approach, the study presented in this thesis seeks to provide a more nuanced processual understanding of CSPs, which invites us to appreciate more faithfully the novel processual emergence of CSP processes. Following Waddock (1989), Vock et al. (2013), Seitanidi (2008) and Kolk et al. (2015), the study aims to generate in-depth process analyses which move beyond simply describing CSPs as tools or entity-like states. Rather, the thesis aims to reveal how CSP processes emerge from and are influenced by wider organisational processes and actions of the partners. By so doing, the study attempts to throw light on the relational and temporal dynamics which influence and shape the partnership workings over time.

The recent studies by Kruckenberg (2015) and Lindberg and Czarniawska (2006) have already partially reflected upon the potential theoretical benefits of developing process analyses. Process perspectives, Kruckenberg (2015) states, re-direct out attention to the micro processes and interactions of CSPs and, in so doing, offer valuable insights into the ongoing dynamics of CSPs.

In an attempt to develop a processual understanding of CSPs, this thesis undertakes an in-depth exploration of two partnerships. By examining the relational becoming nature of these
CSPs, the study provides an alternative understanding of the social complexities of CSP processes.

In order to further clarify and elaborate the main research aims of the thesis, the chapter proceeds as follows. In the first section, an overview and background of the study are provided, hence explaining the rationale behind the thesis. Then, in section 1.2 the main research questions and aims of the thesis are discussed. In particular, the discussion explains what the study attempts to achieve and the contributions it seeks to make to the existing body of knowledge on CSPs. In section 3, the significance of the study is briefly summarised. Finally, section 4 provides an overview of the organisation of the thesis.

1.1 Background

It is now widely argued that CSPs can help societies address societal and environmental challenges (Waddock & Post, 1995; Berlie, 2010). The rising negative effects of poverty, unemployment and homelessness, among other societal issues, have created an urge to develop CSPs to tackle societal problems (Berlie, 2010). So far, there have been numerous suggestions and proposals, especially from governments, to develop cross sector projects to tackle various issues (Kruckenberg, 2015). According to Murphy and Bendell (1997), CSPs enable knowledge exchanges between sectors and so allow novel innovations to emerge. The widespread beliefs, thus, depict partnership workings as ‘tools’ that tackle societal problems (Austin, 2016).

Yet, little is still known about how to develop effective CSPs (Crosby & Bryson, 2007; Lucea, 2009; Bergenholtz & Bjerregaard, 2013). Huxham (2003) states that developing CSPs is a difficult and complex process because organisations have different organisational cultures
and pursue different goals. For example, governmental organisations might be more concerned with pursuing welfare goals (Bryson et al., 2006) while businesses are usually more interested in increasing profits (Monacell, 2015). On the other hand, third sector organisations tend to pursue agendas that are often incompatible with the wider public or private interests (Baraka, 2010). Therefore, Al-Tabbaa et al. (2013) state, if CSPs are to be successful, they need to be carefully planned and implemented in accordance with the wider institutional differences and expectations of the partnering organisations.

Being concerned with the question of how to develop mutually beneficial CSPs that can help organisations achieve their individual goals while also addressing social issues, back in 2010 as a young management student at State University of New York, I became interested in researching how to develop management strategies that can help organisations form effective CSPs. This growing interest encouraged me to develop a research project which eventually motivated me to pursue a Master’s degree in management, which I successfully completed in 2012. With an academic background in social sciences and professional work experience in both the private and non-profit sectors, I wanted to learn more about the ways in which CSPs (especially business-NGOs partnerships, which had received less attention at that time) can help societies achieve important societal goals such as addressing poverty, homelessness or reducing unemployment. While undertaking the research for my Master’s degree, I came to realise that the problem I was facing was much more complex than I had initially thought. After spending months of reading articles, I found out that the literature on CSPs tends to depict the processes of developing CSPs in different ways. For some authors such as Bryson et al. (2006), the design and implementation of CSPs is about planning, calculation and control. Developing CSPs is a linear stage-like process shaped by managerial interests and
goals (Clarke & Fuller, 2011). For others, CSPs are themselves social processes and therefore are much more complex because they emerge non-linearly and are characterised by a high degree of unpredictability and novelty (Seitanidi, 2008).

These two contrasting explanations eventually encouraged me to do a PhD degree in order to develop a more clear understanding about the ways we depict and research the dynamics of CSPs. After becoming familiar with the broad philosophical debates in social science research, I realised that different philosophical underpinnings influence the ways we view, describe, theorise, research and represent CSPs. In particular, I realised that the ways we conceptualise social processes, actions and activities shape our explanations about the emergence of social phenomena. This became one of my main points of interest, which is also the main focus of this thesis.

In 2012, I received a PhD scholarship from the University of Hull to pursue my research aims. In the first year, I came across and became interested in developing a processual perspective to study CSPs for several reasons, which I explain in detail in the next section. Whereas prior research has sought to explain the enablers and barriers for developing CSPs, little research has been undertaken to explain the micro practices and processes that enact partnership workings (Vock et al., 2013; Kolk et al., 2015; Kruckenberg, 2015). The study presented here seeks to throw light on the micro processes enacting and sustaining CSPs. The motivation for undertaking this thesis, thus, comes from my general interest in CSPs and from the desire to develop a more processual analysis that can capture the dynamics of CSPs.

Fortunately, Professor David Collins, who agreed to be my supervisor, introduced me to what is widely known as process philosophy/thinking. As a distinctive mode of thought, process philosophy emphasises quite a distinctive ontological and epistemological stance in
comparison to the conventional ways we usually think about the world (Rescher, 2000; Hernes, 2008; Mesle, 2008; Langley, 2009; Langley et al., 2013; Stout & Love, 2013; Hjorth et al., 2015) (I explore these in detail in Chapter 3). After familiarising myself with the key concepts and concerns of process thinking, I saw a potential of using process thinking to develop an alternative process-based understanding of CSPs. Yet, being cautioned about the difficulties of applying process thinking to empirical research, I was told that the journey would not be easy. And indeed, that was what I discovered later. Yet, despite these issues, I think the thesis offers valuable insights into the dynamics of CSPs, which other theoretical approaches usually tend to overlook or dismiss.

Process thinking has received some attention in the wider fields of organisational studies (see for instance Hernes (2008), Hjorth et al. (2015), Langley (2007), Pettigrew (1997) for short discussions and reviews on process thinking in organisation studies) but not in the field of CSP research. In particular, process perspectives have been developed as alternative lenses to the still predominant structural perspectives which reduce social phenomena to sets of characteristics (Langley et al., 2013). In contrast to such outlooks, process perspectives draw attention to the social processes and practices that enact and sustain what we usually consider as pre-given cultural, societal, environmental phenomena (Chia, 1999). In this regard, process perspectives, and process thinking more broadly, encompass various approaches that seek to capture and explain the micro processes that characterise the processual emergence of social phenomena (Nayak, 2008b). The continued development of process perspectives and approaches within organisation studies has already revealed the potential benefits of processual modes of thinking to advance our understanding of diverse organisational phenomena. And yet, regardless of these theoretical advancements, process perspectives have
rarely been employed in CSP research. Despite the calls by Vock et al. (2013), Kruckenberg (2015), and Seitanidi (2008) for developing processual approaches to try to capture the dynamics of CSPs, little research is still done in this direction. In the following chapters, I will discuss the potential benefits and relevance of process thinking and perspectives to study CSPs and how these can help us address some of the shortcomings of prior studies. In particular, I will discuss how a process perspective can help us develop a more nuanced understanding of the processual emergence of CSP processes. After discussing the main research questions and aims of the thesis, which is what follows in the subsequent section, I will also reflect upon the significance of the thesis and the contribution it seeks to make to the existing body of knowledge on CSPs (also further discussed in Chapter 9). Having said what I intend to do in the thesis, I now want to present the main questions and aims of the study in the next section.

1.2 What the Study Attempts to Explore

There are two main research questions which the study seeks to address and which will guide the analyses in the proceeding chapters. These are:

1. How does the processual emergence of CSP processes relate to the wider organisational processes of the partners?

2. How does the embeddedness within the wider processes of the partners influence and shape the nature and scope of CSP processes?

By asking these questions, the study seeks to trace the becoming nature of CSP processes (interactions, relationships etc.) and to explore how these enact partnership workings over time. The outcomes of the analysis are theoretically valuable for CSP researchers because
they seek to provide detailed explorations of the social complexities shaping CSPs. Likewise, practitioners can also benefit from the analyses because of the valuable insights into the processes of developing CSPs.

Furthermore, the research questions are also developed in response to the recent calls by Seitanidi (2008) and Vock et al. (2013), who argue that by focusing on ‘how’ rather than ‘why’ and ‘what’ questions of CSPs, we can generate a deeper understanding of the dynamic emergence of CSPs. Krucken (2015) has suggested that ‘how’ questions tend to generate a more comprehensive understanding of the processes that enact and sustain CSPs. Similarly, Osborn and Hagedoorn (1997) have argued that most research on CSPs has provided limited understanding of the situated and local complexities which characterise partnership workings.

In response to these calls, the study presented here aims to develop a more nuanced analysis of the processual emergence of CSPs. This aim also raises several secondary questions such as:

1. How can a process perspective enrich our understanding of the becoming nature of CSP processes?
2. How can we develop specific process-based methodologies to study CSPs processes?
3. To what extent can process analyses facilitate dialogues between researchers about the ontological nature of CSPs and encourage discussions about the influence of various epistemological stances on the ways we depict CSPs?
4. To what extent can a process analysis help us develop practically relevant guidance for practitioners?
These secondary questions are directly related to the primary questions and objectives of the study in that: a) they seek to direct attention to the influence of different ontological and epistemological orientations on the way we research and represent CSPs and b) they seek to help us understand how we can elaborate a more processual elaboration of CSPs, which more faithfully appreciates the ongoing social complexities of partnership workings.

Ultimately, the central issue in the thesis is the process of conceptualising CSPs as processes. In particular, the thesis asks questions on how we can conceptualise CSPs as processes that emerge from, are related to and embedded within the wider practices of the partners. These theoretical issues are further elaborated in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, where I focus on the ontological and philosophical assumptions that influence the ways we theorise and re-present CSPs.

Furthermore, each of the above questions also raises the following sub-questions:

1. How do individual interactions, processes and relationships between members of the partners influence the directions of partnership workings?
2. How do temporal dynamics and relational complexities shape future courses of actions between partners?
3. How do the locally situated negotiations temporally determine the scope of CSP projects?

Overall, the above primary and secondary research questions seek to direct our attention to the processual emergence of CSP processes. They will guide the development of my theoretical approach and the empirical analysis in the forthcoming chapters. In particular, drawing upon key process thinking concepts and ideas, I will track and analyse the relational becoming nature of CSPs and will seek to explore how different contextual and temporal complexities
influence the nature and scope of CSP processes. In this regard, I intend to throw light on how local interactions and ongoing negotiations enact, re-enact, modify and re-modify CSP arrangements over time. Moving away from the attempts to seek to categorise the barriers and enablers of CSPs or to describe the steps usually thought to shape the development of CSPs, I aim to explore how unexpected events and social interactions (which are both relationally and temporally associated) enact and sustain partnership workings. By developing a process perspective, I seek to provide valuable insights into the ongoing temporal and relational complexities influencing the emerging of CSP arrangements.

Hence, the research aims of the study can be summarised in relation to what they attempt to add to our process understanding of CSPs. There are two main research objectives of the thesis.

First, by applying and assessing the relevance of process thinking to study CSPs, the thesis aims to conceptualise CSPs as social processes that emerge from, are embedded within and related to the wider social practices of the partners. In particular, the study draws upon key process thinking concepts in order to reflect upon the ontological nature of CSPs as social processes; an aspect that has received little attention in the current literature.

Second, the study also aims to develop a processually-informed empirical analysis of CSPs. The thesis examines two CSPs in Northern England, United Kingdom (UK), which have been running for a number of years. The first partnership is between ConstructionCo, a construction firm, and KidsCharity, a youth development charity. The partnership has been running for more than six years (further details are offered in Chapter 5). The second partnership is between FoodCo, a food manufacturer, and CommunityCharity, a community development charity, which has been running for more than four years. By focusing on these
two cases, the thesis aims to demonstrate how process thinking can enrich our understanding of CSPs. In contrast to the current studies of CSPs which explain the social complexities of CSPs in terms of underlying causes and factors, the analysis presented in the following chapters offers a more appreciative account of the ongoing social and contextual dynamics which characterise the novel emergence of CSP processes. Central to the second aim of the research is the role of the ongoing relational and temporal dynamics that partially shape the novel emergence of CSP processes over time. Thus, by seeking to develop a deeper understanding of the ongoing social complexities influencing the courses of action between the partners, the thesis aims to generate in-depth insights into the dynamic emergence of CSP processes. The main goals of the research, thus, can be seen as an attempt to use a process perspective to understand the emergence of CSP processes. In the next section, I briefly discuss the significance of my study.

1.3 The Significance of the Study

By seeking to provide a more processual understanding of the emergence of CSP processes, the thesis makes three significant contributions to the existing body of knowledge on CSPs. First, it contributes theoretically by developing a processual theoretical framework that helps us explain the processual emergence of CSPs as social processes. In this regard, the thesis also draws attention to the ways different philosophical underpinnings influence the way we view, theorise and explain CSPs. Whilst most extant research has sought to explain how to develop successful partnerships or categorise the barriers that complicate partnership workings, little research has been conducted to explore the ontological nature of CSPs as processes which emerge from and are related to the wider organisational practices of the partners. The research
presented here, thus, seeks to fill this gap by providing a processual conceptualisation of the emergence of CSP processes.

Second, at a methodological level, the thesis seeks to develop a specific process-based methodology to study CSPs. It highlights the importance of being ‘reflexive’ about the ways we use various methods and analytical frameworks to analyse and interpret empirical materials. The study argues that the ways we use various methods to study CSPs influence the way we depict and represent these phenomena. Hence, critical reflexivity (I reflect upon this aspect in Chapter 9) is needed if we are to produce theoretically and empirically rigorous accounts of CSPs.

Last but not least, the study also seeks to offer practical implications for practitioners. In particular, it seeks to draw attention to the non-linear and unpredictable nature of the emergence of CSP processes. The research, hence, suggests that numerous contextual dynamics might lead to unexpected CSP outcomes. Therefore, managers should be aware of the potential unintended consequences that might emerge from the temporal and relational dynamics in CSP workings. Some authors such as Seitanidi (2008) and Huxham (2003) have already highlighted the need to pay more attention to the individual processes of negotiation, conflict, etc. in order to analyse how they influence collaborations. This study adds new points to these suggestions by offering interesting insights into the ongoing social complexities of CSP processes. The outcomes of the analysis of the thesis, thus, provide valuable reflections which can help practitioners improve their practices and develop sensitivity to the social dimensions and complexities of CSP processes.
1.4 The Organisation of the Thesis

As an introduction to the thesis, this first chapter has provided an overview of the main research questions and aims of the thesis, including also a short discussion on the background and significance of the study. In order to further explore the above discussed questions and aims, the rest of the thesis engages in a series of discussions on both the published work on CSPs and the empirical material of this study, generated primarily through qualitative interviews. The thesis proceeds as follows.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature on CSPs in order to explore how different theoretical approaches have depicted the emergence of CSPs. In particular, the review examines the ways in which the current research explains the factors that motive and shape CSPs. In so doing, the chapter identifies a research gap and reflects upon the need to develop a more processually-based approach to study and capture the dynamic emergence of CSPs as social processes.

Chapter 3 discusses the relevance of process thinking as a distinctive mode of thinking to study CSPs and its potential to offer an alternative understanding of the emergence of CSPs as social processes. After introducing the key ontological and epistemological concerns of process thinking, the chapter spells out the specific implications of developing a process perspective to study CSPs. The chapter ends with a discussion on how key process thinking concepts are used to develop a theoretical framework that guides the empirical analysis of the thesis.

Chapter 4 makes the transition from the theoretical realm to the empirical domain. More specifically, the key methodological aspects of the study are discussed, highlighting the challenges of applying a process thinking lens to empirical analysis. Detailed discussions and
reflections are offered in order to elaborate how the empirical material was generated and analysed. The chapter also discusses the analytical steps followed to develop the key themes of the analysis.

Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 present the outcomes of the empirical analysis, using constructs of process thinking. Chapter 5 provides a general background and introduction to the partnerships by discussing the histories and the key organisational aims of the partnering organisations. Chapter 6 reports how the partners became interested in developing CSPs and how they started the partnerships. In particular, the chapter discusses how various organisational concerns and ambitions of the parties eventually led to developing CSP projects. Then, Chapter 7 extends the analysis and provides thick descriptions of the spontaneous and often unpredictable processes and activities which enact partnership workings. More specifically, the chapter explores the emergence of heterogeneous partnership practices which reveal how CSP arrangements emerge from, are related to and are embedded within the wider practices of the parties. Chapter 8 further elaborates how CSPs are developed and legitimised over time, thus reflecting how the partners perceive and legitimise the benefits and outcomes of CSPs. The analysis also reveals how various accounts seek to legitimise partnership workings over time.

Lastly, Chapters 9 and 10 discuss the outcomes of the analyses in relation to the wider current studies on CSPs. In particular Chapter 9 offers a more detailed discussion on the key emergent themes of the analysis with regard to the extant research on CSPs. Then, Chapter 10 highlights the specific contributions the study makes to the existing body of knowledge on CSPs. In this final chapter the limitations of the thesis are also briefly discussed, leading to the suggestion of future research directions that can help us advance our process
understanding of CSPs. In the concluding remarks, the key outcomes of the thesis are summarised and in so doing the discussion invites the readers to reflect upon the implications of the study.
Chapter Two: Review of CSP Literature

The aim of this chapter is to review the current literature on CSPs. Research on CSPs has expanded immensely in the last decades. Currently, the literature offers different explanations about the growing importance and significance of CSPs. Authors from different disciplines and fields have developed and applied different approaches to capture the dynamics and effects of CSPs. The current CSP research is, thus, highly diverse with regard to the research approaches and methods used to study and explain CSPs. Yet, despite the significant efforts of CSP researchers to set up specific CSP research agenda, the extant body of knowledge and research on CSPs is still scattered and fragmented.

Nonetheless, several research streams can be identified in relation to how CSP researchers study and seek to explain specific aspects of CSPs. First, there is a research stream that seeks to uncover and explain the motives or factors that encourage CSPs. A number of studies have sought to explain the underlying factors that motivate CSPs and reflect how various motives influence the scope and nature of CSPs. Second, there has also been a growing number of studies that seek to explain the dynamics of CSPs. Scholars from diverse disciplines have used different theoretical and empirical approaches to try to capture and illuminate the complex processes of developing CSPs. Third, extensive research has also been undertaken to try to explain the effects of CSPs at different individual, organisational and societal levels. Studies within this research stream attempt to categorise the diverse effects of different forms of CSPs.

This chapter offers a review of the extant literature on CSPs and reflects how CSP scholars have sought to research CSPs. The review is intended to summarise what is generally known
about CSPs and in so doing to identify directions for future research. In particular, I articulate the need to develop a process approach which can help us advance our understanding of how CSPs are initiated, maintained and transformed over time.

The chapter proceeds as follows. In the first section, I begin by defining CSPs and reflecting upon their growing significance in relation to addressing different societal and organisational issues. In this section, I also discuss the motives for CSPs and the different forms of partnerships that currently exist between businesses, NGOs and governmental organisations.

Then, in section 2.1, I review the literature on the dynamics of CSPs, discussing how different theoretical orientations explain the social complexities of CSPs. Particular attention is given to the ways in which different accounts explain the emergence of CSP processes and the challenges which partners face in developing CSPs.

In section three, I further reflect upon the effects of CSPs and discuss how current research explains and categorises the outcomes of engaging in CSPs. I conclude the chapter with a discussion on the need to undertake process research in order to advance our understanding of the complex processual emergence of CSPs. More specifically, a gap in the existing literature is identified, emphasising the need for an alternative process-based lens to view and analyse the complex nature of CSPs. The chapter ends with a brief discussion on the potential benefits of developing process-based analyses of CSPs, hence suggesting new avenues for future research.

2.1 The Rise of CSPs

CSPs have become increasingly prominent in the last three decades (Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Valor & Diego, 2009; den Hond et al., 2012; Harris, 2012; Austin, 2016; Selsky &
Parker, 2016). According to Berlie (2010), this is due to the growing societal and environmental challenges which require cross sectorial collaborations. All three sectors have recognised the importance of working together to achieve mutually beneficial goals (Waddock & Post, 1995; Huxham, 1996; Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Wymer & Samu, 2003; Burchell & Cook, 2011; Lee, 2011; Monacell, 2015). As a result, CSPs are now widely viewed as instruments for bringing social change and societal progress (Waddock, 1991; Lowndes & Slescher, 1998; Husted, 2003; Sharma & Kearins, 2010; Graf & Rothlauf, 2011; Selsky & Parker, 2016).

Over the last several decades, a variety of cross sectoral projects have been developed in an attempt to address various issues ranging from poverty and unemployment to homelessness and health issues (Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Berlie, 2010). By developing joint projects, businesses, NGOs and governments are more likely to develop effective strategies and solutions to societal problems (Waddock & Post, 1995; Trencher et al., 2013; Selsky & Parker, 2016). As a result of their growing importance, CSPs are expected to increase in number over the next years, particularly in the developed countries such as the UK and USA (Austin, 2000a). Recent public policies and reports have also suggested that through CSPs, the governments can become more effective and efficient in the initiation of regeneration projects as CSPs can cut costs in the long-term (Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Austin, 2000a; Berlie, 2010; Graf & Rothlauf, 2011). The benefits of CSPs and the potential future positive implications, thus, seem to be beyond debate (Dahan et al., 2010; van Tulder et al., 2015). Furthermore, given the growing negative impact of global problems such as pollution and global warming, international organisations such as the UN have also been calling for more
transnational multi-sectoral partnerships to tackle issues such as environmental pollution (Berlie, 2010).

Yet, despite the potential benefits of CSPs, little is still know about how to develop effective CSPs (Austin, 2000a) and how to overcome sectorial differences which might disrupt collaborations (Huxham et al., 2006). According to Lucea (2009), the number of failures outnumbers the number of successes, which fact casts doubt on the potential positive implications of CSPs. Vangen and Winchester (2013) claim that sectoral differences in aims, cultures, institutional practices and ideological beliefs, among others, are far too vast to be easily overcome. Therefore, if CSPs are to be successful, organisations need to develop mutually acceptable strategies that are in accordance to their wider institutional practices and ambitions (Bergenholtz & Bjerregaard, 2013; Vangen, 2016). Furthermore, Zhang and Huxham (2009) and Getha-Taylor (2012) state, building trust and transparency is crucial and will eventually allow sectors to work towards achieving mutually beneficial goals.

Yet, other scholars such as Glasbergen (2013) are sceptical about the potential of CSPs to address societal challenges and argue that economic and ideological interests of different sectors are far too dissimilar to allow even-handed collaboration between sectors and organisations. Thus, despite the assumed positive effects of CSPs, there are still disputes about whether such initiatives are panaceas to societal issues (Googins & Rochlin, 2000). Furthermore, despite the growing research on CSPs, little is still known about the unpredictable negative effects of CSPs (Hansen et al., 2011). Recent reports issued by the UK government’s Cabinet office have also expressed concerns about the potential lack of cohesive actions and potential abuse of resources, which might result in worsening problems and increasing social exclusion of small organisations by large more well established
companies (Page et al., 2015). Despite these concerns, however, CSPs are still seen as the way forward to continue tackling societal issues (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010; Hansen et al., 2011; Le Ber & Branzei, 2011; van Tulder et al., 2015; Clarke & MacDonald, 2016; Lyakhov & Gliedt, 2016).

Extensive research has been undertaken by scholars from different disciplines to explain CSPs. In the extant literature, authors present different definitions of CSPs, which I now turn to explore in the following sub-section.

2.1.1 Definition and Significance of CSPs

What are CSPs? Why are they important? How do they differ from within sector partnerships? What kinds of CSPs are there?

A starting point for understanding the emergence and significance of CSPs is to examine how they are defined in the current literature. It is worth noting that, as a relatively new and evolving field, a number of terms have been used to refer to CSPs such as cross sector organisations (Ählström & Sjöström, 2005), cross sector interactions (Huijstee & Glasbergen, 2010), cross sectoral social partnership (Seitanidi, 2008), social alliances (Berger et al., 2004), cross sector collaborations (Bryson et al., 2006), social partnerships (Waddock, 1989), community-based partnerships (Austin, 2000a), among others. These terms are often used interchangeably to refer to sometimes complex and sometimes not so complex in nature cross sector relationships and arrangements between businesses, NGOs and governments. As such, different terms are used to discuss and talk about CSPs. Similarly, there are several different and sometimes contrasting definitions of CSPs. According to Waddock (1991: 481), CSPs are:
…the voluntary collaborative efforts of actors from organisations in two or more economic sectors in a forum in which they cooperatively attempt to solve a problem or issue of mutual concern that is in some way identified with a public policy agenda item.

Similarly, Parker and Selsky (2004: 468) define CSPs as ‘project focused and are narrower than routine relationships between and among the sectors that seek to address social metaproblems such as environmental sustainability or social-justice challenges’.

Others, such as Wood and Gray (2016) further add that CSPs involve and/or consist of ‘collective actions’ as opposed to the action of individual organisations, which address a social cause that goes beyond the self-interests and individual concerns of the partnering organisations. In Berlie’s (2010:2) words, CSPs can therefore be ‘described as processes whereby parties with different views of problems work together constructively to find solutions that go beyond their own limited visions’.

Yet, other scholars prefer to distinguish the more informal relationships and temporally-based projects from partnerships. For Murphy and Bendell (1997), a partnership refers to a more formal and institutionalised form of collaboration, while informal relationships are only temporal interactions which demand little commitment and resources.

Thus, different researchers from different disciplines have defined CSPs in different ways and as a result there is no universally accepted definition of what CSPs are or should be. Furthermore, it is also worth noting that with the growing number of research studies undertaken to examine the relationship between CSPs and other processes such as corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices (Murray & Haynes, 2010) and sustainable development
processes (Berlie, 2010), CSPs are commonly viewed as supplementary processes components that play a crucial role in developing CSR strategies.

Despite these diverse definitions and inconsistency in terminology, there are still several characteristics and overlapping aspects which are usually emphasised by the majority of accounts. First, CSPs involve two or more organisations from different sectors working together to achieve a particular goal (Waddock, 1991). This can happen between businesses and NGOs, governments and NGOs, governments and businesses or be tri-partite (Seitanidi et al., 2011). Second, partners contribute some value to the relationship such as resources, skills, knowledge etc. (van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010; Austin, 2011; Page et al., 2015; Lyakhov & Gliedt, 2016). Contributions can be provided in different ways depending on the scope and type of the partnership. Third, CSPs are usually underpinned by a specific rationale such as seeking to achieve a particular objective (Waddock, 1991; Huxham, 1996; Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Murray & Haynes, 2010; Siegel, 2010; Monacell, 2015). According to Wadham and Warren (2013), the main goal of CSPs is to address a social issue. Last but not least, CSPs are defined as voluntary activities and are by no means obligatory or required by laws or policies (Wymer & Samu, 2003). As such, in contrast to same-sector partnerships, which are usually driven by a desire to achieve specific organisational goals, CSPs are generally assumed to be voluntarily actions seeking to address a social cause (Wadham & Warren, 2013).

In this thesis, I use the term ‘CSPs’ to refer to and describe different collaborative relationships and practices between different sectoral organisations which usually, although not necessarily, result in establishing more formal long-term relationships and arrangements. CSPs, thus, can refer to collaborations ranging from sponsorships to cause-related marketing
and strategic partnerships. Partnership working can cover a wider range of activities such as sharing information, funding programmes or developing complex joint projects.

Considering the different types of interactions, CSPs can take many forms based on the levels of intensity of the interactions (Ählström & Sjöström, 2005), the scope and objectives of the partnerships (Arenas et al., 2013) and the specific issues they seek to tackle (Wadham & Warren, 2013). Several researchers have attempted to categorise the different types of CSPs and so to explain their effects at different individual, organisational and societal levels.

Wymer and Samu (2003), for instance, have categorised CSPs based on the motives for engagement. They argue that the motives for engaging in CSPs define the scope and type of CSPs:

…motives and expectations for establishing relationships will influence the type of alliance created and that the type of relationship will influence the outcomes experienced by alliance partners (Wymer & Samu, 2003:5).

According to Wymer and Samu (2003), there are seven types of CSPs:

- **Corporate Philanthropy** (partnerships between businesses and NGOs where businesses give direct donations to NGOs in support of specific social causes)
- **Corporate Foundations** (non-profit units created by companies to manage different philanthropic objectives)
- **Licensing Agreements** (partnerships which allow corporations to use NGOs’ logos in return for a fee)
- **Sponsorships** (partnerships where businesses usually pay NGOs fees to advertise corporate images)
- **Transaction-Based Promotions** (corporate donations to charities determined by the proportion of sales)
- **Joint Issue Promotions** (joint advertising activities that seek to promote a mutually shared causes)
- **Joint Ventures** (long-term partnerships developed to pursue long-term strategic objectives)

Philanthropic partnerships are relationships which require limited engagement and joint work (Wymer & Samu, 2003). In most cases, businesses give donations to NGOs as part of supporting particular causes. ‘Joint issue promotions’, on the other hand, differ from philanthropic partnerships in that they require intensive ‘team-working’ and specific organisational plans, agendas and pre-defined goals. Lastly, joint ventures are long-term partnerships which are strategically aligned with the long-term objectives of the partners. They require intensive interactions and frequent exchanges of resources (both tangible and intangible). Thus, different motives influence the development of different types of partnerships. Examples of different forms of CSPs can be seen from the following table:
Table 1. Examples of CSP Alliances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Type</th>
<th>Business Partner</th>
<th>Nonprofit Partner</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corp Philanthropy</td>
<td>Walt Disney Co.</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>Walt Disney donated $70,000 for construction of a townhouse in Burbank, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp Philanthropy</td>
<td>Mentadoni</td>
<td>Imus Ranch</td>
<td>Mentadoni donated $250,000 to Imus Ranch (which provides recreational experiences for children with cancer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp Foundation</td>
<td>Delta Air Lines Foundation</td>
<td>Atlanta Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>In 1998, donated $500,000 to the symphony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>SmithKline Beecham</td>
<td>American Cancer Society</td>
<td>SmithKline uses American Cancer Society’s logo to help promote its nicotine patch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>Florida Dept of Citrus</td>
<td>American Cancer Society</td>
<td>American Cancer Society’s logo used to promote the role of orange products in preventing cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>MBNA America</td>
<td>National Education Association (NEA)</td>
<td>Affinity card (mastercard) targeted at NEA members. Percentage of sales goes to NEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Honda Motor Company, Acura, Saucony, Tylenol, Gas Company, and Adohr Farms</td>
<td>13th Annual Los Angeles Marathon</td>
<td>This event attracted 40,000 participants and 1 million spectators. Sponsors helped to promote the event. For example, Adohr Farms printed event ads on millions of milk cartons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Insight.com, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona, MicroAge</td>
<td>Fiesta Bowl</td>
<td>Fiesta Bowl National Band Championship, MicroAge Fiesta Bowl Parade. Insight.com Tucson Fiesta Bowl Football Classic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction-Based Promotion</td>
<td>Nabisco</td>
<td>American Zoo Aquatic Association</td>
<td>(1996) Nabisco produced a special edition of its Barnum’s Animal Crackers. Five cents of each box, up to $100,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction-Based Promotion</td>
<td>SC Johnson Wax</td>
<td>15th Annual Night Out Against Crime</td>
<td>In 1998, agreed to pledge up to $200,000 based on consumers coupon redemptions for various products (Glide, Ziplock, Shout).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focusing on the ‘performative effects’ of different CSPs, Vurro et al. (2011) have identified four major types of CSPs: instrumental, transactional, transformative and participative. ‘Instrumental’ partnerships are relationships which allow partners to exchange information and access different resources. ‘Transactional’ partnerships are types of relationships designed to increase the attractiveness of the partners. In other words, these are activities that strive to make each partner ‘look good’. ‘Transformational’ partners, on the other hand, are specific policy-based projects which seek to help partners explore new fields, develop new
opportunities and generate different ‘values’. Lastly, Vurro et al. (2011) state, ‘participative’ partnerships are the most specialised, purposefully built relationships which seek to help organisations achieve their long-term strategic goals.

Several other studies have attempted to categorise different CSPs. Selsky and Parker (2010) have built a typology that categorises CSPs based on the primary orientations of the organisations. Selsky and Parker (2010) have argued that there are three main types of CSPs: resource-dependence, social-issue and societal-sector partnerships. The resource-dependence partnerships are partnerships developed with the aim of providing partners access to different resources. Businesses, NGOs and governments often develop partnerships in order to share different resources. An example of a resource-dependence CSP is the partnership between Boeing Corporation, a multinational corporation that designs, manufactures and sells airplanes and AtWork, a nonprofit that works with people with disabilities to help them develop employability skills. The partners work together on a contract to share resources to deliver diverse programmes. Their programmes require a lot of commitment, software and equipment to deliver specific aspects of the pre-defined goals.

The social-issue partnerships, on the other hand, are much more complex because they pursue wider societal objectives such as addressing specific social cause. An illustration of a social-issue platform CSP is the partnership between Active Voice (AV), a firm that sells voicemail systems and Seattle Worker Centre (SWC), a charity that helps unemployed people find jobs. The partners have worked for many years to identify and address a specific social issue. In contrast to the resource-dependence CSPs, the main motivation for social-issue CSPs comes not from the internal need to share resources but from the desire to address an external social issue (Selsky & Parker, 2010).
The societal-sector partnerships are the most complex form of partnerships which are formed to address bigger societal and environmental issues. An example is the Starbucks-Conservation International partnership which seeks to develop sustainability strategies to preserve biodiversity (Selsky & Parker, 2010).

At another level, scholars such as Rondinelli and London (2003) have classified CSPs based on the ‘levels of intensity’ between partners. They suggest that CSPs can be categorised into three main types: *arm’s-length relationships*, *interactive collaborations*, *highly intensive management alliances*. The ‘arm’s length partnerships’, Rondinelli and London (2003: 64) state, involve:

... corporate support for employee voluntary participation in NPO environmental activities, corporate contributions and gifts to environmental NPOs, and corporate-NPO marketing affiliations.

These partnerships require limited engagement and investment from the partners. An example of this type of partnership is General Motors’ financial contribution of $5 million to the Nature Conservancy. ‘Interactive collaborations’, on the other hand, are more intensive as they require more commitment and responsibility. An example is the Business for Social Responsibility partnerships with companies such as Novo Nordisk and American Express to provide assistance to member companies on CSR issues and promote knowledge sharing among companies (Rondinelli & London, 2003).

The ‘highly intensive management alliance’ is the most complex and intensive type of partnership which demands long-term investments, time, efforts and resources from each partner. These are usually long-term strategic partnerships which are characterised with complex management and organisational objectives. An example is the McDonald-
Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) long-term partnership created to reduce waste in McDonald’s operations (Rondinelli & London, 2003).

More recently, Kourula et al. (2008) have sought to categorise different forms of CSPs in relation to the corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices and agendas of businesses. According to their typology, there are three general types of CSPs in relation to CSR: Philanthropy, Corporate Responsibility Integration and Corporate Responsibility Innovation interactions. Philanthropic partnerships include corporate sponsorships and charity donations. Corporate Responsibility Interaction forms of relationships, on the other hand, are partnerships which seek to address common goals between partners. Lastly, Corporate Responsibility Innovation forms of interactions are partnerships which strive to address wider societal and environmental challenges. Each of these forms of CSPs, Kourula and Halme (2008) state, is influenced by the wider CSR practices of the partners.

As noticed so far, there are different types of typologies of CSPs. Scholars have sought to categorise CSPs based on their effects, levels of interaction, scope and goals. Although there are overlaps and similarities between different typologies, each of them seeks to emphasise how organisations develop specific forms of CSPs in order to pursue particular objectives. What is more, these typologies also seek to explain how different forms of CSPs are underpinned by specific motives and rationales, which I now turn to explore in the following section.

2.1.2 Drivers of CSPs

Why do businesses, governments and NGOs engage in CSPs? This question has attracted much research attention over the last decade. As a result, the literature on the drivers of CSPs has vastly expanded. Studies within this research stream usually focus on exploring the initial
conditions and underlying forces that encourage organisations to engage in CSPs (Waddock, 1989). According to Austin (2000a), it is important to understand the drivers of CSPs because they are the cornerstone for building different types of alliances. Moreover, our understanding of the underlying factors that encourage CSPs may help us predict the future collaborative opportunities between sectors (Siegel, 2010).

Overall, the stimuli for CSPs can be categorised as either micro or macro factors or a combination of both (Huxham, 1996). Murphy and Bendell (1997) state that there are different reasons for engaging in CSPs. At a micro level, organisations may form CSPs in order to improve their organisational performances or develop more effective approaches to address their wider organisational objectives (den Hond et al., 2012). The motives to engage in CSPs, thus, vary depending to the specific needs and ambitions of the partering organisations (Graf & Rothlauf, 2011). Some scholars such as Huxham (1996) have summarised some of the most common motives that encourage organisations to form CSPs:

- Self-interest
- Moral reasons
- Ideological reasons
- Enhancing organisational capacity
- Exchange information

Others, like den Hond et al. (2012) have further argued that that organisations develop CSPs in order to:

- Acquire new technology
- Develop products
• Achieve competitive advantage
• Build reputation

Generally, micro motives can be related at four different levels: economic, ethical, organisational, and strategic levels. Many organisations form CSPs for economic reasons (Waddock, 1991). CSPs can be particularly attractive for NGOs as these activities can help them generate extra income (Harris, 2012). Transaction cost calculations often play a crucial role in calculating the potential economic benefits of engaging in different partnership activities (Austin, 2016). Both economic reasons and perceived economic benefits are likely to motivate organisations to form CSPs (Siegel, 2010). From an economic perspective, Huxham (1996) states, decisions are usually driven by evaluations of the circumstances, risks and expectations about future outcomes. For businesses, these evaluations may include specific calculations of the expected returns on investments (Wymer & Samu, 2003). Economic motives are, thus, underpinned by a resource-based view (Liu & Ko, 2011; Morrow & Robinson, 2013; Clarke & MacDonald, 2016) which suggests that improving performance might encourage organisations to engage in CSPs. In other words, organisations may want to form CSPs in the hope of gaining economic benefits (Clarke & MacDonald, 2016).

At another level, specific organisational characteristics may also motivate organisations to enter CSPs (Berlie, 2010). Research has found that organisations might seek to engage in CSPs in order to improve their employees’ job satisfaction and team working skills (Huxham, 1996). For instance, by working in CSP activities, employees might learn new skills which may improve their individual performance (Ameli & Kayes, 2011). Positive outlooks and attitudes might be developed from engaging in CSP projects, which in turn might motivate employees to become more committed to their work (Burchell & Cook, 2011). Likewise,
employees might perceive their employers as more responsible rather than simply making profits as a result of engaging in different CSP community projects (van Tulder et al., 2015). Research, thus, suggests that there is a direct positive relationship between engaging in CSPs and the wider organisational ambitions and characteristics of partners (Wood & Gray, 2016).

At another level, CSPs might also be underpinned by various ethical and moral values (Huxham, 1996). Nowadays many businesses seem to want to work with local communities as this is considered ethically right (Waddock & Post, 1995; Wadham & Warren, 2013). Companies might engage in community projects with NGOs to tackle issues such as unemployment or poverty (Austin, 2016). As the main polluters of the environment, companies often feel an ethical duty to help societies by working in CSPs to address important societal problems. Ethical reasons, as such, can be seen as important motives that encourage organisations to engage in CSPs (Huxham, 1996).

Others, such as Glasbergen (2013), have also argued that businesses engage in CSPs in order to build their reputations and achieve legitimacy in societies. The legitimacy motive further suggests that organisations engage in CSP activities in order to meet societal expectations (Marano & Tashman, 2012). With the growing public pressure to act responsibly, businesses have looked for different ways to meet the wider societal expectations. By engaging in CSPs and other pro-social responsibilities, businesses have sought to show that they care about societal expectations (Baur & Palazzo, 2015).

More recent research has also pointed out that organisations engage in CSPs because these activities are related to their stakeholder management strategies (Holmes et al., 2007; Huijstee & Glasbergen, 2010; Burchell & Cook, 2011; Moog et al., 2014; Abzug & Webb, 2016). Holmes et al. (2007) have stated that pressures from different stakeholders might motivate
organisations to engage in CSPs. The stakeholder approach to management suggests that firms look at various stakeholders—individual, groups and institutions—in order to develop strategies that can help them more successfully manage these stakeholders (Huijstee & Glasbergen, 2010). The stakeholder approach, hence, suggests that companies are not solely driven by economic interests of shareholders but are also influenced by the interests of all stakeholders (Abzug & Webb, 2016). Companies, therefore, undertake different activities to ensure that all stakeholders’ interests are addressed (Zeyen et al., 2014). Two crucial stakeholders for businesses are governments and NGOs, with whom businesses often develop different relationships to ensure that their interests are met (Moog et al., 2014). By developing CSPs, companies tend to develop relationships with local communities which in turn help them develop more effective management practices and strategies (Abzug & Webb, 2016).

In addition to the micro factors, the literature also suggests that there are several macro factors which encourage CSPs. Berlie (2010) states that certain macro factors such as changing economic conditions and changes in institutional practices have motivated many organisations to engage in CSPs. According to Berlie (2010), the last couple of decades have brought drastic changes in the overall ‘organisational environment’ in which businesses, NGOs and governments operate. Whereas in the past the structure of the organisational environment was much simpler, in the sense that businesses operated locally and there were no serious unpredictable constraints that could affect their operations, the current environment is much more complex (Berlie, 2010). For instance, many businesses now operate internationally and have global products and customers. Similarly, many NGOs work across continents and engage in international projects. Furthermore, the societal and environmental problems we currently face are said to have an impact on all countries, sectors and peoples (Vangen &
Huxham, 2011). The need to address a range of different global problems, as such, has encouraged businesses, NGOs, and governments to develop CSPs in an attempt to tackle ecological, social and economic challenges (Murphy & Bendell, 1997). Changes in the current environment have also created new pressures and demands for acting ‘responsibly’, especially for corporations, which are now expected to help societies tackle social issues (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009). It is such types of changes, Berlie (2010:10) argues, that have led to the recognition of the importance of working together to achieve sustainable development:

The key element in the convergence of corporate and NGO agendas has been the diffusion and acceptance of the concept of sustainable development (i.e., development which should enable society to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs). This sustainability involves a balancing of economic, ecological and social interests...

By developing CSPs, sectors can ensure that renewable resources are secured for the future generations (Morrow & Robinson, 2013; Clarke & MacDonald, 2016).

Other macro factors that are said to have created conditions for CSPs are: the development of different economic zones, de-nationalisation and international economic agreements (Murphy & Bendell, 1997). According to Murphy and Bendell (1997), recent political shifts towards de-nationalisation have largely empowered businesses and as a result private sector firms can now more freely self-regulate their behaviours. However, de-nationalisation processes have also increased public awareness about corporate ‘unethical’ practices (Austin, 2016). As a consequence, many businesses have sought to develop CSPs as a way to implement various corporate responsibility practices (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Murray & Haynes, 2010).
At a policy level, there have also been changes in public policies in many countries which stress the importance of CSPs to deliver public services (Austin, 2016). Particular emphasis has been put on seeking to improve the efficiency levels of delivering public services (Bitzer & Glasbergen, 2010; Sharma & Kearins, 2010; Trencher et al., 2013; McAllister & Taylor, 2015). Engaging in CSPs is, thus, widely believed to be a way forward in becoming more successful in delivering more effective public services (Trencher et al., 2013). Furthermore, Vurro et al. (2011) state, specific institutional changes have urged businesses, NGOs and governments to develop similar practices and align their strategies and goals to tackle societal problems. Vurro et al. (2011:43) have argued that changes in institutional fields and needs have encouraged the development of different CSPs:

…variation in dominant institutional logics leads to different appropriateness needs. Depending on the institutional characteristics in a field, companies interested in establishing a CSSP (original spelling) can pursue a given social aim, while combining it with certain competitive benefits.

According to Vurro et al. (2011), the emergence of CSPs can be linked to what they call ‘appropriation needs’ within specific institutional fields. In each environment, they argue, organisations face similar needs which encourage them to engage in CSPs in the hope of addressing these needs. Specific ‘institutional contexts and logics’, hence, may stimulate organisations from different sectors to develop CSPs in order to address mutual beneficial goals or concerns. These two interrelated factors- namely ‘institutional logic’ and ‘appropriation needs’- determine whether different sectoral organisations engage or not in CSPs (Vurro et al., 2011). A similar argument is also presented by Valor and Diego (2009) who further have suggested that ‘institutional forces’ shape the ‘scopes’ and ‘forms’ of CSPs.
Last but not least, globalisation processes have had a profound effect and influence on the development of CSPs (Loza, 2004). Berlie (2010) has stated that globalisation processes have transformed the nature and relationship between sectors, countries and continents. In his view, globalisation forces are a key driver forcing businesses, NGOs and governments to explore alternative ways to find strategies and solutions to global problems. Many businesses now operate internationally and have headquarters in different locations around the world (Murphy & Bendell, 1997). Similarly, many NGOs have developed transnational projects throughout the globe (Berlie, 2010). As a result, there is a growing economic inter-dependence among countries, sectors and industries, which has created an urge to develop CSPs in order to fight poverty and pollution, among others (Loza, 2004). In this regard, CSPs are seen as a means to create ‘collective value’ (Le Ber & Branzei, 2011) which benefits all countries and sectors. Long-term global strategies are needed (Al-Tabbaa et al., 2013) and often developed (Ählström & Sjöström, 2005) based on the logic of ‘win-win’ scenarios (Austin, 2011) by engaging in CSPs.

As noticed so far, the current literature suggests that different macro or micro factors (or a combination of both) encourage CSPs. The micro factors highlight the importance of individual perceptions and needs to engage in CSPs while the macro factors stress the importance of various national, economic, or global forces which drive businesses, NGOs and governments into collaborations. Depending on these diverse micro or macro factors, different types of CSPs are developed between sectors (Huxham, 1996). Furthermore, scholars have also argued that these factors have shaped the dynamics of CSPs. In the next section, I review the literature that seeks to explain the dynamics of CSPs.
2.2 Dynamics of CSPs

A growing number of studies have focused on explaining the tensions and issues that shape and influence the dynamics of CSPs (see Austin & Seitanidi 2012a and Austin & Seitanidi 2012b, for a review). CSP scholars have developed different models to capture and illuminate the complexities of CSP processes. Some researchers have sought to explain the sequences of stages of developing CSPs (Seitanidi et al., 2011) while others have attempted to explain the barriers, enablers and internal tensions which determine and influence partnership workings (Austin, 2000a; Rondinelli & London, 2003; Huxham et al., 2006; Lewis et al., 2010; Koschmann & Laster, 2011; Nisar, 2013). As a result, the current research offers diverse explanations of the factors that shape the organisational and management aspects of CSPs.

A large portion of extant research has revealed that the development of CSPs proceeds through sequences of stages or phases. Seitanidi et al. (2011), for instance, have argued that partnership development proceeds in three stages: partnership selection, partnership design and partnership institutionalisation. The partnership selection stage occurs when prospective partners assess different options and risks (both internal and external) for partnering. Partnership design then proceeds with processes of designing the partnership and determining the purpose of the partnership. Lastly, partnership institutionalisation occurs as partners institutionalise partnership practices.

Reaching a somewhat similar conclusion, Jamali and Keshishian (2008) have also argued that CSP development proceeds in three stages: partnership initiation, partnership execution and partnership evaluation. In the first stage, potential partners engage in preparation and negotiation processes and set up criteria and goals for engaging in CSPs. Then, in the second stage, the scope of activities is negotiated. Finally, partnership evaluation occurs as partners
evaluate the outcomes of CSP activities and set future expectations and goals. Each stage is characterised by different aspects and issues (Jamali & Keshishian, 2008).

Other scholars such as Gray (1985) have further explained partnership development in terms of processes of problem-setting, direction and structuring. Gray (1985) has stated that in the problem-setting stage an issue is identified by partners and recognition is achieved about the need for partnering. The direction-setting stage then occurs when a common purpose and a plan are developed to guide partnership activities. Finally, structuring occurs as these means and practices are institutionalised. Furthermore, Gray (1985) has stated, particular structures need to be created to support partnership workings.

Waddock (1989) has also built a similar process model which depicts the stages of developing CSPs through the processes of ‘issue crystallization’, ‘coalition building’, and ‘purpose formation’. According to her study, an issue must first be identified. Then, partners need to build coalitions and mobilise actors who negotiate the purpose of the partnership before moving to the final implementation step. These stages, Waddock (1989) states, influence the partnership dynamics and determine the scope and nature of partnership workings over time.

In terms of setting particular strategies for developing CSPs, Googins and Rochlin (2000) argue that partnership processes often proceed through the stages of ‘defining clear goals’, ‘obtaining senior level commitment’, ‘engaging in frequent communication’, ‘assigning professional to lead the work’, ‘sharing commitment of resources’ and ‘evaluating progress’. By following these steps, partners set agreements that ensure more effective strategic management of the CSP activities.
As we can see, different models have sought to explain the sequences of stages or steps that shape CSPs. Furthermore, research has also shown that there are various ongoing tensions and challenges which shape CSP dynamics.

According to Babiak and Thibault (2009), the ‘formulate then implement’ sequential approach should not be understood as a straightforward process, because partners face numerous tensions and issues in the processes of developing CSPs. According to Babiak and Thibault (2009:121), CSP dynamics are largely shaped by issues emerging from having:

…conflicting goals and missions, lack of opportunity or incentive to collaborate, inflexible policies and procedures that do not support the partnership, constrained resources, mistrust, group attitudes about each other that may not be accurate, different organisational norms and culture, and lack of support or commitment to the partnership.

Berger et al. (2004) further state that there are six major issues/differences that might affect the development of CSPs:

- misunderstandings
- misallocation of costs and benefits
- mismatches of power
- mismatched partners
- misfortunes of time
- mistrust.

All of the above differences often create numerous problems and so negatively impact the development of CSPs. In this regard, Joutsenvirta and Uusitalo (2009) as well as Vangen and
Winchester (2013) have stated that cultural differences as well as differences in management styles and institutional procedures are all likely to affect partnership dynamics.

At another level, scholars such as Koschmann and Laster (2011) have also argued that communication is a key determinant shaping CSP dynamics. In the case of poor communication, misunderstandings and lack of agreement may lead to collaborative inertia (Huxham, 1996). Communication issues may also create conflicts and so lead to divergence of interests among employees (Koschmann, 2016). Effective communication is, thus, important for developing successful CSPs (Burchell & Cook, 2011). Through effective communication, managers can easily manage differences and set directions of partnership dynamics (Vangen & Huxham, 2003b). Lack of communication, on the other hand, can lead to poor performance and eventually dissolution of partnership workings (Koschmann & Laster, 2011). According to Huxham and Vangen (2005), therefore, communication is a crucial factor shaping the dynamics of CSPs.

Furthermore, Vangen (2016) states, cultural differences can also create barriers and constraints for developing successful partnerships. Different cultural perceptions and practices can create conflicts and so lead to disagreements about the purpose and long-term focus of CSPs (Lucea, 2009). In this regard, Rivera-Santos and Rufin (2011) state, incompatible cultures add complexity and may lead to unexpected reactions and problems. Finding appropriate ways to deal with cultural differences and developing cultural sensitivities to various differences is an essential step for developing more effective partnership practices (Parker & Selsky, 2004). In addition, more open negotiations and transparency can enhance trust between partners and so increase the likelihood of developing more effective long-term partnerships (Vangen & Huxham, 2003b).
In a similar way, other scholars such as Bergenholtz and Bjerregaard (2013), Bitzer and Glasbergen (2010), Egels-Zandén et al. (2015), Osborn and Hagedoorn (1997), Sharfman and Gray (1991), Vurro et al. (2011), and Zeyen et al. (2014) have argued that realising the effect of institutional differences is highly likely to positively affect the dynamics of CSPs. According to Berger et al. (2004), achieving ‘mission fit’, ‘resource fit’, ‘management fit’, ‘workforce fit’, ‘target market fit’, ‘product/cause fit’, ‘cultural fit’, ‘cycle fit’, ‘evaluation fit’ and ‘increasing fit’, among other, will most likely result in developing successful CSPs. Furthermore, Berger et al. (2004) argue, managers must also develop specific strategies in order to be able to develop, design and structure CSPs in alignment with the strategic objectives of their organisations:

Social alliances can be designed, structured, nurtured, and maintained in a manner that will enable them both to contribute to solving pressing social problems and to fulfilling important strategic objectives for companies and nonprofits...Managers on both sides of the ‘profit’ divide require a full and rich understanding of the factors and processes that drive, sustain, and support this new organisational form (Berger et al., 2004:88).

Research on the management of CSPs also suggests that managing CSPs is often shaped by managerial conflicts (Austin, 2000a; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; Bryson et al., 2006; Huxham et al., 2006; Crosby & Bryson, 2007; Lewis et al., 2010; Clarke & Fuller, 2011; Vangen & Winchester, 2013; Moog et al., 2014). CSPs are, thus, inherently complex relationships and require ‘good’ management to handle issues of trust, conflict and control (Zhang & Huxham, 2009; Getha-Taylor, 2012). Once organisations decide to form a partnership, they are likely to face serious questions and challenges in relation to their intentions (Googins & Rochlin, 2000;
Managers may also benefit from exercising leadership at three different levels (Huxham & Vangen, 2001; Vangen & Huxham, 2003a; Crosby & Bryson, 2007). According to Huxham and Vangen (2001), ‘leadership’ can be exercised through ‘structure, process and participation’. ‘Leadership through structure’ can be enacted by developing specific

Managers may also benefit from exercising leadership at three different levels (Huxham & Vangen, 2001; Vangen & Huxham, 2003a; Crosby & Bryson, 2007). According to Huxham and Vangen (2001), ‘leadership’ can be exercised through ‘structure, process and participation’. ‘Leadership through structure’ can be enacted by developing specific
organisational structures which in turn enable leaders to set up ‘realistic’ goals and plans.

Huxham and Vangen (2001: 1166) state:

…itstructure is a driver of the way agendas are shaped and implemented…Structures thus play an important leadership role because they determine such key factors as who has an influence on shaping a partnership agenda, who has power to act, and what resources are tapped.

‘Leadership through process’ further suggests that leaders are more likely to effectively manage CSPs if they develop specific procedures which can guide employees in the processes of implementing specific agendas. Huxham and Vangen (2001: 1167) state:

… processes integral to a collaboration also play a significant role in shaping and implementing a partnership’s agenda. In this context, ‘process’ are narrowly defined as the formal and informal instruments…

Lastly, ‘leadership through participation’ denotes that individual participation also plays a key role in managing CSP dynamics:

Participants, of course, also play a powerful leadership role in influencing agendas. We broadly define participants as including individuals, groups, and organisations. Any participant associated with a collaboration who has the power and know-how to influence and enact a partnership agenda may take a lead (Huxham & Vangen, 2001:1167).

For Huxham and Vangen (2001), effective leadership is enacted when managers set up specific roles, leadership responsibilities and management strategies that guide and control CSP dynamics. In this context, successful management largely depends on the leaders’ ability
to stimulate collective actions and build trust and transparency between employees (Crosby & Bryson, 2007).

In more recent years, several studies and scholars have called for more research on the micro dynamics of CSPs (see for instance Vock et al. 2013 and Kolk et al. 2015 for a discussion) in order to explore how CSP workings are initiated, maintained and transformed through ongoing micro interactions and relationships between the partnering organisations. In particular, Vock et al. (2013) state, further research is needed to explore how ongoing social interactions and patterns of activities establish, re-establish and un-establish particular organisational arrangements. By undertaking process-based research, Kruckenberg (2015) states, we can gain deeper understanding of the dynamic emergence of CSPs and explore how unexpected events and temporal dynamics shape the novel processual establishment of CSP arrangements.

Besides the numerous studies that have sought to explore the dynamics of CSPs, there have also been a number of studies undertaken to measure the potential implications and outcomes of CSPs at individual, organisational and societal levels, which is what I now turn to explore in the next section.

**2.3 Outcomes of CSPs**

The outcomes of CSPs can be various and at different individual, organisational and societal levels (Austin, 2011; Hansen et al., 2011; Le Ber & Branzei, 2011; Page et al., 2015; Clarke & MacDonald, 2016; Lyakhov & Gliedt, 2016). Deciding to engage in CSPs is in fact first and foremost directly related to the expected outcomes which each organisation expects (Austin, 2011). Organisations usually form CSP alliances because they hope that such
activities would help them achieve their wider goals and ambitions (Murphy & Bendell, 1997). The potential effects of CSPs, thus, vary depending on the scope and nature of each partnership (Selsky & Parker, 2010).

According to Berlie (2010:24), the major benefits of CSPs come from the potentials to help organisations achieve particular objectives such as:

- ‘find solutions to increase its environmental efficiency’
- ‘successfully run compensatory projects (i.e., undertakings which compensate for the negative environmental impacts of operations)’
- ‘enhance reputation and image, differentiate positioning on the market and bring credibility to the environmental initiatives’.

Furthermore, Berlie (2010) states, CSPs can help partners develop strategies to decrease pollution, share resources, and improve internal production of their different operations. In this regard, Googins and Rochlin (2000) also add that CSPs can be particularly useful for businesses in developing ‘technical expertise’, ‘management training’ and ‘volunteer opportunities’ whilst for NGOs, CSPs can help them extend their programmes and initiatives.

Dahan et al. (2010) have also pointed out that CSPs have been valuable instruments, particularly for private sector organisations in:

- ‘market research’,
- ‘product R&D’,
- ‘procurement and production’,
- ‘distribution’, ‘marketing’ and
- ‘new business model development’.

CSPs are, thus, widely viewed as tools which can help businesses achieve their wider organisational objectives. By working with governments and NGOs, Dahan et al. (2010) argue, businesses also learn about different cultural practices which in turn help them develop new ‘modes of value creation’. Dahan et al. (2010:326) state:

Multinational enterprises (MNEs) face a range of challenges when entering developing countries, including the need to adapt their business models to local markets’ cultural, economic, institutional and geographic features. Where they lack the tangible resources or intangible knowledge needed to address these challenges, MNEs may consider collaborating with non-profit nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) to help facilitate new modes of value creation. In such cross-sector partnerships, parties contribute complementary capabilities along each stage of the value chain to develop products or services that neither could produce alone, creating and delivering value in novel ways while minimizing costs and risks.

In a more recent study, Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) have attempted to classify and explain the sources and levels of values resulting from forming different CSPs. According to Austin
and Seitanidi (2012a), CSPs can generate different types of ‘values’ at different organisational levels, some of which are:

- **Resource complementarity** (CSPs help organisations get access to different resources)
- **Resource nature** (CSPs help organisations develop new knowledge and capabilities)
- **Resource directionality and use** (CSPs assist organisations in addressing and achieving their wider organisational goals and concerns)
- **Linked interests** (CSPs enable organisations to create ‘fair value’ which benefits everybody in societies)

These ‘sources of value’ can produce four different types of collaborative effects: 1) ‘associational value’ (benefits resulting from having a collaborative relationship), 2) ‘transferred resource value’ (benefits from having access to your partner’s resources), 3) ‘interaction value’ (various intangible benefits which allow partners to find solutions to their long-term problems) and 4) ‘synergistic value’ (potential benefits from accomplishing more by working together). Each of these sources of values, Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) argue, shows the positive effects and the potential benefits of engaging in CSPs.

Several studies have also suggested that CSPs produce innovations (Holmes et al., 2007; Jamali et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2012). Jamali et al. (2011), for instance, state that by working together, businesses, governments and NGOs can find innovative solutions to different issues which are crucial for their long-term survival and strategic objectives. Jamali et al. (2011:386) state:

A very important finding of their paper is that innovation links organically to the notion of better strategic fit or alignment. The research suggests intricate links between
strategic partnership dynamics and increased innovation. Partnerships are prone to more innovation when they translate unambiguously into some form of competitive advantage or tangible benefit for both partners. Alternatively, partnerships also tilt towards innovation when they enable both partners to leverage their core competence.

At individual and group levels, Reast et al. (2011) have also pointed out that engaging in CSPs helps employees learn new practices and generate new knowledge sets. Many organisations enter alliances with the expectation of learning from their partners’ different practices (van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010; Ameli & Kayes, 2011; Murphy et al., 2012). Murphy et al. (2012), for instance, state that learning occurs as partners acquire, diffuse and apply new information, knowledge and skills which enhance their wider organisational performance. According to Ameli and Kayes (2011), the process of learning in CSPs usually happens in four sequential stages. In the first stage, partners exchange information and get to know each other’s ‘different language’. In the second stage, a ‘conversation space’ is opened which allows partners to discuss different ‘leadership practices’. In the third stage, the newly accumulated knowledge sets are diffused internally to each organisation’s stakeholders. In the final stage, actors return to their partners and share how the newly accumulated knowledge impacted their individual practices. This ‘learning process’, Ameli and Kayes (2011) suggest, show the potential ‘positive learning effects’ of engaging in CSPs.

Furthermore, potential learning benefits might also help organisations retain employees as new knowledges usually enrich their experiences (van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010). In addition, it has also been shown that CSPs might improve the productivity level of employees as a result of their new experiences and acquired skills (van Tulder et al., 2015).
In regard to the wider organisational level benefits, recent research has further revealed that CSPs can help businesses develop CSR practices (Jamali & Keshishian, 2008; Nijhof et al., 2008; Murray & Haynes, 2010). Walters and Anagnostopoulos (2012) argue that CSPs have become of the most preferred ways for business to develop and delivering CSR practices. Nijhof et al. (2008) have explored the potential benefits of CSPs on CSR. They claim that CSPs can be developed in order to implement different corporate socially responsible practices which in turn assist companies in: 1) decreasing potential public ‘attacks’ on corporate behaviour, 2) building images of ethical companies and 3) developing ‘common values’ with the wider societal organisations. For a review on the link between CSPs and CSR, see Kourula et al. (2008), Nijhof et al. (2008) and Murray and Haynes (2010).

Last but not least, Vangen and Huxham (2011) argue that CSPs are useful instruments for strengthening communication between sectors and societies. Through CSP projects, businesses, governments and NGOs also engage with local people and so learn about their wishes and problems (Wadham & Warren, 2013).

Such types of representations in the extant literature depict CSPs as multi-purpose instruments (Wymer & Samu, 2003; Holmes et al., 2007; Dahan et al., 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2010; van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010; Hansen et al., 2011; van Tulder et al., 2015; Clarke & MacDonald, 2016; Lyakhov & Gliedt, 2016) which can help sectors share knowledge and develop new ways of thinking about different issues (Jamali et al., 2011; Le Ber & Branzei, 2011; Murphy et al., 2012). As a result, CSPs are now widely considered mechanisms for social change (Selsky & Parker, 2010; Wadham & Warren, 2013). In the next section, I summarise the key points of this chapter and reflect upon the need to further undertake
research that can help to enrich our understanding of the dynamic emergence and effects of CSPs.

2.4 Summary and a Way Forward

As seen from the above review, the current literature offers different explanations about the drivers, dynamics and implications of CSPs. A large portion of the present research has focused on explaining the motives for engaging in CSPs (Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Wymer & Samu, 2003; Siegel, 2010; Graf & Rothlauf, 2011; den Hond et al., 2012). A variety of micro and macro factors are said to have encouraged the development of different types of CSPs (Huxham, 1996). Furthermore, the drivers of CSPs are often portrayed as pre-given forces that determine whether businesses, NGOs and governments engage in CSPs. For instance, some organisations engage in CSPs because of economic or ethical reasons, while others are prompted to do so because of the underlying conditions in the environment in which they operate (Huxham, 1996; den Hond et al., 2012). Either way, micro and macro factors are depicted as pre-given underlying causes which stimulate organisations to engage in CSPs. Nevertheless den Hond et al. (2012) state, it is difficult to ascertain the ‘true’ motives for engaging in CSPs because factors change over time and so do organisations’ needs to form CSPs. Therefore, further research is needed to explore the complexities around the decisions to engage in CSPs (Graf & Rothlauf, 2011).

In addition, the review also revealed that a large portion of the present research has focused on explaining the dynamics of CSPs (Waddock, 1989; Austin, 2000b; Berger et al., 2004; Ählström & Sjöström, 2005; Joyner & Smallman, 2007; Wilburn, 2008; Lewis et al., 2010; van Huijstee et al., 2011; Bergenholtz & Bjerregaard, 2013; Manning & Roessler, 2013; Nisar, 2013; Zeyen et al., 2014). Different models have been built to identify the stages of
developing CSPs and to explain the most common barriers and enablers that enable or distract CSP partnership workings. In the majority of cases, scholars argue that the development of CSPs unfolds in a linear sequential manner. Seitanidi et al. (2011), for instance, state that partnership development proceeds through three stages during which plans and goals are negotiated and implemented. CSP development is, thus, conceptualised as a series of steps that lead to particular outcomes. In such explanations, there is a common assumption of rationality in the processes of developing CSPs, where everything follows a linear pattern and is planned in advance by managers. Moreover, such conceptualizations also emphasise how specific organisational, institutional and cultural differences can act as either barriers or enablers for developing CSPs.

Differences in aims, structures, cultures, among others, are often depicted as forces that influence partnership workings negatively (Lowndes & Slecher, 1998; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; Huxham et al., 2006; Joutsenvirta & Uusitalo, 2009). Therefore, they have to be overcome by managers if CSPs are to be successful (Waddock, 1988). Huxham and Vangen (2005) also state that differences in management styles may also negatively influence the overall management of CSPs. Research within this research stream further suggests that developing CSPs is characterised by different challenges and tensions which shape CSP dynamics over time (Austin, 2000a; Huxham et al., 2006; Koschmann & Laster, 2011; van Huijstee et al., 2011; Nisar, 2013; Moog et al., 2014; Stadtler & Van Wassenhove, 2016). At a managerial level, therefore, it has been suggested that the successful management of CSPs depends on the ability of leaders to achieve ‘fits’ (Berger et al., 2004), build trust between employees (Zhang & Huxham, 2009; Getha-Taylor, 2012), and develop appropriate
management structures and strategies to guide CSP actions (Ählström & Sjöström, 2005; Bryson et al., 2006; Al-Tabbaa et al., 2013; Nisar, 2013).

Yet, other scholars such as Kruckenberg (2015) express doubts about such explanations and argue that partnership developments are better viewed as emergent phenomena. CSP workings do not always unfold in a predictable pattern but rather emerge in a novel way as partners negotiate, re-negotiate and adaptively learn how to work together (Seitanidi, 2008). In this regard, Kolk et al. (2015) also state that CSPs are not always formulated in an objective manner, but rather emerge through designing, exploring, and adapting particular plans and courses of actions. Hence, Kruckenberg (2015) states, instead of trying to identify the barriers and enablers of CSPs, more research is needed to explore the micro practices which enact and sustain CSP workings. Authors such as Kolk et al. (2015) and Vock et al. (2013) have called for more micro-based process research which can help us advance our understandings of the processual emergence of CSP dynamics. However, research in this direction is still scarce and incomplete.

Last but not least, the review revealed that much research has been undertaken to explain the outcomes of CSPs (Dahan et al., 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2010; van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010; Austin, 2011; Hansen et al., 2011; Le Ber & Branzei, 2011; Page et al., 2015; van Tulder et al., 2015; Clarke & MacDonald, 2016). The current literature suggests that there are numerous benefits of engaging in CSPs at different levels (Wadham & Warren, 2013; Selsky & Parker, 2016). In general, CSPs are viewed as a means to an end or as input-output mechanisms that produce particular outcomes. The majority of the research, therefore, has sought to classify the potential outcomes of CSPs at different levels. Hansen et al. (2011), for instance, state that, at the organisational level, CSPs can improve organisational performance
and generate extra income. At the individual level, CSPs can boost employees’ productivity and commitment levels (van Tulder et al., 2015). Furthermore, research has also revealed that by working in CSPs, organisations can learn about new practices and develop different knowledge sets (van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010; Ameli & Kayes, 2011; Reast et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2012).

However, other scholars such as Lyakhov and Gliedt (2016) argue that the effects of CSPs are difficult to measure because the majority of CSPs are short-lived and in most cases only economic indicators are used to capture the implications of CSPs. In addition, measurements are often considered either objective or subjective and therefore they are unable to provide a definite explanation on the effects of CSPs (Sanzo et al., 2014). For this reason, instead of trying to measure or explain the objective effects of CSPs, more research is needed to explore how CSP processes emerge from and are related to wider processes (Kruckenberg, 2015) and to analyse how these processes seek to legitimise and/or de-legitimise particular activities in relation to the wider public, non-profit or corporate interests (Marano & Tashman, 2012; Glasbergen, 2013; Baur & Palazzo, 2015; Rueede & Kreutzer, 2015). At present, there are only a small number of studies which have explored some of these aspects. The review, therefore, suggests that more research is needed to explore the links between CSPs and the wider organisational processes of the partnering organisations and to analyse how CSP activities seek to legitimise different wider organisational ambitions and interests.

In seeking to advance our understanding of the dynamic processual emergence and social complexities of CSPs, in the next chapter I will introduce process thinking/philosophy and discuss how some of its key principles can help us develop a framework to research and theorise the social becoming nature of CSPs. As a distinctive mode of thinking from the still
predominant substance-based approaches, which explain CSP dynamics in terms of pre-given underlying factors, process thinking re-directs our attention to the constantly evolving patterns of activities which enact and sustain social phenomena (Chia, 1999) such as CSPs. As an alternative theoretical orientation, I argue, a process thinking approach can help us more faithfully appreciate and capture the ongoing social dynamics of CSPs.
Chapter Three: Towards a Processual Understanding of CSPs

In the previous chapter, I offered a review of the CSP literature and identified a need to undertake more processual-based research in order to advance our knowledge of the social complexities characterizing the novel emergence and implications of CSPs. The evaluation revealed that the present research on CSPs appears to be largely split between approaches that focus on the enablers and barriers for developing effective CSPs and more recent approaches (although still scarce and rare), which seek to explore the actual ongoing processes enacting CSP arrangements. The first stream of research explains CSP developments as undertakings based on pre-defined goals, strategies, plans and stakeholder interests. The task of empirical research is to track and elucidate how CSP strategies are designed and implemented at different organisational, individual and group levels. The second stream of research, on the other hand, moves away from trying to identify the barriers and enablers of CSPs and instead seeks to explain the dynamic ongoing social complexities of collaborative processes in situ or how diverse activities, processes and actions enact, re-enact and un-enact different temporal CSP arrangements. In contrast to the prevailing models of CSPs, the more recent process-based approaches have sought to develop alternative theoretical and empirical approaches which can help us track and explore how CSP processes emerge from, are embedded within and relate to wider processes of the public, private and nonprofit sectors. Yet, research in this direction is still scarce and insufficient.

In this chapter, I introduce process thinking and discuss how it can help us develop a process perspective which enables us to analyse the dynamic processual emergence of CSPs. The chapter is central to the thesis as it builds a theoretical orientation that addresses the primary research questions identified in chapters 1 and 2. In contrast to the predominant resource-
based views of CSPs, I argue that the development of a process-based practice perspective enables us to study and emphasise the dynamic activities enacting CSP arrangements. Developing a process thinking perspective, I further suggest, enables us to address the literature gaps identified in Chapter 2. The chapter proceeds as follows.

In the first section, I introduce process thinking and discuss some of its key ideas and principles. In particular, I discuss the key ontological and epistemological aspects of the wider process thinking tradition. Then, in section two, I discuss the implications that follow from developing a process thinking perspective to research the emergence of CSPs. I conclude the chapter with a discussion of how a process-based theoretical approach can help us advance our understanding of the social complexities of CSPs.

3.1 What is Process Thinking?

Process thinking (Whitehead, 1927; Barad, 2007; Nayak & Chia, 2011; Hernes et al., 2015; Bakken & Hernes, 2016), or as it is widely known process philosophy (Rescher, 2000; Keller & Daniell, 2002; Styhre, 2002; Mesle, 2008; Weik, 2011; Stout & Love, 2013) or process metaphysics (Staton & Stout, 2011; Weik, 2014) is a mode of thinking which assumes that reality is a dynamic process of becoming (Cooper & Fox, 1990; Chia & King, 1998; Chia, 1999; Collins, 2001; Cooper, 2003; Brigham, 2005; Bakken & Hernes, 2016; Clegg et al., 2016) and that the processual emergence of reality should be the primary focus of any empirical investigation (Weick, 1979; Gherardi & Strati, 1990; Collins, 2001; Styhre, 2002; Van de Ven & Engleman, 2004; Chia & Holt, 2006; Hernes & Weik, 2007; Langley, 2007; Langley et al., 2013; Hjorth et al., 2015; Hussenot & Missonier, 2015; Wood & Ferlie, 2016). Although we experience our everyday life experiences as dynamic and constantly changing, we usually tend to think of ourselves as static individuals who change only derivatively from
time to time (Van de Ven, 1992). In contrast to such a conception of reality, process thinking argues that any description of reality should be grounded in how the constantly changing nature of occurrences comes about and how they construct different realities (Tsoukas, 1993; 1994; Langley, 2007; Langley, 2009; Staton & Stout, 2011; Stout, 2012; Langley et al., 2013; Stout & Love, 2013). In other words, the primary focus of process thinking is to explain activity and process, not the so called unchanging nature of material bits and pieces (Sundgren & Styhre, 2007; Weik, 2016).

That, however, does not mean that process thinkers reject the notion of temporal stability (Hussenot & Missonier, 2015) or that they perceive everything as chaotic and purposeless (Halewood & Michael, 2008). On the contrary, process thinkers view what we usually consider stable phenomena as effects of ongoing processes which enact and sustain these phenomena (Bowen & Steyaert, 1990; Chia & King, 1998; Chia, 1999). In this respect, the task of process thinking is to reveal that processes are the fundamental force in and of everything (Keller & Daniell, 2002; Styhre, 2002; Langley, 2009; Nayak & Chia, 2011). Such an assumption stands in sharp contrast to the still predominant substance-based modes of thinking (Chia, 1999) which insist that reality consist of relatively unchanging bits and pieces (Bakken & Hernes, 2016). According to Hernes (2008), since the times of Aristotle and Plato, most Western thinkers have argued that ‘reality’ is fixed and unchangeable. It has been widely believed that ‘reality’ consists of fixed substances and that processes are secondary and subordinate to those substances (Keller & Daniell, 2002). For instance, if a student changes his/her university, he/she is still the same. The student is the same person (he or she is essential) while the change (the change of university) is accidental (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010). Substance-based thinking, thus, insists that ‘entities’ are fixed units and that their
qualities are unchanging (Robinson, 2009). In contrast to such modes of thought, which privilege being as primary, process thinking prioritises ‘becoming’ over ‘being’ (Collins, 2001; Styhre, 2002; Brigham, 2005; Nayak & Chia, 2011; Hernes et al., 2015; Hjorth et al., 2015; Bakken & Hernes, 2016; Clegg et al., 2016; Wood & Ferlie, 2016). That is to say, the key question for process thinkers is not ‘what is the essence of things?’ but ‘how do things emerge and perish over time?’ (Brigham, 2005). The key focus is on the ‘becomingness of phenomena’ rather than simply assuming that they are pre-given or fixed units (Cooper & Fox, 1990). Going back to the example above, a student is what he/she is because of activities he or she does (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010). It is the activities of going to university, writing, reading etc. that make up student experiences, not the other way around (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010). Process thinking has a long history which can be traced back to ancient Greece and the philosophy of Heraclitus, who argued that everything is in a constant process of becoming (Rescher, 2000; Mesle, 2008; Robinson, 2009; Stout & Love, 2013). In the next section, I explore some of the key ideas and principles of process thinking.

3.1 Key Ideas and Principles of Process Thinking

Historically, process thinking can be traced back to the Greek philosopher Heraclitus, who stated that ‘everything flows and nothing abides’ (Chia, 1999; Hernes & Weik, 2007). According to Heraclitus, reality is composed of dynamic processes which create ongoing strife that leads to nothing but ongoing change and transformation (Chia, 1999). For Heraclitus, everything is in constant process of becoming, which makes change and movement the basis and most universal features of all things existing (Rescher, 2000; Keller & Daniell, 2002). Over the centuries, process thought has been advanced by various thinkers coming from different disciplines and backgrounds, such as Whitehead (1927), Bergson
(1944), and Deleuze (1994a). Generally, there are a number of essential ideas and key principles which distinguish process thinking from still predominant substance-based modes of thinking in contemporary sciences.

First, at an ontological level, process thinkers generally argue that the fundamental basis or element of the world is not unchanging things but *processes* (Whitehead, 1925; 1927; Rescher, 2000; Mesle, 2008). For Heraclitus, reality does not consist of things or entities but of processes, although we often tend to describe reality as consisting of enduring substances such as people, stones, and mountains (Chia, 1999). For the process thinker, process is fundamental to all things in the world (Cobb, 2007). For instance, a river is not a thing, but a process of ever changing flow. The sun, too, is a process, as is anything that comes into existence (Cobb, 2007). But what is process? For James (1909), processes are best defined as ‘drops of experience’ or what Whitehead (1927) calls ‘actual occasions’. Whitehead (1927:18) states:

‘Actual entities’ -also termed 'actual occasions' -are the final real things- of which the world is made up. There is no going behind actual entities to find anything more real.

According to Whitehead (1927), ‘actual occasions’ are event-like happenings which emerge from, are part of and at the same time novel emanations of past happenings which suggests that reality is nothing but a dynamic process of becoming. In this regard, Whitehead (1927:23) states, ‘the actual world is a process, and the process is the becoming of actual entities’. ‘Actual occasions’ can also be conceptualised as specio-temporal events that are internally related to each other (Rescher, 2000; Mesle, 2008; Robinson, 2009). ‘Actual occasions’ can correspond to atomic events but also to humans, organisations, etc., which are nothing but societies of innumerable occasions (Wood & Ferlie, 2016). For Whitehead
(1927), an atom is not a substance isolated in space and time, but a fluctuating bundle of processes that endure temporally over time. Whitehead (1927) coined the term ‘nexus’ to refer to the network of a multiplicity of processes which enact and sustain what we usually refer to as enduring objects or phenomena. From a process view, what we usually conceptualise as substances, such as people, stones or organisations, are nothing but networks of processes indefinitely interrelated to each other. If we break up a rock, for instance, or an atom into smaller ‘substances’ and then into smaller ‘substances’, we will eventually find out that there are only energy events (Whitehead, 1925). Therefore, it is misleading to suggest that atoms are entities or substances with unchanging qualities. According to Whitehead (1925), there is an urgent need to rethink the way we view things and re-conceptualise what we call ‘entities’ as temporal accomplishments enacted by overlapping occasions of experiences.

But how do processes come into existence?

Whitehead (1927) argues that each new occasion emerges from other occasions through the process of concrescence, whereby the emergence of new actual occasions always includes/incorporates ‘traces’ of other occasions. This process of incorporating ‘traces’ of past actual occasions into the constitution of new actual occasions Whitehead (1927) calls prehension. Briefly summarizing the key aspect of Whitehead’s concept of prehension, Cobb (2007:570) states:

A prehension is the way in which what was there-then, becomes here-now. This occurs throughout the physical world, but we can study it best in our own experience. Prehension is the way in which one momentary experience incorporates its
predecessor. It is not difficult to observe this, although it is a topic that has had little attention in western philosophy.

And yet, Whitehead (1927) argues, the nature of each new actual occasion is not fully determined by past *prehensions*, because there is always a degree is self-determination and novelty in the process of coming into existence of every new actual occasion. It is this level of novelty inherent in the process of becoming of each new actual occasion that led Whitehead (1927) to conclude that the scientific notion of linear causality- *A causes B* - is misleading. In any given situation, Whitehead (1925) argues, there might be many forces causing particular behaviour, which directly contradicts the commonsensical notion of direct relationship between cause and effect.

In one of his major books entitled ‘Creative Evolution’, Bergson (1944), too, argued that free will and novelty are essential and inherent in the processual becoming of reality. Processes of becoming are never deterministic in the sense of our common understanding of causality (Bergson, 1913). Rather, Bergson (1944) argues, new processes usually emerge in unexpected and non-linear manner. He says:

…*reality is undoubtedly creative, i.e. productive of effects in which it expands and transcends its own being. These effects were therefore not given in it in advance, and so it could not take them for ends*… (Bergson, 1944:25)

Rejecting the traditional scientific methods of studying and capturing reality, which for Bergson (1913), simply seek to objectively measure and define the reality in terms of numerical calculations or pre-defined formulas, we need to develop a more sensitive awareness and appreciation of processual reality through what Bergson calls the method of intuition. Bergson (1913) calls the method of ‘intuition’ the act of getting back to the ‘things
themselves’. In his view, acts of experience happen spontaneously and often unpredictably and therefore cannot be structurally modelled (Bergson, 1913). What we experience in everyday life is an ongoing interfacing and engagement with the world (Grosz, 2005) which is, we should note, an immediate and non-conceptualised experience (Linstead & Mullarkey, 2003; Robinson, 2009). A simple example is the experience of visiting a city. Although we can read tourist brochures about a city, construct divisions of different parts of it, draw models or even take photographs from every possible angle (although that would be practically impossible), we can only ‘experience’ a city by visiting it. Only by walking through streets, visiting museums, talking to local people etc. can we get a glimpse of what it feels like to be in that city. According to Bergson (1913), there is a need to revisit our theoretical habits which simply seek to structure our realities in terms of pre-given categories. What is needed, Bergson (1913) claims, is to open space for alternative conceptualizations of processual reality that acknowledges rather than reduces our everyday experiences of ongoing flow and interfacing with the world. By working in this direction, Bergson (1944) states, we can more fully grasp that dynamic, becoming nature of existence.

Second, at an epistemological level, process thinkers have also sought to develop alternative epistemological frameworks which can help us more fully depict and re-think the becoming nature of reality (Collins, 1996; Chia, 1999; Mesle, 2008; Nayak, 2008b; Stout, 2012). In particular, three of the more recent and well-known thinkers, Derrida (1973) and Deleuze and Guattari (1987), have insisted that we need to review the way we use language to conceptualise reality and develop ‘reflexivity’ in relation to how language, words and concepts structure our realities and understandings.
For Deleuze (1994b), empirical investigations are about creating logical frameworks for discussing the character of reality. Frameworks are, therefore, not direct discoveries of the laws or facts of nature (Deleuze, 1994b). Instead, it is the creative force of language, Deleuze (1994b) points out, which allows us to formulate, conceptualise and describe the becomingness of reality which, however, always remain partial and incomplete. To discover previously unknown facts of the world is to confuse the ‘concrete with the abstract’ or as Whitehead (1927) calls it to fall into the ‘fallacy of misplaced concreteness’.

In several of his books, Deleuze has sought to reveal that behind our concepts, frames and words, there is no truth as usually expected and assumed by many scientists. Rather, behind words and concepts there are more words, concepts and appearances which jointly create new meanings, words and appearances. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) have also pointed out that since ancient times, not only philosophy but also commonsensical thinking has been trapped into a form of thought which assumes that language acts by representation. That is to say, words are assumed to be signs that refer to some external ideas ‘out there’ in our heads or in reality. Such a view of language, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state, makes us believe that there are transcendental realms which give our reality meaning. Questioning such a conceptualization of language, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argue that language does not act by representation but is rather the fabric of reality. It is through words (which are both sounds and marks) and the internal interrelatedness between them that any meaning is produced. In Chapter Four in one of their major books, ‘A Thousand Plateaus’, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argued that the primary function of words and language is not simply communication of information but to inscribe different worlds in linguistic forms. Thus, challenging the common assumption that language gives a direct link to reality, Deleuze and Guattari (1987)
have sought to draw attention to how language, words and concepts create different realities and meanings.

Questioning the common modernist epistemological assumptions, which aim to convince us that words stand for things, Derrida (1967) too has sought to explicate how language functions in terms of differential relations and so to open up space for an alternative epistemological framework for understanding the processual becoming of reality. For Derrida (1974), Western philosophical traditions have fallen into what he calls a ‘metaphysics of presence’, which presumes that things are pre-given and that language is a tool that can give us direct access to the essences of reality. In contrast to such a view, Derrida (1982) claims that language is not a tool but a system of differential relations between sounds and marks in which each ‘word’ gets its ‘temporal meaning’ by the play of different and deferral. He has coined the neologism ‘différance’ to indicate the dynamic, iterable and changing processual emergence of meaning-making in language. A simple example is to look up the word ‘love’ in the Online Oxford Dictionary, which gives us the following statement:

…feeling or disposition of deep affection or fondness for someone, typically arising from a recognition of attractive qualities, from natural affinity, or from sympathy and manifesting itself in concern for the other's welfare and pleasure in his or her presence (Online Oxford Dictionary)

If we further look up what the words ‘affection’ and ‘sympathy’ mean, we will get the following:

*Affection*: A gentle feeling of fondness or liking (Online Oxford Dictionary)
We can continue looking up other words such as ‘feelings’ and ‘liking’, but we will never find the final meaning of ‘love’. This ongoing differal and deferral ‘play’ where each word gets its ‘temporal meaning’ in relation to other words suggests that there is no ultimate meaning of things (Derrida, 1982). By revealing the ‘difference’ at play in language, Derrida (1981) has sought to reveal the impossibility of finding the so called ‘truth’ of reality. Similar to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), Derrida (1993) has urged us to rethink our common understanding of language, truth and meaning and so to open more space for alternative epistemological understandings which allow us to welcome what is ‘to come’ in terms of knowledge and conceptualization of reality.

For process thinkers, therefore, it is impossible to reach a neutral point of view that explains the essence of reality (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Bakken & Hernes, 2016). Such an epistemology leads us away from seeking to find correct interpretations of the meanings of words (Stout, 2012). Instead, introducing new concepts that open space for alternative understandings of reality is considered to be a more fruitful way forward in our empirical inquiries (Halewood & Michael, 2008; Nayak, 2008b). Furthermore, instead of asking traditional questions such as ‘What is the meaning of this or that?’, process thinkers ask questions such as ‘What do words do?’ and ‘How does meaning-making work?’ (Nayak, 2008b). Such forms of thinking are anti-deterministic because they seek to acknowledge the ongoing dynamic becoming of our realities (Styhre, 2002; Brigham, 2005; Cobb, 2007; Hernes & Weik, 2007; Nayak & Chia, 2011; Bakken & Hernes, 2016; Clegg et al., 2016).

Process scholars such as Chia (1999), Cooper (2003), Chia and King (1998), Hernes et al.
(2015), Hjorth et al. (2015), Langley (2007), Pettigrew (1992), Rasche (2011), Styhre (2002), Weik (2011), and Wood and Ferlie (2016) have sought to incorporate some of these key ideas in the fields of organisation studies which, in their view, can help us gain a more faithful appreciation of the dynamics that construct our organisational lives. In the next section, I discuss the implications of developing a process thinking approach/perspective to study the dynamic emergence of CSPs as social processes of becoming.

### 3.2 Implications

In the last several decades, process thinking has slowly entered the fields of organisation studies. Scholars such as Andrew Pettigrew, Ann Langley, Van de Ven, Haridimous Tsoukas, Robert Chia and Robert Cooper, to name a few, have sought to develop different process-based theoretical orientations and empirical analyses to explore and explain diverse organisational phenomena such as organisational change, organisational development, organisational identity and culture.

For Pettigrew (1997:338), process-based theoretical orientations and analyses enable us to ‘catch reality in flight’:

> The driving assumption behind process thinking is that social reality is not a steady state. It is a dynamic process. It occurs rather than merely exists. Human conduct is perpetually in a process of becoming. The overriding aim of the process analyst therefore is to catch this reality in flight.

Similarly, Langley (2007) argues that process thinking can help us develop alternative understandings of the dynamic complexities of our organisational lives. She says:
Process thinking may involve consideration of how and why things – people, organisations, strategies, environments – change, act and evolve over time or ... how such ‘things’ come to be constituted, reproduced, adapted and defined through ongoing processes (Langley, 2007:271).

In contrast to the still predominant structural approaches in organisation studies, which seek to explain social behaviour in terms of pre-defined factors, process thinking invites us to acknowledge the ongoing social complexities and dynamic processes which enact and transform organisational phenomena (Chia, 1999; Styhre, 2002; Van de Ven & Engleman, 2004; Hernes & Weik, 2007; Langley et al., 2013; Stout & Love, 2013; Bakken & Hernes, 2016; Wood & Ferlie, 2016). From a process view, what we usually consider pre-given entities such as ‘individuals’ or ‘organisations’, are temporal accomplishments enacted and sustained by processes (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010). The main task for process research, therefore, is to explain not why things exist but how processes enact and sustain different social organisational phenomena (Brigham, 2005). Viewed from a process perspective, social phenomena such as CSPs are nothing but dynamic multiplex constellations of mediating networks and processes. The implications of process thinking for CSP research, as we might suspect, are enormous. In the following sub-sections, I discuss the specific implications that follow from developing a process thinking approach to study CSPs.

3.2.1 Towards a Processual Analysis of CSPs

What would a processual analysis of CSPs look like? First of all, a process analysis of CSPs would focus on explaining how CSP processes emerge over time. Rather than seeking to explain the barriers and/or enablers of CSPs, a process analysis would seek to explore how mediating networks of events enact temporal CSP organisational accomplishments. Van de
Ven and Engleman (2004) state that a focus on events and processes and how they enact organisational phenomena is a crucial ingredient in any process-based analysis. To trace the emergence of CSP processes is, therefore, to explore how heterogeneous processes and events are mobilised in constructing CSPs. Chia and King (1998: 467) state:

For process metaphysicians there is an unmistakable commitment to thinking the heterogeneous becoming of phenomena rather than their manifest outcomes.

This commitment to thinking heterogeneous becoming of phenomena invites us to explore how multiple processes are connected to form CSPs. In this regard, Hernes (2008:129) states:

Without connectedness there is no process. Connectedness implies bringing together things to form a basis from which action can take place.

Second, a process analysis of CSPs would also seek to track how CSP processes emerge as part of and in relation to other wider organisational process. A key feature of process thinking is showing interconnectedness or how processes come into existence only in relation to other processes (Whitehead, 1927; Cooper & Fox, 1990; Rescher, 2000; Barad, 2007; Stout & Love, 2013). For Whitehead (1927), the emergence of new processes is always related to what he calls ‘prehension’, which is the process whereby the emergence of new processes incorporates ’traces’ of past processes. In the context of my study, this suggests a need to explore how CSP processes emerge in relation to the wider organisational processes of the partners and to examine how wider organisational processes partially influence the nature of CSP processes.

Process thinking rejects the assumption that processes are externally related as if they are independent from each other (Cooper & Fox, 1990). On the contrary, Cooper and Fox (1990)
state, processes constitute each other and therefore cannot be separated and analysed as separate units. Our common understanding is that processes are independent and only externally related to each other. For process thinking, however, this is a misleading assumption because no process makes sense without an internal relation to other processes (Hernes et al., 2015). Viewed from such a perspective, organisational processes such as CSPs are not separate processes existing independently of other organisational processes but are rather internally related to wider organisational processes of partners. Therefore, it is more important to explore how CSP processes emerge from, are part of, and are embedded within wider organisational processes.

Third, process thinking further suggests that the emergence of new processes is not fully determined by past processes. As stated by Whitehead (1927), there is a degree of self-determination in the process of emergence new occasions. A process analysis of the emergence of CSP processes, therefore, needs to trace and explore the degree of novelty inherent in the processual becoming of CSP processes. According to Whitehead (1927) and Bergson (1944), our common scientific notion of linear causality, where A is supposed to cause B, is a false one because there is a degree of novelty inherent in emergence of every new process. Both thinkers have sought to reveal that in any given situation there are multiplicities of forces which can shape reality in a totally unexpected manner. In the context of this study, this suggests a need to explore how particular CSP organisational arrangements emerge from the multiple possible ones.

Fourth, a process analysis of CSPs would also need to track the dynamic changing nature of CSP processes over time. According to Pettigrew (1997), temporality and change are crucial elements in any processual analysis of social phenomena. He states:
The second guiding assumption of process research is the need to reveal temporal interconnectedness. There is a search to catch reality in flight. Understanding the sequence and flow of events over time is a crucial requirement for the process scholar. There is the looming presence of the heavy hand of the past. History is crucial. (Pettigrew, 1992:10)

Following Pettigrew (1992), I will track and examine the evolving/changing nature of CSP over time. Studying processes over time, Hernes (2008) further reminds us, also allows us to explore and analyse the levels of iterability inherent in the processual emergence of new processes. According to Hernes (2008), the becoming nature of social processes is characterised by ongoing repetitions and reiterations. He says:

Reiteration is necessary in order to uphold the system of relations, and the reiteration must therefore be incremental rather than radical. It is the mundane day-to-day incremental changes embedded in continuity, forming the undergrowth of activity, which allow for movement and the possibility of discovery and connecting to other elements. This is how reiteration and connecting can be seen to form two complementary parts of the process of organisation (Hernes, 2008:134).

By studying mundane activities of CSP processes, I can track how repetitions produce different levels of iteration, which both enables and constrains new possibilities. Hernes (2008:132) states:

Without reiteration, orders fade into oblivion, and without reiteration that reproduces connections new possibilities cannot be realized. Without reiteration, actors fail to be reminded of the organisation.
By focusing on the ongoing changes and dynamics of CSP processes, I hope to be able to develop a deeper understanding of social complexities inherent in the processual emergence of CSPs.

Last but not least, a central question for every process analysis of social phenomena is ‘What and how are social phenomena sustained?’ or to put it in other words, ‘What enables continuity?’ (Hernes, 2008). According to Hernes (2008:134), social phenomena construct and revolve around particular ideas or themes which enable the continuity of social processes:

…in all thinking there must be some topic or subject about which all the members of thought revolve. That ‘something’ around which connecting operations coalesce is what I call a ‘plot’ (Hernes, 2008:134).

He further states:

A central question is: what enables continuity? Reiteration constitutes continuity, but it is not by itself sufficient to enable continuity. Reiteration needs to be performed around a theme that provides meaning to the acts of reiteration. Reiteration consists of numerous processes, but for it to provide for continuity it needs to relate to a theme, to a distinction that marks the difference between one organisational setting and another (Hernes, 2008: 134).

Following Hernes (2008), I will track and examine how CSP processes construct and revolve around particular themes and how these seek to legitimise and de-legitimise particular CSP activities. Furthermore, exploring these themes will also give us a sense of why partners continue to work together.
Building upon the above key process thinking ideas and concepts, in the next chapters I will provide a processual empirical analysis of two CSPs in the UK. By doing so I hope the analysis will provide us a deeper understanding of the ongoing social complexities and dynamics characterizing the processual emergence of CSPs as social processes. In the next section, I further reflect upon the specific implications coming from developing my process thinking perspective in relation to the specific questions identified in Chapters 1 and 2.

3.2.2 Specific Implications In Relation to the Research Questions

Seeing CSPs as emergent processes of becoming requires an acknowledgement of the ongoing dynamics that characterise their processual becoming nature. In contrast to the studies that seek to explain the emergence of CSPs as linear unfolding(s) shaped by pre-defined factors, barriers and enablers, my empirical analysis in the proceeding chapters will strive to throw light on the influence of numerous contingent social dynamics on the novel emergence of CSPs. The specific implications in relation to the specific questions identified in Chapters 1 and 2 are as follows.

First, in contrast to the current literature, which explains the emergence of CSPs as effects of pre-defined external factors in the environment, my analysis would strive to examine the decision making processes to engage in CSPs. In the present literature, multiple factors are presented as underlying causes encouraging CSPs. In the majority of the accounts, there is a common assumption that there are external forces directly motivating CSPs. Factors are generally presented as something external to organisations, which motivate them to engage in CSPs. In contrast to such conceptions of the drivers of CSPs, my process thinking approach would seek to redirect attention to the social dynamics of decision-making. My goal is to trace
and examine how different social decision making dynamics eventually lead organisations to engage in CSP processes.

That, however, does not mean that my analysis will undermine the role of wider social processes such as policies, globalizations etc., which are usually conceptualised as pre-defined factors. Instead, I re-conceptualise these ‘factors’ as processes that might or might not influence decisions to engage in CSPs. In my view, these wider social processes play a more precarious role and, therefore, might not be directly related to why one organisation engages in CSPs. A more essential concern, I argue, is to trace and examine how decisions are made in relation to engaging or not in CSPs.

According to Graf and Rothlauf (2011), decisions to engage in CSPs can be very complex. Some managers might consider CSPs as part of what is considered as doing the right thing for the community (Vangen & Huxham, 2011) while other might view CSPs as instruments for implementing corporate social responsibility practices (Husted, 2003; Egels-Zandén & Wahlqvist, 2006; Nijhof et al., 2008; Murray & Haynes, 2010; Walters & Anagnostopoulos, 2012). Yet, other managers, Huxham (1996) states, might conceive CSPs as economic opportunities that generate specific type of income or profit. According to Harris (2012), many NGO managers see CSPs as a way to influence corporate practices while also generating extra income. For many businesses, Graf and Rothlauf (2011) state, decisions to engage in CSPs might by underpinned by the rationale ‘license to operate’. The way managers view CSPs, therefore, can have a direct effect on the decision making processes to engage CSPs. Analysing the ways in which CSPs are viewed can give us a deeper understanding about the processes that prompt managers to decide to engage in CSPs.
Furthermore, Pettigrew (1992) states, decision-making processes are also often influenced by power dynamics between members within organisations. According to Pettigrew (1992), it is necessary to explore how power dynamics influence organisational decisions. In big firms, decision making processes are often influenced by particular interests of senior members who also happen to be the ones that make decisions about engaging in CSPs. My empirical analysis will, therefore, seek to explore how different power dynamics influence the decision to engage or not in CSPs.

Besides the local social dynamics, I will also track the influence of past decisions on the emergence of CSPs. Process thinking insists that the emergence of new processes is always partially influenced of past processes (Whitehead, 1927). That is to say, new processes always bear ‘traces’ of past processes (Chia & King, 1998). Therefore, it is necessary to explore how past decisions and organisational processes of partners might influence their decisions to engage in CSPs. Present research has focused little attention on these aspects which, however, can give a deeper understanding of how decisions are taken to engage in CSPs.

Second, instead of seeking to explain the structure of the dynamics of CSPs in terms of stages or phases or steps, as it is the common practice in present literature, I argue that there is a need to focus on exploring how ongoing multiplicities of processes enact CSPs and to examine the level of iterability and novelty inherent in these processes. The literature review in Chapter 2 revealed that CSP research has mainly tended to explain the dynamics of CSPs in terms or phases or linear stages. For instance, Seitanidi et al. (2011) argue that the development of CSPs proceeds in three stages- partnership selection, partnership design and partnership institutionalization- during which partners have to address different internal and external issues related to the purpose of the partnership. Similarly, Jamali and Keshishian
(2008) claim that CSPs are developed in three sequential stages: partnership initiation, partnership execution and partnership evaluation, each of which is characterised by different sets of aspects and issues.

Furthermore, present literature has also mainly sought to explain how specific barriers and enable shape the development of CSPs. Issues of lack of communication (Koschmann & Laster, 2011), lack of learning (van Winkelen & Zulauf Sharicz, 2010; Ameli & Kayes, 2011; Reast et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2012) and trust (Getha-Taylor, 2012) or presence of conflicts (Murphy & Bendell, 1997) are generally viewed as barriers negatively shaping the development of CSPs. In contrast to such forms of analysis, my process approach would seek to explore how a multiplicity of ongoing processes enact and re-enact specific CSP arrangements. According to Hernes and Weik (2007), processual analyses of the becoming nature of social phenomena need to explore how networks of processes enact social phenomena and how these processes emerge from, are relate to and are embedded within wider social processes. In the context of this study, this means to explore and investigate how CSP processes emerge from and in relation to the wider organisational processes of partners and to analyse how CSP processes are embedded within wider organisational arrangements. Furthermore, Hernes (2008) states, the becoming nature of social phenomena is also always characterised by ongoing change and iterability which need to be scrutinised in any process analysis. Following Hernes (2008), I will explore how ongoing constantly changing processes characterise the novel emergence of CSPs.

Last but not least, I will also explore how CSP processes construct and revolve around particular themes which, as we shall see, enable the continuity of CSPs. Following Hernes (2008), I argue that it is necessary to explore how partners construct and revolve around
themes which encourage them to continue working together. In particular, my process analysis will track how CSP processes construct diverse ‘plots’ (Hernes, 2008) and how these help organisations legitimise or delegitimise particular actions.

In the present literature, CSPs are often depicted as input-output systems that produce particular effects. Authors such as Murphy et al. (2012) state that CSPs produce positive effects such as learning and innovation. Others, such as Walters and Anagnostopoulos (2012), have also stated that CSPs are instruments that can help organisations cut costs and improve CSR practices. In contrast to such forms of analysis, which mainly seek to explain the positive or negative effects of CSPs, I will aim to explore how CSPs legitimise particular activities in relation to the wider organisational practices and arrangements of the partners. By doing so, I hope to provide a more critical understanding of the ways in which CSPs legitimise certain actions.

3.3 Summary

In this chapter, I introduced process thinking and discussed the implications of developing a process perspective to study the becoming nature of CSPs as social processes. This chapter is central to the thesis because it further stresses the need, identified in Chapter 2, to develop an alternative lens to study CSPs.

To briefly recall the key observations from Chapter 2, the current CSP literature has mainly sought to explore the underlying factors encouraging CSPs and to explain the barriers and enablers shaping the development of CSPs. Generally, CSP scholars tend to explain the emergence of CSPs as causal effects of various macro or micro factors (see Murphy & Bendell (1997) for an example). It is widely argued that there are particular underlying factors
motivating CSPs. What is more, CSP researchers also tend to explain the dynamics of CSPs as linear unfoldings shaped by particular barriers and enablers. In a similar fashion, CSPs are also generally depicted as input-output machines that produce particular outcomes. Writers such as Huxham (2003), Berger et al. (2004) and Babiak and Thibault (2007) all depict CSPs as tools which organisations employ to achieve particular goals. Despite the rich insights which the current literature has provided, more research is needed to explore and explain the social becoming nature of CSPs. In particular, Kruckenberg (2015) states, more process-based research is needed to explore the dynamic social complexities of CSPs. According to Kruckenberg (2015), current approaches are not able to fully capture the ongoing relational dynamics of CSPs and to acknowledge the novelty inherent in the process of developing of CSPs. Therefore, new theoretical orientations and empirical analyses are needed to study the complex becoming nature of CSP processes.

Responding to these calls, I have introduced process thinking and discussed how it enables us to explore the social dynamics of CSPs as social processes. Basing my process approach on key process thinking ideas, I have sought to build a framework that can help us empirically study the ongoing social complexities characterizing the processual emergence of CSPs. In particular, I argued, a process thinking perspective invites to us to explore and trace how CSPs emerge from, are related to and are embedded within wider organisational processes of partners. By re-directing our attention to these social dynamics of CSP processes, I hope to be able to advance our knowledge of the ongoing social complexities of CSPs. In the next chapter, I explore the empirical aspects of the study, mainly how I developed my process-philosophical empirical approach to generate and analyse the empirical material.
Chapter Four: Method and Design

In the previous chapter, I introduced process thinking and discussed how some of its key principles can enable us to analyse the processual becoming nature of CSPs. In particular, I argued that process thinking re-directs our attention to the multiplicity of processes which enact and sustain CSPs and by so doing it invites us to explore the relational novel becoming of CSP processes.

In this chapter, I explore the empirical aspects of the study, mainly how I collected, analysed and presented the empirical material. I start the chapter with a general discussion on my process view of doing empirical research. In particular, I explore and reflect upon the processes at work in undertaking empirical research. Then, in the second section, I explain why I decided to undertake a qualitative approach. In contrast to the still predominant quantitative approaches in social sciences, which generally use statistical analysis to explain social phenomena in terms of related variables and factors, a qualitative approach is more suitable for my study because it allows me to trace and explore the social complexities of CSPs.

In section three, I further discuss how I designed the two case studies and how I chose to use specific methods and techniques to generate and analyse the empirical material. I end the chapter with a discussion on the issues of trustworthiness, limitations and ethical considerations of the study.

By providing a series of reflections on the practice of carrying out processual research, I also hope to throw light on some of the main issues involved in undertaking process-based studies.
as well as to reflect upon the potential methodological benefits of further developing processual empirical inquiries.

4.1 Process View of Empirical Inquiry

Doing empirical research is usually defined as a process whereby a researcher follows a particular procedures or steps (Cassell & Symon, 2004) to study and explain the essence of particular social phenomenon (Yanow, 2006). Using different formulas, methods and measurements, researchers hope to produce credible reports that explain the fundamental nature of social phenomena (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 2007; Singh, 2007). This is the traditional or classical view of doing research, which emphasises the importance of rigor, precision, generalizability and testability of empirical analysis (Cassell & Symon, 2004). Furthermore, Gorard (2003) states, there is a general assumption that we can build a complete understanding of phenomena if we employ the most appropriate methods to capture their objective essences. In this regard, Alvesson (2003) also adds that social phenomena are usually perceived to exist separately from our understandings and, therefore, the aim of empirical research is to capture and explain what is ‘out there’ in the environment. The classical view of doing research, thus, assumes that phenomena are immutable, homogeneous entities with specific characteristics (Deetz, 2009). By undertaking empirical research, scholars are expected to be able to discover and explain the essential structural characteristics of phenomena (Gorard, 2003; Singh, 2007).

In contrast to this traditional view of doing research, my process standpoint emphasises the dynamic nature of conducting empirical research. From a process thinking perspective, attaining final understanding is impossible (Isabella, 1990; Dawson, 1997; Langley, 1999; Bartles, 2012; Vaara, 2016). Doing research is not simply a matter of developing concrete
theories and explanations (Dooley, 2002; Walsham, 2006; Johnson et al., 2007b; Cassell et al., 2009; Deetz, 2009; Bartles, 2012; Sandberg, 2016) but about engaging with social phenomena and trying to make sense of them (Rhodes, 2000; Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Bryman & Cassell, 2006; Hosking & Pluut, 2010; Bartles, 2012). Since we are not able to predict the future completely (Gudmundsdottir, 1996), we will never be able to finally formulate the ultimate laws of nature (Jeffcutt, 1994b). Therefore, our theoretical assumptions will always remain incomplete (Rhodes, 2002; Sandberg, 2016).

In this respect, Alvesson et al. (2008) state, empirical knowledge is not about discovery but about constructing temporal evaluations about our experiences and observations. Our theories of reality are not absolute truths but are better perceived as transitory reflections which change from period to period (Czarniawska, 1995; Bryman & Cassell, 2006). Thus, from a process perspective, doing research is about structuring and constructing different views of our realities which remain forever partial and incomplete (Dawson, 1997).

The answer to the central question in science, ‘Why do our theories and explanations fail?’, thus, seems self-explanatory: because everything changes and so do our notions and theories of reality (Rhodes, 2000; Hosking & Pluut, 2010). Instead of simply seeking to cement a particular view of reality, we need to constantly revise our theoretical assumptions if we are to achieve a more faithful appreciation of the processual nature of existence. According to Whitehead (1927), general theories seek to reduce the processual complexities of reality to sets of categorizations which do nothing but prevent us from acknowledging the ongoing changing dynamics of reality. For Whitehead (1925), scientific investigations will never find the ultimate truth, final knowledge and wisdom. Instead, what is needed, Whitehead (1925)
argues, is ongoing revision of our theoretical claims, if we are to be able to advance our understanding of ongoing social dynamics of our existence.

From a process view, thus, we can no longer assume that research is simply about reporting the truths about the reality ‘out there’. Rather, we need to re-direct attention to the processes of undertaking research and to reflect how these construct particular views of the phenomenon under investigation (Rhodes, 2000; Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001; Yanow, 2006). Hjorth and Steyaert (2004) state that our empirical engagements are not only temporal in the sense of being relevant for a specific period of time but are also histricallogy shaped as research practices have been defined, re-defined and modified over time. Thinking of doing research in this way reveals the impossibility of straightforwardly accumulating concrete knowledge (Hester & Francis, 1994). Process scholars, therefore, have sought to become reflexive about the way processes shape how we describe and represent social phenomena (Dawson, 1997; Langley, 1999; Sminia, 2009; Hosking & Pluut, 2010; Bartles, 2012).

Such a process view of doing empirical inquiry is both challenging and complex because it seeks to emphasise the processual nature of reality without ever being able to do so completely (Langley, 1999; Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). However, what process thinking teaches us is to be cautious with our assumptions and to always re-think the way we seek to represent our experiences (Sminia, 2009). The implications that follow from viewing empirical research in process terms are as follows.

First, in a world of constant change, our theoretical reflections and understandings need to be viewed as temporal interpretations which cannot and do not fully capture the ongoing dynamics of social phenomena (Bartles, 2012). Empirical research accounts are, thus, better viewed as reflective narratives which are shaped by the employment of particular theoretical
lenses and methods (Czarniawska, 1995; McCormack, 2004; Chase, 2005; Søderberg, 2006; Vaara, 2016). In other words, it is important to recognise that our ontological and epistemological orientation, along with our theoretical and methodological choices, influence the way we explore and represent social phenomena (Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Yanow, 2006; Creswell, 2007).

Second, the process of doing research should be seen in the realm of the historical period in which it is conducted (Sminia, 2009). What was considered relevant a hundred years ago might not be the same today (Bartles, 2012). Past interpretations change and so do our current interpretations, which are subject to disagreement and change in the future (Isabella, 1990). At an epistemological level, this means that we can never develop a final explanation of phenomena. Therefore, Stout and Love (2013) argue, we need to constantly revise our explanations in order to develop new methodological orientations and insights which can give us a partial glance of what ‘is coming about and going on’.

Third, the notion of impermanence in process thinking also challenges the common way of building scientific knowledge based on objectivity and invites us to develop more narrative-based forms of knowing (Czarniawska, 2002; McCormack, 2004; Chase, 2005; Ville & Mounoud, 2010; Vaara, 2016). Czarniawska (1995) states that scientific knowledge is conventionally distinguished from everyday narrative knowledge in that it relies on objective and linear explanations of phenomena. Narrative knowing, on the other hand, assumes understanding of our experiences through the stories we tell (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010; Fenton & Langley, 2011). Whereas scientific knowledge is structured in terms of the logic ‘either/or’ (true or false), narrative knowing is about plotting our experiences and, thus, depends on the power of persuasion of how a story is told (Rhodes & Brown, 2005). Narrative
knowing is negotiated between the storyteller and the listener and therefore temporal understanding depends on the way we interpret and negotiate meanings of experiences (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). In this respect, Czarniawska (2004) states, what is peculiar about narrative knowing is that it is created in use. Furthermore, Tsoukas and Hatch (2001) state, narrative forms of knowing do not simply assume linear causality, as is the case in logo-scientific forms of knowing. In narrative knowing, A might lead to B but also to F and G, which in turn might lead to many things (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). Thus, instead of seeking to explain universal factors, narrative forms of knowing emphasise how actors narrate and give meaning to the events they experience (Rhodes & Brown, 2005; Søderberg, 2006; Vaara, 2016).

For Czarniawska (2004), narrative modes of knowing reveal how we organise our experiences by applying particular linguistic schemes that assume intentionality of human activity. Gudmundsdottir (1996) also argues that narrative knowing does not require a proof of truth but relies on plotting or temporally ordering events that can be interpreted and judged by the listeners. In this regard, Pentland (1999) defines narrative knowing as a way of expressing multiple temporalities of events and so it is not simply driven by scientific norms such as A causes B. Vaara (2016) also argues that narrative knowing incorporates temporal linkages between experienced events over time and so provides a form of knowing that gives specific meanings to particular events.

In contrast to the logo-centric scientific modes of knowing, narrative knowing is more subjectivist and interpretative in nature as it seeks to provide temporally arranged descriptions and explanations of human activity (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). In general, scholars who advocate narrative knowing take an interpretative approach to research which allows them to
explore and understand phenomena in terms of motion, flux and time (Vaara, 2016). For Feldman (2004), narratives offer different ways of studying processes of organizing depending on the specific meanings and interpretations given to specific activities. The main interest of narrative organisational scholars is how actors make sense and give meaning to specific events and actions and how these change over time (Balogun & Johnson, 2016). In this respect, Buchanan and Dawson (2007) state that reflecting upon the interpretations of people as they engage in particular organisational phenomena can throw light on the multiple and competing narratives of processes, thus revealing the social complexities (conflicts, interests, etc.) of organizing. Vaara (2016) further argues that by using a narrative process approach to empirical research we can examine the multiple interpretations and explanations of phenomena, which can help us develop a more processual understanding of the becoming nature of social phenomena.

Process scholars such as Buchanan and Dawson (2007) have called for more narrative approaches to organisational analysis which, in their view, can eventually help us build more insightful and less restrictive accounts of our social organisational lives. In this regard, Balogun and Johnson (2016) also state that narrative analyses allow us to examine how different people make sense of and give sense to events. Narrative is particularly relevant to organisational analysis because actors do not simply tell stories, they enact them (Czarniawska, 1995). Pentland (1999) states that narratives also reflect different relations between events which give us a chance to analyse various nuances of particular activities. According to Pettigrew (1997), process scholars look for patterns of events and variation in order to track and explain how organisational phenomena are established, re-established and un-established over time. Narratives are useful in this regard because they reflect different
ways in which actors talk about social processes (Ville & Mounoud, 2010). What is more, Pentland (1999) states, narratives always report a focal actor or actors, thus revealing the issues around organisational roles and power dynamics. Building process theory with narrative, as such, seems to be particular relevant for process organisation studies.

According to Tsoukas and Hatch (2001), the potential key contribution of narrative research comes also from re-directing the attention on the temporal issues in organisations. Rather than viewing organisations as static, homogeneous entities, narrative approaches allow us to demonstrate the processual characteristics of organising processes (Vaara, 2016). Buchanan and Dawson (2007) also state that narratives reveal the plurality of organising processes, which is a key goal for process organisational analysis. Having introduced the process view of undertaking empirical inquiry, in the next sections I will discuss why I decided to undertake a qualitative approach to generate and analyse the empirical material of the study.

4.2 A Rationale for a Qualitative Approach

There are, broadly speaking, two main approaches for doing social science research: quantitative and quantitative (Miles & Huberman, 2007). Each approach promotes different methods for collecting and analysing empirical materials (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Stake, 2005; Singh, 2007).

Quantitative approaches, which are still the dominant ways of collecting and analysing empirical materials in social science research, mainly seek to uncover the underlying factors shaping social behaviour (Cassell & Symon, 2004). Quantitative scholars usually carry out statistical analyses in order to uncover the causal relations between different variables. It
is generally assumed that different factors shape social behaviour in particular ways. Singh (2007: 66) states:

…the main emphasis is on determining a cause and effect relationship. It is undertaken to determine which variable might be causing a certain behaviour, that is, whether there is a cause and effect relationship between variables and if a relationship exists then what is the nature of the causal relationship. In order to determine causality, it is important to hold one variable constant to assess change in the other variable and then measure the changes in the other variable.

In quantitative research, measurement is a key element explaining the causal relations between different dependent and independent variables (Gorard, 2003). Other common features in quantitative research are confirming or rejecting hypotheses, as well as using and developing different statistical models to capture different relationships between variables (Singh, 2007). The preferred methods for collecting data are surveys, questionnaires, and structured observations, which usually generate a large amount of data (Gorard, 2003). Furthermore, in quantitative studies reality is assumed to be independent of our perception. Therefore ‘good’ research depends on the ability to explore phenomena objectively. In other words, quantitative scholars are concerned with objective facts and believe that it is possible to discover generalizable laws of nature (Singh, 2007).

Despite the still predominant role of quantitative research in social sciences (Cassell & Symon, 2004), in the last three decades there have been some issues raised about the general purpose and nature of quantitative studies. According to Yanow (2006), quantitative methods are useful insofar as they seek to provide statistical explanations of phenomena, but are ultimately unable to capture the situated local complexities and dynamics of social
phenomena. Certain complex phenomena such as identity and organisational development cannot be simply explained by measurements (Johnson et al., 2007a). Furthermore, from a process view, depicting social phenomena as objects with particular pre-given and fixed characteristics does not allow us to acknowledge the complex social processual becomingness of social phenomena. Thus, quantitative approaches offer limited understanding of the social complexities of our everyday organisational experiences.

Qualitative approaches, on the other hand, are much more suitable for studying social behaviour because they focus on the local social dynamics of our experiences (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Cassell & Symon, 2004; Walsham, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Johnson et al., 2007b; Baxter & Jack, 2008). Generally, qualitative research can be defined as a situated activity that locates the researcher in the world (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003) and which through a set of interpretative and interactive practices generates a particular understanding of phenomena (Walsham, 2006; Yanow, 2006). By engaging directly with the object of study through different methods (field notes, interviews, memos etc.), qualitative researchers seek to produce various accounts of the phenomena under investigation (Tracy, 2010). Furthermore, qualitative research emphasises the interpretative nature of doing research and so stresses the importance of how researchers’ interpretations and understandings influence the way we undertake and present empirical inquiries (Jeffcutt, 1994a; Spiggle, 1994; Sandberg, 2016). In this respect, Yanow (2006) states that interpretation is a crucial element in social science research because in empirical research we mainly deal with language, discursive constructions, and narratives. Furthermore, Cassell et al. (2009) state, for the qualitative scholar social life is a process rather than as static thing. Therefore, we need qualitative methods to study the ever-changing dynamics of our experiences (Johnson et al., 2007b). The
processes of generating empirical materials usually require direct engagement with participants through which the researcher seeks to generate rich accounts of the phenomena under investigation (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Yanow, 2006).

Viewed in this way, doing research is not an independent activity imposed on phenomena but a constitutive process of engaging with social phenomena and trying to make sense of them (Morgan & Smircich, 1980; Walsham, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Baxter & Jack, 2008). By adopting alternative epistemological perspectives, researchers seek to develop different understanding of social phenomena. Cassell and Symon (2004:4) state:

*Qualitative approaches and research adopting alternative epistemological perspectives hold out the promise of new insights by adopting a critical stance on accepted practices and approaching research topics with different objectives.*

In the case of this study, a qualitative approach seems more suitable for analysing CSPs because: a) it is in alignment with my process ontological view of reality and b) it allows me to reflect how the adopted epistemological orientation shapes and influences the way I represent CSPs.

Furthermore, adopting a qualitative approach allows me to use different methods and sources of ‘data’ to explore and explain the processual becoming nature of CSP processes (Yin, 2009). Moreover, Ritchie and Lewis (2003) state, qualitative research is more appropriate when phenomena are complex and require intensive explorations. Therefore, I argue, undertaking a qualitative inquiry is better suited for the study because it allows me to generate richer accounts and thicker descriptions of the becoming nature of CSPs.
The majority of process scholars generally take a qualitative approach to study different organisational phenomena. One of the reasons is that qualitative approaches allow researchers to develop more insightful and detailed accounts of the social complexities of phenomena. Creswell (2007) states that qualitative empirical material is richer in detail in comparison to quantitative data. Furthermore, Spiggle (1994) states, qualitative approaches allow scholars to be more reflexive on the way they interpret empirical accounts. In this regard, Søndergaard (2002) further states that organisational complexities cannot simply be modelled and represented through formulas and static models. Rather, interpretation is needed (Walsham, 2006) in order to develop more sophisticated understandings of the dynamics of social phenomena. Therefore, process researchers often prefer interpretative and qualitative approaches in order to generate richer and more detailed accounts of the dynamics of organisational phenomena.

Lastly, qualitative approaches also provide more space for discussion about the links between empirical analysis and the wider key process thinking ideas and principles (Sminia, 2009). That is to say, qualitative approaches allow scholars to reflect upon the inconsistencies, difficulties and challenges of undertaking process research (Langley, 1999; Bartles, 2012). Therefore, qualitative approaches seem to be more suitable for process studies of organisational phenomena and are particularly appropriate for CSP research and for my study more specifically.

In the next section, I discuss how I designed the qualitative case studies for the study, mainly how I chose specific partnerships and how I collected, analysed and presented the empirical materials.
4.3 A Case Study Design

Designing qualitative studies is usually a complex and time consuming process (Booth et al., 2003). One of the most preferred and well-known approaches for designing qualitative studies is the case study approach. Hartley (2004:323) defines the case study approach as:

…a detailed investigation, often with data collected over a period of time, of phenomena, within their context. The aim is to provide an analysis of the context and processes which illuminate the theoretical issues being studied. The phenomenon is not isolated from its context (as in, say, laboratory research) but is of interest precisely because the aim is to understand how behaviour and/or processes are influenced by, and influence context. The case study is particularly suited to research questions which require detailed understanding of social or organisational processes because of the rich data collected in context.

Researching social phenomena as case studies is appropriate when the researcher is not in control of the social phenomenon and neither hopes or intends to be (Hartley, 2004). Rather, the main goal is to undertake a detailed analysis of phenomena in the contexts in which they occur (Yin, 2009). The intention is to provide rich descriptions about the social processes which enact and sustain organisational phenomena (Harley, 2004). ‘Understanding’ rather than ‘explanation’ is more important for case study research (Stake, 2005). In this regard, Yin (2009) states that case studies are preferred when researchers focus on the questions of ‘how’ and ‘why’ rather than ‘what’ of social phenomena. Yin (2009:1) states:

In general, case studies are the preferred method when a) ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are being posed, b) the investigator has little control over events, and c) the focus is on
a contemporary phenomenon within real-life context. In case studies, the richness of the phenomenon and the extensiveness of the real-life context require case study investigators to cope with a technically distinctive situation.

The case study design is also the approach most widely preferred by organisation scholars. According to Sminia (2009), case studies allow us to explore particular phenomena in great detail. Eisenhardt (1989), too, argues that case study designs are particularly appropriate to study complex issues such as organisational culture, development, trust and control.

CSP researchers have also widely studied CSPs as case studies. For instance, Seitanidi et al. (2011) analysed the processes of formation of CSPs by focusing on two case studies. Similarly, Arenas et al. (2013) analysed how conflicts shape collaboration processes by exploring four case studies. A case study approach seems particularly suitable for my study because I can focus on a small number of partnerships and study them in great detail. Focusing on a large population of partnerships would not allow me to explore the contextual and processual aspects of the becoming nature of CSP processes. Therefore, I argue, a case study approach is more appropriate for the study. Furthermore, a case study approach allows me to use different methods to analyse the becoming nature of CSPs, such as interviews, observations and documents. By using different methods, Stake (2005) states, qualitative researchers usually generate much richer accounts about the phenomena under investigation. Following Stake (2005), I argue that a case study design allows me to generate a rich understanding of the different social aspects which influence the emergence of CSP processes at different levels over time.

A case study design also fits well with the wider interpretivist, processual, and narrative orientation/approach of the study because it allows me to analyse how diverse actors’
narratives reflect upon the processual social complexities of CSP workings. By analysing how actors reflect upon their experiences and how they make sense of and give meaning to CSP workings, I can also explore changes over time and so provide a more temporal processual understanding of the emergence of CSPs. A case study approach, Hartley (2004) argues, also helps researchers compare and contrast different narratives and so provide a more in-depth analysis of differences and similarities as experienced by organisational actors. Following Hartley (2004), I claim that a case study approach is appropriate for the study as it allows me to link process theory and my interpretative-narrative approach with the empirical aspects of the study in a more articulate way. Process scholars such as Langley (2009) have already reflected upon the suitability and appropriateness of a case study approach for process organisation studies and revealed the potential implications of using a case study approach to develop a more processual understanding of diverse organisational phenomena. In the following sub-sections, I discuss how I designed the case studies.

4.3.1 Selecting the Organisations and the Participants

Qualitative researchers use different methods for selecting particular cases (Gillham, 2000). Some prefer random sampling, which consists of selecting a company (and/or participants) without any strict criteria (Yin, 2009). A company, for example, may be chosen randomly from a larger population. In this form of sampling, each participant (organisation or/and individual) has an equal chance of being selected. Other scholars, on the other hand, rely on what is widely called ‘purposive’ sampling. This is a form of sampling which allows researchers to choose companies and/or participants based on their suitability for the particular study (Yin, 2009).

How did I choose the cases for the study?
Considering the nature of the research questions and aims, random sampling was deemed inappropriate for choosing partnerships for two reasons: a) it is driven by a positivist epistemology and b) it tends to favour quantitative types of analysis. Random sampling is usually preferred by scholars who seek to analyse and generalise about large populations (Gillham, 2000). In such cases, the specificity or uniqueness of each company (or individual) is not considered important (Yin, 2009). ‘Purposive’ sampling, on the other hand, is much more suitable for my study because: a) it is driven by a non-positivist epistemology and b) it encourages qualitative types of analysis. In the case of my study, purposive sampling allows me to select cases that can provide insightful analysis on the processual nature of CSPs. Therefore, I consider purposive sampling to be much more appropriate for the study.

The process of selecting the organisations, however, was not a straightforward one. Before I selected the cases, I set up some preliminary criteria. First, due to the availability of a variety of CSPs in Hull and the Humber region, I decided to focus on local partnerships. This saved me travelling costs and allowed me to make more regular trips to the organisations. Furthermore, by focusing on local partnerships, I could more easily arrange the interviews with the participants at mutually convenient times and locations. Second, I decided to focus on CSPs that had been running for more than a 1 year. A short-term partnership would provide insufficient ‘data’, which in turn would not allow me undertake more extensive analysis.

After carefully considering a number of potential partnerships, I selected and contacted four organisations. Two replied positively. To gain access to their partners, I asked them if they would kindly introduce me to their partners. The processes of gaining access went without any serious complications. By March 2014, I had managed to arrange some preliminary
interviews with all four organisations (two businesses and two NGOs) to discuss the main goals of the project. The first CSP consists of ConstructionCo (pseudonym), a construction company, and KidsCharity (pseudonym), a youth development charity. The second partnership consists of FoodCo (pseudonym), a food manufacturing company and CommunityCharity (pseudonym), a community development charity. It is worth briefly introducing the partnerships here.

**ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership**

The ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership consists of ConstructionCo, a large construction company founded in the 18th century in Hull, and KidsCharity, a youth development not-for-profit organisation founded in Hull in the late 2000s. ConstructionCo is a well-known company in the region and one of the most successful and respected companies in Hull. It mainly operates in Hull and the wider Humber region, with only a handful of small projects in other regions such as York, Leeds and Scarbrough. KidsChairty is one of the more well-known charities in Hull and is widely considered as one of the most successful and innovative NGOs in the region. Over its eight years of existence, the charity has managed to develop and deliver a number of big programmes that tackle various children’s issues and needs in Hull and the Humber region. The partnership between ConstructionCo and KidsCharity started in 2009 and it is still running. For 6-7 years, the partners have successfully delivered a number of small and large projects addressing different issues such as unemployment and youth training (I discuss these in great detail in Chapter 5). ConstructionCo-KidCharity partnership is particularly suitable for the study because: a) it has been running for a number of years which gives me the opportunity to trace and to explore the partnership processes and issues over time, b) the partnership is still running, which allows me to analyse some of the
current issues and concerns in the partnership working practices and c) I was assured of long-term access to core participants. For these reasons, I consider ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership particularly relevant for the study.

**FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership**

The FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership has been running for four years. It consists of FoodCo, a large food manufacturing company founded in Hull, and CommunityCharity, a Hull-based community development not-for-profit organisation. FoodCo was founded in the 18th century and since then it has been operating mainly in Hull and the wider Humber region. The company’s long-term success and survival has made it one of the most well-known and respected manufacturers in the region. CommunityCharity was founded in 1990s by a group of local residents. Over the last two decades, the charity has grown to become one of the largest NGOs in the country. The partnership between FoodCo-CommunityCharity started in 2012 and since then the partners have developed and delivered a number of small projects. In 2013, however, FoodCo and CommunityCharity initiated several big projects (I discuss these in detail in Chapter 6) which are still underway. The FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership is particularly interesting and suitable for the study because: a) it has been running for a number of years, which gives me the chance to analyse different CSP projects and b) the partners are currently developing several big projects, which allows me to explore how the partners develop different partnership practices and arrangements as they unfold. Similar to ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, I consider FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership an appropriate case study for my research.
Participants

After contacting the companies in 2014 and discussing the research aims of the study, I eventually established more formal relationships with two key persons, Saewald (pseudonym) and Gabe (pseudonym). They became my main points of contact and were responsible for the arrangement of all the meetings with the other participants/organisational actors. Through informal discussions we decided who the most appropriate actors to be interviewed were. By March 2014, I had managed to arrange interview meetings with eight employees from ConstructionCo and seven from FoodCo. In the meanwhile, Saewald and Gabe also introduced me to KidsCharity and CommunityCharity. As a result, I managed to negotiate and arrange interviews with four actors from each charity. I conducted the interviews in two sets.

The first set of interviews was conducted between April-July, 2014. I interviewed a variety of different actors ranging from customer service directors to CEOs. By talking to different participants, I sought to gain different insights about CSP processes. The following table shows the participants I interviewed for the first set of interviews (all names are pseudonyms):

Table 2. Actors Interviewed for the First Set of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConstructionCo</th>
<th>KidsCharity</th>
<th>FoodCo</th>
<th>CommunityCharity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Napier</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management assistant and coordinator of various activities</td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Project Manager, Partnership and External Coordinator, Programme Designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saewald</td>
<td>Finance Director and leader of professional service team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quint</td>
<td>Senior Operations Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadee</td>
<td>Head of Communication and Community Engagement Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paine</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radburn</td>
<td>Non-executive director, chair of charity committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pany</td>
<td>Non-executive director, charity committee member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacy</td>
<td>Charity Committee member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then, after several months, during which I analysed the interviews (see section 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 for further details), I conducted the second set of interviews. The preliminary analysis of the first set of interviews helped me develop/design some follow-up questions. In addition, I collected some documents from the participants, which further helped me generate complementary questions about different cross sector partnership practices and issues (see the appendix for a list of the questions). For the second set of interviews, I interviewed the following actors (the others were not available due to various reasons, such as annual leave etc. or were not directly involved in the issues I wanted to learn more about):
Table 3. Actors Interviewed for the Second Set of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConstructionCo</th>
<th>KidsCharity</th>
<th>FoodCo</th>
<th>CommunityCharity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saewald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Director and leader of professional service team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Design and Manage individual programmes for CS Partnerships and communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gabe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Sustainability Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaidan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Manager (develop new initiatives and projects including the CS partnerships)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to the HR team and advisor, CS coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the interview meetings, I also collected various company documents, booklets and minutes of meetings which I decided to use as complementary secondary sources (I discuss this in more detail below). In the following sub-section, I discuss in more detail how I conducted the interviews.
4.3.2 The Process of Generating the Empirical Material

Qualitative scholars have used different methods for generating empirical materials (Gillham, 2000; Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Cassell & Symon, 2004; Yanow, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Johnson et al., 2007b; Miles & Huberman, 2007). Some use interviews while others rely on observations or a combination of interviews and observations and/or documents (Morgan & Smircich, 1980). According to Kvale (2016), methods influence the way we collect and analyse empirical materials and so are of central importance in qualitative research.

After gaining access to the above explored organisations, I spent some time discussing their CSP arrangements through informal conversations. After the initial conversations, I found out that CSP processes happen in an ad hoc manner/spontaneously and, therefore, it is impossible to engage in direct observations. After discussing other possible ways to learn about CSP processes, interviewing seemed to be the most appropriate method for generating the empirical material.

According to Bryman and Cassell (2006), interviews are useful methods for collecting data because they allow researchers to record and analyse different accounts and perspectives about the phenomena under investigation. For this research, I considered interviewing as a reliable method for generating the empirical material because it allowed me to talk to diverse people and discuss different issues about CSP processes. Furthermore, interviewing also allowed me to compare and contrast different accounts and so gain deeper insights about the tensions and complexities of CSP processes.

According to Kvale (2016), interviewing is by far the most used method in qualitative studies. By studying how actors make sense of and give meaning to their experiences we can gain a
deeper understanding of their everyday experiences (Hester & Francis, 1994; Gudmundsdottir, 1996; Johnson & Weller, 2002; McCormack, 2004).

However, different views exist on what interviews do and how they should be conducted. According to Alvesson (2003), there are three main views of interviews: neopositivist, romanticist, and localist. Scholars who hold a neopositivist view assume that interviews are concrete tools which can help us discover the ‘truths’ about reality ‘out there’. Alvesson (2003:15) states that scholars who hold this view are:

… eager to establish a ‘con-text-free’ (original spelling) truth about reality ‘out there’ through following a research protocol and getting ‘re sponses’ relevant to it, minimizing researcher influence and other sources of bias.

Scholars adhering to this view usually develop specific protocols and procedures which guide the processes of conducting the interviews (Alvesson, 2003). The aim is to reduce the biases of the researcher and so generate accurate and objective accounts about the phenomenon under investigation (Alvesson, 2003). The issues around the social construction of the interview accounts and the context in which they happen are usually considered insignificant because it is assumed that they do not influence participants’ responses. The accounts that participants produce in the interviews are believed to have direct relation to their real experiences beyond the interview situation. As such, interview accounts are treated as accounts that provide real representations of the experiences of the interviewees outside the interview situation.

The romantic view, on the other hand, assumes that the aim of interviews is to try to understand the inner feelings of actors. Scholars who hold a romantic view of ‘interviewing’ believe that this method provides a more ‘genuine’ approach to study human experiences. The
task, as such, is to understand the ‘inner worlds’, meanings and intentions of social actors. Alvesson (2003:16) states:

The romantic, advocating a more ‘genuine’ human interaction, believes in establishing rapport, trust, and commitment between interviewer and interviewee, in particular in the interview situation. This is a prerequisite in order to be able to explore the inner world (meanings, ideas, feelings, intentions) or experienced social reality of the interviewee.

From this perspective, the interviewer needs to develop close relationships with the interviewees, as this is believed to be a crucial step which predisposes them to discuss their personal emotions. Scholars who advocate this view do not follow any strict procedures and protocols because they believe such restrictions are impractical and to a great extent artificial (Alvesson, 2003). Instead, they prefer more open conversations which, in their view, allow them to learn about the ‘real’ experiences of actors.

The third, localist view, radically differs from the other two in that it emphasises the influence of the social construction process between the interviewer and interviewees in the process of generating interview accounts (Alvesson, 2003). Scholars who hold a localist view see interviewing as a social process where both the interviewer and the interviewee co-construct different accounts of their worlds. In contrast to the romantic view, where the researcher takes the primary role of deciphering the feeling of interviewees, the localist view suggests that interview accounts are ‘situationally generated accounts’ (Alvesson, 2003). Indeed, it is believed that there are different ways of talking about a social topic or a phenomenon. Therefore, what interviews do is produce locally generated accounts about particular social processes. Viewed in this way, interviews are no longer perceived as simple tools used to
explore the inner world of actors but rather as social processes that construct different narrative accounts of our worlds (Alvesson, 2003).

Sharing some concerns with the localist view of interviews, I see interview accounts as locally produced narrative accounts (Czarniawska, 2002) co-constructed between the researcher and the participants (Gudmundsdottir, 1996). Furthermore, recognizing the complex processes at work in co-constructing interview accounts led me to adopt a narrative approach (McCormack, 2004) to the process of generating empirical material (Söderberg, 2006).

In the previous section, I briefly discussed the process view of doing empirical enquiry which recognises and reflects upon the complex processes at work in conducting empirical research. In particular, the co-construction process of generating empirical interview narratives invites researchers to explore how individuals make sense of and give meaning to their experiences and events. In addition, since each person has different experiences, we need also to explore how they give meaning(s) to these experiences (McCormack, 2004). Diverse narratives, Czarniawska (2002) states, challenge the commonsensical official accounts which present phenomena as homogeneous entities. For Czarniawska (2002), narratives show the multiplicity of processes involved in the construction of organisational phenomena. Furthermore, Gudmundsdottir (1996) states, because narratives express temporality they report past, present as well as future-oriented processes. These narrative characteristics, as such, can help researchers explore how different narrative accounts reflect upon the emergence of CSP processes in relation to the wider processes of the partners.

Furthermore, Johnson and Weller (2002) argue, narrative forms of interviewing allow researchers to ask questions depending on the responses they receive from actors. Yet,
Buchanan and Dawson (2007) warn us, we should also be aware that narratives can be and indeed are ‘political’ in nature because they include some aspects while excluding others. According to Buchanan and Dawson (2007), narratives should be treated cautiously and critically because they might seek to influence or privilege particular views and de-privilege other ones. By comparing different narratives, scholars need to reflect upon these issues, which in turn can help them illuminate the complex dynamics of social phenomena (Buchanan & Dawson, 2007).

The focus on narratives has taken a major stage in organisation research in the last several decades (Pentland, 1999; Dunford & Jones, 2000; Tsoukas & Natch, 2001; Czarniawska, 2002; McCormack, 2004; Chase, 2005; Rhodes & Brown, 2005; Søderberg, 2006; Bartel & Garud, 2009; Syrjälä et al., 2009; Ville & Mounoud, 2010; Vaara, 2016). Czarniawska (1995) states that taking a narrative approach in empirical research seems to be a natural process because in interviews people tell stories about their experiences. Furthermore, Rhodes and Brown (2005) state, we make sense of the world by giving it meaning through language. Pentland (1999), too, argues that narratives are the natural way people make sense of their experiences by giving them meanings. The acts of narration organise our lives (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001) and influence the way we make sense of organisational events (Fenton & Langley, 2011). Narratives are, thus, particularly relevant for studying organisational processes because actors make sense and give meaning to their experiences through narratives.

Buchanan and Dawson (2007), however, remind us that narratives should not be considered real representations of reality but rather expressions of particular versions of our complex experiences. In other words, narratives should not be treated as mere mirrors to reality but
constitutive forces of constructing realities. In this regard, Rhodes (2002) states, different narratives construct different realities, which reveal the polysemous nature of organising. By treating narratives as different ways of constructing and reflecting upon our life experiences (Rhodes, 2002), we can explore and analyse how different people make sense of and give meaning to their organisational experiences (Weick, 1995; Brown et al., 2008; Monin et al., 2012).

But what is narrative? How is narrative defined in the general literature?

According to Czarniawska (1998:2) ‘a narrative, in its most basic form, requires at least three elements: an original state of affairs, an action or an event, and the consequent state of affairs’. Others such as Pentland (1999) adopt a similar definition but also include ‘sequences of events’ that focus on deeds, consequences and intensions. In the broader literature, however, some scholars distinguish narratives from stories. Boje (2001), for instance, warns that we should not confuse narratives with stories. Narratives, for Boje (2001), are plotted and staged to present a coherent picture of events, while stories are flowing, self-deconstructing and non-linear in nature. Narratives, Boje (2001) further claims, construct sequential events that are usually single-voiced. Seeking to provide an alternative to this view of narrative, Boje (2001) has introduced the concept ‘antenarrative’ which turns our concern to the non-linear, uncoherent, un-plotted collective storytelling in which we engage in our everyday lives. Thus, for Boje (2001), stories are antenarratives because they precede narratives. Once stories are staged, they become coherent narratives.

Expressing similar concerns with seeking to define and distinguish stories from narratives, Gabriel (2000) offers a different definition of what counts as stories and what counts as narratives. For Gabriel (2000), stories are forms of narrative which offer intimate emotional
accounts of situations and events. For Gabriel (2000), storying is an art of constructing intimate knowledge and expressions which are interwoven with plots and characters. For Gabriel (2000), therefore, stories are different from other forms of narrative such as histories, opinions, and reports, which in themselves present different forms of discursive expressions and which might or might not have a beginning, middle and end. Opinions and reports, for instance, Gabriel (2000) points out, do not always have a clear plot and might not focus on specific characters. Thus, unlike Boje (2001), Gabriel (2000) sees stories as special forms of narrative.

As noticed, the terms ‘narrative’ and ‘story’ are contested concepts which might be defined in different ways. Some define them interchangeably (Chase, 2005) while others such as Boje (2001) and Gabriel (2000) distinguish narratives from stories. Yet, despite the disputes over terminology, scholars have argued that narratives and stories offer interesting insights into the plurality of experiences and flows in organisation. Rhodes (2002) states that narratives and stories are worth studying because they can help us analyse and reveal the fragmented and polysemous nature of organisational practices.

In this study, I adopt Vaara’s (2016:3) definition of narrative, which he defines as:

… a temporal discursive construction that provides means for individual, social, and organisational sensemaking … Furthermore, we regard narratives as multifaceted means of sensemaking and sensegiving that are not always complete stories with a clear beginning and end, but are often articulated only in fragments as part of organisational discourse.

In addition, taking into account the more recent scholarship on narratives in social sciences, I also consider the following features essential for narratives.
First, narratives are discursive accounts that reflect past, present as well as future-oriented events (Pentland, 1999; Dawson & Buchanan, 2005). Narratives, Fenton and Langley (2011) state, reflect sequences of interviewing events that are meaningful to the narrator. However, Buchanan and Dawson (2007) remind us, we also need to recognise that some narratives do not always reflect linear chronological unfolding(s).

Second, narratives emphasise the interconnectedness between events (Pentland, 1999). For instance, when a narrator reflects upon an event, he or she usually relates this event to other events which are further related to other events etc. So, in order to make a meaningful story, narrators emphasise temporal connectedness between events (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). Narratives, thus, Tsoukas and Hatch (2001) state, give us a sense of the interconnection between events.

Third, narratives always focus upon particular issues and express a particular point of view (Brown et al., 2008). In other words, narratives have intentions (Rhodes & Brown, 2005). In the view of Czarniawska (1998), when people tell their stories they always do this with some form of purpose. Narratives, therefore, include specific events and interpretations by excluding alternatives. Therefore, Brown et al. (2008) state, narratives always seek to legitimise particular points of views and understandings. According to Czarniawska (1998), Vaara (2016), Rhodes and Brown (2005), Pentland (1999), Tsoukas and Hatch (2001) and Dawson and Buchanan (2005), by analysing the above general features of narratives, we can gain a more faithful appreciation of how people make sense of and give meaning to their everyday social experiences.

Furthermore, narratives are also easily gathered from different sources. Researchers can use interviews to generate diverse narratives. Through interviewing, Czarniawska (2002) states,
researchers can encourage participants to tell their stories about their personal experiences. Normally, when interviewed, people usually respond to questions by telling stories about their experiences. In this regard, Gudmundsdottir (1996) states, the main aim of narrative interviews is to invite actors to tell their stories about their personal experiences. Narrative forms of interview have become popular among organisation scholars, who often use interviews to generate rich narratives about different organisational phenomena such as organisational change and identity (Dunford & Jones, 2000; Bryant, 2006). Narratives can also be collected from secondary sources such as company documents, books, media reports etc. (Ville & Mounoud, 2010). Narratives are easily accessible, which makes them particularly relevant for qualitative forms of research (Chase, 2005; Fenton & Langley, 2011).

Using narratives in empirical research also aligns well with the wider principles and ideas of process thinking, as they reveal the fluid embodied nature of doing research and the way we construct accounts of our experiences (Shotter, 2005). Narratives, as such, do not simply mirror what is ‘out there’ but construct insights into the multiplicities of complex social engagements which characterise the emergence of social phenomena (Vaara, 2016). Narratives offer diverse and sometimes contrasting accounts of social experiences and so give a chance to analyse the social complexities of social phenomena. Furthermore, narratives give us a sense of temporality, which is a crucial aspect in process analysis (Buchanan & Dawson, 2007).

For my study, I used semi-structured but also sometimes more open-ended forms of interviews to generate different narratives about CSP processes. In particular, I sought to ask questions which invited actors to talk about their experiences in detail. The benefit of adopting such a form of interviewing was that it allowed actors to construct rich accounts
about their experiences which, in turn, allowed me to analyse how they made sense of the processes of engaging in CSPs.

During the interviews, I asked diverse questions (see appendix) which sought to encourage actors to discuss past as well as present CSP events. In particular, I sought to ask various questions about the way the organisations started their CSPs and the historical aspects which might have influenced their decisions to engage in CSPs. A set of questions was asked to trace how historical events as well as more recent ones encouraged the organisations to seek to develop CSPs. Another set of questions was asked to explore the relational becoming dynamics of CSPs. In particular, following the main research questions I attempted to explore how CSP processes are embedded within and related to the wider practices of the parties. A key task of process analysis is to analyse how new processes emerge in relation to past or already existing processes (Pettigrew, 1996). Following Pettigrew (1996), therefore, I sought to ask various questions that helped me analyse and make sense of how CSPs emerge from and are embedded within the wider practices of the partners.

Last but not least, I also asked questions regarding the legitimacy of CSPs and sustainment of the partnerships. For instance, I often asked why the partners continued working together and how they perceived the benefits of CSPs. As we shall see in the following chapters, these diverse questions helped me not only to track the historical roots and contextual dynamics which influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs but also to report how actors make sense of and give meaning to the ongoing dynamics, negotiations as well as power dynamics shaping the emergence of CSPs. By asking multiple questions, I was also able to compare and discuss differences and similarities between actors’ accounts and so to reveal the social complexities inherent in the processual emergence of CSPs.
The date and time for each interview were arranged with the participants in advance via emails or sometimes telephone calls. Before each interview, I asked participants to sign a consent form. Following the University of Hull ethical guidelines and instructions, I made sure that the interviewees knew the terms of the research project regarding the issues of anonymity and confidentiality (see the last section for more detail).

For each interview, I also prepared a general list of questions which I used to guide the interview process (see the appendix for a list of the interview questions). However, I often diverted from the list and asked specific questions depending on the interviewee’s responses. In particular, I often asked questions such as:

‘Can you, please, tell us more about this (i.e. specific CSP aspects)?’

‘Who is engaged in these processes? Why?’

‘What happened next?’

‘What are some of the issues you faced? Why?’

‘How has the partnership evolved?’

‘How are CSP processes related to the other organisational processes?’

I usually opened each interview with a general question regarding each person’s role in their organisation. Then, I proceeded with more specific questions about their engagement in CSP processes. Since I wanted to track and analyse how different actors reflected upon the complexities of the processual emergence of CSPs, I asked them to give their personal reflections on partnership developments. I asked diverse questions regarding different CSP interactions, issues, practices, tasks etc. through which I sought to gain different insights about the complexities of CSPs.
I also encouraged actors to talk about the relationship between CSP processes and their wider organisational concerns and to reflect upon the dynamics of CSP processes. In this way, I sought to learn how ongoing changes and unexpected events have shaped the processual novel emergence of CSP arrangements. Different narrative accounts gave me different reflections upon the decision making dynamics and reflected how wider organisational policies and power dynamics and various ongoing changes have influenced the emergence of CSP arrangements.

During the interviews, I also collected a number of secondary resources from actors, which I decided use in the research analysis.

4.3.2.1 The Use of Secondary Sources

During the first set of interviews, I collected a large number of organisational documents. Some actors gave me corporate agendas, minutes of meetings and books, while others gave me various brochures, diaries, event programmes, letters, newspaper articles, press releases, programme proposals, application forms and other company documents. I decided to use these documents as secondary resources because: a) they reflect a wide range of issues about the companies’ CSP processes, b) they provide some historical background on the emergence of CSPs processes, and c) they can be used to compare and contrast the interview accounts, which increases the credibility and trustworthiness of the analyses.

According to Yanow (2006), company documents are essential secondary sources for qualitative research. Qualitative scholars can draw upon secondary sources to analyse different social aspects of the phenomena under investigation (Walsham, 2006). Furthermore, Miles and Huberman (2007) state, secondary sources can be used as complementary data to analyse and compare primary sources of data such as interview accounts. I mainly used the
collected secondary sources to compare and contrast the interview accounts. Since the
documents record and reflect different CSP aspects over a period of time, I decided to use
them mainly to compare various issues mentioned in the interview accounts.

However, being aware that the documents were produced by specific authors to target specific
audiences, I used them very cautiously and critically. Some of the documents were produced
by the organisations for internal reporting, such as reports to spread the aims of CSPs or to
reveal the links between CSP projects and their wider organisational goals. Other documents
such as brochures mainly targeted external stakeholders, such as the public. Several
documents were produced to communicate the benefits of CSPs to the local communities. In
particular, they depict the partners as local organisations that seek to address important social
challenges such as unemployment. These documents, hence, mainly seek to legitimise CSP
workings and build the reputations of the organisations.

Another set of documents were produced to report CSP aspects between the partners. Some
documents reflected operational and organisational aspects of CSPs, thus suggesting what is
needed to successfully undertake CSP projects. Various documents proposed suggestions and
sought to give guidelines on how to extract more benefits from CSPs. Such documents
seemed to have been produced for managerial purposes.

In short, a variety of documents have been produced to serve different purposes and therefore
emphasise specific aspects of CSPs. In this regard, they are helpful because they provided
different views on the CSP workings, which revealed the social complexities inherent in the
emergence of CSPs over time. Yet, on the other hand, the majority of the documents seemed
to seek to reflect only the positively perceived aspects of CSPs and in so doing depict CSPs in
a positive light. They report too little about the decision making dynamics or the conflicts in
CSP workings and so give partial descriptions of CSP processes. Therefore, I mainly used them to generate specific questions and compare and contrast them with issues mentioned in the interview accounts. In the next section, I discuss how I analysed the empirical accounts.

4.3.3 Interpretative Framework and Analysis of the Collected Material

Qualitative scholars have used different methods and techniques to analyse qualitative empirical material. Depending on the scope and goals of research projects, scholars can choose either already established methods (such as ‘thematic analysis’) (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006; Floersch et al., 2010) or develop their own methods and techniques for analysing empirical accounts (Miles & Huberman, 2007). The benefit of using already established techniques, Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006) state, is that they provide guidelines and instructions. However, Yanow (2006) points out, these guidelines also usually limit analysis to pre-determined intentions. Developing individual procedures, on the other hand, allows researchers to analyse their empirical material depending on their specific research goals and theoretical orientations.

Because of the difficulty and challenges of developing qualitative process studies and analysing processual data, Langley (1999) has proposed various strategies such as ‘narrative strategy’, ‘quantification strategy’, ‘alternative template strategy’, ‘grounded theory strategy’, ‘visual mapping strategy’, ‘temporal bracketing strategy’, and ‘synthetic strategy’ to analyse empirical materials. Others such as Simons et al. (2008), on the other hand, have suggested more common coding and comparative types of techniques for analysing empirical accounts. Yet others, such as Gabriel (2000) and Boje (2001) have focused on analysing elements of narratives such as specific plots and characters to represent the plurality of voices in narratives. Despite the growing number of methods for analysing qualitative empirical data,
they are still developing and need to be further advanced (Gorard, 2003; Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Creswell, 2007).

Nevertheless, what remains common among all approaches is the emphasis on and importance of interpretation (Walsham, 2006). According to Yanow (2006), a key feature in qualitative research is interpretation. Taking an interpretive approach, qualitative scholars try to make sense of empirical material through acts of interpretation (Sandberg, 2016).

Generally, qualitative analyses of empirical materials seek to describe what meanings actors assign to their actions and experiences (Isabella, 1990; Cassell & Symon, 2006; Deetz, 2009). In other words, the goal is to explore and analyse what meanings people construct about their social experiences (Berry, 2001; Brown et al., 2008; Teulier & Rouleau, 2013). Interpretative researchers, therefore, seek to engage in analyses that emphasise the plurality of voices in the different empirical narrative accounts (Rhodes, 2002). Taking an interpretive approach to analysis further assumes that nothing means anything on its own (Yanow, 2006). Rather, researchers construct different meanings depending on their wider theoretical and conceptual orientations (Cassell & Symon, 2004). Thus, interpretation is a dual act of manoeuvring between direct engagements with empirical accounts and the wider theoretical concerns held by researchers (Spiggle, 1994).

Considering the nature of this research and the aims of the study, I argue it is essential to have some preliminary understanding of already established social science techniques such as thematic analysis and narrative analysis. However, I also recognised that I needed to develop some more specific procedures which would allow me to analyse the dynamics of CSPs as expressed in different narrative accounts. I analysed the empirical material in the following way.
First, I transcribed the interviews verbatim (Rhodes, 2000). This is a common practice in qualitative research, which allows researchers to read, re-read, analyse and re-analyse transcripts at their convenience (Miles & Huberman, 2007). For this task, I used a computer and a special software (NVivo) which helped me transcribe the interviews more easily and accurately. On completion of this process, I had 478 pages of transcribed interview material.

Second, I spent some time reading and re-reading the transcripts in order to familiarise myself with their contents (Rhodes, 2000). This process helped me make sense of how different people narrate and reflect upon their social engagements in different CSP arrangements. In addition, the reading also assisted me in identifying both the shared as well as contested realities of CSP dynamics as presented by different actors.

Third, I employed various analytical techniques to analyse the narrative accounts in a more in-depth way. The process was abductive (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006), drawing upon my theoretical framework while also leaving room for individual themes to emerge in a more inductive manner. According to Brown and Humphreys (2003), interpretation generally begins with the task of ascertaining the narrators’ interpretations of key events, which requires some form of marking or coding the empirical material. Because each narrative communicates and focuses on particular events (Czarniawska, 1998), the task of interpretation requires a dialogue between the text and the researcher during which the researcher seeks to identify certain details, sequence of events, situations, contradictions, and characters in the narratives (Pentland, 1999). For the coding process, I integrated different elements of thematic and narrative analysis (see below) in order to explore different aspects in the narratives. In particular, following the steps of Pentland (1999) and Hsieh and Shannon (2005), Simons et al. (2008), and Ryan and Bernard (2016), I first generated an initial list of codes by reading
the transcripts and identifying sections in the accounts where actors talked about the processes of decision-making to engage in CSPs, the dynamics of CSP processes, contextual complexities, actions and discussions of the goals of CSP activities. Since each narrative constructs a different temporal sequence of events (Pentland, 1999), I sought to identify how different actors reflected upon different activities in relation to the development of CSP arrangements. By so doing, I was able to explore how different actors made sense of and gave meaning to different events which, in turn, revealed the polysemic nature of CSP activities.

Furthermore, following Tsoukas and Hatch (2001), I sought to identify how different narratives reflect the interrelationships between different events. In particular, I sought to identify how actors discussed different interrelationships between CSP events and wider organisational processes. Then, drawing upon Hernes (2008), I grouped these narrative accounts into themes such as: ‘the primacy of connecting’, ‘reiterations and novelty’, which enabled me to compare how actors discussed the influence of different ongoing social dynamics and unexpected events on the novel emergence of CSP arrangements. Emphasizing the temporal narration of sequences of events and the diversity of voices and accounts, my analysis aimed to explore the social complexities around individual engagements of actors in CSP processes and so to enrich our understanding of social dynamics of CSPs.

Moreover, recognizing that narratives are not mere descriptions but ways of constructing particular accounts and versions of experiences (Alvesson, 2003), I also sought to analyse how different narratives describe and reflect upon the positive and/or negative aspects of CSP engagements. According to Boje (2001), narratives always express a particular point of view which seeks to influence the meanings attributed to particular experiences. Rhodes and Brown (2005), too, argue that narratives assume intentionality because they seek to express particular
positions and interests. Narratives construct subject positions (Gudmundsdottir, 1996) and are therefore political in nature as they always privilege particular points of view over others. For this reason, following the analytical steps of Brown (1998), I sought to analyse how narratives seek to present CSPs in particular ways and how they seek to legitimise or de-legitimise particular CSP activities.

Last but not least, in the final phase of the analysis, I compared and contrasted different accounts and grouped them into broader themes in order to present the outcomes of analysis in a more coherent and comprehensive manner. In the following four chapters, I will present the outcomes of my analysis as follows. First, in Chapter 5, I will introduce the organisations and discuss their historical as well as more recent organisational concerns and aims. Then, in Chapter 6, I will focus on and analyse how different accounts discuss the issues and complexities around the decision making processes to engage in CSPs. In particular, the chapter discusses how different power dynamics, past decisions, as well as temporal context dynamics have encouraged the organisations to engage in CSPs.

In Chapter 7, I extend the analysis and explore how various accounts discuss the dynamic becoming nature of CSP processes. I offer detailed discussions of the iterable and novel emergence of different CSP arrangements.

Lastly, in Chapter 8, I analyse how different narratives depict CSPs and how they seek to legitimise each organisation’s engagement in CSP processes. The analysis reveals how diverse accounts depict different positive aspects of CSPs and how they seek to legitimise particular CSP activities. Furthermore, the analysis also suggests that these positive depictions also seek to encourage partners to continue working together. By providing a variety of examples and extended discussions, I hope the analysis provides an insightful and rich
analysis of the becoming nature of CSP processes. In the following section, I discuss the trustworthiness, the limitations and ethical considerations of the study.

4.4 Trustworthiness, Limitations and Ethical Considerations

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), empirical research has to address the issues of trustworthiness, limitations and ethical considerations. Whereas quantitative studies seek to achieve generalisability, qualitative inquiries need to demonstrate the credibility of their arguments (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Cassell & Symon, 2004; Johnson et al., 2006; Tracy, 2010). For Lincoln and Guba (1985), ‘trustworthiness’ is a key feature for ‘good’ qualitative research. In the case of this study, I strove to establish ‘trustworthiness’ by undertaking the following steps.

First, in each chapter I have sought to discuss how I addressed different issues in the processes of designing and conducting the research. By being reflective, I attempted to achieve reflexivity in relation to how I designed the research study (Cunliffe, 2003; Bryman & Cassell, 2006; Alvesson et al., 2008; Hosking & Pluut, 2010). According to Bryman and Cassell (2006), reflexivity is important for qualitative studies because it shows awareness about the wider processes which influence the way we write, reflect and report our research. Reflexivity is, therefore, more than a mere reflection (Alvesson, 2003) because it shows awareness of how our wider judgments and theoretical orientations influence the way we design and present research projects (Hosking & Pluut, 2010). Following Cunliffe (2003), throughout the thesis I have discussed how various issues and processes have influenced the way I developed the research.
Second, to ensure the ‘good quality’ of the empirical material, I regularly engaged with my interviewees (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003; Walsham, 2006; Johnson et al., 2007b; Cassell et al., 2009; Deetz, 2009; Bartles, 2012). I often talked to the participants informally through emails and sometimes telephone calls to discuss different issues of their CSP arrangements. By doing so, I aimed to generate rich empirical accounts which would allow me to analyse and reflect upon the processual becomingness of CSPs. Following Guba and Lincoln (1985), I argued that these prolonged engagements were essential for increasing the trustworthiness of the research.

Third, I have also chosen an appropriate method for generating the empirical accounts. According to Cassell et al. (2009), choosing appropriate methods is a crucial feature for generating rich accounts. Considering the ad hoc nature of CSP processes and the inability to follow actors as they engage in CSP processes, interviewing seemed to be the most appropriate method for generating the empirical material. After discussions with my supervisors, I decided to use interviewing because: a) it is a widely-used and reliable method in qualitative research and b) in contrast to the other methods (such as surveys which would only give limited insights into CSPs), interviewing allowed me to explore and analyse different social aspects of CSPs in great detail.

Fourth, I used secondary sources to triangulate the primary empirical accounts. According to Booth et al. (2003), using only one source of data can be a limitation and a weakness in qualitative research. Therefore, Booth et al. (2003) state, researchers should strive to use different methods to compare and contrast different accounts. As I have already mentioned in the previous section, I collected a number of different documents (such as strategic agendas,
minutes of meetings, reports, books and company brochures, and reports) which I used to compare and contrast the interview accounts.

Last but not least, in the concluding chapter I discuss the outcomes of the analysis in relation to the wider literature on CSPs. Dooley (2002) argues that by discussing research outcomes in relation to the wider literature, researchers can demonstrate the ‘validity’ of their arguments. Therefore, in Chapter 8, I discuss the outcomes of my analysis in relation to the wider existing body of knowledge on CSPs.

In the following sub-section, I discuss the limitations of the study.

4.4.1 Limitations

Each study has its limitations and mine is no exception. I have identified the following limitations of this study.

First, I have focused on a small number of cases. This can be considered a limitation because researchers cannot generalise about wider populations (Cassell & Symon, 2004). For my study, I have only explored two partnerships, which is a small sample size. However, considering the nature of the research objectives and the dynamic complex nature of CSPs, a small sample size seemed to be appropriate for the study. By focusing on two cases, I was able to analyse and explore in greater detail the social complexities of the two CSPs.

Second, my analysis does not provide any predictions or guidelines on how to develop effective CSPs. Johnson et al. (2006) state that qualitative studies are often accused of not being able to provide clear guidelines for practical implications. From my process view, however, such predictions are impossible because there are multiple social-contextual dynamics which might influence CSPs processes. Therefore, the study has sought to re-direct
attention to the novel and unpredictable ways in which CSP processes emerge and by so doing to invite the reader to consider the numerous ‘nuances’ and ‘complexities’ which might influence the emergence of CSPs.

Third, interview data can be considered problematic. Cassell and Symon (2004) state that scholars who use interviews can be accused of being selective about the questions they ask and the issues they consider for their research. In other words, researchers may focus on particular questions which they consider important but which might not reflect the reality ‘out there’ (Singh, 2007). Although interviews are flexible methods, they also limit empirical analyses to particular issues and problems (Richie & Lewis, 2003). Being one of the most used methods in qualitative research, however, interviewing is widely considered as one of the appropriate methods for exploring different social complexities. Following Yanow (2006), I see interviewing as a valuable method which can help to produce interesting insights into the social dynamics of our organisational lives.

Fourth, undertaking qualitative studies is usually a long and time-consuming process (Søndergaard, 2002). Cassell and Symon (2004) state that qualitative scholars need a lot of time to generate and analyse empirical materials. In my case, I spent 6-7 months to generate and analyse the interview accounts. Furthermore, I also had to make regular trips to the organisations to discuss different issues. However, I hope that these prolonged engagements have helped me produce rich and insightful analyses of CSPs.

In the next sub-section, I discuss the ethical considerations of the study.
4.4.3 Ethical Considerations

According to Creswell (2007), every research study must be conducted in accordance with the generally accepted ethical principles and procedures for social science research. Although there are no ‘official’ ethical standards, there are still some ethical considerations which researchers need to take into account when conducting research (Creswell, 2007). In particular, qualitative researchers need to address the issues of privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity of the research participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

For the study, I followed the University of Hull general ethical guidelines and requirements. To ensure the privacy of the participants, I removed all personal and company names from the analyses. In addition, during the research processes, I made sure that the interview accounts were stored in a safe place where only I could access them. In terms of confidentiality, during the interviews I avoided asking questions which might be considered confidential. I did not ask any specific questions if I felt that the interviewees were uncomfortable discussing particular issues. Before each interview, I also asked each participant to sign an informed consent form, which I had prepared in advance (see the appendix). Lastly, I also informed the participants that they could withdraw from the study at any time, should they encounter any problem or feel that they no longer wanted to be part of the study. In that way, I made sure that the research was conducted according to the ethical principles and requirements of the University of Hull.

4.8 Summary

This chapter is central to the thesis because it discusses how I generated and analysed the empirical material based on the wider theoretical concerns of the study. In particular, I
discussed my process view of doing empirical inquiry and why I chose to undertake a qualitative case study approach. I argued that a qualitative approach was consistent with my wider theoretical and empirical concerns, which allowed me to use appropriate methods to reflect upon the processual emergence of CSPs. Regarding the process of generating the empirical material, I used qualitative semi-structured interviews, along with a variety of secondary sources, to generate diverse narrative accounts of CSP processes. In the analysis section, I explained how and why I used various analytical techniques to explore and analyse the empirical accounts. I concluded the chapter with a general discussion of issues of trustworthiness, limitations and ethical considerations, which are all vital elements for undertaking qualitative research. In the next four chapters, I will present the outcomes of my analysis.
Chapter Five: Background and Introduction to the Case Studies

The aim of the next four chapters is to explore and analyse the dynamic processual becoming nature of CSP processes based on the generated empirical material, thus presenting the key outcomes of the analysis. In this chapter, I introduce the two case study partnerships by briefly introducing each organisation individually. From a process perspective, it is important and necessary to explore each organisation’s past as well as more recent history and emerging concerns in some detail because, as we shall see in the next chapters, these aspects have encouraged the organisations to engage in different CSPs.

In chapters 6, 7 and 8, I extend the analysis and examine the dynamics of CSP processes. By presenting the key outcomes of the analysis in four consecutive chapters, I seek to offer more detailed and insightful analysis of the becoming nature of CSPs. This chapter proceeds as follows.

In the first section, I explore the first partnership between ConstructionCo and KidsCharity. ConstructionCo is a large construction firm and one of the biggest companies in Hull. KidsCharity, on the other hand, is a youth development charity and one of the biggest charities in Hull. Both organisations are locally-based and mainly operate in Hull and the Humber region. ConstructionCo and KidsCharity have been working together for about six years. Over this period, they have developed a variety of projects that tackle various issues such as children’s needs and management training (I explore these in detail in the subsequent chapters). Then, in the second section, I introduce the second case partnership between FoodCo and CommunityCharity. FoodCo is a large food manufacturing company, while CommunityCharity is a community development charity. FoodCo and CommunityCharity
have been working together for four years, during which they have managed to successfully develop and deliver a number of CSP projects.

Drawing upon different narrative accounts from various actors as well as official documents, I will provide an overview of the organisations and discuss their main recent organisational objectives. By so doing, I also seek to offer a process interpretation of how different historical as well as present concerns of the organisations eventually led to discussions about the needs to form different CSPs.

5.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

ConstructionCo is a construction firm founded in 1876 in Hull, UK. According to the official accounts of the company history book, ConstructionCo has had an illustrious history demonstrating financial stability and sound management over the last two and a half centuries. In more recent years, the company has been recognised several times as ‘Sunday Times Best Company to Work For’ and is often portrayed in the local media as ‘a great company to work for’. The following table presents the chronological history of the company focusing on the key dates as presented by the official documents of the company:

Table 4. History of ConstructionCo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Fred Sewell and his gang working on Sutton Chapel in East Hull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>F Sewell &amp; Son was formed with son Herbert. Over in West Hull, Robert Sewell was selling fruit from a handcart to feed his family of 20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1960

Robert Sewell’s son, Ron, grew the fruit handcart business to half a dozen grocers in Hull and York.

1978

Having met at Leeds University, Paul, son of Roger the grocer, and Dennis, son of Doug, joined the building firm and ConstructionCo was born.

1980

Sutton village station in East Hull was acquired by ConstructionCo. Five years later, ConstructionCo built the new Sutton service station next to the Sutton bypass.

1980s

ConstructionCo donated nearly half the year’s profit to Castle Hill Hospital in East Yorkshire for vital operating theatre equipment. Over 30 years on, the legacy of giving back continues.

1990

ConstructionCo became a Private Limited Company. The firm moved to Geneva Way in East Hull. ConstructionCo built Dove House Hospice, which was opened by the late Diana, Princess of Wales.

1994

ConstructionCo formed a Facilities Management joint venture, The FMP Group.

1996

ConstructionCo gained Investors in People status and the quality standard BS 5750 accreditation. Both were regional firsts.

1998
Paul’s son, Patrick, formed ConstructionCo Retail and added the Maybury and Southcoates sites to its portfolio.

1999

ConstructionCo began a 15-year estates partnership with BAE systems in Brough, East Yorkshire. ConstructionCo, Hull City Council and the Deputy Prime Minister opened Victoria Dock Primary School, the first UK PFI school.

2002

ConstructionCo built Age Concern, the UK’s first older person’s healthy living centre. ConstructionCo acquired Ferriby service station on the M62 east bound corridor.

2003

The day nursery next to Victoria Dock Primary School was acquired and Little Learners was born.

2004

ConstructionCo brought the Yorkshire International Business Convention (YIBC) to Hull. Sewell partnered with City of York Council to develop and maintain Hob Moor Children’s Centre, St Barnabas CE Primary School and St Oswald’s CE Primary School. ConstructionCo developed Preston Road Village Centre.

2005

ConstructionCo was intrinsic in the creation of Humber Business Week.

2005-2013

Following a procurement process, ConstructionCo, NHS Hull and UME formed Hull Citycare Ltd. Since then, the partnership has transformed the primary care estate in Hull.

2007 & 2008
Sewell Retail acquired the Cottingham, Chanterlands, Wyton Bar, Pocklington, Holderness and Willerby filling stations.

**2009**

ConstructionCo entered the Sunday Times Best Companies to Work for listing.
ConstructionCo Retail won UK Forecourt Trader of the Year.
ConstructionCo formed a partnership with young people’s charity CatZero.
ConstructionCo formed Hull Esteem Consortium, a public private partnership to regenerate schools.
21 schools
£516m local economic impact
500+ apprenticeships

**2010**

The ConstructionCo Studio & Skills Academy was created.
1500 students were engaged in employability skills 6 sample trades

**2010 & 2011**

ConstructionCo again became a top 10 ‘Sunday Times Best Company to Work For’.

**2011**

Patrick Sewell joined the Association of Convenience Stores Board and was later appointed Vice Chair.
Paul Sewell was awarded an honorary doctorate from the University of Hull and an OBE from her Majesty the Queen.

**2012**

ConstructionCo invested in and created a new public private partnership, Shared Agenda Solutions. Dennis retired. Paul became sole owner.

**2013**
ConstructionCo Retail transformed its A63 westbound branch into Hull West Service Station as part of a multi-million pound programme of store improvements. The company re-branded to ConstructionCo on the go.

Citycare and Sewell Facilities Management won the national Building Better Healthcare ‘FM Provider of the Year’ award.

ConstructionCo invested in a new consultancy, ConstructionCo Commercial Safety.

2014

ConstructionCo picked up its 10th award in 8 years from Considerate Constructors. An academic journal of ConstructionCo’s Construction Excellence was published.

2014 & 2015

ConstructionCo formed further and higher education estates partnerships in Leeds and Hull.

2015

Continuing its support for young people, ConstructionCo transformed the Skills Academy into the Tommy Coyle Academy.

The Esteem framework was utilised to get Hull ready for the UK City of Culture 2017.

ConstructionCo was listed as the 12th biggest company in the Humber region and reached 400 employees.

ConstructionCo on the go made further investments in its estate with the redevelopment of Maybury and South Cave service stations.

Construction transformed the Grade II listed Print Hall into a world class library and learning space for Leeds City College.

2016

“Hull’s ambition for its year as UK City of Culture is huge and we aim to deliver a cultural programme that will leave a lasting legacy on the City.”

Martin Green
CEO & Director
Hull 2017

ConstructionCo on the go won Forecourt Trader of the Year 2016, winning six awards overall.

MD of ConstructionCo on the go, Patrick Sewell becomes Chairman of the Association of Convenience Stores (ACS).
ConstructionCo on the go open three Subway stores in the South Cave, Chanterlands Avenue and Cottingham fuel and convenience stores.

West Yorkshire office opens as part of the group’s growth in the Yorkshire region.

2017

ConstructionCo completes Hull New Theatre refurbishment as part of the Kingston Square transformation.

As noticed, the official accounts reveal how the company has grown substantially in the last half a century. They further remark that the company has also recently started to focus on delivering public sector projects and forming various CSPs. Being proud of its long history and presence in Hull, the company often presents itself as a business that has developed a very strong sense of place, rooted in the place in which it operates. Several actors, particularly the ones that have worked for the company for decades, state that the company is committed to work locally, as illustrated by the following extracts:

I think the business, particularly the construction side of the business, has been around for one hundred and thirty-five years. So, you know, it has always been recognised as, you know, as a local business, part of the community, quite a humble business as well. (Saewald)

… I think a lot of people probably think of the community as being quite a small little bit of a small surrounding, a particular area but I think we all feel that Hull is our community and the area is our community. (Lacina)

Hull is the heart of it because we work here mainly. (Lacina)
Lacina and Saewald seem to emphasise the historical success of the company and suggest that as a result the company has been deeply rooted in the place in which it operates. According to Brown and Humphreys (2003), organisations with long histories tend to develop a particular sense of belongingness to the areas in which they operate. Successful firms often construct stories which celebrate their past and present successes (Vaara, 2002). This also seems to be the case with ConstructionCo. Over the decades, ConstructionCo has grown to become one of the biggest construction companies in the region. It has successfully constructed numerous buildings ranging from state schools to health centres. The current business division is made up of four business units: investment, construction, facilities management and Construction on the Go (convenience and fuel stores) which provide a range of services available across the Yorkshire region. Currently, the company employs around 500 employees and is still expanding. Yet, some interviewees argue that the history of ConstructionCo was not always so monumental. Although the official accounts report the successful moments, the company has gone through a number of challenges over the decades. According to Mario, who is the current project manager of the company, in the past the company used to be a typical contractor that did not care about its clients:

When we first started or when I first started at ConstructionCo, we were your typical contractor who did not care about paying subcontractors, upset the architects, didn't really care about the end products, upset the client, didn't have a repay business as part of our key strategy.

With more than 25 years of work experience as a project manager at ConstructionCo, Mario argues that the company has gone through tremendous changes and problems. In particular, when I asked Mario to reflect upon the past as well as present concerns and ambitions of the
company, he pointed out that in the past the company was all about ‘getting the job done’. Success, in his terms, was measured simply by ‘profit’ without caring too much about customer services, safety etc. However, the last 25 years, Mario argued, have brought big changes in the way the company works. When asked to reflect upon the key triggering moments that changed ConstructionCo’s strategies, Mario stated:

…the Letham report and the Egan report which were both national government reports on the state of the construction industry in the early 90s. And those two reports changed our business forever because it was at that point where we said, ‘Right we are going to be competitive’ and we changed our business approach from there to an approach whereby we made ourselves far more customer friendly, cooperative, we pay people on time, we tried to make sure that we didn't upset people. But it was those two reports, the Letham Report and the Egan Report, that made the massive change. (Mario)

In addition to the influence of these two reports, another triggering moment which seems to be identified as a crucial factor that changed the strategy of ConstructionCo was the appointment of the new CEO, as Mario further points out:

And obviously the direction from our MD, Parry Parr, said, ‘Right guys, this is now the new direction that we are going’ and we have never really looked back. We never looked back in terms of the amount of work that we have done, the amount, the satisfied customers that we have had etc. (Mario)

Since 1990s, the company’s new strategy and approach have put ‘customers’ at the centre of everything the company does, which has led to the development of what the project manager calls the ‘single team delivery’ strategy:
So I mentioned earlier about what I describe as a ‘single team delivery’ and the single team delivery is about breaking down those silos that says the clients, the architects, the designers, the contractors and subcontractors will work together as a single team. And that is how we, you know, how we moved on if you like and embrace some of the values, if you like, the values from the Egan Report, the Letham Report. That is, we took on board, how they suggested people should work together in construction and that is, that modelled the way that we have, you know, shared our business. (Mario)

The last 25 years have also been described as a ‘squeaky bum time’ which brought a number of problems and challenges which the company had to deal with:

It was quite a, it was as, Alex Ferguson described it, ‘squeaky bum time’, because we were, it was new, it was a new sort of a new world really… And in the early days, you know, it was a bit of a struggle. (Mario)

As a result of some of these changes, ConstructionCo seemed also to have re-directed its attention to public sectors projects, mainly due to the large public investments projects Hull has attracted over the last decades. Since 1990s, Hull and the Humber region have attracted a number of public investments which aim to modernise public services. According to the company’s official documents, recognising the business opportunities coming from such investments, ConstructionCo decided to bid for some of these public projects. Luckily, the company was successful and won a number of projects as part of the following public schemes:

- Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Scheme- a scheme that aims to improve the public sector services and infrastructure
- Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Scheme - a government investment scheme for building secondary schools through private-public partnerships
- Reviving Health Centres Scheme - a scheme that seeks to modernise existing health centres and build new ones throughout the UK

As we shall see in the next chapters, although the managers identified only a few triggering moments which they argued shaped the company’s strategy over time, other actors also pointed out there were a variety of other issues which shaped the company’s destiny. In particular, several employees suggested that past concerns as well as the framing of the need to explore new business opportunities had led ConstructionCo engage in a range of CSP projects. Various accounts revealed numerous issues and nuances about the processes that partially influenced the managerial decisions to engage in different CSPs.

On the other side of the partnership, we have KidsCharity. It is a small charity founded in 2010 by three key people: Dain, Danny and Jim, who at the 2007-8 Around the World Yacht Race came up with an idea for establishing KidsCharity to help children in need acquire a range of skills, as narrated by Dain:

KidsCharity is a youth development charity and as I said it was set up just over five years ago now to work with the big problem in the area with young people being categorised as not in education, employment and training, known as NEETs. So I specialised in children services and designed a programme that linked with the Around the World Yacht Race that ran from Hull with Clipper Adventures. Jim Dive was the chairman of Yorkshire Race Group and Danny Waters was the skipper from Hull. So we designed this programme, ran this programme with a couple of young people and
that was very successful so we created KidsCharity as an organisation to work with long-term unemployed and not engaged young people. (Dain)

KidsCharity now works with NEETs not only in Hull but in the wider Humber region. According to Selsky and Parker (2016), ideas for establishing charities are usually born out the desire to address particular issue. Furthermore, Burchell and Cook (2011) state, individuals usually develop charities depending on their skills and knowledge. Undoubtedly, this seems to be the case of KidsCharity which, according to the managing director, was developed to address the issues of the continuously growing number of NEETs in Hull:

The local authority and their key partners are spending a lot of money but there was a circulation of young people that were not still moving forward. (Dain)

The official mission and aim of the charity as depicted in the official documents is:

Our aim is to equip people with the skills, belief and attitudes to help them move on in the world - there are no limits.

During the last five years, KidsCharity has sought to develop and deliver programmes that tackle NEETs’ needs. The managers of the charity seem to have also recognised and emphasised the importance of working together with other organisations in order to develop and deliver various projects. With a small and limited budget, the MD argues, KidsCharity can only function if it works in CSPs:

I think KidsCharity works because it is a partnership. We have brought together different people, local businesses etc. (Dain)
We have brought together the private business, voluntary sector, the local authority and this team of people are helping young people go through a process of challenge and support. (Dain)

When I asked the MD to further reflect upon the importance of CS interactions in the way KidsCharity has evolved over time, he explained that different local associations and networks helped the charity develop and attract new partners:

So being part of the network is beneficial because we are having communications about the developments of the city and everything that is going on. We fit into that development. (Dain)

According to den Hond et al. (2012), more and more charities are starting to work in partnership with different private and public sector organisations. Due to the public funding cuts, particularly in the USA and the UK, many NGOs have turned to look for new opportunities to work in partnerships to develop and deliver a range of projects (Austin, 2016). This also seems to be the case with KidsCharity. During the last five years, KidsCharity has successfully developed a number of partnerships with various governmental and private sector organisations.

Furthermore, hoping to create different programmes, the managers of KidsCharity seem to have pursued an ambition to buy a boat, which they considered necessary to develop different ‘challenge and support’ types of exercises to train NEETs’ different skills (resembling Around the World Yacht Race exercises). The official accounts state that in 2009, with the support of the local National Health Service (NHS) branch, KidsCharity finally succeeded in buying a yacht. This initiative, however, sparked a lot of the debates and criticisms about what some believed was a misuse of public money. As Dain states, the prime minister at that
time, David Cameron, even appeared on the BBC to express his discontent and disappointment about this initiative:

   And our yacht, part of our programme revolves around sailing, the yacht was purchased by NHS money and David Cameron used it as part of the Conservative election campaign to say how ridiculous it was for the NHS to buy a yacht. (Dain)

Since then, the managers pointed out, one of the major goals of KidsCharity has been to try to build local partnerships and relationships with various businesses and public organisations to build and protect the charity’s reputation and image.

CS relationships with well-known companies, however, can also be harmful (Jamali & Keshishian, 2008). Lucea (2009) states that many NGOs have damaged their reputations by building relations with businesses, because there are some concerns and criticisms about what some consider to be incompatible aims between sectors. Yet, despite the threats, there seems to be a tendency for charities to seek to develop CSPs in order to attract funding and deliver more effective projects (Wymer & Samu, 2003; Loza, 2004; Dahan et al., 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2010; Page et al., 2015; Clarke & MacDonald, 2016). Austin (2016), too, has observed that the role of NGOs has slightly moved away from what we usually consider to be the traditional role of third sector organisations. Building good relationships with the private and public sectors seems to be the preferred approach now by KidsCharity’s managers, who seem to argue that staying interlinked within local networks with businesses and governmental organisations is beneficial for their organisation:

   One thing you do find about Hull, in particular, is that its local networks are very tight and not everybody can engage in those local networks. There is a small group of maybe 10-15 people that are key within the city, business people. They are involved in
lots of things and to get an introduction into that, to have a relationship with those people is very very beneficial and that would just expand. Thankfully we are in that mix, we constantly get new organisations that are being introduced to us.

…partners support us, it is beneficial and this is the credibility of what we do as an organisation.

Developing and maintaining cross sector relationships and partnerships, however, is not easy (Huxham et al., 2006; Lewis et al., 2010; Moog et al., 2014; Stadtler & Van Wassenhove, 2016). Joutsenvirta and Uusitalo (2009) state that for many businesses, charities often lack professionalism and sound management which makes it difficult to work with them in the long-term. Recognizing some of potential benefits of having a good business plan and sound management, KidsCharity’s management team has strived to design a ‘business plan’ which, as expressed by the managing director, has helped the charity attract new partners:

…we came up with a programme that was different and a very good business plan that proved that it would work. We had a lot of the key people in the city who would say … it is a very good business plan and we would support you. (Dain)

According to the company documents, in 2015 the KidsCharity team also established what they call a general ‘programme foundation structure’ which is a framework that they now tend to use to design different programmes. One of the key aspects of the framework emphasises the importance of developing and delivering KidsCharity’s programmes with partners (business, charity or public sector organisations). In Dain’s view, KidsCharity’s programmes should be joint projects because this enriches the experiences of NEETs and helps them acquire different skills:
We engage with partners from the private, public and voluntary sectors who work alongside our staff to support young people and offer work placements or provide volunteering time. Working alongside local business people also enables the young people to meet professionals from an array of organisations, agencies and backgrounds. Working in partnership with local business people on the boat allows the young people to realise their potential and see themselves as equals.

When I asked the managers to further discuss how the charity had evolved over time, they tended to reflect on how various managerial plans enabled KidsCharity to develop successful projects. Since the first set of questions in the interviews mainly sought to elicit the background of the organisations, I did not ask specific questions related to issues around the decision making processes in KidsCharity. The later questions, which I present in the following chapters, provide more details about the internal organisational dynamics in relation to CSP processes. As far as the more recent concerns of KidsCharity are concerned, the MD stated that the management team had put together a 5-year plan which they hope will help the KidsCharity expand their current programmes in the wider Humber region, as expressed in the following extract:

…we put a 5-year strategy in place. Now, our 5-year strategy is about looking, working across the Humber sub region, probably working with local enterprise partnerships and working strategically within priority communities across the Humber region…And we see ourselves as a foundation to find the people that need the support, motivating them, building their aspirations and then sending them to all opportunities, college places and other training providers that are available. So that is where our 5
year plan I see will grow to and we are communicating that through our key partners. (Dain)

In addition, partnership working is also widely described as a key opportunity for KidsCharity’s employees to learn about different business needs in the region:

Meeting business leaders aims at providing the team with a broader picture about the needs of business and the ways in which they can work together to provide better services to the children. This includes seeking to involve people, developing networks and working together with all sectors. Numerous networks, constant relationship building practices with potential employers is a key for developing ideas and introducing new practices for the programmes of NEETs. (Dain)

Furthermore, KidsCharity’s management team also seems to express a recognition of what they think to be the potential funding benefits coming from working with partners, as described by the project manager, Salford:

I mean funding is, funding is becoming harder and harder, especially to get national funding because budgets have been cut and cut and have been cut...and I think it is becoming more and more important for local business to actually look at their local community and invest because it is not coming from the national government. And business do want to put something back. They do realise that they make their money out of the local community and the local workforce and they need it to be sustainable for the future. And for us it is equally important because when you create a partnership, network it is about funding, it is about getting the organisation involved with you, so there might be job opportunities for the young people, it might be work experience opportunities, funding… (Salford)
As we can see, KidsCharity’s members argue that the charity faces various challenges and has set up a number of ambitions for developing and delivering its projects. The above narrative accounts, thus, seem to suggest that there are various issues and concerns which KidsCharity needs to address. Some actors stated that fighting criticisms and protecting the reputation of the charity are the key goals while others emphasised the importance of building sound management and business plan to improve the design and management of KidsCharity’s projects. These framings and recognitions of the needs to address organisational concerns and ambitions through partnerships along with various temporal contextual dynamics, which I analyse in the next chapter, have influenced KidsCharity’s decision to form CSPs. Before I explore these aspects, however, let me first introduce the second case partnership between FoodCo and CommunityCharity.

5.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

Similar to the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership involves two locally-based organisations which primarily operate in Hull and the wider Humber region.

FoodCo is a large food manufacturing firm founded in 1851 in Hull, UK. According to the history book of the organisation, in the early years the company only consisted of two corner shops which used to sell grocery products. Over the decades, however, FoodCo has grown substantially and in 1903 it opened up its first manufacturing unit in Hull, which is still functioning today. By 2015, FoodCo had become one of the biggest companies in the region. The actors interviewed state that the company currently operates five production units and employs more than 2000 employees. As a result of its long history, FoodCo has sought to
present itself as a company that has developed a very strong sense of place, an aspect heavily emphasised and expressed by various actors such as Gabe and Paddy:

Our development has always been strongly tied to the City of Hull and its region; indeed, all the direct descendants of FoodCo continue to live within a few miles of Hull today. (Paddy)

The family who are the shareholders are still involved and run the business, are all located in this part of the country. So, there is a strong family association with the geography, I suppose. With the city, there is a strong business association with the city, our offices are still here. Two of the business of the group are still located here. There is a long history, not just the shareholders but some of the people who work for us; people who work at the bakery have worked here for decades which is quite unusual these days. So all of that ties us together to give us a shared history I think. It is this part of the country and all of us are here and have been in this part of the country for all our lives. So that all combines to give us, I think, the history. (Gabe)

Radburn, who is responsible for developing the company’s CSPs, further states the long presence in Hull has also strongly influenced the way in which the company interacts with local communities, in particular how the company seeks to build its reputation as a local company that engages in charitable work:

... we trade as a family business obviously and I think that is, it is good for the business to be seen to be involved in communities, in charitable giving. But we are a Hull-based, you know, a Hull-based business for 160 years and I think there is a connection for the business. And I notice it from going, for being, you know, out and around the people, people know who FoodCo are and they generally have a good, a
good impression because we are, we are trying to be a good employer… I think the charitable giving and the fact that we are focused on Hull-based charities…and I think this reflects on the business, people view the business in a good way, we build our image.

Over the years, FoodCo has donated food to a number of different local charities. This is considered part of the giving back initiative of the company, which is defined by the MD as a crucial part of the FoodCo’s history. Charitable giving is often also related to what they call FoodCo ‘family values’, as pointed out by the MD, Napier:

I think you got to start from, to step back to the stage and try to understand the sort of organisation that we are inspired to be. And we are driven by certain behaviours and values…

We’re very true to our family values and people are unquestionably at the heart of everything we do, including charities, communities etc.

According to the MD and also the official history book of FoodCo, the company’s behaviour is driven by key values which influence the decisions regarding CSP engagements. The values are perceived as underlying beliefs which help the company do ‘the right thing’ (Napier) in relation to community involvement. It is worth briefly exploring these ‘family values’ because, as we shall see later, many interviewees argued that there are directly related to CSPs.

Bertrand and Schoar (2006) state that family firms usually have specific values which guide their decisions and actions. Yet, that does not necessarily mean that actors hold the same perceptions and views about how their company should be run. Since each manager/employee
can interpret values differently (Syrjälä et al., 2009), negotiations are often crucial for addressing differences in perceptions in organisations (Vangen & Huxham, 2003b). Despite the existence of differences and conflicts (Dumlae & Janke, 2012), certain values usually dominate and act as key driving forces influencing company behaviours (Gehman et al., 2012). According to the history book of FoodCo, there are six major ‘values’ which guide the decision making processes in the company. The following table summarises these values:

Table 5. Company Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Company Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are a family business and consider those around us – our colleagues, customers, suppliers and local communities – as part of the family. A community should be a better place for having one of our businesses in it and we make sure this is the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We look after people well. We respect them and appreciate their role in our success. We’re keen to attract and develop brilliant individuals who share our passion, our pride and our values. We enjoy seeing colleagues succeed and encourage them to be the best they can be by motivating them and giving them the best possible training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are ethical and trustworthy. We take pride in knowing everyone in our supply chain, right the way back to the farmer. We value our reputation for supplying fantastic trusted food, and make our decisions wisely as whatever we do today will impact on tomorrow. We don’t define rights and wrongs, but have a saying “No sharp practice – you will know it when you see it”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boldness</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Our business is built on boldness. We’ve had to be bold to survive the challenges of the past 165 years. We will continue to be bold in making our decisions and executing our strategies to ensure we survive for another 160 years and more.

Openness

Trusted long-standing relationships are as important to us today as they were to our founder Jack William six generations ago. We believe great relationships are secured by being honest, open and transparent, with no sharp practice.

Commitment

With more than 160 years behind us, there’s no doubt that we’re in it for the long-term. But in addition to having a business to be proud of today, we must demonstrate the perseverance to ensure we have a future to be proud of and as the custodians of this very special business this is something we are all very committed to.

It is worth noting that although these values are presented as key underlying factors shaping FoodCo’s behaviour, they do not reveal the complexities, power dynamics and other contextual dynamics which might influence the strategy and behaviours of the company. As such, despite the desire of the managers to define these values as the core guidelines, they do not fully explain why and how FoodCo develops CSPs. Therefore, during the interviews, I sought to ask questions about how these values related to the company’s engagement in CSPs. Several participants answered that these values provide a variety of motives that influence the decisions to engage in CSPs with charities. The first value, ‘consideration’, for instance, emphasises the importance of working with communities and organisations in the locality in which FoodCo operates, as clearly explained by Napier:

…one of those (values) we call ‘consideration’. When we try to explain what we mean by ‘consideration’, that is being good with our colleagues, with our suppliers, with our communities. And we say, a phrase we use very often, the community should be a
better place for having a FoodCo business there. So, if you start from there, that value
drives the way we seek to behave wherever we do business to be honest, wherever we
do business but, you know, it is a belief that the community should be better having
FoodCo business there. (Napier)

Consideration- we have said that phrase that the community should be a better place of
having one of our businesses there. Consideration is something we would wish to
apply to the colleagues in the business, your customers, your suppliers, and to your
communities. So, that is one that shapes our approach to work in the communities.
(Napier)

As the MD of the company, Napier seems to give deep meaning to CSP engagements as part
of what he considers necessary for doing business. In his view, the value ‘consideration’
suggests that the company should support local communities and engage in different activities
to improve the localities in which the company operates.

Similarly, the second value, ‘people’, seems to emphasise that looking after people is a crucial
factor for the company’s success:

We look after our people well. We respect them and appreciate their role in our
success. We’re keen to attract and develop brilliant individuals who share our passion,
our pride and our values. We enjoy seeing colleagues succeed and encourage them to
be the best they can be by motivating them and giving them the best possible training.
(official document)
In the view of Gabe, the sustainability director of the company, this value is also strongly linked to the notion of ‘care’, which he defines as the need to support local communities, charities and local causes in the city:

… the shareholders have an in-built desire to give something back, as it were. Not because we have taken anything out but the business should be more than just a commercial enterprise, it should serve something of a community purpose as well.

So, we have always donated to local good causes, we have always supported young people, that has been an ongoing, an ongoing theme.

Gabe’s narrative account also seems to reflect upon the issues around ‘giving back’ initiatives and the ‘need’ to support local causes. Similar to Napier, he seems to see CSPs as part of their wider community scheme which is encouraged by the family values.

Furthermore, ‘integrity’ is also widely considered an important factor that plays a key role in the company behaviour. The MD defines ‘integrity’ in the following way:

… we talk about integrity and you probably expect that in a family business but that is sort of the feeling that we are committed to something and that, you know, we have a little saying that we don't define sharp practice, you would know when you see it.

According to the MD, employees are expected to pursue common goals and objectives in trying to build the company’s integrity. This also means to pursue common ‘giving back’ initiatives.

The fourth value, ‘boldness’ is further emphasised as a crucial factor influencing the decision-making processes in the company:
Our business is built on boldness. We’ve had to be bold to survive the challenges of the past 162 years. We will continue to be bold in making our decisions and executing our strategies to ensure we survive for another 160 years and more. (family book)

For Napier, being ‘bold’ reveals that over the decades FoodCo was successful in addressing different problems and issues as they arose:

And the company survived over many years because it had to take bold steps to change, we change a lot as you would have imagined for all these years. So boldness is one of our values that we try to deliver what we do.

The last two values, ‘openness’ and ‘commitment’, are further defined to be the forces that encourage and promote ‘transparency’ and ‘honesty’ in building relationships, as seen in the following extracts:

Openness, we try to be open and easier, transparent to deal with. It is a role rather than a value but it comes under the heading of people and that is all about care about people who share our passions and values and recognise that when people come and work for you then that is quite a step in faith and actually they are investing a portion of their career with you, so…we try to make sure that we can make them the best they can be. (Nicholas)

And commitment, that is the last one that is actually that if we believe in the destination we are committed to achieving it, we can be worried about it, but that is all about I think we can do it in the family business to take that long-term view. (Nickolas)
These family values, as seen from the above accounts, are presented as the underlying key factors influencing the company behaviour and decisions regarding CSP engagements. As the official accounts, however, they reflect little about the social dynamics in decision making processes and therefore are only partial depictions of the way the company has sought to build its ‘culture’ and presents itself to the public (I discuss this in more detail in the next chapters). During the interviews, the actors seemed to focus on the above issues which they defined as a ‘good’ way to introduce FoodCo.

On the other side of the partnership, we have CommunityCharity, which is a community development organisation established in 1994 by 10 local residents of Hulles estate. Kaidan, who is the managing director of the charity, states that the idea to establish CommunityCharity came from the need to address the issues the residents faced during the 1990s:

…the organisation was formed 20 years ago by a group of residents who lived on this housing estate, who felt that they were being ignored by public agencies and they wanted to do something about it. And, you know, from very humble beginnings they started to bring, you know, advice services onto the estate to support what was then and still is very high levels of unemployment…(Kaidan)

Similar to KidsCharity, CommunityCharity seems to have been formed as a result of a desire to address a local need or problem. According to the history book of the organisation, ten local residents of the estate gathered together and decided to form a charity that could help them address the local problems of the estate. The original mission of CommunityCharity as stated in the history book is:
We are a locally controlled and accountable organisation, committed to improving the Quality of Life within communities through identifying and addressing the needs of local people and by working in partnership with them and with statutory, voluntary and professional organisations. (original mission statement, company history book)

When I asked Paine, the current managing director of the charity, to describe how the charity was formed, he stated that during the 1990s the Hulles Estate suffered serious socio-economic degeneration which sparked a desire to develop a charity:

I think at the time rather in an incoherent way, they (residents) found that the estate has been abandoned by other agencies. So, suffering considerable economic decline, social deprivation, you name it, their educational performance, all that, take all the usual stuff. (Paine)

In his view, the local residents decided to take the issues into their own hands and establish what later became Community Charity Resource Central Association:

And they got together in an attempt to take control of that process … So, the intention was, if no one cared, we cared, we live here, we should take some responsibility and attempt to get some control of our community. (Paine)

I guess that was the point of origin… And originally, they set up a thing called a Charity Resource Central Association entirely run by volunteers that eventually evolved into the Community Charity... (Paine)

For Paine, the desire to ‘take care of’ and ‘take responsibility’ for this estate united the residents who, through many efforts, eventually succeeded in establishing an initiative to help them address their local needs.
Since its establishment, CommunityCharity has been entirely run by the local residents, who are responsible for planning and delivering all of the CommunityCharity’s projects. For its 20 years of existence, the charity has successfully grown to become one of the biggest charities in England. It currently employs around 200 employees and provides a wide range of services not only to the residents of the Hulles Estate but also to many local communities in Hull and the wider Humber region. The company book currently states that CommunityCharity owns and manages 25 properties which offer a range of services not only to the local residents but also to private and public sector organisations (such as conference halls etc.).

Kaidan, who is the current operations manager, argues that the charity has also successfully managed to develop a number of partnerships with the local council, local businesses and other charities which, in his view, has helped CommunityCharity to successfully design and deliver a number of different projects (I explore these in the next chapter):

…we work not only with business and other private sector food donors but we work very closely with public sector, particularly Hull City Council…

According to the MD, one of the major goals of CommunityCharity over the years has been to develop what they call a ‘trade on aid’ approach which allows them to work in partnerships with different sectoral organisations. What is more, the MD further states, this approach also seeks to help the charity adapt an asset-driven strategy which is committed to asset-driven growth, as expressed in the following account:

… we have adopted an asset-driven growth strategy. So, a long time ago we decided in order to be, if the aspiration was to be, you know, in charge of our affairs, or at least to have some purchase on it, then we needed to be independent from other people’s funding strengths. So, probably 15 years, we are now 20 years, the direction travelled
from the board toward an asset-driven strategy. So the acquisition of assets comes from our balance sheet and the acquisition of assets comes from different streams.

Several other important organisational ambitions and objectives were identified by the interviewees. First, Paine stated, one of the major goals is to increase the number and size of their current programmes by working in partnership with the public and private sectors:

…I think it is that, that recognition that to coin a phrase, we all need to be together now... The public sector is not able to deliver what it used to do. And it is sort of collaboration and partnership and that recognition that those three sort of types of sectors, you know, have specialism and through collaboration you can get, you know, more impact.

For Paine, it is only through working in CSPs that the sectors can achieve a ‘bigger impact’. The operation manager, Kaidan, too, seems to suggest that all the three sectors need to pursue common goals that can benefit all members of society:

We do collaborate with businesses and the council... it does come back to the idea of common goal, that we can't do things on our own. We need to partner and collaborate.

Furthermore, Kaidan also argued that the Community Charity strives to increase the number of services it offers. Currently, the charity runs three children’s centres, a nursery, a youth project, an employment support service and health care provider, a community warden scheme and food distribution. However, new services are needed, as expressed in the following extract:

…our organisation is about improving the quality of life of people who live in Hull because obviously we have deprived communities... so certainly we operate in the area
of children’s centres, nurturing, we work with families with children. We operate youth services, we deliver a lot of skills and training activities. We support business start-ups, you know, we just need more and try to improve I suppose the social economic fabric of Hull really. (Kaidan)

Lastly, the management team also seemed to emphasise the need to develop a more ‘flexible approach’, which can help them respond to different opportunities as they arise:

We are, try to be opportunistic. I mean the world we inhabit, back to Neil Kendy, it is a dynamic and fast changing environment. We are in the business of delivering public services which is all subject to public policy which changes at national or local level. So, the world we inhabit is a very mutable and dynamic environment. You know, I think what we are able to do in our organisation is to respond quickly when an opportunity presents itself…(Paine)

As noticed, different accounts seem to represent different aims of the charity. They reflect the issues which CommunityCharity currently seeks to address. The actors also express a variety of issues around these goals and ambitions, which I will more fully analyse in the next chapter. Having briefly introduced the two case studies in this chapter, I want now to move to the next chapter, where I will analyse how different narratives reflect the dynamics that led the parties to develop the partnerships.

5.3 Summary

This chapter has attempted to introduce briefly the partnering organisations by discussing each one’s individual past as well as present organisational concerns and ambitions. The chapter has discussed how different interview accounts and official statements present the
various historical circumstances and situations which have influenced the present organisational concerns and ambitions of the organisations. Furthermore, it has also sought to discuss some of current challenges and problems which organisations face and need to address regarding their CS engagements.

From a process thinking view, these historical descriptions of the cases are important because they set up the scene for the next chapters, where I engage in deeper and more detailed analysis of the social complexities of CSPs.

In the next chapter, I analyse how different narratives reflect the various dynamics that have eventually led to the decisions to engage in CSPs.
Chapter Six: Central Elements of Decisions to Form CSPs

In the previous chapter, I briefly introduced the partnering organisations and discussed how actors as well as the official written accounts present the past and emerging concerns and ambitions of each organisation. In this chapter, I extend the analysis and further explore how different narratives reflect upon the social dynamics which influence the decisions to engage in CSPs. Following the research questions and aims of the thesis, I will analyse how various interview accounts reflect upon the influence of different past events as well as present contextual dynamics on the decisions to engage in CSPs. By analysing different narrative accounts, the chapter seeks to highlight the numerous social dynamics which have encouraged the organisations to engage in CSPs. The chapter proceeds as follows.

In the first section, I analyse how different actors reflect upon the influence of past events and dynamics on the present concerns and ambitions of each organisation in relation to their engagements in CSPs. From a process perspective, past events influence the emergence of new events. Nayak and Chia (2011) state that history is immanent in the present because past situations are the conditions for the emergence of present circumstances. Taking into account this key process thinking remark, I seek to analyse how different accounts report the influence of historical situations and events on the decisions to engage in CSPs.

Then, in the second section, I extend my analysis and explore how different accounts reflect the influence of the temporal organisational ambitions in relation to framing the need to engage in CSPs. A key feature in the process thinking notion is interrelatedness or relational becoming (Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Mesle, 2008; Garud & Gehman, 2012; Stout, 2012; Stout & Love, 2013) which invites us to analyse how decisions to engage in CSPs are related to the
way in which actors frame the relational importance of CSPs in regard to their wider organisational ambitions and concerns. In this section, therefore, I seek to explore how different framings of the needs to engage in CSPs in relation to the wider organisational goals of partners influence their decisions to form CSPs.

Lastly, in the third section, I analyse how different narratives reflect the influence of different power and negotiation dynamics in the decision making processes to engage in CSPs.

Following Seitanidi (2010), I have structured the chapter in three separate sections in which I discuss each partnership individually in accordance with the key recurrent themes of the analysis. This allowed me to clearly illustrate and present the key outcomes of the analysis and to explain how they address the research questions and aims of the thesis.

6.1 Accounts Reflecting Historical Influences

A processual account of the emergence of new phenomena requires analysis of how past events and processes influence and shape the emergence of new ones (Hernes, 2008). A key feature of process thinking is interconnectedness (Langley, 2007; Mesle, 2008; Nayak, 2008b) which suggests that we cannot explore the emergence of CSPs without first understanding the history of each organisation or how they have evolved, changed and transformed over time. In other words, the historical dimension is essential for process analysis (Pettigrew, 1997). Styhre (2002) states that a processual analysis of the emergence of new processes needs to emphasise how past events are linked to the emergence of new ones. Although I have briefly introduced the organisations in the previous chapter, I still need to further reflect upon how actors report and reflect upon the influence of past decisions on the decisions to engage in CSPs. A key recurrent theme in the analysis of the empirical material was the influence of
past decisions on the need to form CSPs. Following the key research aims of the thesis, I have traced and examined how actors reflect upon the influence of past decisions and events on the decisions to engage in CSP processes.

6.1.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

Some of the primary opening questions which I asked during the interviews aimed to encourage actors to: a) discuss each one’s role in the company and their engagements in CSPs and b) to share what they saw as the driving forces encouraging their organisations to engage in CSPs. I asked a range of questions which allowed interviewees to share their views, experiences and stories about what they considered to be the driving forces encouraging their organisations to engage in CSPs. The questions generated different narratives about the historical dynamics that led to the decisions to form CSPs. Different narratives provide examples of how actors perceive and frame different historical dimensions as crucial conditions that have shaped the decisions to engage in CSPs.

In the case of ConstructionCo, many actors stated that over the years the company had specialised in delivering public sector projects which eventually helped them develop CSPs, as Saewald points out:

… what we do is predominantly public sector focused. So we are dealing with health centres, schools…I think as a business, we can be proud of what we have achieved a lot working with the public sector across Hull.

Since the 2000s, Hull has attracted substantial public funding for undertaking major regeneration projects. Large projects have been undertaken to renovate and revive the public sector services in the city. As a result, many local firms have expressed interest in bidding for
these public projects. Being part of that local business landscape, ConstructionCo too seemed to have expressed interest in bidding for some of these projects, as Becky states:

…it was in Hull, they needed, the education system needed redevelopment. We thought, we look to do that, who better to do it than someone in the community who loves to work in Hull? We have been in Hull, we have worked in Hull and we would like to give the local people great products and services. So we put our bid in alongside the other people and we were lucky to win that.

Over the last 15 years, according to the official company documents, ConstructionCo has bid for and successfully delivered a variety of public projects as part of the following schemes:

- Citycare Initiative- launched to modernise the healthcare industry in Hull and the Humber Region.
- Private Finance Initiative Scheme (PFI)- launched to build new schools as well as to modernise some old ones.
- Preston Road New Deal- a community regeneration project that sought to renovate various parts of the city

ConstructionCo’s shift towards specializing in public services delivery might be interpreted as a key strategic move by the managers to get involved in major regeneration projects in the city. Or, perhaps, over the years the company has successfully developed strong links with the public sector and as a result decided to work with them as a private service provider for different services. Either way, ConstructionCo seems to be mainly striving to undertake public sector service projects. These projects, as we shall see later, were considered by several interviewees to be the main motives that encouraged ConstructionCo to form different CSPs
with charities. In particular, the MD and the communications director stated that the idea for forming different CSPs with charities was born out of the desire to deliver ‘extra customer services’ to the schools ConstructionCo were building, as clearly explained by Saewald and Parry:

I think that, first and foremost it comes back to, you know, our business model is around working in education and in health. So, any project (be it charity or anything else) that we can do that sits in those areas, does sit very nicely with our business. Yes, if somebody came to us with a proposition for something that is completely not our field, you know, we might think slightly differently about it. (Saewald)

It (working with charities) is connected to our business, we were building schools for the future at the time and that could allow kids to go to that when in need. (Parry)

Saewald emphasised that the company business model is around education and health and therefore the company might consider various CSP projects that could help them deliver the projects. His framing of the need to engage in CSPs, thus, seemed to be around finding ‘fits’ in relation to their wider projects. If ConstructionCo did not specialise in public services delivery, perhaps the company would not have engaged in CSPs with charities. For Parry, too, CSP projects with charities seem to be ‘connected to the business’ and therefore helpful for delivering the school projects. The specialisation in public services, therefore, was seen by Parry as a major motive for engaging in CSPs.

In addition, several interviewees also argued that working in CSPs with charities is part of the general company’s approach and strategy to doing business. To briefly recall from the previous chapter, during the last decades ConstructionCo has sought to transform itself from
being a company that did not care about customers, quality, and community relations etc. towards a business that cares about customers, as Mario states:

When we first started or when I first started at ConstructionCo, we were your typical contractor who did not care about paying subcontractors, upset the architects, didn't really care about the end products, upset the client, didn't have a repay business as part of our key strategy.

According to Mario, during the last two decades, however, the company has adapted and developed an approach based on the Letham and Egan reports that puts customers at the centre of its business case:

…the Letham report and the Egan report which were both national government reports on the state of construction industry in the early 90s. And those two reports changed our business forever because it was at that point where we said ‘Right, we are going to be competitive’ and we changed our business approach from there to an approach whereby we made ourselves far more customer friendly, cooperative, we pay people on time, we tried to make sure that we didn't upset people. But it was those two reports, the Letham Report and the Egan Report, that made the massive change. (Mario)

These two reports helped ConstructionCo develop a new approach which, according to several actors, requires working in CSPs, when needed, as part of developing different relationships and networks to deliver different parts of construction projects, as Sage points out:
I think it is a relationship thing, we are not like a lot of businesses, I think it is not so much about us, we are doing this because it makes money there, we are very much about longer lasting relationships and helping to build, you know, relationships in the community as well. (Sage)

The above accounts, thus, reflect another historical influence and concern of the company which is considered a key motive for forming CSPs. Akintoye et al. (2000) state that the construction industry in the UK has experienced massive changes in the last decades. The Letham and Egan reports along with the new industry standards have partially transformed the way construction companies work (Akintoye et al., 2000). In particular, construction companies have become much more professional (Li et al., 2005) and as a result they have developed strategies that draw upon some of the key recommendations of the Letham and Egan reports (Akintoye et al., 2000). Although some commentators doubt such improvements and criticise the official accounts, there is still a general consensus that the construction industry services and standards have improved over the years (Li et al., 2005). In the case of ConstructionCo, these reports were said to have shaped the company’s new business model which now emphasises the importance of building close relationships with customers, suppliers, communities, charities etc. in hoping to assure that all issues and concerns are ‘properly’ addressed, an aspect Cadee clearly explains:

…most people business model will start how, what, how much profit do we need to make? We start the other way, say, ‘Right, if we do all these things right, we know at the end of it, we should do alright’. We are not here to make the most profit possible, we need to make a profit, we are not just about it… But we have the confidence to say, if we do the right things, you know, with the community, our people, you know, with
the customer, you know, we do things from a right environmental perspective, we do the things right from a health and safety perspective. If you do all those things right on the project, I think it would be a pretty successful project.

Building long-lasting relationships and partnerships not only with businesses but also with charities is believed to be an appropriate approach to deliver different projects, as emphasised by Sage:

So I think from our point of view, our partnerships are all long-term partnerships and we are trying, it is almost like, it is the bigger picture view I think. Rather than just taking in and trying to make a quick fix or what have you, we see the longer-term view, we are hoping to be here in the next 10-15 years. (Sage)

...we are very much about longer lasting relationships and help to build, you know, relationships in the community. (Sage)

How exactly the new strategy is related to the CSPs and how do consider and frame the need to engage in CSPs are issues further discussed in the following sections.

In the case of KidsCharity, members stated that the interest in CSPs seems to have grown out of the fact that they seek to specialise and align their projects with the wider projects that tackle NEETs in the city. To recall Dain’s words from the previous chapter, KidsCharity’s projects are successfully designed and delivered because of the partnerships with various public and private sector organisations:

I think KidsCharity works because it is a partnership. We have brought together different people, local businesses etc.
For Dain, it seems, it is only by working in partnerships that KidsCharity can tackle NEETs’ problems:

We engage with partners from the private, public and voluntary sectors who work alongside our staff to support young people …

The majority of KidsCharity’s projects, as we might expect, are linked to the wider regional initiatives and undertakings in Hull. Some of these projects, according to official accounts, are:

- Wilberforce Youth Development Programme- funded by local strategic partnership OneHull and geared towards working with disaffected young people who have multiple issues of various kinds
- KidsCharity-NHS programmes - tackling health issues/unhealthy behaviours of young people
- Blue Sky Programmes- projects seeking to develop leaders of the future through working with local businesses
- ConstructionCo Sparks Programmes- a partnership with local businesses that seeks to help school children in their final year at school
- BSF Scheme Programmes with ConstructionCo- includes working in partnership with ConstructionCo to develop specialised programmes that help school children acquire different business skills

KidsCharity’s managers pointed out that developing CSPs has been their historical aim and concern. Furthermore, working in CSPs seems to also be related to the KidCharity’s approach to fight criticism. Over the years, KidsCharity has attracted much criticism, which has
negatively impacted the image of the charity. When I asked the MD to reflect on how this historical issue has affected the way Kids Charity works in CSPs, he replied:

We need to (work in CSPs), a lot of it was driven by the bad publicity. So we wanted to create a network of organisations that stood alongside us to deal with this negative publicity. And this publicity was international, this negativity, so, it even hit the papers in Australia about the NHS's buying the yacht. So we proactively went to speak to partners to say ‘Help us with this and stand alongside us’.

These two historical concerns and goals - seeking to design and deliver various NEETs programmes by aligning them with wider private and public projects in the city as well as fighting criticisms - seemed to be identified by the actors as the two critical historical situations that encouraged Kids Charity to engage in CSPs. Perhaps, over the years, there might have been other historical issues that might have influenced the Kids Charity’s decision to engage in CSPs, but the above two seem to be the ones identified as the most recent and important ones that led to the development of different CSPs.

As we can see from the above accounts, various interviewees reflected upon the influence of different historical events and situations on the decisions to engage in CSPs. They point out that emergence of the need to engage in CSPs is related to the particular historical concerns and aims of each organisation. Furthermore, the narratives also reveal how different actors made sense of and gave meaning to specific past events and decisions which they considered to have influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs. The above accounts, as such, help us get a glimpse of how past situations have influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs. In the next sub-section, I explore how different accounts reflect the influence of past circumstances on the need to engage in CSPs in the FoodCo-Community Charity partnership.
6.1.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

According to the history book of FoodCo, the beginning of the company’s community engagements (such as charitable giving, volunteering etc.) can be traced back to 1867 when the founder, Jack Williams (who was believed to be a strong Christian) decided to allocate an annual percentage of the company’s profits to charitable causes. Driven by Christian values and beliefs, the history book reports, he set the practice of giving 2% of the company’s profits to community/charity causes. As stated by the interviewees, this practice is still kept up today. Every year, FoodCo supports various charities by donating 2% of its annual profits to different causes and in different ways. When I asked the interviewees why the company engages in charitable work, many stated that it is because this practice has been inherited over the years. Yet, the process of choosing who to support and how to support them seemed to have drastically changed over time. Sal, who is currently the secretary of the organisation and is the one responsible for organising all the internal processes around charitable work, stated that various changes have taken place in the last decades. In particular, a company charity committee was established to handle different issues around charitable work:

Originally, there wasn't a charity committee, it was just me and the HR director and we received all the requests in, back in the days when we had our stores. So we used to do product donations or vouchers to be spent in the stores. We very rarely gave away money and I think the first budget that we ever had was something like £ 5000. It kind of just evolved and then when the company decided that they needed a more joined-up approach to it, we brought family members in. That was about maybe eight years ago now. (Sal)
Hyndman and McMahon (2010) state that the traditional forms of charity work that companies used to practise in the past have drastically changed over the decades. More and more private sector organisations nowadays adopt alternative approaches to charitable work which involve more interactions with the recipients and more engagement of employees in different activities (Wymer & Samu, 2003). In addition, Hyndman and McMahon (2010) state, more and more companies now require regular reports about how their donated money is spent. In the case of FoodCo, before 2007, the official documents state that there were no strict criteria or company policies that were used to guide the decisions about charitable donations. Charitable giving was simply considered a transaction which was aimed to help those in need, as the sustainability director explains:

I think we have always gone for the very traditional definition which is you give money to somebody to do something that they can't do for themselves. And it is more like give a man a fish, it is the old fashioned charity... (Gabe)

In the last 9-10 years, however, FoodCo seems to have changed its approach to charitable giving. Some of the reasons are, according to the interviewees, the large number of requests and growing number of issues around how to engage with charities. Thus, decisions seem to have been taken to build more structure into what was already happening. The managing director and sustainability director stated that the company decided to develop what they call a ‘joined-up approach’ or ‘strategic approach’ to charitable giving and community engagement, as reflected in the following extracts:

Historically, we have never been quite so structured about it although I am trying to develop a process now where what we do has a slightly more strategic approach to our generation of social value. That is not necessarily about delivering benefit to us, it is
about delivering to the community, greater benefit to the community and managing it in a slightly more structured way. (Gabe)

Well, I think we have always done it (charitable giving) but we have never, it was probably maybe 10 years ago that we decided we needed to be a bit more deliberate and a bit less ad hoc about it. (Napier)

Some of the new propositions related to charity work suggest that the company needs to be more collaborative and interactive with charities, as reflected by the charity committee chair Lacy:

We are less just giving, we are more interactive, I think, more involved with it such as having days, we never used to have a day building poles, gardens or anything of that sort. So we are much more involved, we are more interactive with the things we are involved with I think, definitely. People are more interactive with their charitable giving, I think generally. I think it is, it is, it's a sort of evolved, hasn't it, over the years and I think that goes into the business as well really.

In Lacy’s words, the company approach evolved over time as a result of the desire to be more interactive with charities. The past forms of traditional charity work seemed to have moved away from simply ‘give a man a fish’ (Gabe) towards a way of seeking to build more ‘business principles’ (Gabe) into charity projects and striving to make a ‘bigger impact’ (Napier). The actors argued that the past concerns of charitable work had to be updated and so new forms of engagement were needed. Furthermore, they seemed to emphasise a need to focus on a smaller number of projects in order to generate greater benefits to the city, as stated by the sustainability director:
So, the mechanics of what we do, we tend to have a core set of central projects with charities... (Gabe)

... what we are trying to do is to find areas in which we can work that are genuinely important to the city. (Gabe)

So if you choose the right partners who are capable of turning their passionate into something that is useful then you are getting more benefit ... (Gabe)

To achieve this ambition, the company seems to rely on working in long-term partnerships with different charities. The actors seem to suggest that the company is not capable of achieving its goals on its own. Therefore, partnership working seems to be emphasised as a way forward in developing new forms of cross-sector charitable work. What is interesting to note is that the general definition of charitable work has also changed from what Gabe stated above and at the moment there is no clear definition about what and how charitable work should be undertaken. Yet, the company has set up some rules and criteria about its cross sector engagements. One of the most emphasised essential criteria, as identified by interviewees, is that CSP projects must be about ‘permanent change’ and ‘difference’:

...what we are after is delivering benefit and making a difference. It is being a better member of the communities in which we operate. And the way in which you do that is by measuring the benefit that you deliver and not just by hoping. (Gabe)

And to try to find a smallish number of significant engagements rather than a larger number of small engagements which will not have the same sticking power. It is about real permanent change...The collaboration and partnership is a key to it. (Gabe)
From Gabe’s perspective, the new form of charitable work has to be interactive in order to show that the company seeks to help address the challenges of the city. By engaging in partnerships, FoodCo can eventually ‘measure’ (Gabe) and show the long-term ‘benefits’ (Gabe) and ‘difference’ (Gabe) of CSP projects. The emphasis is on a ‘small number of significant engagements’, ‘measuring the benefit’ as well as ‘bringing permanent change’.

Yet, what it means to bring ‘permanent change’ and how to measure seem to be questions that have received little attention in the company, if any at all. When I asked the interviewees how they measured the benefits, they seemed to suggest that in most cases it is a subjective measure. The desire to build a more structured approach, however, according to the official documents, led to the establishment of a new corporate strategy and framework in 2004 which, it is believed, is crucial for guiding the company in the processes of developing new CSPs. According to the official framework, potential CSP projects need to take into account the following aspects:

Table 6. Strategic Framework for Engaging in CSPs

| Content: we set the agenda so we know exactly what our involvement will mean |
| Alignment: our engaging can be tuned to support the Group’s values by design from the outset |
| Control: we assemble the most appropriate partners to deliver the desired outcomes and so can minimise the pitfalls around high overhead associated with the large charities and the capacity limitations of smaller ones |
| Scale: maximum benefit is delivered from the available investment by concentrating it on key interventions |
• **Fairness**: we can ensure equitable distribution across all the communities of which we are a part and environments that we impact

• **Ownership**: by playing a role in managing projects we improve the chances of delivery and appropriate recognition of our involvement

• **Impact**: we can measure the outcomes against the goals-
  
  o What resources do we bring to bear?
  o How do we invest those resources?
  o What immediate outcomes does the investment deliver?
  o How do these outcomes act as a proxy for social/environmental impact?
  o What impact arises from the outcomes?
  o What is the value of the impact to the community?

• **Legacy**: our investments has a better chance of making a lasting difference

(company strategic framework)

Built around eight key aspects, the framework is believed, especially by the sustainability director, to be the first step towards achieving more strategic approach to CSPs. Yet, my analysis suggests that not all actors of the company are aware of what is going on and the potential outcomes of adopting this framework. When I asked several actors how the framework had been adopted and implemented, they stated that they were not entirely sure. So, there seems to be some inconsistency between what the framework suggests and what is actually going on.
Yet, what actors seem to emphasise is that the establishment of the charity committee in 2014 was a crucial step in building more structure in the decision making processes about community engagements and CSPs, as expressed by Napier and Gabe:

… the purpose of the charity committee is to try to go through all those applications and make sure that the money we have available to give is used in a way that is more consistent with the objectives, the objectives of the charities, not so much what the business wants because the charity committee is separate from the business. It is to make sure that we are all joined up and what we are doing is going to deliver the greatest benefit that it can. (Gabe)

The charity committee was set up to provide some structure to what was already happening and also to recognise that we all want to commit more funds to it anyway. (Napier)

According to the official documents, the committee currently consists of five members who meet regularly and discuss the issues of developing cross sector relationships and projects. The committee members are also required to participate in and attend various social events and networks in the city in order to find potential partners.

As we can see from the above narratives, various past events and situations are identified by actors as crucial factors that have shaped the company approach to CSPs. They reflected upon various historical dynamics which have influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs.

Members of CommunityCharity, too, seem to suggest that various past concerns, ambitions and ideas have influenced their decisions to engage in CSPs. According to Kaidan, who is the
current project manager of the charity, a historical concern for CommunityCharity has been to try to develop projects that can be aligned with the wider public sector projects in the city:

… we are particularly driven by public policy in terms of aligning initiative to government policies.

In this regard, the managing director Paine stated that their ‘business model’ (this is what they call their approach) is primarily around public service delivery as expressed in the following account:

The business model is primarily one of the public service delivery contract. 80-85% of our income comes from commercial contracted income being primarily in the public sector. And that sort of increased, I guess, the fiscal pressure on the public sector health provision, authority provision, finding ourselves doing more and more services...

The historical concern and aim to seek to develop partnerships with the public sector organisations has also recently spilled over into relations with the private sector, as pointed out by the MD:

Lately and recently I guess we started to develop cross sector partnerships with the private sector. This has not been historically a usual feature. And I guess that has become an interesting cultural development in terms of the organisational culture.

The emphasis on their ‘not having been historically a usual feature’ suggests that CSPs with private sector organisations are a new endeavour. Yet, ‘historical concerns’ such as seeking to develop diverse projects and aligning them with wider regional undertakings seem to have served as pre-conditions for seeking to develop CSPs.
The interest in CSPs with the private sector seems to have also been partially influenced by CommunityCharity’s desire to build some flexibility and opportunism in their approach, which the managing director view as a crucial factor for the survival of the organisation:

We are opportunistic, I mean the world we inhabit back to Neil Kendy, it is a dynamic and fast changing environment we are in the business of delivering public services which is all subject to public policy which changes at national or local level. So the world we inhabit is a very mutable and dynamic environment. You know, I think what we are able to do in our organisation is to respond quickly when an opportunity presents itself…

As such, there seems to be a recognition that responding quickly to opportunities is a key advantage in adapting to the fast changing and dynamic environment. For the development manager Kaidan, CSPs are important in this endeavour because they can create new opportunities for the charity:

…it is actually around opportunistic points I think. I think there has always been around where are the opportunities to do something different that is really going to have an impact and always work, work the gaps, where are the gaps in the market place and how do we sort of connect to that? And in many ways certainly the work with FairShare, Jackson's food distribution, manufacturing line to be honest has just been a luck and opportunity. (Kaidan)

Over the years, CommunityCharity has successfully developed and delivered a variety of CSPs with different organisations, some of which are part of:
- **Children and Young People Services Projects** - a partnership between CommunityCharity and different local businesses. With funding coming from the UK Government and the EU, the partnership strives to design and deliver a range of different programmes that help children in need.

- **The Doula Project** - a project between CommunityCharity, the Council and the Primary Care Trust. Its main purpose is to help women through pregnancy and childbirth.

- **Ethnic Minorities Programmes** - a partnership between CommunityCharity and the local council that strives to help ethnic minorities adapt to the English society and culture.

- **West Hull Community Transport Project** - a project between CommunityCharity and the city council that provides affordable transport to the people of West Hull.

- **FairShare Food Distribution** - a partnership between FoodCo and CommunityCharity that strives to distribute excess food to people in food poverty in Hull and the Humber region.

Similar to FoodCo, CommunityCharity’s narratives seem to emphasise how various historical concerns have influenced the charity’s decisions to engage in CSPs. My analysis, therefore, argues that the above presented narrative accounts seem to challenge commonsensical beliefs and official accounts which claim that CSPs are simply motivated by some pre-defined sets of dis-embodied external factors. Rather, different historical concerns of each organisation play a key role in influencing the decisions to engage or not in CSPs (I reflect upon these aspects in more detail in Chapter 9).
In the next section, the analysis further highlights how actors frame the needs to engage in CSPs in relation to their wider organisational needs and temporal concerns. A key feature in process thinking is relational embeddedness (Hjorth et al., 2015) which invites us to explore how decisions to engage in CSPs are related to the way CSP processes are linked to the wider organisational practices and ambitions of the organisations.

6.2 Framing(s) of the Needs to Engage in CSPs in Relation to the Current Concerns of Each Organisation

The outcomes of the analysis also suggest that various framings of the need to engage in CSPs also play a crucial role in the decision making processes. In this section, I extend the analysis and explore how different accounts frame the organisational needs to engage in CSPs and how they reflect upon the influence of these framings on the decisions to engage in CSPs. In particular, the analysis reveals that framings of the needs to engage in CSPs are directly related to the wider organisational processes and projects of the organisations. From a process perspective, the emergence of new processes only makes sense in relation to other processes (Stout & Love, 2013). Seeking to explore this aspect, I will analyse how actors frame the need to engage in CSPs in relation to their wider organisational concerns and how this influences their decisions to form CSPs.

6.2.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

During the first and second sets of interviews, I tried to ask questions regarding the relationship between the decisions to engage in CSPs and the wider organisational concerns and ambitions of the partners. Process analyses usually emphasise how various contextual dynamics influence the decision making processes in organisations (Bartles, 2012). According
to Langley (1999), a key goal of process research is to show relational embeddedness or how new processes emerge in relation to wider organisational processes.

In the case of ConstructionCo-KidsCharity, the interviewees provided different narratives which reveal how various framings of the need to engage in CSPs influenced the decisions to form CSPs. According to Bab, the framings of the need to engage in CSPs were directly related to what the company considered to be ‘doing the right thing’:

… it goes back to that doing the right thing. We did it (engage in CSPs with charities such as KidsCharity) because as a business we wanted to, because it was the right for the local community and the future generations as they come up through their education. It was the right thing to do. It didn't come down to profit or anything like that, because there wasn't anything there.

In Bab’s view, ‘doing the right thing’ for the community does not relate directly to profit but to the desire to help the community address its problems. Working in CSPs, as such, is seen as part of this framing of the need to help the ‘local community and the future generations’ (Bab).

A similar emphasis was also provided by Saewald, who framed the need to engage in CSPs in the following way:

That is, I guess, more of a right thing to do type of approach of partnering. It is based on relationships; we know people and we want to work with them because we have similar values and then the other side of it is where we work as a business we naturally sort of mix with the public sector, schools, hospitals, health centres... it is the right thing and the obvious thing to support.
For Saewald, ‘doing the right thing’ also seems to relate to the company’s wider approach and desire to develop long-term relationships with communities, including charities and public sector organisations. ‘Doing the right thing’ seems to be directed related to the general desire to seek to help the company develop relationships with the communities while also hoping to help address social challenges. Furthermore, the managing director also framed the need to engage in CSPs as a way to create an opportunity that benefits everyone concerned:

It is going beyond the pure transaction to somewhere that benefits all concerned, you know, because it has to be a win-win for everybody and I think we do that not purely to be philanthropic. (Parry)

The win-win logic and the potential mutual benefits were also emphasised by the communication manager, Cadee, who stated:

So that is the big thing. Benefits on both sides, if we can get involved in something that is distinctive…

According to Clarke and MacDonald (2016), businesses usually engage in CSPs because they expect a variety of different benefits. For instance, they might want to learn about new practices, gain financial benefits, build their reputations or a combination of all these (Graf & Rothlauf, 2011). According to Cadee, ConstructionCo wants to engage in CSPs because managers see these engagements as beneficial for the company because they provide:

… ‘our team and our people the opportunity to get involved in something that they might not usually get involved in... It develops those people as well, our staff, and takes the organisation forward because our people have got better skills sets that then transfers to our customers, and our customers are getting better service and it sort of
creates that circle so there is a, you know, a business benefit. It is not just, you know, the feel of writing a cheque for some, for a football or whatever it is. There are sponsors out there, it is very much a different approach why we are doing it and how we see the benefits.

In Cadee’s view, CSPs provide interactive opportunities which help employees learn and acquire new skills and knowledge. Framing the needs to engage in CSPs in this way, thus, seems to be related to potential learning benefits coming from CSPs. What is more, Quint states, the need to engage in CSPs is also part of ConstructionCo’s general strategy and leadership approach, which he summarised as follows:

I think that (working in CSPs) is absolutely the sort of things that we would do, you know, that is, fits in our strategy, you know, it makes a difference, and it isn't just about the gain, it is just not about throwing a cheque at somebody and saying ‘Yeah we will support’, it is not about that. It is more about the time you put into it, it supports us as well because you, you know, could find hidden gems, pick the people who are, have no chance, and you also got kind of control. I think this helps with the leadership side of our staff and team working.

For Quint, decisions to engage in CSPs always take into consideration the wider corporate strategy of the company, which helps ConstructionCo decide why and with whom to collaborate. In this regard, some interviewees also stated that the motive for engaging in CSPs was part of their wider strategic approach to build what they called ‘a bank of goodwill’, which essence is clearly defined in the following extracts:

Another reason, I suppose, why we are doing it (engaging in CSPs) and why we are so considerate is because when we do mess up (because everybody messes up) we have
got that bank of goodwill. So we build a bank of goodwill with our communities, with our partners, with our customers, so they think yes, they might have got this a little bit wrong and it is not the good guys because they have written a cheque and they do not really care and we never see them and they are not committed. It's the good guys because they go the extra mile, they do things a little bit different and they understand that community. And in the long run that makes a difference. (Cadee)

We do it (engage in CSPs) for the bank of goodwill. Because when we make mistakes and it happens to everybody because we are human, you get more of a break if people think you are the good guys and you’ve got relationships with them than if it is a pure type of transaction. So for the bank of goodwill reason I think … (Parry)

The above framings, as we can see, suggest that ConstructionCo frame CSPs as beneficial and needed initiatives which help the company address its wider organisational concerns and ambitions. In the case of KidsCharity, the interviewees too seemed to frame the need to engage CSPs as a way to address their wider organisational concerns such as ‘making a bigger impact’, as emphasised by Dain:

By working in partnership with other local organisations, KidsCharity can make a huge impact on improving the prospects of young people who face a variety of challenges when moving into the world of work, training or further education. (Dain)

Dain further argued that CSPs allow the charity to create new collaborative ventures, an example being one of the more recent projects which they have embarked on with ConstructionCo:
So ConstructionCo is currently building a new school for the Sentamu Academy and this school is going to be an inclusion school and we specialise in working with our client group. So ConstructionCo has funded us to do some work with young people that would be going to the new school. So it helps to build that relationship with the school, and support the school and we go into a new venture as well.

The managing director also seems to frame the need to engage in CSPs as a way to introduce KidsCharity to different networks and associations in the city:

… like I said before, success breeds success so if Parry is speaking to another key business partner he will mention that he is involved with KidsCharity when they get an introduction from that and it expands. And over the years our partnerships and links with organisations just expanded, expanded and expanded. One thing you do find about Hull in particular is that its local networks are very tight and not everybody can engage in those local networks. There is a small group of maybe 10-15 people that are key within the city, business people. They are involved in lots of things and to get an introduction into that, to have a relationship with those people is very very beneficial and that would just expand. Thankfully we are in that mix and our, we constantly get new organisations that are being introduced to us.

For Dain, the potential to engage in local networks seems to be a key factor encouraging KidsCharity to form CSPs. When I asked the managing director to further reflect on this aspect, he replied that there are also secondary benefits of working in CSPs, as described in the following extract:

That (benefits) varies I suppose, it is different, it is access to free services. Some of it is money, but the benefits are broader than that because if we can have open
communication with partners and partners show to support us, it is beneficial and the credibility of what we do as an organisation...So being part of the network is beneficial because we are having communications about the development of the city and everything that is going on. We fit into that development. But some of it is cash, some organisations do give us money to fund things and some organisations as I say give us services. I suppose there is another side of it as well, that it creates momentum. So, you know, we know Parry, we know Charlie Spencer, a number of the key players in the city and they speak to other key players in the city and introduce us and we have the communications and develops onwards. So it helps us with our credibility.

As we can see, Dain offers different framings of the need to engage in CSPs. CSPs are considered to be a useful tool for addressing NEETs’ problems because children can work with different business people:

Working alongside local business people also enables the young people to meet professionals from an array of organisations, agencies and backgrounds. Working in partnership with local business people on the boat allows the young people to realise their potential and see themselves as equals. (Dain)

The above accounts, thus, suggest that there are different framings of the need to engage in CSPs which influence the decisions to form partnerships. If managers did not frame the needs in the above explored ways, perhaps, they would not have decided to form CSPs. Despite the differences in framings, the above accounts tend to suggest that decisions to engage in CSPs are linked to the wider organisational needs and ambitions of the organisations. Some actors emphasised that CSPs help their organisations address temporal goals and ambitions, while others suggested that CSPs are part of the organisations’ wider long-term strategies. Deciding
to engage or not in CSPs, hence, seems to be influenced by the way actors frame the need to form CSPs. This aspect also points out that as the major concerns and ambitions of organisations change over time, so will be the framings of the need to engage in CSPs (I reflect upon this aspect in more detail in chapter 9). In the next sub-section, I analyse the different framings of the need to engage in CSPs in FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

6.2.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

Various actors in FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership also framed the need to engage in CSPs in different ways. In the case of FoodCo, several interviewees argued that the need to engage in CSPs is part of what the company generally considers to be ‘doing the right thing’:

It's (working with charities) not done out of a sense of obligation, it is not done or at least it is not out the sense of commercial obligation, it is done out of the sense of wanting to be seen to be doing the right thing. (Gabe)

We take the general this 'doing the right thing' looks like then let's pick up a partner, set against some criteria and then decide whether we want to achieve that and put a strategy to do it. (Dace)

Gabe’s emphasis on ‘wanting to be seen to be doing the right thing’ seems to suggest that CSPs are seen as a way to build the company’s reputation. For the HR director, Dace, ‘doing the right thing’ is also strictly related to creating more long-term value, which can only be achieved if there are some criteria and a strategy put in place. At another level, Dace and Gabe also state that the need to engage in CSPs is also framed as part of the desire to become a more responsible corporate citizen which further reflects the family values and the company’s corporate social responsibility agenda, as exemplified in the following extracts:
Now, our shareholders aren't faceless who invest money to make profit. Our shareholders find value in non-financial paybacks like being good corporate citizens, like being good members of the community, like sharing some of their good fortune to people who are less fortunate. So we are generating shareholder value by doing some of these things (engaging in CSPs). I don't know if you could put virtue on a spreadsheet so we, the company maybe attracts people as employees who are motivated by non-financial returns, doing the right, who have a responsibility to people who are less fortunate than themselves, as good members of society, the same way that you might give money to a man begging on the street. That is maybe doing the right thing. (Gabe)

It is part of our corporate social responsibility agenda and it just feels like the right thing to do. We are a family owned business, we have family values, and as I say one of values should be, we are not just in a community to make money. We should make money in the right way. And if we can help a community by being there, that works well for everybody. So, it just feels like the right thing to do. (Dace)

For Gabe, thus, CSPs generate a variety of individual benefits such as shareholder value, while also showing the FoodCo’s desire to help the society addresses its problems. In other words, the framing of the need to engage in CSPs seems to be related to the perceived benefits which the company seeks to generate through CSP projects. For Dace, CSPs are, therefore, part of the corporate social responsibility agenda of FoodCo because they reveal the firm’s family values which stress the need to do the ‘right thing’ (Dace) for the communities.

The above accounts, thus, seem to suggest that the need to engage in CPSs is framed in different ways depending on FoodCo’s wider organisational ambitions, values and goals.
In addition, several other actors also stated that the framing of the strong ‘sense of location’ of the company also influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs. For instance, Radburn, who is a member of the charity committee of the company, stated:

We are a Hull-based, you know, a Hull-based business for 140 years and I think there is a connection for the business and I notice it from going, for being, you know, out and around the people. People know who FoodCo are and they generally have a good, a good impression because we are, we are trying to be a good employer and they think, you know, and I think the charitable giving and the fact that we are focused on Hull-based charities...I think it reflects on the business, people view the business in a good way. We are not seen, you know, we are not seen as a purely commercial enterprise that is only concerned, you know, for profits and I think that, you know, we are viewed as that we have some community spirit.

According to Radburn, working with local charities helps the company build its image of a good employer who cares about the local community. The notion of a sense of location seems to refer to the desire to build the company’s reputation as a firm that is doing more than simply making profit, a view also clearly expressed by Gabe and Radburn:

We are a family-owned business. The family that owns the business is from this area and our current chairman is the fifth generation of the family. We have sixth generation shareholders on the group board and there is a seventh generation of the family alive, although not yet old enough to be taking an active part in the business. So, the company has a very strong sense of place. It has been in Hull and the Hull area since 1851 and as a result the family, the shareholders, have an in-built desire to give something back, as it were. Not because we have taken anything out but the business
should be more than just a commercial enterprise, it should serve something of a community purpose as well. (Gabe)

I think it is because, again, we are a Hull-based business, a big part of the area and have been, you know, since the business was started, you know, and, you know, I think it is important because the majority of the people in the family, shareholders, the majority of them actually live in the area. All the generations above me live within 20, 25, 20 minutes from Hull...So we have a link, you know, to this area. So we feel yes if we can do something because the other point is that nationally, Hull isn't seen as the nicest place in the world. It is, there are some deprived areas of Hull over and above as compared to other cities and there are more of them then again, we have one of the worst school records in the country, you know, the unemployment has been an issue over the years with the decline of the fishing and things like that. So obviously anything we can do to help, raise the profile and just improve the local, it sounds very passionate, improve the local area, I think, in my opinion is improvement. (Radburn)

As noticed, the narrative accounts suggest that decisions to engage in CSPs are influenced by the sense of belongingness and the desire to give something back to improve the local area. These seem to be moral reasons which reflect both how the company seeks to build its business and the ways it tries to help the city meets its objective, as stated by Gabe:

The business is trying to help the city of Hull meet some of its objectives. So we are trying to do something to tell the city, it is not necessarily about us, we are engaging with other local companies and help to that.

But the company cannot partner with all local charities. For this reason, the managers decided to set up some criteria to guide when and why to engage in CSPs. According to Napier and
Gabe, CSPs need to be aligned with wider practices and areas of expertise of the business, as expressed in the following accounts:

…we will be involved in things that are related to health, nutrition, employment, that kind of thing, because we are a food business. It wouldn't make a great deal of sense for us getting involved in things we don't have expertise or knowledge, then no engagement. (Gabe)

We see a bit of focus on children. Probably, increasingly, I would think, if we are trying to relate it back to the business, you know, food, health, education, these are the things that we care about. It seems to be the areas that we want to be focused on. (Napier)

There is, then, a strong emphasis on the connection between CSPs and the areas of business. Furthermore, managers also argued that the company tends to engage with charities in which employees are involved. Several actors reflected upon this aspect:

Well, the organisations we support are because of the family connections there. This is, organisations that we will support because there is an employee connection there and employees usually support charities that have touched on their own lives. So, you know, if your mother has been to Dove House Hospice, they will do something about it, help raise funds for Dove House or somebody, you know, we have had employees with breast cancer so every year a team of employees of Aunt Bessies will do the Race for Life so we will automatically support them and their cause and the employees who are involved. Things that have touched employees will also touch us, so we then help support them in their endeavour. (Sal)
Other charities that we support, the criteria tends to be, it needs to be in our local community, it is helpful if it is or has a connection, some connection, whether it is connected to the industry, whether it is connected to an individual, that, if there is an individual in the business who is supporting something and is working hard, then we always tend to try to help and support them. (Napier)

According to Abzug and Webb (2016), organisations who have adopted a stakeholder approach to management usually tend to identify different stakeholders’ interests and develop plans on how to address them. In family businesses, in particular, employees are often treated by managers as part of their family and, therefore, extra care is usually put in making sure that employees’ interests are addressed (Bertrand & Schoar, 2006). This too seems to be the case of FoodCo, because the company tends to engage with particular charities if its employees are supporting them.

In addition, several other managers also argued that the framing of potential business benefits coming from engaging in CSPs, such as employee recruitment potentials, usually plays a key role in decision-making processes to form CSPs. The following extracts reveal the framings of the potential business benefits, as narrated by Napier and Dace:

… CommunityCharity in particular, clearly, a lot of their efforts is in communities where there is a higher rate of unemployment and as a business we take people on an agency basis, you know, if we could have these people trained, they would be then, you know, will be the ones when we need them or we need additional staff... So when they do arrive to us then we don't have to tell them what to do, they would have a pretty good idea of what is actually happening…that is picking a partner who, you know, can deliver these things. (Napier)
This particular plan was developed by the operations director of FoodCo. It was his idea, but it was born out of the fact that a lot of the people applying for jobs appear to be very unskilled. And we do not always have the time and resources or the money to train people. We would rather bring somebody who is already, who has some skills like CommunityCharity…And as I say, somebody then had a good idea: Why don't we ask them to do a better training for young people and then we bring them in? (Dace)

Thus, according to Napier and Dace, framing the potential business benefits in terms of potential employees motivated the organisation to form a partnership.

As noticed, different accounts present different framings of the need to engage in CSPs. Some actors frame the need to engage in relation to particular business concerns, while others argue that CSPs can create a variety of new opportunities.

CommunityCharity’s managers, too, seemed to frame the need to engage in CSPs in relation to their wider organisational objectives of the charity, such as seeking to find common objectives with the private and public sector organisations, as stated by Kaidan:

We do collaborate … because it is around, it does come back to the idea of common goal, that we can't do things on our own. We need to partner and collaborate.

CSPs seemed to be seen by CommunityCharity’s employees as a way to develop and design new projects which can help them achieve their wider organisational goals. In the case of the partnership with FoodCo, CommunityCharity’s managers stated that the overlaps in areas of expertise motivated the development of different CSP projects:
We are interested in food, they (FoodCo) do food. We are from West Hull they (FoodCo) are from West Hull. We do some business principles, they (FoodCo) do some business principles. So, that was the root of it (the partnership)… (Paine)

A lot of the work we do is trying to skill people to go into employment and they (FoodCo) are an employer, so that is important. But the fact that the increasing amount of work we are doing is around food and they being a food producer, so synergy, that, so it comes on a number of levels I think. That is why it is important to engage with FoodCo. (Kaidan)

The emphasis on ‘synergy’ and ‘overlaps at a number of levels’ seems to suggest that the CommunityCharity’s managers’ framings of the need to engage in a CSP are influenced by the way they seek potential opportunities for collaboration. Kaidan’s narrative also seems to point out that the framing of the need to work with FoodCo is further underpinned by the strong notion of a sense of place. Similarly, the managing director stated that the shared history motivated CommunityCharity to seek to develop a partnership with FoodCo, as seen from the following extracts:

And actually what we said to FoodCo group is what we have in common is geography, we both live in the same place, you know. Our people and your people are the same people they have the same answers. You have been here for 180 years, I don't know we have only been here for 20 but that in my business is a long time. So we are both rooted in place, a sense of community we have both, it is that idea of common purpose I guess. (Paine)

I think what was interesting was that we have actually, something that we have a definite sense of place. We emerged from this piece of geography we are working in
this piece of geography. Our board of directors come from this piece of geography. And almost the FoodCo group itself is very much a business of a place, in this piece of Hull. So there is almost, some sort of 19th century capitalist view of the world. FoodCo group have this and acknowledge this responsibility to place in the community. So I think, you know, having talked about this cultural thing they get you. We are a business, we don't turn up and say ‘Please donate’. They get all that but actually, you know, you are also in that place, we are in that place, we can, so there was I think, we gradually established the lingua franca that was our common language that was to exchange interest. (Paine)

Paine’s emphasis on ‘common geography’, ‘the same place’, ‘the same people the same problems and answers’, ‘rooted in place’, ‘sense of community’, ‘common purpose’, ‘sense of place’ all seem to suggest that CommunityCharity decided to form a partnership with FoodCo as a result of pursuing common goals and establishing a ‘lingua franca’ (Paine). These various framings of the need to engage in CSPs, thus, seem to have played a key role in the decision makings processes to form the partnership.

A similar view was also expressed by the development manager, Kaindan, who stated that the several overlaps between the organisations have motivated them to collaborate:

I think definitely, I mean, I mean FoodCo is related to Hull, not only the bakery but when they used to run retail outlets. And I think the fact that they are a local family, you know, they recognise they have corporate social responsibility around their organisation and staff and wider population of Hull... I guess the CommunityCharity is a local charity, I think it’s synergy in which way you want to go. We are very, we realise that we could collaborate in a more formal partnership.
Last but not least, Kaidan seemed also to frame the need to form CSPs as a way to make a bigger impact at a local level in regard to the local problems of the city:

… I think it is that recognition that to coin a phrase, we are all in it together now, hopefully isn't for one, the public sector is not able to deliver what it used to do. And it is sort of collaboration and partnership and that recognition that those three sort of types of sectors, you know, have specialism and through collaboration you can get, you know, more impact. (Kaidan)

As we can see, different narrative accounts present different framings of the need to engage in CSPs. Yet, they all point out that the decisions to engage in CSPs are directly related to the wider processes and objectives of the organisations. Deciding to engage in CSPs, thus, seems to be about framing the potential benefits of engaging in CSPs. This aspect further reveals that the decisions to engage in CSPs are not straightforward, because different framings of the need to engage in CSPs might change over time and so would the desire to engage in CSPs. Furthermore, the analysis also highlights that each organisation frames the need to engage in CSPs in different ways depending on its wider organisational goals. The notion of fitting seems to be a crucial aspect in all decision making processes. Lastly, the analysis also suggests that, in addition to the different framings of the need to engage in CSPs, various power and negotiation dynamics seem to influence each organisation’s decision to engage in CSPs. Several informants emphasised these aspects, which I now turn to explore in the next section.
6.3 Power and Negotiation Dynamics

During the interviews, several actors reflected upon the influence of negotiation and power dynamics on the decisions to engage in CSPs. In particular, actors seemed to suggest that decisions to engage in CSPs always depend on the senior managers and managing directors, who have the final say.

Due to the inability to observe these power dynamics in situ, I am not able to reflect upon these aspects in great detail. However, I can briefly discuss how different informants reflected upon these dynamics and explained their influence on the decisions to engage in CSPs.

6.3.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

Decisions to engage in CSPs can be very complex (Graf & Rothlauf, 2011). Each sector pursues different short-term and long-term goals (Arenas et al., 2013) and has a different style of working which might contradict potential CSP undertakings (Murphy & Bendell, 1997). Therefore, negotiations seem to be natural processes which influence decisions to engage or not in various CSPs (Seitanidi, 2010; Moog et al., 2014). Burchell and Cook (2011) state that negotiations are an inseparable part of collaboration processes, because they partially determine individual and collective actions of actors. Furthermore, Rodrigues et al. (2007) state, negotiations are characterised by power dynamics, which additionally determine future courses of actions between organisations.

In the case of ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, several actors reflected upon the importance of negotiations in the decision-making processes. In particularly, actors stated that by engaging in different networks, managers seek to negotiate and identify what kind of CSPs are appropriate for their organisations, as Bab clearly stated:
It evolved (CSP working with KidsCharity) but like as I said, it did start from us knowing the local community, knowing people in the community. And Parry knew Dick who worked at KidsCharity and it evolved from asking, just asking questions, ‘Can you help us?’, or ‘Would you like to help us with that?’ Again, it is about relationships and respectful relationships...

By asking questions, Bab states, managers engage in negotiations which eventually influenced the decisions to establish the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership. In this regard, Lacina and Saewald also argue that power dynamics play a key role in the decision-making processes:

Cadee, our communication manager, not very much input from me but mainly the communication team will have a big decision to play in it (the decision to engage in CSPs) as well as our managing director...Lots of factors are taken into consideration to whether we do anything and to what extent we do it. Probably, more likely the MD, the company's manager. (Lacina)

I guess the strategic decision makers Parry, Cadee will make sure that it (CSP) aligns with what we are trying to achieve and makes the best impact. So it is all at different levels. (Saewald)

As pointed out by Lacina and Saewald, the final decisions to form CSPs seem to be made by the senior managers, in particular the MD and the communication manager. This aspect is also emphasised by the managing director himself, who stated:

I felt, because it was my decision. I felt it (deciding to work in a CSP with KidsCharity) was the right thing with our partners, that we would do a really good
business with them. We value, to take the boat to try to do something, these kids need education and training, and there’s been, money thrown at them for years and it didn’t work out. So we needed to do something different. So doing something different was obviously the right thing to do. And I was excited, supporting our partners was the right thing to do. (Parry)

A brief reflection on the power dynamics in the decision making processes is also provided by Quint who stated that the final decisions are taken by the board of directors and the senior managers:

I think in terms of KidsCharity, this comes from the main group, from the main board for us. I think they have to say it is in this direction... the big stuff tends to be, it comes from them anyway...

The managing director of KidsCharity, too, seemed to argue that the final decisions to engage in CSPs are taken by the senior staff. By participating in different networks, KidsCharity’s management team sought to find potential partners and decide whether to develop or not different CSP projects, an example being the partnership with ConstructionCo:

With ConstructionCo. Well, our chairman, Jim Dick, is very well linked in the city and knew Parry personally … So through Jim we spoke to some of the key people in the city, Parry being one of them and said, ‘We get all this negative press; would you stand by the side of us and support us?’ We had a lot of the key people in the city who were saying ‘No’ this is a good idea, it is a very good business plan and we will support you. And then the relationship with Parry and the ConstructionCo was just developed from then onwards. (Dain)
In Dave’s view, by participating in different networks managers negotiate and decide whether to develop different CSPs. Similar negotiation and power dynamics seem also to be apparent in FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

6.3.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

In the case of the FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership, several interviewees pointed out that a lot of discussions and dialogues at different levels influence the final decisions to engage in CSPs. The HR director, for instance, stated that before any decision is taken in relation to CSPs, there are numerous discussions between managers:

> We just discuss it. We just discuss it and if it feels right, then, you know... we would just sit and discuss each application and see if it feels like that it is a sort of charity that we should be supporting. (Dace)

For Dace, the charity committee allows members to discuss all issues before any decisions are taken to form CSPs. In this regard, Lacy, who is the chair of the charity committee, also stated that the company tends to engage in open discussions which eventually determine who they should partner with and why:

> I think we are, we are quite open enough to our thoughts. If something takes our imagination or we think is a good thing to support, we will support it. Sometimes we like to do something different and unusual. Sometimes we will take on a large project such as this Opera Systema which is going to happen over this City of Culture period in Hull.

The emphasis on ‘discussion’ and ‘open dialogue’, thus, seems to suggest that negotiations between members influence the final decisions. Radburn, who is also part of the charity
committee, further adds that the shareholders often have separate informal meetings where they discuss different issues in relation to CSPs:

… one thing we do do is discuss everything at family meetings. Everything is discussed, it is a case of the charity committee will make donations and people are happy to, you know, pass that decision making process onto the charity committee. But again everyone is kept in the loop and if there was a problem somebody would voice it because that is a family group.

These open negotiations and decisions further reveal that there is a degree of novelty in the decisions making processes. Nothing is fully determined in advance in regard to CSPs. Yet the HR director stated that CSP projects and partnerships need to be always aligned with the charity committee budget:

Normally, the decision revolves around money. So, you know, the charity committee would say yes, we will support this and we will give this much money and that is something the business has to contribute to. But at the same time the charity committee will endorse the choice, let's say, that sounds very appropriate for us to be involved in.

The interviewees argued that the establishment of the charity committee was underpinned by the idea of creating space for negotiations and discussions about different issues around CSPs. The actors also stated that this gave the charity committee power to decide with which charities to collaborate. Yet, different internal power dynamics between members can also influence the decisions to form CSPs. For instance, Sal, who is the secretary of the company, stated that the sustainability director Gabe often sought to influence the company approach to CSPs:
Gabe asked me once whether or not I think the charity committee would like to have a more rigid approach and I said, ‘We can put together a paper if you want but I think you will find Lacy would want to do her own thing or have a degree of freedom’… when I sit with the EBT committee and they say, ‘What should we do now, shall we give money for this or should we sponsor this kind of awards for employees?’, and I say, ‘Ok then, can we have some rules and regulations?’ and they would just laugh and say, ‘It is our money, Sal. If it fits we will give, it if it doesn't we won't’. You can have some basic rules if you want but they don't, they don't like to be the handcuffed, they like to be able to decide this is the right thing to do or this isn't the right thing to do. So every so often they will let me have rules and regulations and I push back to them and say that yes, we call them guidelines as opposed to rules, not having any guidelines but it's creating some more questions than I have got answers for.

According to Sal’s account, different power dynamics seem to take place at different levels. First, she argues that the sustainability director insists on having a more rigid approach, which would lead to a more structured way of dealing with CSPs. However, she further adds, the head of the charity committee would not want to be ‘handcuffed’ and would prefer a more open approach to CSPs. Second, Sal seems to state that it is the shareholders who decide because it is their money that the company is spending. So, various power dynamics might influence the processes of setting up rules and regulations about CSPs. Third, Sal states, despite the guidelines, the shareholders will often have the final say in the decisions to engage in specific CSPs.

Sal’s narrative, then, seems to emphasise different internal power dynamics which seem to influence the decisions to engage or not in particular CSPs. Since she is the secretary of
FoodCo and the main communicator between the charity committee and the shareholders in relation to the issues around CSPs, I tried to ask her questions that could allow us to reflect upon the power dynamics in decision making processes to engage in CSPs. The following table presents some of her replies:

Table 7. Narratives Reflecting Negotiations and Power Dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotations Reflecting Negotiation and Power Dynamics</th>
<th>Remark/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... the family members like it to be a bit more butterfly (making decisions regarding CSPs) if they like it they will do it, if it fits they will do it. But Gabe would like us to be more focused and this is where the money is going and we are not doing anything else outside of that, this is it and that is and then we can see that our 5000 pounds has done this...(Sal)</td>
<td>Sal reflects how different views between members seek to influence the decisions to engage with different charities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And at that meeting Gabe was proposing a slightly different approach, (has he told you about it?), so now when the charity committee are looking at things we are looking at it in terms of following the principles that he is suggesting in terms of it being in the schools that we are working with</td>
<td>Sal discusses how the sustainability director, Gabe, seeks to influence the development of a new approach, according to which, the company needs to follow some principles and guidelines in the decision making processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the bread donations and, you know, helping people through that channel as opposed to just like a scattering approach where we just give money. (Sal)

*They (the family members) don't like this handcuffing and these rules and regulations and they smile at that whenever I say ‘Come on, let's sit down and put something in place’…*(Sal)

Again, Sal discusses different power issues in relation to the approach preferred by the family members who do not seem to like the new approach very much. To use Sal’s words, the family members do not like the ‘handcuffing’ which the new approach proposes. Yet, she seems to agree with Gabe that some structure is needed.

*But at the end of the day the money is their money, it is whatever they want. (Sal)*

Sal agrees that the power of the shareholders will most likely influence the final say in the decisions to engage in CSPs.

*If Gabe gets his way, yes. But I think the family would pull back from being totally handcuffed in how we give money. And if we did that then we would not need a charity committee, we wouldn't need the family involvement and it's the family that decides how much we are giving and where we are* (Sal)

Sal reflects in detail on the numerous power dynamics and issues which take place and seek to influence the decision making approach to develop CSPs with different charities.
As we can see from the above accounts, there seem to be various negotiation and power dynamics within FoodCo which influence the decisions to engage in CSPs. As far as the adaptation of the new approach is concerned, Gabe seems to want to change the way FoodCo engaged in CSPs. Yet, he still admits that the final decisions are taken by shareholders who decide whether or not to engage in particular CSPs, as expressed in the following extract:

…at the end of the day it is the shareholders’ money, not mine. So it is important that they feel they are doing with it what they want to do with it, but they do recognise in a world where there is a lot of good that needs to be done, if we put a bit more structure in what we do then we can deliver more benefit. (Gabe)

On the other side of the partnership, CommunityCharity’s managers, too, seem to emphasise that informal discussions and negotiations impact the decisions to engage in CSPs. A clear example is the partnership with FoodCo, which started as a result of informal meetings between the managing director of FoodCo and the senior management team of CommunityCharity:

All things in this life, at the end, it all comes to the individual, you know, human contact, you know, probably two key people really, Gabe who you have met, who arranges all across the whole FoodCo and a guy who worked, who was at the
presentation I gave, originally he was working I think at the bakery a guy called Jason who became the director of Abee. He contacted me, saying, ‘I was at your presentation and the story you told, I am delighted to talk to you about how we can become more involved’. So, yeah, key individual personal relationships. (Paine)

… it was at the university business school. I turned up as an occasional guest lecturer there and I was invited to talk to the FoodCo senior management team I think there were two week sessions at the business school across the whole FoodCo group. I did a presentation on social economy. And this seemed to trigger a number of interesting individuals and so we met up subsequently and we talked about what we were doing in terms of food.

The different narrative accounts, thus, reveal that informal discussions, negotiation and power dynamics play a key role in influencing the decisions to engage in CSPs.

By reflecting upon the historical influences, the framings of the need to engage in CSPs, and the power dynamics inherent in the decision making processes, my analysis has sought to throw light on the multiple complexities influencing the final decisions to engage in CSPs. In the next chapter, I will further analyse the ongoing dynamics characterising the processual emergence of various CSP arrangements.

6.4 Summary

This chapter presented a processual-narrative interpretive account of the ways in which actors make sense of and give meaning to the influence of different historical, social, contextual and dynamics on the decisions to engage in CSPs. In particular, the chapter has attempted to provide a processual-narrative interpretation of the ways actors reflected upon the key events
and situations that influenced their organisations’ decisions to engage in CSPs. The chapter has revealed how various individuals make sense of and reflect upon the importance of different wider social processes on the decisions to engage in CSPs. It has argued that diverse historical aspects, framings of the need to engage in CSPs as well as negotiation and political dynamics have all played a major role in the decision making processes to engage in CSPs. The key argument of the analysis is that there is no one single factor encouraging CSPs. Rather, there are various social dynamics which might prompt organisations to engage in CSPs. By analysing different narrative accounts, the chapter has sought to develop a more plurivocal understanding of the actions or events that motivated CSPs. In the next chapter, I extend the analysis and explore how various accounts reflect upon the ongoing social dynamics of developing CSPs.
Chapter Seven: The Ongoing Dynamics Characterizing the Emergence of CSPs

In the previous chapter, I attempted to explore the processual emergence of the ‘need’ to engage in CSPs, or how the organisations become interested in developing CSPs. The analysis suggested that various historical, temporal as well as diverse ongoing organisational concerns and power dynamics influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs. In this chapter, I further explore the ongoing dynamics characterising the emergence of CSP processes.

According to Hernes (2008), a processual account of the emergence of social phenomena requires an analysis of the heterogeneous processes which enact phenomena. In this regard, Chia (1999) further states that process analyses need to explore how multiple processes are mobilised in bringing and sustaining particular organisational arrangements. In the case of my study, I will explore how the mobilization of multiple processes eventually led to the establishment of particular partnership workings over time. Furthermore, following Stout and Love (2013) I will also explore the relational embeddedness between the emergence CSP processes and the wider already existing practices of organisations. In other words, I will analyse the relational becoming nature of CSPs in relation to the wider practices of the partners. In particular, I will examine how CSP processes emerge from and are influenced by the wider organising processes of partners, thus revealing the embeddedness of CSP arrangements within the wider organisational practices of the partners.

Lastly, my process analysis will also analyse how various narratives reflect upon the novelty inherent in the emergence of CSP processes. According to Hussenot and Missonier (2015), various unintended effects and consequences usually create disruptions in organising
processes which in turn create a degree of novelty in the emergence of organisational arrangements. By analysing how actors reflect upon the various ongoing intended and unintended actions, I will try to throw light on novel emergence of CSP arrangements. The chapter proceeds as follows.

In the first section, I explore how different accounts reflect the numerous social interactions and processes that construct CSPs. In particular, I will examine how various narratives reflect the constantly shifting patterns of activities which construct and sustain CSP workings.

Then, in the second section, I will examine how various accounts discuss the relational becoming nature of CSP processes in relation to the wider organisational processes and concerns of the partners. As we shall see, various actors reveal how CSP arrangements are aligned to and embedded within the wider practices of the organisations, which partially influence the scope and nature of CSP arrangements.

Lastly, in the third section, I will analyse how different accounts reflect upon the novelty inherent in the emergence of CSPs. A number of interviewees described how various tensions, struggles and other contextual dynamics shaped the novel emergence of CSP arrangements. By analysing different narratives, the analysis will try to highlight how various CSP arrangements emerge in a unpredictable and novel way.

**7.1 The Emergence and Mobilization of Heterogeneous Processes**

How are CSPs enacted? How are they sustained? How are specific partnership arrangements developed and changed over time? These questions remain central to CSP research. A process view/account requires an analysis of the multiplicities of processes which enact and sustain social phenomena (Hernes, 2008). Chia and King (1998:467) state that for process scholars
‘there is an unmistakable commitment to thinking the heterogeneous becoming of phenomena rather than their manifest outcome’. That is to say, there is a need to explore how various heterogamous processes enact and sustain organisational phenomena. Hernes (2008), too, argues that the heterogeneous becoming of phenomena requires an analysis of how diverse practices and resources are mobilised in the enactment of organisational phenomena. According to Hernes (2008), it is crucial for process analysis to develop detailed investigation of the variability of actions which enact phenomena.

In this section, I will examine how different accounts depict the heterogeneous processes which enact and sustain partnership workings over time. In the first sub-section, I investigate the multiple processes and interactions which construct the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership. Then, in the second sub-section, I explore the diverse processes which construct and sustain the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

7.1.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

When I analysed the interview accounts, I paid specific attention to how actors recounted and reflected upon the different activities and actions which enact and sustain particular CSP arrangements. The analysis considered both the diversity of different accounts as well as how they describe changes in CSP activities over time.

In the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, various actors stated that partnership workings evolved from simple to more complex activities and actions over time. Different narrative accounts provided by the actors revealed how each actor made sense of their personal engagement in different events and how they gave specific meaning(s) to the mobilization of different processes in the course of establishing the partnership.
To allow participants to reflect upon these dynamics of CSP processes, I asked them questions such as, ‘How was the CSP formed?’, ‘How did it evolve over time?’. These questions allowed the interviewees to discuss how CSP processes emerged over time.

According to the interviewees, the beginning of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, can be traced back to 2009 when the parties developed and delivered their first joint project. As part of their ‘giving back initiatives’, two of the managers of ConstructionCo stated that the company helped KidsCharity refurbish and renovate its offices:

… as part of our engagement with that ‘giving back’, we helped KidsCharity get started, refurbished their office down at the marina. And that started a long-term relationship that we have had for a number of years. (Cadee)

It was about 10 years ago, we refurbished the office down there. (Lacina)

… when I joined, there was a big project to support KidsCharity, we refurbished their head office, from what I know that was the relationship before. But ever since then we have had a really close relationship whereby we almost share support... (Saewald)

Dain, who is the current managing director of KidsCharity, stated that the refurbishment of the building, although considered a small project, still required intensive mobilization of multiple interactions, meetings and engagements between ConstructionCo’s and KidsCharity’s members. For instance, ConstructionCo’s construction team had to visit KidsCharity several times to discuss different aspects of the construction work. In addition, other people were involved, such as ConstructionCo’s supply chain, in order to supply materials for the construction work, as Dain clearly points out:
…they (ConstructionCo) spoke to all of their supply chain and their supply chain supported ConstructionCo to make this building what it is today…

After the completion of this project, according to the interviewees, the partners decided to develop other projects to address their wider organisational concerns and ambitions. These initiatives required additional mobilization of various actors who began to negotiate potential future joint projects.

Several other participants stated that diverse programmes were developed, ranging from specific projects dealing with the needs of NEETs to various management training sessions. Each of these programmes required specific activities and engagement of different actors. An example is one of the most recent programmes which was developed to work with children who struggle with school, that consists of various activities dealing with young people aged 14-15, as Dain clearly describes:

Our current programme is to work with Semood Academy, with a group of young people aged 14 to 15 … this particular programme is to look, to work with a group of young people who are struggling with mainstream school and to actually encourage them to stay in this new school that is being built and looking at an alternative, different curriculum as part of that delivery.

Regarding this programme, Cadee, who is one of the persons directly involved in the delivery of the programme, stated that the programme consisted of delivering a variety of sessions to children with the hope to motivate and inspire them to develop new skills:

…we work with those who are struggling with their exams or cannot pass their exams or are not going for lessons. We pull them into the KidsCharity programme and
KidsCharity run parallel with some employability support from the business and then from our business showing the young people what you need to go forward and chatting with them about stuff. They came to our construction sites and all these young people that went through that process are all employed or in the Higher Education (Cadee).

As Cadee’s narrative clearly reflects, the development of the CSP project includes a process of mobilization of different activities with the children. For example, she pointed out that children were taken to the construction sites and given an introduction to how construction work is undertaken. In addition, employees from both KidsCharity and ConstructionCo were engaged in joint sessions with children in order to help potential NEETs acquire different skills and knowledge. In this regard, Bab, who is another person directly engaged in the delivery of the project, stated that a variety of sessions have been developed to help children acquire a range of skills, as expressed in her account:

…we do sort of brand skills like personal brand. So, why it is important to have a good appearance, good time keeping ... So, we are trying to give them better employment skills and at the same time we do mock interviews … to try to encourage them as part of a wider scheme that they are doing with KidsCharity, to try to encourage them to try to find what they enjoy to do. (Bab)

Bab’s account also seems to reveal that partnership working consists of designing and delivering different sessions between children and the employees from different levels.

Similarly, several other actors also stated that various arrangements were made in regard to another new programme called the ‘Sparks Programme’. According to the official documents,
the ‘Sparks Programme’ is aimed to engage the managers of both organisations in different activities to help children develop ‘leadership skills’. In this respect, Cadee stated:

We ran a leadership programme last year called ‘Sparks’. We were looking for people who have got the spark, you know, the leadership spark and what we were going to do is target these guys to mentor the young people on the KidsCharity programme.

This new programme seems to also suggest that managers are required to engage in a range of activities with the children in order to help them learn about ‘leadership’. Various sessions were developed to cover different topics such as business planning, team building etc., as reflected by Saewald:

September, we have a programme, it is business planning, we use that for team building and things. I have just been through the process for team building, you build plans, business plans, where you go in the morning and spend time with children at KidsCharity in the afternoon.

Various interviewees pointed out that since 2015 the development of the partnership consisted of expanding the different types of programmes, which now cover a variety of training courses between the organisations, as narrated by Saewald, Bab and Cadee:

…. we try to do an internal team building, you know, we had some of our guys on the boat who have gone sailing the Humber river, have a challenge. We have done some team building exercises, we went to water. We have used them for that kind of thing. (Saewald)

… they (KidsCharity) have the yacht and they allow us to do some training, to use it, to let some of our trainees go on that for teambuilding. (Bab)
… so for example our trainees, we have a leadership programme and our people actually go and work with KidsCharity’s people, be that on the yacht or that sort of thing. (Cadee)

The development of the partnership, thus, seemed to consist of developing new programmes which engage different actors in diverse activities. The events reflected in the above accounts all suggest that there are multiple developments and changes in the CSP workings as new programmes are established over time. The narratives also illustrate how different actors make sense of and give meaning to the different activities in which they participate. Furthermore, within each narrative, different descriptions are presented in regard to specific aspects in which each actor is engaged in relation to the development of CSP workings over time.

Although the narratives do not offer full details of the specific practices, they still reflect the variety of experiences and engagements of the actors in various CSP activities. A key outcome of the analysis is that CSP workings consist of constantly changing patterns of activities which enact and sustain CSPs over time. In the next sub-section, I briefly examine how various accounts reflect the multiplicity of processes enacting and sustaining FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

7.1.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

In the case of the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership, the organising of the CSP also seems to involve multiple interdependent patterns of actions, as expressed in different accounts. According to Gabe, who is the sustainability director of FoodCo, the partnership workings consist of multiple interactions and projects, which he describes as ‘a whole mishmash of things’:
CommunityCharity is a whole mishmash of things that we are doing with them.

During the last four years, according to official documents, the partners have successfully constructed and delivered a variety of temporal projects. Projects vary greatly, some are simple financial donations, while others are intensive collaborative projects that require employee volunteering activities, training etc. (I explore some of these below), as pointed out by Gabe:

Some of it is providing funding, some of it is providing skills, some of it is providing a labour resource through our volunteering schemes…

For all these activities, the partners need to mobilise different resources and activities in order to deliver specific parts of the projects. One example is a recent training programme, which required different mobilizations of various members in delivering training activities, as Gabe clearly describes:

… Paine, who is the director of CommunityCharity, comes along and addresses our management development course every year to give the delegates an idea of, I suppose, the environment in which our business is and the community need or what they are doing. So, training activities for our members…

The CSP workings seem to revolve around designing different in nature projects. One project, which is still undergoing, aims to train unemployed people the skills needed to work in FoodCo’s factories:

We are doing some work with them (CommunityCharity) … to get unemployed people into work. And that will develop over time into a training facility that we co-run with them. (Dace)
The idea for the project seemed to have come from the HR director of FoodCo, who wanted to try to use CommunityCharity’s facilities and skills to train unemployed people the skills needed to run the production lines in FoodCo’s factories, as Kaidan and Paine reveal:

… it was the FoodCo’s idea to develop packing line…because they saw the potential, how that could lead through training people, skilling people could actually form a pathway for their future employees to come to their factories. And I think we are interested in how we can collaborate and make younger people align to the opportunities and careers in what they actually care in the food industry. (Kaidan)

Last year we had, we worked with their HR team, you know, we looked at what the ideal employee skills set would be, what their approach would be. (Paine)

Whereas the past projects seem to have been quite insignificant in magnitude, this new big project appears to require members to meet regularly to discuss different issues regarding the packaging line facilities, as well as the type of skills needed from potential employees, as Kaidan clearly explains:

… we work with them (FoodCo’s members) regularly to start identifying training, skilling people need to actually work through their intermediately employment agency to actually get people in their factories. And that is a big piece of work that we are looking to develop over time.

According to the Kaidan’s account, the partnership workings are expected to intensify as the new project is developed, which, again, would require regular visits and discussions about identifying training opportunities. As part of the delivery of the project, the general secretary
of FoodCo stated that extra work is needed to arrange and install a production line facility at one of the CommunityCharity’s centres:

We put a production line at CommunityCharity, so when they are doing the food parcels, they don't call them that, do they? The charity bags of food. So, an obsolete production line at FoodCo has gone to somewhere within the CommunityCharity and what they are doing is they are using it to show the service users how the factory works. They are breaking down big consignments of food into smaller parcels and they are using the production line to do that, food bank parcels, that is. (Sal)

The secretary’s narrative indicates that in the future the partners are expected to engage in multiple other activities to train people in how to break down big consignments. In the long run, the project is expected to engage actors in diverse activities such as recruiting potential employees for the FoodCo’s factories, a point emphasised by Dace:

I believe it is all about training up people within CommunityCharity, giving them some basic skills which could then lead to them having jobs in our businesses in the future. (Dace)

The analysis, thus, indicates that the CSP workings evolve over time. As a result, members now have to talk to each other on a regular basis, meet up and communicate through phone calls, emails etc., as Gabe revealed:

The relationships we have with the people of CommunityCharity, my relationship is based around the emails, phone calls, meetings, every couple of months. Maybe I will sit down physically, usually because there is something that is going on that requires face to face discussion. (Gabe)
So, there are a number of channels of communication with a lots of different people at our end, a number of different people at their end and they overlap a little bit. They run more or less independently because these are independent things. (Gabe)

As we can see, CSP workings consist of ongoing interactions, discussions and relationships. The table below further reflects how different narratives reflect upon the wider range of different processes which enact and sustain the CSP workings over time:

Table 8. Different CSP Projects and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSP Projects</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
<th>Remark on the Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Refurnishing the Café Area in CommunityCharity’s centre</em></td>
<td>We have helped them (CommunityCharity) refurnish the café area. (Dace)</td>
<td>This project required mobilisation of a number of staff from both parties. In particular, CommunityCharity’s cleaning staff to deep clean the kitchen area. In addition, other members such as health and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different projects with the local council</td>
<td>We are helping them (CommunityCharity) with three government projects … (Dace)</td>
<td>managers had to be involved for different parts of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FoodCo has helped CommunityCharity with the development of various governmental projects such as the food-based production facility for redistributing surplus food to people in food poverty. Different members from both organisations have worked together to set up the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct financial donations, food donations or donations of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have certainly given them money in the past through the charity committee. (Dace)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…FoodCo is donating some equipment so they can train their trainees on an actual proper production packing line. (Sal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We donate bread to them (CommunityCharity) for their food bank. (Sal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They (FoodCo) also donate surplus food into our Fairshare bubble, so they regularly donate bread which is fantastic… (Kaidan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommunityCharity has received a substantial amount of money from FoodCo in the form of donations to support different projects. In addition, FoodCo has also given CommunityCharity food donations and recently a facility equipment to run various training programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The chief executive of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In recent years, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Training Courses

CommunityCharity comes and speaks to us on our management development programme... (Sal)

Partners have developed various training programmes that allow their members to work together to acquire a range of skills.

### Various Volunteering Programmes

Over the last year we have provided volunteering opportunities for FoodCo staff. So they volunteered in our kitchen and our community activities. (Paine)

FoodCo’s members often volunteer and help CommunityCharity runs individual projects.

As can be noticed from the table, similar to the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, FoodCo-CommunityCharity members’ narratives indicate that partnership workings are enacted by numerous processes, interactions and arrangements. CSP workings are, thus, better viewed as emergent accomplishments because they are enacted by a multiplicity of constantly changing patterns of activities. In the next section, I will analyse the relational complexities and embeddedness between CSP processes and the wider practices of the partners.
7.2 Relational Dynamics and Embeddedness

How is the emergence of CSP processes related to the wider practices of the partners? Are CSP processes strongly influenced by the wider processes of the partners and vice versa? Some process scholars have argued that in order to track the dynamic emergence of new processes, we need to explore the relational becoming nature of the emergence of new processes in relation to various wider already existing processes (Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Hosking, 2011; Garud & Gehman, 2012). In other words, because every new process emerges in relation to other already existing processes, we need to track how this relational embeddedness influences the nature of the newly emerging processes (Stout & Love, 2013). In this section, I will explore how different narratives reflect upon the interdependences between the emergence of CSP processes and the wider organisational practices of partners and how this embeddedness influences the scope and nature of CSP arrangements. In the first sub-section, I reflect upon the relational becoming of CSP processes in the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, while in the second sub-section I investigate and reflect upon these dynamics in the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

7.2.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

In addition to highlighting how mobilizations of heterogeneous processes enact CSP workings, my analysis has also sought to explore the relational embeddedness of CSP processes within wider organisational arrangements of the partners. A variety of narrative accounts reflected and emphasised how CSP processes emerge in relation to the wider practices of the partners, which partially influence the scope and nature of CSP arrangements.
In the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, several actors emphasised how CSP arrangements are developed in accordance with their wider organisational projects. More specifically, they stated that CSP projects are intended to serve as complementary practices to their wider projects which, in one way or another, influence the scope of the CSP programmes. According to Dain, ConstructionCo’s and KidsCharity’s members need to communicate regularly in order to develop close relationships which allow them to more openly discuss potential CSP projects in relation to their wider organisational projects:

…with ConstructionCo’s members, we often have meetings with them… So we have that type of communication that influences what we do. And myself speaking with the ConstructionCo’s managers basically, that is very good for me, you know, I can have very open conversations, I can ask them questions about potential projects...

In this regard, Bab too states that depending on each party’s wider emerging organisational concerns, different CSP projects are developed and initiated:

It depends really because, like KidsCharity, they can come depending on the time of the year and the support KidsCharity need. And they know that we are willing to help them, we are always ready to help them. So, if they need help with something in particular, they give us a call. At the same time, we say, ‘We’ve got two teambuilding activities that we would like to do, you guys are great at it, would you be able to help us out with that?’ (Bab)

Bab’s account, thus, seems to indicate that depending on their wider projects, each organisation might want to seek to develop different CSP projects. A number of other accounts also highlighted that programmes are embedded within the wider projects of the
organisations. For instance, Saewald stated that CSP programmes tend to be aligned with the wider programmes of the parties:

> They (CSP projects) would tend to have some, usually we have a programme which is running and generally I think there is a description probably between Parry and Dain. It would be, this looks like something that we can work well together on and they sort of have different modules and that type of thing....

Saewald’s narrative points out that various negotiations between managers (in this case Parry and Dain) seem to play a crucial role in identifying potential projects that can be aligned with both parties’ wider concerns. A clear example is a recent programme that the partners have developed to accompany the Skills Academy project of ConstructionCo. In short, the Skills Academy is a purpose-built building which the company uses to provide various services to the schools they were building:

> The Skills Academy is a purpose built building … we used it whilst we were doing the BSF school and we had in there meetings, self-employability skills, time keeping and what not, and different trades, whether construction whether it was sort of carpentry, plumbing, painting and decorating …(Bab)

For some of the Skills Academy projects, ConstructionCo seem to have invited KidsCharity to help them deliver some of the programmes, as Lacina explains:

> …after the Skills Academy came to life, it came in at just the right time of KidsCharity when they started a new programme with Job Centre Plus. So it was for people between 18-24 and they wanted to incorporate skills sessions in their 12 week
programme, every group that they have and that naturally sits in that programme, didn't it?

According to Lacina, the sessions were designed and delivered in accordance with the wider expertise and services of the parties. Another similar example is a project that was developed between ConstructionCo, Kids Charity and one of the schools ConstructionCo was building. As said by Lacina, the CSP project was linked to the various wider practices and projects of the partners:

One of the more integral ones we are doing with Kids Charity is starting in the next couple of weeks where we are working on the Inspire Academy which we just started the construction down there. Inspire Academy fits into Archbishop estate, I do not know if you know anything about the Inspire Academy but it is for, it is for young people, vulnerable people who don't fit into the mainstream. So they put them in a different building, in a different location before they are excluded so it is bit of like a last chance to lose. Kids Charity, I have got in contact with Kids Charity and the principal of Archbishop centre and have created a programme for a group of young people. So in a couple of weeks time, 30 will be going with team leaders from Kids Charity to do a team building day.

Lacina’s account, thus, suggests that the development of a specific CSP project is quite a complex process, engaging members from all three parties in designing sessions that match their wider expertise, areas of work and projects.

Descriptions of the embeddedness of CSP arrangements within wider practices are also found in other interview accounts which similarly indicate that wider practices play a key role in setting the boundaries of CSP projects.
Another more recent example is the ‘Sparks Programme’ which, according to the project manager of KidsCharity, reveals how the wider practices influence the scope of the CSP programme:

I programme manage the ConstructionCo’s Sparks Program. So the first contacts were with Parry and Paul where they indicated that they wanted to fund a programme to help young children who were at school but were not achieving what they could but had a spark in them so they could achieve more if they were given help. So we went and designed the programme linked to the Archbishop Sentimu Academy, who identified some young people who had been excluded from mainstream education but who were all still being educated by Archbishop Sentimu Academy. So we designed the programme, had two or four meetings with ConstructionCo to cheque that they were happy with this sort of programme that they were funding. We invited the school to the meetings so, they was a real collaborative venture so as to make sure that it meets the school's criteria too. (Salford)

Again, the emphasis seems to be on the embeddedness of CSP arrangements within the wider projects and arrangements of the partners. Salford’s account, thus, seems to suggest that the development of CSP projects is highly influenced and determined by the wider organisational practices of the partners.

Besides the alignment with the wider organisational projects of the parties, the participants also stated that various institutional requirements such as the curricula of schools, rules and regulations also influence the scope and nature of CSP projects, as identified in the following extract:
The school, yes, we included them from point 1 really, in that, the point was us designing was replicating what they were already doing. So, we had a meeting with the head teacher, Andrew, right in the beginning to tell him that we received the funding and this is a programme we would like to run. He was very, very keen on us to do it. So we went from, yes, so we went to the school to let them know what it is we wanted to achieve. The head teacher then introduced us to a couple of members of staff who were particularly involved with these young people. So, we said, ‘This is our overall plan, this is what we would like to do. We would like to do inspiring activities with the young people, we would like to fit it around their exam timetable’, because these were young people in their final year at Archbishop Sentimu. So we said what we wanted, it was to inspire the young people to take their exams and then make sure that when they did take them, they were in the best preparation they could be. (Sage)

According to Sage, CSP projects are developed in relation to the school exam preparations times, replicating what the school was already doing. By aligning the CSP activities with the wider school activities and exams, the partners seek to develop and deliver a range of sessions. The scope of CSP projects, thus, seems to be largely influenced by the wider temporal goals of the partners. In this regard, Bab further states that the schools’ agendas and curricula are the major factors influencing the design of CSP project:

Sometimes the schools had certain agendas that they were looking for, which might be more specifically, mock interview, CV, career advice, employability skills. So, we would do more around that or with KidsCharity it can sometimes be shorter sessions but more sessions to keep their engagement because they can often lose interest or if it is not something that they are necessarily comfortable with. (Bab)
It depended on the curriculum for the school or what project they were involved in or what other companies might want to look at. (Bab)

As seen from the above narratives, actors seem to suggest that the development of CSP projects is influenced and shaped by the different temporal needs, concerns, ambitions and institutional requirements of each party. The narratives reveal that CSP projects are not only undertaken in accordance with the wider temporal projects of the partners but are also in line with the individual skills of the employees, their roles and capabilities. The analysis, thus, suggests that the relational becomingness and embeddedness of CSP arrangements within the wider practices of the partners largely influence the scope and nature of CSPs over time.

My process interpretation of the narrative accounts, therefore, reveals that CSP activities are not independent processes that simply address a social issue outside the partnering organisations, as is usually assumed. Rather, CSP activities seem to resemble what the partners are already doing in terms of pursuing specific organisational arrangements, projects and goals (I further reflect upon this issue in Chapter 9).

In the next sub-section, I briefly reflect upon these complex relational dynamics in the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

7.2.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

The majority of the interviewees from FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership also widely emphasised how CSP workings were embedded within and influenced by the wider practices of the partners. The participants reflected upon a variety of different relational contextual dynamics which, they argued, influenced the ways in which CSP projects were developed.
For instance, CommunityCharity’s managers stated that their long-term approach to partnering demanded more intensive relationships with FoodCo rather than simple transactions and/or donations. FoodCo’s manager, Paine and Dace, too, stated that the partnership needs to be more than just a simple transaction or a quick solution:

And I think the one thing that we established very early on was that we weren't in it for a quick buck. (Paine)

Well, we like to think of it as more than writing a cheque. We would like to see what happens and like to be involved and we would rather be honest, not just writing a cheque. (Dace)

Various narratives sought to reflect how the wider practices influence CSP engagements. For instance, FoodCo’s reporting practices require regular reports on CSP activities, particularly in relation to the donations they give to CommunityCharity:

We would always want to know what you are going to spend that money on. It does not have to be too specific but what are you supporting? Where is that money going to go to? We like to see some evidence that our money goes to that, maybe going to refurbish a building, going to provide some training for somebody or something like that. We don't just give money without knowing how that money is going to be spent on. (Dace)

Dace’s narrative emphasises the specific practice that the company seeks to follow in regard to its donations and other financial investments. At another level, the HR manager also seems to suggest that CSP arrangements have to follow specific regulations and policies (such as
‘health and safety policies’) which need to be taken into consideration when developing CSP project:

…you have to be careful in terms of health and safety. If people are going to help out on a project, it got to be safe. I am not sure every charity has the resources to make sure that things are safe and, you know, they won't always be familiar with the risk assessment procedures. We can help with that because we have professionals who do that type of stuff … And if you need to put somebody in to help, just assess before we start the project and then we can do that. So health and safety is an aspect if it is a physical project. (Dace)

Dace’s account draws attention to several aspects which seem to be important in the process of developing CSP projects. First, he states that the health and safety procedures of the company must be taken or need to be taken into consideration. Second, he also points out that the company has ‘professionals’ who must address these issues. In his view, the charity does not seem to have professionals who can do risk assessments. Therefore, he is a bit sceptical about the CommunityCharity’s ability and knowledge to do the health and safety checks.

Furthermore, according to Kaidan, the company’s wider policies also determine how many days each member can volunteer for the CSP projects, unless negotiated otherwise:

… FoodCo have a policy where they allow their employees I believe it is two days volunteering opportunities a year. So I think they have been continually seeking out meaningful volunteering opportunities and as I say through that we provide the road of opportunities which go back to their staff. (Kaidan)
Kaidan seems to suggest that employees cannot engage in CSP activities for an indefinite period because the wider policies and rules dictate how many days each employee can participate in CSP projects.

Furthermore, the MD of CommunityCharity, Paine, also stated that the volunteering opportunities depend on the wider temporal operations of the organisation and therefore CSP projects must not disrupt the wider every day practices of FoodCo’s members:

… the one thing you need to do is not make life more complicated for these people. So, giving them an opportunity to do the right thing but actually, say, you can do it in a way in which it won’t disrupt your day job. If FoodCo are producing 10 million puddings per hour, you know, it is not good for me to go and say, ‘Can you, please, stop that for five minutes?’. They can't stop their day job. So, it is almost like if we are going to take their puddings off, so how can we take them off without slowing their production process?

The emphasis on the influence of the wider operational processes on the CSP projects reveals how the wider practices influence the scope and length of CSP activities. In this regard, the sustainability manager, Gabe, too, stated that CSP projects must be developed in accordance with the staff’s expertise and skills:

I don't think we are good at teaching people to fish because we are not a fishing company. We might be good at teaching people to bake; we are a baking company. So there are things that we can sensibly do with our skills for greater impact. (Gabe)

What we are doing is using our business skills, our logistics skills, our organisational skills, our communication skills, team building skills, we are using all of those to
make sure that five hundred children get a proper breakfast, that is an example of that.

(Gabe)

What our approach tries to do is to find from the recipients’ perspective what they really need doing and then using some of the skills that we have to deliver some of that. (Gabe)

Other narrative accounts further reflected how various wider temporal organisational practices influence the emergence of CSP arrangements over time. For instance, the ‘production line facility project’, which is one of the most recent programmes, is supposed to train unemployed people depending on the seasonal demands/needs for employees at FoodCo’s factories:

At the moment, the production for puddings operate from September to March, so at that time they can recruit an additional 200 hundred staff members to meet that production capacity…The bakery, their production season is the summer, so they would then recruit potentially, an additional 100-200 agency staff as well. (Kaidan)

For Kaidan, the CSP training for unemployed workers depends on the seasonal needs of the factories. So, depending on the number of workers needed, the partners will develop specific training sessions to recruit additional workers. In terms of the specificity of the trainings, Kaidan stated that FoodCo’s members identify the skills needed to operate the machines at the factories and, as a result, they are expected to spend considerable time training potential employees:

They (FoodCo) have already provided us with almost a profile of skills and qualifications that their staff would possess, so what we would do is so much build
that course and operate those skills and qualifications within that field. They know that actually we are promoting potential employees to them, they know that they will have the all basics that they need to go and work in their factory.

And one of the things, you know, that we are looking to do is to develop a welfare food distribution, in particular developing a packing line which will provide great training opportunities for employing people. But that skill set is just the skill set that FoodCo is looking for in their factories…It is anticipated that they would devote a lot of their staff time to their corporate volunteering to help establish that programme, you know, which will incorporate the donation of equipment but also staff time and that will be pretty high level technical staff time as well. So it is certainly one of the things that is high on our agenda for the next 12 months.

For Kaidan, the partnership workings co-evolve with the wider practices and organisational goals of the parties, which influence the scope and nature of CSP projects.

What is more, the sustainability director of FoodCo further pointed out that CSP arrangements have to also meet the expectations of shareholders, who have to be content with the CSP projects:

It is also important that the shareholders are also happy with it, because it is their money we are spending. This is always part of the decision making process. (Gabe)

As we can see from the above narrative accounts, CSP projects seem to be largely influenced by a variety of wider organisational practices (such as temporal needs, policies, regulations etc.). My analysis, thus, revealed that there is a direct relational interdependence between the emergence of CSP processes and the wider practices of the partners. The key outcome of the
analysis is that CSP processes only make sense in relation to the wider practices of the partners, which highly influence the scope and nature of CSP projects. In other words, CSP processes bear ‘traces’ of the wider practices of the parties. Yet, as we shall see in the next section, CSP processes are not entirely determined by the wider processes of the partners because there is a degree of novelty in the emergence of CSP processes. A key concept in process thinking is novelty, which suggests that there is a degree of self-determination in the emergence of new processes (Hussenot & Missonier, 2015). Hernes (2008) argues that novelty is inherent in all social phenomena. In the field of organisation studies, MacKay and Chia (2012) have pointed out how different choices, unintended consequences and chance can lead to unexpected directions in organisational processes. In the next section, my analysis will highlight how different negotiations and unanticipated situations can shape the novel emergence of CSP arrangements over time.

7.3 Ongoing Negotiations, Disruptions, and Unintended Consequences

In this section, I will briefly discuss how various accounts reflected upon the influence of a variety of ongoing contextual dynamics on the novel emergence of CSP arrangements. In the first sub-section, I focus on the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership while in the second I explore these dynamics in the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

7.3.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

According to Kruckenberg (2015), CSP workings can be quite complex processes because of the differences between sectoral organisations. What is more, organisational actors usually hold different perceptions and views about the design and goals of CSP projects (Vangen & Huxham, 2011). These differences, along with other contextual dynamics, might result in
numerous unintended consequences and effects. Novelty, thus, seems to be naturally evident in organizing processes (Hussenot & Missonier, 2015). Novelty, thus, seems to be inherent in the development of CSPs. According to Hernes (2008), organisational novelty can emerge in different ways based on the levels of complexity of various contextual dynamics, such as interruptions, changes of roles of actors, or unexpected technical issues, to name a few. In this regard, Hussenot and Missonier (2015) state that when actors face new situations, they might engage in different activities or invent alternative ways of dealing with organisational issues and problems that can result in novel accomplishments. What is more, Garud and Gehman (2012) state, sometimes actors intentionally strive to create novelty as a way to create new opportunities for action. Hence, whether one strives or not, novelty always seems to be present in organisational phenomena (Hernes, 2008). According to Chia (1999), it is this inherent level of novelty in organising processes which reveals that nothing can be fully pre-planned and anticipated. Facing unintended issues and situations, organisations often change their plans which, in turn, results in temporal novel accomplishments (MacKay & Chia, 2012).

Various accounts in the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership have reflected how ongoing negotiations, interruptions and unexpected events shaped the novel emergence of CSP arrangements. In particular, the participants stated that at the beginning of the partnership they had an initial idea of what they wanted to undertake. Yet, various novel CSP arrangements emerged which were not initially planned. In this regard, Bab stated that different partnership arrangements emerged by asking, just asking questions, ‘Can you help us, or would you like to help us with that?’ (Bab). She, therefore, argued that CSPs projects have emerged in novel ways, a point also made by Cadee:
We just find out what is going on with them and where we can help them. As we say, whether help in terms of, you know, help with project planning or whether it is a health and safety. So, you know, it tends to be very informal.

The emphasis on ‘informality’ in the partnership workings seems to be a key recurrent theme in almost all narratives. When I asked questions regarding how the parties develop CSPs, most of the actors replied that informal discussions and ongoing negotiations often led to the establishment of novel CSP arrangements. The emphasis on communication and discussion seems to be identified as a key aspect influencing the collaborative courses of actions. For instance, Bab states:

So if we have something that we are not quite sure or we need to question, we will just drop them a line and ask them and they will be happy to answer; at the same time, they would do the same.

They would quite happily, as it is called, drop us an email, ask a question, can you help us with this, or do you know someone that can or from where we can get this sort of stuff. (Bab)

As Bab’s account points out, communications and discussions between partners can lead to different temporal arrangements. Similar characteristics were also emphasised by Saewald and Lacina, who stated that temporal CSP projects can be developed from telephone calls or informal meetings, which do not necessarily follow any strict rules or procedures:

I think because we are quite flexible, you know, we do not have a process that we have to necessarily, we have to adhere to. (Saewald)
So they can just pick up the phone and most of us know them. So they might, you and I know quite a few people at KidsCharity and know and we can just pick up the phone and speak to them really easily. (Lacina)

The above accounts, again, indicate that there are no concrete plans which direct courses of action. ‘Formality’ does not seem to be considered important, because it can lead to limited communication between members. The following table presents different replies provided by actors on the issues of ‘spontaneity’ and ‘informality’ that can lead to the establishment of novel arrangements:

Table 9. Narratives Reflecting Informality in CSP dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reponses to the questions:</th>
<th>My Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are CSP arrangements developed? Are there any procedures</td>
<td>Cadee states that there is no central point of contact. Therefore, anyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you follow?</td>
<td>can ring anyone at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think they know that they can just pick up the phone, any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area for the business really whether it would be ringing me,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication department, whether Saewald or Parry, you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know, whether it be, whatever area you pick the phone, do you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need anything? So it does not need that formality really.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cadee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You don't need formality, you can just pick up the phone because you know that they are always there. How do we want to get to, how do we ask to do that? With KidsCharity, no, I think no, every Tuesday I ring the phone, no it is just, you just always know that if they need anything they are always there. (Cadee)

Again, Cadee argues that there is no need for ‘formality’ and that there is no plan for how the CSP workings can unfold.

… it is quite an informal sort of relationship which works well for both of us. If they need it we can help with that, we don't prescribe anything. There have been programmes where we mapped out a whole year and there has been a time where you just what do you think to do so we can try to support each other. (Sage)

In agreement with Cadee, Sage too states that the CSP activities are quite informal and nothing is ‘prescribed’ in advance.

I can ring him (Parry) and I can email him and he will meet with me and he will spend time and communication and planning as part of that. So there is no set strategy to think in the next years I want X number or thousand pounds off ConstructionCo. (Dain)

Dain emphasises how open communication is essential for planning CSP projects and that there is no ‘set strategy’ which dictates what has to be done.

As noticed, various accounts seem to suggest that CSP projects are not developed according to some pre-determined plans. Some actors suggest that CSP projects can just develop from simple informal conversations, while others state that various temporal arrangements might emerge as a result of some unintended consequences or questions. The accounts, thus, reveal that the development of CSP projects is not a straightforward process because various engagements and negotiations can lead to novel arrangements. In particular, the role of negotiations was specifically highlighted by managers as a key factor creating space for clarifications. Negotiations and open communications also seem to empower employees to take personal responsibility in relation to their wider work duties and responsibilities.
At another level, actors also widely stated that depending on their temporal needs and ambitions, various small unplanned CSP projects can be developed, as explained by Bab:

So we don't necessarily start at the beginning of the year and say we’ll do 30 sessions, sometimes it evolves depending on the situation.

It depends on what it is because sometimes we might say, ‘We’ve got a teambuilding event, it is 1 day, would you guys be able to help us out?’…It depends on what each party is looking for, the content is always the same, when we support them and when they support us but it depends on how often these things are needed really.

It depends really, because like KidsCharity, they can come depending on the time of the year and the support KidsCharity need. And they know that we are willing to help them, we are always ready to help them. So if they need help with something in particular, they give us a call. At the same time we say, ‘We’ve got two teambuilding activities that we would like to do. You guys are great at it, would you be able to help us out with that?’ It is a two way street really.

An example of how temporal needs can lead to novel CSP projects is one of the more recent leadership programmes which, according to Bab, was developed from a telephone call:

But like the leadership element that I was talking about earlier when we used the Ark building in Hull. That came from a telephone conversation and by the end of the day we had a programme of what we were going to do for six months…so even from a telephone call that is a six months programme…

Temporal needs, then, seem to be able to lead to different temporal novel CSP arrangements.
In addition, several actors also seemed to suggest that unexpected issues, challenges, and problems can create modifications in particular arrangements, as seen from the following extract:

It is not a very easy relationship, let me explain this. It is not just the case of Parry rolling over all the time, ‘I will do that for you, I will do that for you’. He will challenge us, he will hold us to account and he will constantly ask us things like, ‘What are you trying to achieve? What is your business model around it? What does success look like? Why you are doing it? Why are you doing it in that way? What is the evidence behind?’, which is exactly what we need. And I think that is what makes the relationship strong with a key partner because what you don't want is just somebody to put it (money) in your pocket and you spend the money without having a clear understanding of what it is for, what is the impact, because if there is any problem, or something goes wrong, it can end our relationship. (Dain)

According to Dain, there are always numerous questions and challenges in CSP workings which can lead to new directions. In this regard, he further states:

We always face issues because that is part of the development and that is part of the moving on. But I think the key is how we deal with that. And if you've been very clear, if you've scoped it out and people understand what we are doing, when you are not hiding any of those problems that arise, you openly discuss how we have got into this situation, whatever it might be: ‘We just want to let you know about it, this is what we are planning to do. Are you happy with that? Do you think we should do anything differently?’ It's, myself, I have always worked like that and I find it very beneficial and the response you generally get from partners is very very positive. So,
you know, everybody accepts that things might go wrong and you have to modify and adapt. I think problems can occur if you are not open and frank and do not have that relationship, to have those conversations with them. If you try to hide something it is not going to work because people will find out in the end. So it's much better to put it on the table and say, ‘This is going wrong’ or ‘We have to change this X, Y, Z. What do you want us to do about it? Are you happy with our response? What do you think?’

Again, there is an emphasis on modification, adaptation, and open dialogue, which are seen as crucial for overcoming challenges. What is also interesting to note is that problems are not perceived as something negative or wrong but as a way of ‘moving on’ (Dain). Dain seems to suggest that the ‘ways we deal with them’ is more important and crucial for establishing different CSP arrangements. From a managerial perspective, Dain also seems to argue that informal negotiations have played a key role in addressing problems and determining future courses of action.

Yet others, such as Mario, emphasise that the initial agreements usually play an important role in dealing with unexpected events and situations:

I think very rarely does something crop up but from time to time we do do that. There is, a lot of it is I would say, it is the importance of what we agree on day one. So, for example, if we agree that there is a scope of, of, for a school and then somebody comes along and says, ‘Where is my swimming pool?’, well sorry but we never agreed there was going to be a swimming pool on day one. There is a lot of it, it is the importance of what did we agree on day one…

Initial agreements are seen by Mario as another key factor for dealing with unexpected issues. Agreements set the boundaries and seem to help partners define the scope of CSP projects.
What is, thus, worth noting is that some interviewees emphasised the importance of ‘informality’ while others stated that initial agreements determined the future courses of actions in the CSP projects. This inconsistency seems to come from the specific engagements and perceived responsibilities of each employee in different CSP activities. Each actor seems to engage in specific activities and so reflects her or his personal experiences in relation to the ongoing issues and unexpected events influencing the novel emergence of CSP projects. Yet, what all interviewees seem to agree on is that the scope of CSP projects is not entirely pre-determined or pre-planned and that different CSP projects might emerge in a novel manner. In this regard, Bab states that the CSP workings might evolve over time in different directions:

I think we will maintain what we do and that may naturally evolve. So we may do less with private more with public, less with public more with non-for-profit, more with the local community, more with our staff, maybe more or less with KidsCharity I think, I don’t think you can plan for something like that because it becomes a task, if you plan that is direct, the next five years this is our plan, this is how much we give ourselves a budget, staff time and this amount, it becomes a chore, it becomes a job where someone has to try to meet these targets and it takes that special engagement, that interaction away from it…I think it depends on the project that we get involved in so if our local area stretches that little bit further from Hull, maybe Hull and Humber, then we might do some more regional things. So it might be new communities that we work in, I think it does depend on where we work as well.

Bab’s account, thus, suggests that planning beforehand is not entirely necessary because the company can develop different CSP projects depending on its ‘future work and business projects’. So, different temporal needs and goals might lead to new novel CSP establishments.
As we can notice, the analysis highlights that both intended and unintended consequences might shape the emergence of CSP projects. Various actors reflected how their different negotiations, chances, and unanticipated effects shaped the novel emergence of the CSP over time. As we shall see in the next sub-section, similar types of dynamics are also evident in the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

7.3.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

In the case of the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership, various actors also reflected how ongoing negotiations and unexpected events have shaped the novel emergence of CSP arrangements.

The analysis of the interview narratives suggests that diverse ongoing internal challenges and issues influence the novel emergence of CSP workings. In particular, actors stated that issues might emerge in the process of seeking to align the CSP activities with their wider organisational roles and responsibilities of the parties. In addition, several managers also stated that technical issues have also created various problems that led to numerous modifications.

At a communication level, the partners stated that they did not have any concrete plans to guide the partnership workings. This, however, often led to misunderstandings and problems regarding the delivery of projects. In order to minimise communication issues, several actors stated that regular discussions were needed to address ongoing challenges and problems. In the majority of the interview accounts, informal negotiations were emphasised as key mechanisms for dealing with issues. In this regard, Dace stated that there is no one single person responsible for the delivery of the CSP projects:
There is not any one point of contact in terms of developing CSP projects...

Rather, Dace argued, through regular visits and interactions, CommunityCharity and FoodCo’s members develop different temporal novel CSP arrangements. In this vein, Gabe and Paine too argued that there are no strict plans or protocols to dictate what is undertaken, why and how:

And there is no formal, written procedure as to how we go about, it is done by discussion, in quite an ad hoc way. (Gabe)

So, I think it is an evolutionary thing. There isn't a plan written anywhere and the key personal relationships and it seems to be because we leave a lot of time for that to evolve. (Paine)

The emphasis on ‘evolutionary thing’ and ‘no formal written procedure’ seems to suggest that there is no direct management control on CSP activities. Not having a written procedure, however, can put an extra pressure on employees to take personal responsibility in the processes of developing CSP projects. The preference for a more informal way of dealing with CSP projects is also identified as a key feature in CSP arrangement, as stated by Paine and Gave:

In the end, we just said we would make it up on a day to day basis… We do not have a memorandum of spending; we do not have written protocols. We talked to each other a lot. (Paine)

… we make it up as we go along. And I think that worked…I think by learning as we go we, with a lot of repetition we managed to identify common interests, mutual interest, mutual benefit, you know, by allowing us to develop the relationship, we
managed to get to a point where, you know, we trust each other, it is comfortable, you know. (Paine)

Again, there is no formal file that says this is our CommunityCharity strategy in quite that way. It is dispersed. (Gabe)

Paine and Gabe’s accounts seem to emphasise two important aspects which lead to the establishment of novel CSP arrangements. First, Paine states that the actors prefer to ‘make it up on a day to day basis’, which can be interpreted as a tactic that gives them freedom to improvise. In this regard, Pain also argued that ‘learning as we go’ seems to be a more flexibility approach which allows members to adapt to changing conditions. Second, Gabe also stated that the development of CSP projects is ‘dispersed’, which indicates that there is no a concrete plan that tells actors what to do. The ad hoc nature of developing CSP workings seems to be the favoured approach by the partners because it allows actors to talk to each other more openly, as stated by Gabe:

The relationships we have with the people, with CommunityCharity, my relationship is based around the emails, phone calls, meetings, every couple of months. Maybe I will sit down physically, usually because there is something that is going on that requires face to face discussion. So if, for instance, we are doing some work on a breakfast club scheme for children’s centres at the moment. If it gets to the stage where that has moved on to a level that needs a debate, then we get together, otherwise we wouldn't probably routinely. So, that is quite ad hoc.

At a communication level, Gabe further stated, there are a variety of channels by which to converse:
So, there are a number of channels of communication with a lot of different people at our end, a number of different people at their end and they overlap a little bit. They run more or less independently because these are independent things. When we speak to them or when I speak to them I always try to understand what else there is that they are doing because they are closer to the community needs so they are a good source of information.

Gabe’s account, however, raises important questions about the links between different independent channels of communications, in particular how they are coordinated in relation to the design and delivery of the specific projects. In this regard, the MD of CommunityCharity, argued that trust is essential for sharing ideas and communicating understandings between members:

So I think it is an evolutionary thing, there isn't a plan written anywhere and the key personal relationships and it seems to be, because we leave a lot of time for that to evolve. That seems to be based on trust and mutual respect and that works well I guess. (Paine)

For the MD of CommunityCharity, this approach seems to ‘work well’ for the partners. In his view, ongoing discussions based on trust and respect allow managers to discuss and address problems as they arise. On the other hand, however, not having concrete plans and tools can lead to numerous unexpected issues. Napier, for instance, stated that the lack of direct control does not help managers keep track of who is engaged in different volunteering opportunities, as seen from the following extract:

… we do volunteering in a number of places and I am not sure, I couldn't tell you where everybody, where everybody has been volunteering. But I am sure that some
would have been there, I didn't know that the kitchens at Fairshare, our hygiene team from Aunt Bessies went there and cleaned there for a day, for example. And undoubtedly someone from Aunt Bessies will have to go and show them what is expected from them on the production line. So, yes there is quite a lot of engagements that go on between the two and Gabe is obviously our sort of link between the two.

Napier seems to heavily rely on Gabe for keeping track of and making arrangements with CommunityCharity’s members. Not having direct control and a plan, however, does not seem to bother the MD who argued that a more open approach is better for dealing with CSP arrangements.

The MD of FoodCo, too, seemed to argue that open discussions and informality allow managers to develop CSP projects based on their preferences. So, if any unexpected consequences happen, the partners can develop new CSP arrangements as needed. A clear example is the way the overall nature and scope of the partnership projects evolved over time, as pointed out by Paine:

We set up with Gabe, one of the first projects was to look at developing a network for breakfast clubs at primary schools and the FoodCo’s family wanted to fund it. And the more we went into it, it did not make any sense. So we very quickly said, ‘We are not going to do that’. So that was our first project we did not pursue it because it did not make any sense. But we decided we would find something else that did work well. So it is almost like ability to be honest to each other and that one did not work because it just was not right.
According to the PM’s account, CSP projects might change depending on managerial perceptions of the usefulness of particular CSP activities. He seemed to also argue that an activity-based management is quite useful in this regard:

I think we have an activity-based management strategy which means we make it up as we go along ... I think by learning as we go we, with a lot of repetition, we managed to identify common interests, mutual interest, mutual benefit, you know, by allowing us to develop the relationship, we managed to get to a point where, you know, we trust each other, it is comfortable, you know. If I and Gabe have not showed that, you can’t do, no. (Paine)

As we can see, the above narratives suggest that a range of dynamic activities, such as ongoing negotiations, addressing temporal challenges and unexpected events might lead to the novel emergence of CSP arrangements. The majority of the interviewees reflected how different negotiations and ongoing informal challenges influenced the emergence of specific CSP arrangements.

Similar to the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, the narratives in FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership suggest that difficulties and challenges are common in the processes of developing CSP arrangements. Whether it is health and safety issues, the technical side of installing equipment or the coordination between different activities, actors pointed out that various contextual dynamics might lead to novel directions.

The different narratives also offered reflections on the working relations between employees and the way they make sense of and give meaning to their experiences in the various CSP processes. The noticeable differences in the accounts also revealed that there was not a straightforward way of dealing with issues, because different actors engaged in different
spontaneous activities in order to manage different parts of the CSP projects. Such ongoing contextual dynamics, unexpected events and negotiations helped us get a glimpse of the complex novel emergence of CSP arrangements over time.

7.4 Summary

This chapter has attempted to provide a processual interpretation of the emergence of CSP arrangements. In particular, it argued that the emergence of CSPs involves acts of mobilization of diverse processes which are related to and embedded within the wider practices of the partners. Furthermore, the analysis also argued that the wider practices do not fully influence the scope and nature of CSP processes because a variety of contextual dynamics, negotiations and unexpected events might lead to novel CSP arrangements.

By reflection upon the novel relational becoming of CSPs, the chapter has drawn attention to the delicate and complex contextual dynamics and conditions (such as unanticipated events, ongoing negotiations and institutional requirements) which might influence the novel emergence of CSP arrangements.

The key outcome of the analysis is that actors engage in iterative activities which are interconnected with their wider everyday working practices. As their wider organisational practices and tasks change, so do the scope of CSP processes. In addition, the analysis reveals that actors face numerous issues and unexpected events in the processes of developing CSP arrangements which can result in the establishment of different temporal novel organisational engagements. Various ongoing negotiations and unexpected consequences, thus, seem to play a crucial role in shaping the novel emergence CSP arrangements over time.
In the next chapter, I extend the analysis and explore how the partners construct the positive and/or negative aspects of their CSP arrangements and how these narrative constructions seek to legitimise or de-legitimise particular CSP activities.
Chapter Eight: The Legitimisation of CSP Workings

How are CSP workings legitimised? Why do partners continue working together? How are the positive and negative effects perceived by the organisations and their employees? In this chapter, I explore how different narratives/actors construct the positive and negatives effects of CSPs and how they legitimise particular CSP activities. From a process thinking view, it is important to explore the continuity of CSP processes. According to Hernes (2008), organisational processes do not happen for no reason. Rather, he states, organisation processes construct and revolve around particular themes which he calls ‘plots’. It is the construction and circulation of different themes over time which, in one way or another, enables the continuity of organising processes. Hernes (2008:134) says:

A central question is: what enables continuity? Reiteration constitutes continuity, but it is not by itself sufficient to enable continuity. Reiteration needs to be performed around a theme that provides meaning to the acts of iteration. Reiteration consists of numerous processes, but for it to provide for continuity it needs to relate to a theme, to a distinction that marks the difference between one organisational setting and another.

…in all thinking there must be some (original emphasis) topic or subject about which all members of thought revolve. That ‘something’ around which connecting operations coalesce is what I call a ‘plot’.

Hernes (2008) calls ‘themes’ or ‘plots’ the repeated, shared and circulated refrains or patterns of words around which organising processes revolve. By analysing the different ‘themes’ around which organizing processes revolve, we can explore how ‘some sense of connection’
(Hernes, 2008:136) is created between members/organisations and how this encourages actors/organisations to continue engaging in particular organising activities.

Following Hernes (2008), in this chapter I attempt to explore how the partners construct, reconstruct and circulate different themes around which the partnerships revolve. By doing so, I attempt to analyse how these narratives describe the positive and negatives aspects of CSPs and how these accounts legitimise or de-legitimise particular CSP actions. For analytical clarity, I have divided the ‘themes’ into two main categories: ‘broad themes’ and ‘specific themes’. The ‘broad themes’ tend to portray CSPs as beneficial for the wider communities. The specific ‘themes’, on the other hand, seek to describe the individual benefits of CSPs for each party. Although there are several overlaps between the broad and specific themes, I hope that the analytical separation will help the reader more easily grasp the ways in which partners legitimise or de-legitimise particular CSP activities. The chapter proceeds as follows.

In the first section, I focus on the ‘broad themes’. These are ‘themes’ which seek to emphasise how CSPs can help us fight poverty, decrease unemployment and address hunger, to name a few. Various broad ‘themes’ are widely shared, repeated and circulated among the members of the partners. They usually depict CSPs as activities that help communities address their needs and problems. In the second section, I explore and analyse what I call ‘specific themes’. These are ‘themes’ which describe the individual benefits of CSPs for each party.

8.1 Broad Themes

The important role of legitimacy in organisational life has been widely acknowledged in recent organisational research (Brown, 1998; Sillince & Brown, 2009; Joutsenvirta, 2011; Marano & Tashman, 2012; Glasbergen, 2013; Baur & Palazzo, 2015; Rueede & Kreutzer,
In today’s dynamic environments in which organisations operate, questions arise regarding the kinds of activities they engage in (Rueede & Kreutzer, 2015). As a result, organisations must constantly legitimise their actions to different external and internal stakeholders (Brown, 1998).

In this first section, I explore how the partnerships attempt to establish their legitimacy by analysing the ways in which actors describe the potential broader effects of CSP arrangements at different societal levels. In particular, the analysis highlights how various accounts depict the positive benefits of CSP undertakings. In the first sub-section, I focus on the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, while in the second sub-section I concentrate on the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

8.1.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership

During the research, I asked diverse questions which aimed to encourage actors to reflect upon the reasons for continuing to work together. By asking such questions, I attempted to analyse the different ways actors frame and perceive the benefits of CSP arrangements and to examine how they legitimise or de-legitimise particular CSP arrangements.

In the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, actors provided various accounts which presented different reasons for continuing to work together. In particular, I have identified three general ‘themes’ around which the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership seems to revolve. These are: ‘doing the right thing’, ‘leaving a legacy’ and ‘doing good, feeling good’. These themes present different reasons and motives for sustaining CSP workings and so present different ways of legitimising the partnership over time.
The ‘doing the right thing’ theme denotes a general notion of ‘doing something right’. Both parties seem to argue that CSPs are the ‘right thing to do’. According to Parry, the MD of ConstructionCo:

…doing the right thing is all about being respectful of yourself, other people, the community etc., and once you do that people respect each other, have good teams, they watch out for each other, they watch out for each other's backs and it all springs from being respectful and doing the right thing by each other, by your clients, by the community and always not by policy, not by rules and awards or monitoring value, but by a moral compass.

Parry seems to argue that ‘doing the right thing’ is more than simply following policies and rules. In his view, developing CSP projects is a way of tackling social issues. In this regard, he further states:

It (working in a CSP with KidsCharity) just feels like the right thing to do. And of course at higher level I have more to say than more people and it feels like the right thing to do, to say, ‘I really think we should do this’.

The ‘doing the right thing’ theme, thus, places some emphasis on developing CSPs as a way of ‘building a sense of community’ (Parry). CSP projects are considered voluntary activities which reveal the desire of the business to do something more than just make profits. For Parry, ‘doing the right thing’ is also linked to idea of giving something back to communities:

And giving back to the community that is giving us a living is the right thing to do.

Other interviewees have also pointed out that CSPs are generally considered to be part of what the company commonly refers to as ‘the right thing to do’, as stated by Bab:
We did it (engaged in a CSP project with KidsCharity) because as a business we wanted to, because it was the right for the local community and the future generations as they come up through their education. It was the right thing to do.

On the other hand, actors such as Saewald also stated that CSPs are needed to develop collective efforts in order to help the city prosper, as seen in the following extract:

Because as a business, again, you might think, why do we bother…but if you look at the start of how much of a drain on the local economy those people are, when they fall in that category, when they are claiming benefits, everything else that comes with that, if you get an alcohol problem, drugs problem, the strain on the NHS, then that impacts our local economy, impacts the business community. So, that is, it is the right thing to do but also benefits the local economy. (Saewald)

Saewald’s account, thus, links the notion of ‘doing the right thing’ with economic reasons and to some extent moral beliefs. For him, CSP projects tackle local issues which make them economically vital, because they help the city prosper, which is ‘the right thing to do’ (Saewald). The narrative seems to suggest that CSP activities are legitimate because they produce various positive effects at societal and economic levels. The notion of ‘doing the right thing’, however, is not a universally accepted behaviour or set of universal beliefs, but rather seems to be what the company members specifically define or consider to be the positive effects of CSPs. In other words, ‘doing the right thing’ is a specific way of framing the benefit of and the need to engage in CSPs to tackle specifically defined issues.

Other actors also pointed out that CSP projects are legitimate because they ‘leave legacies’ to the communities. The theme ‘leaving a legacy’ was widely emphasised as a key factor
encouraging the partners to continue working together. The MD of ConstructionCo, Parry, states:

So leaving a legacy of a better community. When we did the home schools, 21 schools for building the schools for the future, we could only leave 21 shining schools at that, but we wanted to leave role models, we wanted to leave principles, we wanted to leave a glimpse of the world of work for the kids, we wanted to leave micro charity work around the school, you know…? So the legacies, what is left after we have finished those schools and hopefully they are some jobs and careers, there is some training, there is some awareness of working with some rules, models, it is nice that we have gone beyond the contract.

For Parry, ‘leaving a legacy’ seems to be both about providing communities with better services and creating opportunities for people to take advantage of. In addition, by developing CSP projects, the company also seems to seek to build its image of a firm that provides extra customer services to its clients. Such endeavours are believed to eventually help the company create new business opportunities. In this regard, the notion of ‘leaving a legacy’ is also related to the ways ConstructionCo uses CSPs to provide more innovative services to its customers. Despite portraying CSPs as positive effects for everybody, the ‘leaving a legacy’ theme in fact seems to suggest that the company only engages in CSPs in order to address its customer service issues or ambitions.

What is more, because CSP projects only tackle specific issues, they can be said to target and leave legacies only to particular groups of people and not all communities in the city. For instance, Parry states that ‘leaving a legacy’ is about providing services to children in need, in the hope of helping them advance their career paths:
We leave a legacy whether it is one star fish or a number of star fish that could have been imprisoned or living a life on the edge. They will be in the world of work and learning. So I think if we could say through KidsCharity we have saved half a dozen, 10, 12 people, you know, you might say that is not a lot of people in the image of Hull. But it is 12 peoples' lives. And a whole lot more are having a chance of choice, what people need, these are choices. If people have opportunity to go on that programme, to see the world of work, to come and have mentors and work on that and come out qualified for food hygiene or whatever the cause is, education as well, there is not the 12 we have saved, we also gave a chance to dozens of others and that is a personal responsibility that were taking, to take the task on.

The notion of ‘leaving a legacy’, thus, seems to suggest that CSP are legitimate tools for creating positive impacts for children at different levels. A variety of other accounts further reflected upon similar aspects, some of which can be seen in the following table:

Table 10. Leaving a Legacy Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaving a Legacy Accounts</th>
<th>My Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I think it is just as much about leaving them at the building as well but leaving them also with the legacy. So you know when the young people start the Inspire Academy hopefully they will, we will leave them with a legacy there with the programme</em></td>
<td>Lacina reflects upon the importance of working in CSP projects to leave a legacy to the schools. She states that CSP projects ‘have done something pretty amazing in the community and the area’ which can be interpreted also as a way of showing the positive of CSP projects and encouraging the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(with KidsCharity) that we have done with them... It is about knowing that we have done something pretty amazing in the community and the area. (Lacina)

That to me is about leaving a legacy, the KidsCharity side of it. Again, it is the KidsCharity that is leaving the legacy for those kids that have come out of the school without education, you know, and have gone on and have learnt some new skills that give them new life confidence and hopefully make them go off and get themselves a job or continue with education or whatever it is. We give them some new aspiration. So I think in the linkage with KidsCharity, they should take the credit for taking, for making the legacy. But I think we can be proud that we were there from the start to support them. (Saewald)

Saewald states that the KidsCharity are the ones leaving the legacy. Through the CSP projects, the company hopes to leave legacies to the children as well as to the school they are building. Leaving a legacy seems to be related to ‘aspirations’ and notions of having done something different.
In terms of the programmes that we develop as well, part of leaving the legacy is that we search on it, and the points we touched, it is, part of the legacy is the looking local first and what that leaves to the economy.

(Cadee)

Cadee also states that leaving a legacy is about the ‘emotional side of CSP projects’ as well as the economic benefit at a local level.

As can be noticed, the ‘leaving a legacy’ theme seems to suggest that partners need to continue working together because it is ‘beneficial for everybody’ (Parry). In most accounts, the central emphasis is on the positive relationship between addressing community issues while also helping the organisations achieve their wider organisational goals.

In terms of the third theme, ‘doing good, feeling good’, the analysis also suggests that various accounts generally consider CSPs as positive engagements which create positive feelings in employees, as narrated by Lacina:

I think it is the feeling probably that we create. That you are doing something for other people, doing something good for other people and you think that can help them improve lives, it can improve their community.

Parry and Bab, too, depict CSP projects as positive experiences which create stories and anecdotes:
I think the anecdotes are more valuable. The anecdotes and that you remember that those kids witnessed protection...you know, they got proper jobs, they got self-esteem and they are talking again and that is anecdotal feel good. (Parry)

…. it’s about stories, it's about motivation, it's about engagement, it's not about statistics, it's not about ticking a box for helping people, it's doing it because you actually want to physically help those people in whatever way we can. (Bab)

CSP projects, thus, can be viewed as a legitimate way for creating positive experiences which are valuable for both employees and children in need. In this regard, Salford states:

… it is quite nice for the young people to hear from other voices, peoples' experience, and ConstructionCo as an organisation is very, very forward thinking. Because they have a whole lot of people at senior level who have come from different backgrounds…So that is really positive....

A common characteristic in the ‘doing good, feeling good’ theme is, therefore, the potential benefits of CSPs to create positive experiences for employees and NEETs alike. These effects are presented as key outcomes which legitimise CSP projects and encourage the partners to continue working together. Despite the multiple challenges, problems and issues which actors face in the processes of developing CSPs (explored in the previous chapter), they still tend to consider CSP processes as positive engagements which enrich their experiences.

As we can see, the above narratives use different frames to construct the positive aspects of CSP projects. They suggest that CSPs are part of what the partners consider to be ‘doing the right thing’, ‘leaving a legacy’ and ‘doing good, feeling good’ initiatives. What is more, they throw light on how the partners seek to legitimise their engagements in various CSP activities.
In the next sub-section, I briefly explore how different interview accounts construct a range of ‘broad themes’ which, in one way or another, seek to legitimise the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

8.1.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

Similar to the Construction-KidsCharity partnership, I have identified several broad themes around which FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership revolves. These are: ‘sense of place’, ‘making a difference’, ‘doing the right thing’, ‘common purpose, mutual benefits’ and ‘helping people in need’.

When I asked the interviewees to report why they continued working in a partnership and how they perceived the benefits and legitimacy of CSP projects, a variety of explanations were provided.

One strand of explanation drew on the notion of ‘sense of place’. According to the chief executive of CommunityCharity, Paine, both organisations have very strong sense of place and share similar concerns which encourage them to seek to develop meaningful ways to collaborate:

I think, what was interesting was that we have a definite sense of place. We emerged from this piece of geography, we are working in this piece of geography. Our board of directors come from this piece of geography. And almost the FoodCo itself is very much a business of a place, in this piece of Hull …FoodCo have this and acknowledge this responsibility to the place in the community.

I think the sense of place is important, that fact that FoodCo are FoodCo. If FoodCo were, I do not know, you know, a multinational bakery based in Ohio and this was one
of their 40 plants that they have globally, that would be different. Somewhere the fact that they are who they are and where they are, I think it has been a very particularly positive part for our relationship.

Paine’s use of expressions such as ‘sense of place’ seems to suggest that having a common geography requires working together to solve common issues, which encourages the organisations to continue working together:

And actually what we said to FoodCo group, what we have in common is geography, we both live in the same place, you know. Our people and your people are the same people they have the same answers...So we are both rooted in place, a sense of community, we have, it is that idea of common purpose I guess. (Paine)

Paine emphasises the importance of sense of place, which he sees as the main factor sustaining the partnership workings. A similar view is also shared by the sustainability director of FoodCo, Gabe, who further states that partnership activities aim to improve Hull, as seen in the following extract:

… Hull becomes more attractive place for people to live and work...we have done anything to contribute to that... So inevitably Hull becomes a better, brighter, happier place...

Other actors, such as Sal, also claim that CSP projects improve the community by helping unemployed people find jobs:

So actually we bring up enrichment in the area, not only are we bringing jobs and helping, putting money into that community but more so doing other things. It is not all about the money, it is about us interacting with the community and helping them.
Having a ‘sense of place’, however, does not necessarily mean that FoodCo would simply cooperate with all charities in the locality. There are some other views that encourage the partners to continue working together. In addition to the ‘sense of place’ theme, my analysis further suggests that members of the organisations also frame the CSP projects as tools that can ‘make a long-lasting difference’, which motivates them to continue working together:

… we feel we have the ability to make a difference, however small. We have the ability, be it through cash, products or time, to make, you know some difference. (Radburn)

It is not about giving a cheque, it is much more, what is says, about you as an organisation helping people who need help …making a difference… (Napier)

There is a widely shared belief that the partnership can achieve particular long-term results. The legitimacy of the FoodCo-CommunityCharity CSP activities, thus, seems to be related to the desire to make a difference, however small. Yet, questions regarding what it means to make a difference or how a difference can be measured seem to have received little attention by the partners.

In terms of the third theme, ‘doing the right thing’, the analysis suggests that several narratives depict CSPs as part of what the partners define as ‘doing the right thing’. The following table provides some reflections on the relationship between CSP activities and the notion of ‘doing the right thing’:
Table 11. The Notion of ‘Doing the Right Thing’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links Between ‘doing the right thing’ and CSP activities</th>
<th>My Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...it just feels like the right thing to do. We are a family owned business, we have family values, and as I say one of values should be, we are not just in a community to make money... And if we can help a community by being there that works well for everybody. So, it just feels like the right thing to do. (Dace)</td>
<td>Dace states that family values stress the importance of continue working in CSPs and therefore the company strives to commit to these values. He also states that there is a general notion that CSP projects ‘benefit everybody’, which also legitimises CSP activities over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I suppose, being seen to be doing the right thing ...(Kaidan)</td>
<td>Kaidan states that CSP projects achieve a company’s aim of showing the public that they are ‘doing the right thing’ for the communities in which the company operates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the collective of that is that the organisation seems to be doing the right thing. (Napier)</td>
<td>Similar to Kaidan, Napier states CSP projects are meant to show the public that the company ‘is doing the right thing’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above quotations provide different reflections on how actors associate CSPs to the notion of ‘doing the right thing’. The accounts seem to legitimise CSP activities by claiming that they are doing ‘the right thing’ at different levels. Furthermore, Kaidan also stated that CSP
activities are also ‘doing the right thing’ in regard to the PR and marketing strategies of the company:

… I suppose, being seen to be doing the right thing in terms of PR and marketing. So, in terms of doing the right thing, brilliant PR and actually the opportunity to sort of recruit skilled and qualified staff, you know, it is a real driver for them in terms of that.

For Kaidan, the potential benefits in terms of PR and recruitment legitimise CSP engagements and encourage the organisations to continue working together. Similar to the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, the notion of ‘doing the right thing’ does not refer to some universal beliefs or actions which justify the effects of CSPs, but rather to what the partners consider to be ‘doing the right thing’ in their particular context.

At another level, actors also stated that CSPs are all about ‘mutual benefits’ and ‘common purposes’, which further legitimises the CSP projects. For Paine and Kaidan, one of the reasons for continuing working together is the ‘mutual benefit’:

I think that the mutual benefit is the basis of the partnership and I think to me that is critical. (Paine)

I think specifically that there has to be that mutual benefit, doesn't it, mutual overlap...

(Kaidan)

We said this should be a long-term relationship based on mutual benefit, mutual respect, and actually mutual learning as well. (Paine)

Various narratives seem to emphasise that by working together partners can develop projects which pursue common objectives and create a win-win for everybody, as emphasised by Dace:
… CommunityCharity would provide basic skills, training, to young unemployed people. Aunt Bessies will then take them on and train them further, and if they prove they are good enough we will get them a job. So that is a win-win situation for everybody really.

The notion of mutual benefits and the potential to achieve common goals seem to be a driving force in legitimising the CSP projects and encouraging the partners to sustain the CSP.

Lastly, the analysis suggests that several actors sought to legitimise CSPs by claiming that CSP projects help the people in need. For instance, Kaidan stated that the participants recruited for the projects learn new skills, which can eventually lead them to different career opportunities:

Yes, because the other thing, factor is that through our Fairshare network and the other food producers and manufacturers, they all need a similar skills set for their workforce. So yes, it is very much focused on FoodCo but if this starts to take off, the potential benefits for the people to go to other food manufacturers and producers, you know, the potentials are enormous.

The emphasis on the potential positive career effects for the participants, thus, seems to be identified as a crucial factor encouraging the partners to continue working together. In this respect, Napier states:

It is not about giving a cheque, it is much more, what is says about you as an organisation helping people who need help...

Yet, questions regarding how the participants can pursue specific career paths, the issues around these processes, what might stop them from pursuing particular job opportunities, or
the issues around the potential negative effects of undertaking specific types of training, seem to be little discussed by the partners. Instead, they seem to simply suggest that the training provided will be a sufficient basis for participants to achieve their individual work-related goals.

As we can see, various framings of the broad potentials and effects of CSP projects seem to legitimise the partnerships and encourage the partners to continue working together. Different narratives have reflected how the parties make sense of and give meaning to the societal effects of engaging in CSPs. In addition to these broad themes, the analysis also highlights that there are various specific individual themes which seek to further justify and legitimise each party’s individual reasons for continuing engaging in CSP projects. In the next section, I reflect upon these aspects in some detail.

**8.2 Specific Themes**

In this section, I analyse how each party constructs and legitimises its own particular engagement in CSPs. My analysis highlights that each party constructs and circulates its own ‘themes’ which seek to legitimise their individual engagements in CSPs. In the first subsection, I explore the specific themes in the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership while in the second I focus on the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership.

**8.2.1 ConstructionCo-KidsCharity Partnership**

In the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, the analysis highlights that both ConstructionCo and KidsCharity construct specific accounts that seek to legitimise their individual engagements in particular CSP activities. For instance, various actors from
ConstructionCo reflected that CSP activities are beneficial because they serve the company’s customers. For instance, Sage stated:

… we often say … but serving customers and serving those people who serve the costumers. And I guess in the case of KidsCharity they are ultimately the ones serving our customers and we are going to serve theirs, aren't we?

From Sage’s perspective, the legitimacy of the CSPs comes from the direct link between CSP projects and the company’s customers, in particular the schools they are building. Engaging in CSP projects, thus, seems to be considered as a way of providing extra customer services. In this regard, Parry further stated that CSP projects have also helped the company build its image of a local firm that cares about the people and the community:

I think it is a brand thing. I think it is a brand presentation that these people are easy to deal with, they are honest, they are open, they do the right thing and when they make a mistake and do the wrong thing they…will solve the problem.

For the MD of ConstructionCo, the legitimacy of CSPs comes not only from the potential to build their brand but also from the potential of CSP projects to build what they call the ‘bank of goodwill’, as seen from the following extracts:

We do it (engaging with KidsCharity) for the bank of goodwill. Because when we make mistakes and it happens to everybody because we are human, you get more of a break if people think you are the good guys and you’ve got relationships with them than if it is a pure type of transaction. (Parry)

It means that if you do that (work with KidsCharity), kind of big or small, you would always get a credit back, credit in the bank of goodwill. (Parry)
Considering the nature of construction services and the risks associated with providing construction services, there seems to be a belief and an expectation that by developing CSP projects with KidsCharity, ConstructionCo can fill up what they call ‘the bank of goodwill’. This theme can be interpreted as a strategy ConstructionCo use to build good relationships with the communities in which they operate. By ‘filling the bank of goodwill’, they hope to protect and build their corporate image. Subsequently, if a negative unexpected accident happens at a construction site, the company can handle the reputation damage more easily, as stated by Parry:

So we are putting into the bank of goodwill ... when, very early an accident happened—one of the PFI schools’ children ran to the end of the field and there was a wasp nest and it was the field of PFI. The fence was pushed against the nest, and wasps bit (i.e. stung) the child badly and it was and it could have been an event for the media saying haha PFI school, private school kills a child or whatever. But there was so much in the bank of goodwill that the media came to us and said, ‘This was what happened, what do you want to say?’ etc. So that was a very early example of the fact you can't avoid this stuff but you can have your own way with it.

And you build that credit balance in your bank of goodwill. If you do something wrong and there is a problem, they will withdraw if there’s no bank of goodwill. That is why we call it the bank of goodwill and so kindness, a right act, a support act... If there is nothing in the bank of goodwill, the relationship is over...

Parry’s account seems to reflect upon two aspects which give CSP engagements legitimacy. First, CSPs are regarded as way of reducing the risks of potential attacks from the media. Second, there also seems to be a strong emphasis on what the company considers a good way
of working with the communities in which it operates. Similar views and notions are also expressed by the project manager who claimed:

Well, all this positive engagement…fills up the bank of goodwill. And if we have a blip then we need to make a withdrawal. But what it doesn't do, it doesn't create a massive damage to our brand because of the blip, and our reputation is that we will always do a cracking job. (Mario)

Again, the reference to reputation and branding seems to suggest that CSP projects are legitimate tools for addressing wider organisational goals and concerns.

Other narratives further reflected and sought to emphasise other positive effects of CSPs for the employees, as described by Saewald and Lacina:

It makes our, I think, own peoples' jobs more enjoyable as well. If we are doing something that we feel is the right thing to do as well we want to come to work. From a business point of view, people who want to come to work and enjoy working, I think that is an obviously a business benefit. (Saewald)

We are doing these things so much that it can't do anything other than improve our job satisfaction more than what it already is. (Lacina)

Job satisfaction and increasing the loyalty of employees seem to be widely shared aspects which suggest that CSP projects enrich the experiences of employees. Other actors also stated that CSP projects show that the company is going the extra mile to help people in need, which also creates positive feelings in employees:

I think it is the feeling probably that we create. There is a feeling that is created within the business. So, it is an emotion, isn't it? That you are doing something for other
people, doing something good for other people and you think that can help them improve lives, it can improve their community. You know, I think we try and stand out to do something, not to do something different but do, as Sage said, the right thing…But yes, I think it is definitely the, I think if you can make your staff feel good, if ConstructionCo can make the staff feel good and make the community feel good, this is all…(Lacina)

The references to ‘emotion’ and ‘feelings’, thus, seem to further emphasise the importance of CSP projects for retaining workers. In particular, several managers stated that CSPs create a ‘feeling good factor’ in the company which legitimises the development of CSP projects over time:

And if you speak other people, they enjoy coming to work and that is part of, it builds on that feel good factor and enjoy and when you go home you think, ‘Yes, I have done something good today’. (Cadee)

Various accounts also emphasised that CSP activities create ‘success stories’ for the company and as a result many employees feel proud of their giving back initiatives, an aspect revealed by Sage:

I think, well, you know, from a profile perspective and our linkage with that, as Cadee said before, it is quite a strong value relation, KidsCharity and we have done very very well, a lot of success stories, you know, and we are intrinsically linked with that. They are great for our rounds, but equally as Cadee said before, we have a lot of people who’ve been touched personally by the KidsCharity experience … So, actually there are a number of people in our organisation that have done, have experienced that and,
you know, that giving back feeling if you like, is a lot higher than if it had been just another charity and write a cheque for it.

The HR team also drew attention to the potential implications of acquiring new skills from CSP activities, which further encouraged the partners to continue working together:

We are so linked to the employee engagement types of stuff, there is a tangible in that. It is about our learning and development of our staff. KidsCharity has been an intrinsic part of that...Cadee

I think our people develop as mentors. Then we are able to go back to KidsCharity and say, ‘We’ve got these kids. Could we have the boat to go and do some challenges, outbound work?’ (Parry)

Learning and development of staff are considered key outcomes which reveal the benefits of CSPs. And yet, what is interesting to note is that there are no concrete measurements or statistics that can categorise or explain the effects of CSP engagements. Instead, the actors stated that subjective perceptions of the effects of CSP engagements are more important. The MD of ConstructionCo stated:

We measure, well, measure, sometimes things are very subjective… I think the anecdotes are more valuable Peter. The anecdotes and that you remember that those kids witnessed protection, child prostitution is actually, you know, they got a proper job, they got self-esteem and they are talking again and that is anecdotal feel good.

Parry’s emphasis on ‘anecdotes’ and ‘anecdotal feel good’ reveals that individual perceptions of the potential benefits are more essential for legitimising the ConstructionCo’s engagements in different CSP projects.
On the other hand, KidsCharity’s members also emphasised several ‘themes’ which they considered important for legitimising their individual engagements in different CSP activities. According to Dain, CSP projects introduce KidsCharity to new potential partners:

So, you know, we know Parry, we know Charlie, a number of the key players in the city and they speak to other key players in the city and introduce us and we have the communications that develop onwards. So it helps us with our credibility.

CSP workings, thus, seem to be related to what Dain calls the ‘credibility’ of the charity. CSP engagements can be interpreted as strategic moves employed by KidsCharity to seek to develop new connections in the city. Dain’s account emphasised the importance of the context, in particular the city-wide networks and events which he saw as beneficial for developing CSP projects:

One thing you do find about Hull in particular is that its local networks are very tight and not everybody can engage in those local networks. There is a small group of maybe 10-15 people that are key within the city, business people. They are involved in lots of things and to get an introduction into that, to have a relationship with those people is very very beneficial and that would just expand. Thankfully, we are in that mix and we constantly get new organisations that are being introduced to us…(Dain)

By working with ConstructionCo, KidsCharity hopes to develop new connections with potential partners, which not only legitimises the partnership but also reveals the potential future benefits of continuing working together. In addition, Dain pointed out, CSP projects also generate more publicity on the charity’s key projects:
Our relationship with the private sector is expanding all the time because we have good publicity, people like what we do. Like I said before success breeds success, so if Parry is speaking to another key business partner he will mention that he is involved with KidsCharity, then they get an introduction from that and it expands. And over the years our partnerships and links with organisations just expanded, expanded and expanded.

According to other interviewees, CSP projects also help KidsCharity achieve its wider organisational goals (I discussed these in Chapter 6), which aspect further legitimises their engagements in different CSP projects.

At another level, several managers also stated that CSP projects allowed them to acquire new knowledge and skills, an example being Dain, who argued that he had learned a lot from his engagement with the MD of ConstructionCo:

Parry himself has been to myself, he acts a bit as a mentor to me from time to time and they have also helped with some other things that I have been involved in over the years. (Dain)

And Parry Parr is an expert in leadership, I have, if I ever want to have a conversation about leadership I will go and see Parry, and he will give me an endless amount of lectures on this which I really enjoy. (Dain)

Dain’s reflections seem to suggest that managers from both parties can learn from each other and acquire new skills, which is a strong motive for sustaining the partnership.

Similar to ConstructionCo, KidsCharity’s members construct and circulate various individual themes which seek to legitimise their particular engagements in different CSP projects.
Overall, CSP workings are described as opportunities which help the charity address its long-term organisational ambitions. Various accounts reflected upon a range of meanings actors attach to CSP workings and how they perceive and conceptualise the benefits of CSP projects. What is interesting to note is that actors did not report any negative aspects of CSPs. When I asked them to reflect upon any negative outcomes of CSPs, they argued there were not any serious issues and challenges that could put the partnership at risk (I discussed this aspect in some detail in the previous chapter). Despite several potential negative effects of CSPs, the actors tended primarily focus on the perceived positive effects of CSPs, which they argued, legitimised the partnerships and encouraged them to continue working together. In the next sub-section, I explore and analyse how different accounts legitimise FoodCo’s and CommunityCharity’s individual engagements in the CSP.

### 8.2.2 FoodCo-CommunityCharity Partnership

In the case of the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership, the analysis also highlights that each partner constructs and circulates different specific ‘themes’ which seek to legitimise their individual engagements in CSP projects. For instance, the members of FoodCo argued that the positive effects of CSP projects, such as retaining people, attracting new talent, showing their corporate social responsibility activities to the public and attracting publicity, all legitimise their CSP engagements and encourage them to continue working with CommunityCharity. According to the MD of FoodCo, Napier, CSP projects help the company attract some publicity and build the company’s image as a ‘good’ local firm:

> I mean, we do get some publicity out of it ... And we would like to think that the communities we operate in people speak well of you and ultimately that message does, it is progressively spread. (Napier)
Napier’s account, thus, seems to suggest that the company seeks to use CSP engagements in order to interact and communicate with the local communities. In this regard, Kaidan further added that the PR and marketing effects are also directly linked with the legitimacy of the CSP:

I think there are a number of benefits. I think very clearly that PR and marketing, it is something that they can talk about.

Potential marketing benefits can result from increases in sales. Several other actors also emphasised the importance of CSP activities for the PR communications of the company. At another level, some members of the charity committee also argued that CSPs ‘tick the boxes for corporate social responsibility (CSR)’, as expressed by Gabe:

…I suppose to be brutally honest, it is, it ticks all the boxes for corporate responsibility, corporate social responsibility...

Working with CommunityCharity is considered to be a way of showing and communicating the FoodCo’s corporate social responsibility practices. From Gabe’s perspective, CSR is important for the company, although they do not seem to have a specific CSR agenda or policy. Instead, the analysis suggests that they seem to view CSPs as part of showing their CSR intentions.

Other narratives also further reflected that CSP projects are legitimate tools for increasing the job satisfaction of the employees, as seen from the following quotations:

But partly they (FoodCo) are doing it because it makes them feel good, makes the individuals feel good, and that is the reason we do it. (Gabe)
Well, I think it gives the business a sense of wellbeing, I think it is a good thing to do and gives the business, you know, we feel we are putting back something, which I think is a good thing. (Lacy)

I think it is about feeling good about yourself, wanting to do the right thing individually or at corporate level. (Paine)

The positive feelings that CSP projects create seem to be widely emphasised as an important factor for wanting to continue engaging in the CSP. In this respect, Paine and Napier further stated that CSP projects allow their employees to volunteer in different activities which, in turn, enrich their experiences:

I think it creates an opportunity for employees to be more engaged, to feel that there is more to life than turning up baking bread or making puddings. (Paine)

CSP projects are, thus, widely seen as opportunities which enrich employees’ experiences. CSP activities allow actors to engage in diverse activities and acquire new skills, as Gabe clearly pointed out:

So there is an internal benefit because our employees hopefully learn from what they enjoy what they do... they might learn a little bit about communicating and working together, they might learn a little bit about how things are … So their perspective might broaden a bit ... (Gabe)

For the HR director, Dace, CSR activities are also a way of building the company’s culture. The following table reflects how the HR director reflects upon and legitimises the effects of CSP projects at a HRM level:
Table 12. HRM Director’s Accounts Reflecting upon the Legitimacy of CSPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM Links and the Legitimacy of the CSP</th>
<th>My Comment/Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The indirect link is, we are helping to support, most of our employees come from these communities. So why shouldn’t we support the communities in which our employees live? It is indirectly, it is helping our employees as well which then help to retain their loyalty, their good will. (Dace)</td>
<td>Dace links CSP projects with the community in which people live and assumes that employees will see these engagements as beneficial. So that is one of the main reasons the company continues in CSPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other thing, as I mentioned, the staff turnover, you get more loyal employees as a result. So it is better to keep somebody in continuously engage as a group. It helps, gives them some attention. (Dace)</td>
<td>Dace seems to argue that CSP projects reduce ‘staff turnover’ and that CSP projects increase the loyalty of the employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think they feel valued and I think because the business is engaging with the community they live in. That makes them feel better about what they do. And yes that should lead to better productivity to be honest. Because somebody who cares about their job, is</td>
<td>For Dace, CSP projects also reveal that the company is doing something positive for the employees and as a result they feel valued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**always going to do a better job than somebody who doesn't. (Dace)**

As noticed, there are several important HRM effects pointed out by Dace, which seem to reveal the legitimacy of CSP workings. Furthermore, the HR manager also emphasised that CSP projects can help the company recruit and attract new talent for its factories, as seen from the following extracts:

But I think there are undoubtedly benefits I think. If the business is about being able to attract great talent, that is what it is all about, then I think doing the right thing in your community helps you attract people who are talented and want to work for an organisation that genuinely care …So those are commercial, you know, real commercial benefits. (Napier)

And I think ok, you could say that there are some business benefits if you start to get employees from CommunityCharity. Then, that is probably a business benefit for us, we don't need to use agency workers anymore so much. (Dace)

The above accounts seem suggest that the company has struggled over the years to attract employees for its factories. By working with CommunityCharity, the company hopes to be able to address this concern by attracting new workers. In this respect, Dace states:

… if we give them (unemployed people) training, they could potentially come to our businesses as an employee because we have already given them those basic skills and we can use them as an employee... (Dace)
The above perceived business benefits, thus, seem to seek to legitimise FoodCo’s individual engagements in the partnership and encourage the company to continue working with CommunityCharity.

On the other hand, CommunityCharity also tended to express various individual reasons which seek to legitimise their individual engagements in various CSP projects. For instance, Kaidan stated that the FoodCo helped CommunityCharity attract funding, which is essential for their wider organisational goals:

… I think another thing is that we can generate income from working in partnership with FoodCo through the delivery of skills and training which would be funded, you know, through the Skills Funding Agency which is basically through government to deliver accredited courses. That is how we would generate, we will potentially generate, we, if we move people from unemployment into employment and again that is the outcome that a government would fund.

According to Kaidan, the CSP projects with FoodCo create potential opportunities for generating additional income through the government funding agency. This is considered one of the main reasons for continuing developing different CSP projects with FoodCo.

In addition, there also seems to be a strong emphasis on the potential opportunities to ‘put people into employment’ (Kaidan) which is a collaborative goal that is expected to eventually create a long-term venture between the partners, as reflected in the following account:

And one of the things, you know, that we are looking to do is to develop a Fairshare food distribution, in particularly, developing a packing line which will provide great training opportunities for employing people….It is anticipated that they (FoodCo)
would devote a lot of their staff time to their corporate volunteering to help establish that programme, you know, which will incorporate the donation of equipment but also staff time and that will be pretty high level technical staff time as well. So it is certainly one of the things that is high on our agenda for the next 12 months. (Kaidan)

Furthermore, Kaidan stated, CSP projects can create career opportunities for young people, which shows the legitimacy of CSP activities and projects. In this regard, he further stated:

… we are interested in how we can collaborate and make younger people align to the opportunities and careers in what they actually care in the food industry.

… we are creating, you know, employment opportunities for people, you know, with a good employer, you know, I think that is fantastic.

The link between creating opportunities and addressing wider organisational goals of the charity, thus, seems to suggest a strong reason for sustaining the partnership. Overall, the managers tended to describe CSP projects as legitimate undertakings which tackle important individual issues and challenges of the charity.

At a higher level, some managers also stated that the CSP employment-based projects are expected to help CommunityCharity become a social recruitment agency for FoodCo. There is an expectation that over the years CommunityCharity will continuously provide employees to FoodCo’s factories, as Kaidan and Paine clearly explained:

We are particularly hopeful that this is a start of something that does become quite, you know, strategic for both of us… It is that idea of being a social recruitment agency. (Kaidan)
… the idea of and in effect almost like social recruitment agency…this idea that we can provide pool of skilled labour maybe because they have serious demands. (Paine)

The legitimisation of CSP projects, thus, seems to be directly linked to the wider organisational concerns of the charity. First, the actors stated that the CSP projects are aligned to their wider current projects. In particular, CSP projects seem to fit well with Community Charity’s wider employment and food-based projects. Second, the managers also argued that there are several future potential opportunities coming out of the CSP, such as becoming a more formal ‘social recruitment agency’.

As we can see, a variety of diverse narratives seek to provide different reasons for sustaining the partnerships. Some accounts construct and present various economic reasons, while others express more moral points of view about the need to sustain the CSPs. The narratives also reveal different framings and perceptions of the benefits of CSP activities and how these are depicted by different employees at different levels. What is more, the analysis also suggests that as the partners develop new projects so do their views change of the benefits of the CSPs. Future research, however, is needed to explore and analyse these aspects in more detail.

8.3 Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to explore how the partnerships succeed in building their legitimacy. In particular, I analysed how different narrative accounts construct and present different reasons for sustaining the CSPs. The analysis highlighted how various narratives seek to legitimise CSP workings by revealing how actors define both the broad and more specific benefits of CSP projects. The chapter revealed that different framings seek to present different reasons to legitimise the CSPs. A key outcome of the analysis is that there is no one
single unitary ‘theme’ around which CSPs revolve. Rather, there is ongoing construction and circulation of multiple ‘themes’ which legitimise the CSPs and encourage the partners to continue working together.

At an individual level, the chapter also revealed how different employees make sense of and give meaning to their CSP activities. For instance, the majority of the managers seem to perceive CSP projects as tools that they can use to build their companies’ reputations, implement specific HR strategies or address various CSR issues. The employees, on the other hand, seem to view CSPs as engagements which enrich their experiences and help the communities in which they live. As a result, some narratives seem to have a more functionalist orientation, while others a more ethical one, thus revealing the diverse ways in which the partners view and seek to legitimise their CSP engagements.

Furthermore, the analysis also revealed how specific actors give various meanings to the CSP experiences depending on the individual roles and engagements in the CSP projects. This key aspect showed that the legitimisation of the CSPs is an ongoing process that aims to give meaning and reasons for why the partners should or should not continue working together. By throwing light on these social complexities, the chapter attempted to advance our understanding of the ways partners legitimise their engagements in the CSPs.

In the next chapter, I summarise the key outcomes of the analysis and offer a more in-depth discussion in relation to the existing literature on CSPs.
Chapter Nine: Research Discussion

This chapter discusses the outcomes of the analysis in a more focused manner. In particular, the chapter discusses how the study has addressed its primary and secondary research questions and aims. The chapter also aims to set the scene for the next and final chapter of the thesis, where I discuss the theoretical, empirical and practical contributions and implications of the study. The chapter proceeds as follows.

In the first section, I discuss my analysis of the motives for engaging in CSPs in relation to the wider literature. I begin by reflecting on how my analysis provided various processual insights into the emergence of ‘needs’ to engage in CSPs. Then, in the second section, a discussion follows on the dynamics of CSPs or how ongoing practices and processes enact and sustain partnership workings over time. Various theoretical and empirical issues are discussed in relation to the wider current studies on the dynamics of CSPs. Lastly, in the third section, I discuss my analysis of the effects of CSPs and offer a more politically-informed process interpretation of the ways in which CSPs seek to legitimise particular wider sectoral practices and interests. I conclude the chapter with a short summary of the key themes of the analysis.

9.1 Reflections on the Main Research Questions and Aims

In Chapter 2, I revealed that in extant research there is still a tendency to explain CSPs in terms of enablers and barriers or factors that encourage and shape the scope and nature of CSPs. Furthermore, a large portion of the literature tries to identify and classify the positive and negative effects of CSPs. My literature review, therefore, suggested that there is a need to
develop more process-based analyses which can help us generate a more processual understanding of the emergence and implications of CSPs at different levels.

In chapters 6, 7, 8, and 9, I offered an empirically-informed analysis which sought to track and understand the social becoming nature of CSPs. Moving away from trying to identify the enablers and barriers of CSPs or to measure the effects of these phenomena, the analysis attempted to throw light on the practices and processes which enact and sustain CSP arrangements.

In the sections that follow, I want to further discuss the outcomes of my analysis in relation to the wider literature on the motives, dynamics and outcomes of CSPs.

9.1.1 Questions Related to the Drivers of CSPs

The primary research questions of the thesis attempted to generate an analysis of the processual emergence of CSPs by examining how these processes emerge from and are embedded within the wider practices of the partners. Seeking to track the processual emergence of CSPs also required an analysis of the decision making processes that led to the decisions to engage in CSPs. In this regard, my analysis sought to explore some of the issues around the decision making processes in the hope of exploring how the ‘need/desires’ to CSPs emergence over time. There analysis, therefore, sought to explore how various actors reflected the complexities and contextual dynamics which influenced their decisions to form CSPs. In particular, the analysis revealed that ‘past events’ along with ‘ongoing negotiations’ and ‘framings of the needs’ to engage in CSPs played a crucial role in influencing the decisions to form different types of CSP arrangements. In what follows, I will discuss each of these aspects separately in a more detailed manner.
9.1.1.1 Influences of Past Decisions and Events

In regard to the decision making processes to form CSPs, my analysis attempted to explore a variety of different social dynamics which are said to have influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs. According to Graf and Rothlauf (2011), a variety of micro or macro factors prompt organisations to engage in CSPs. In the extant literature, a large portion of the studies has attempted to identify how various factors influence the decisions to engage CSPs (Murphy & Bendell, 1997; Wymer & Samu, 2003; Siegel, 2010; den Hond et al., 2012; Austin, 2016). Berlie (201), for instance, argues that the changing economic conditions have prompted organisations to engage in CSPs. Similarly, Loza (2004) states that globalization is a key factor motivating CSPs. On the other hand, authors such as Huxham (1996) and Graf and Rothlauf (2011) have further suggested that micro factors such as ethical beliefs also play a crucial role in stimulating organisations to engage in CSPs.

In contrast to these approaches, which seek to identify the underlying factors that lead to CSPs, the process perspective adopted here sought to explore the social complexities around the decision making processes that led to the decisions to engage in CSPs. In particular, the analysis sought to explore how the decision making processes were influenced by the past decisions and concerns of the parties.

From a process perspective, studying processes in isolation can underestimate the influence of the past or how past processes influenced the emergence of new ones (Jarzabkowski et al., 2015). Therefore, Pettigrew (1997) states, process studies need to analyse how past events influence the emergence of new ones over time.

My analysis revealed that each party’s past historical concerns and goals influenced its decisions to form CSPs. In particular, the analysis revealed how various members reflected
upon the influence of past concerns on the need to engage in CSPs. In the case of FoodCo, a variety of actors argued that institutionalised practices such as FoodCo’s family constitution encouraged the development of CSPs. Members of ConstructionCo, too, stated that their widely established practices of ‘doing the right thing’, ‘going the extra mile’ or ‘leaving a legacy’ encouraged them to form CSPs with NGOs. On the NGO side, Community Charity and Kids Charity, also seemed to argue that their decisions to engage in CSPs were widely influenced by their past concerns and ambitions. Members from both charities stated that developing CSPs is seen as a way of addressing their wider past ambitions and goals. The influences of past decisions and concerns on the decision to form CSPs, thus, seem to be key elements motivating the organisations to form CSPs.

In Chapters 5 and 6, I briefly analysed each organisation’s past as well as more recent emerging issues and concerns. The analysis showed that each organisation has faced different issues over the years. These past concerns eventually led to considerations about engaging in CSPS as a way to address various wider short-term or long-term objectives. In the case of FoodCo and ConstructionCo, a number of actors argued that CSPs are linked to their long-term strategies, such as building their images as local companies serving local people and communities. The links between CSPs and the wider strategic goals were identified as key determinants encouraging the companies to engage in CSPs. On the NGO side, Community Charity and Kids Charity, too, stated that their decisions to engage in CSPs were influenced by their wider historical goals and perceptions of the need to develop more joined-up approaches to develop and deliver different projects to tackle social causes. All parties, thus, emphasised the importance of past events/decisions on the need to engage in CSPs.
According to Engwall (2003), each organisation has its history, which influences the emergence of new organisational arrangements over time. The influence of the past, Collins (2001) further argues, reveals that nothing drops from the sky and that everything has a context to which it relates to and is part of. By studying the history of organisations over time, we can examine how various historical events and decisions shaped the emergence of new organisational arrangements (Engwall, 2003).

For Sminia (2009), historical influences also reveal that nothing is simply pre-determined and that the motives to engage in particular endeavours might change over time. Taking into consideration these remarks, my analysis sought to examine and reveal how past events and goals of the partners influenced their decisions to engage in CSPs. Furthermore, the analysis pointed out that as partners develop new ambitions, they might or might not continue working in CSPs. In this respect, the analysis contributed interesting insights to the studies which seek to analyse how different historical conditions and circumstances influence the emergence of new organisational arrangements.

At an empirical level, the analysis also revealed how different narratives identified and emphasised the influence of different past aspects on the decisions to engage CSPs. During the interviews, the actors were given the opportunity to reflect upon a variety of past concerns and events which they considered to key in influencing the decisions to engage in CSPs. Different narratives emphasised a variety of specific events which, to a greater or lesser extent, eventually led to the decisions to engage in CSPs. Yet, the majority of the actors emphasised more recent historical concerns and goals, especially during 1990s, 2000s, and 2010s, which, they argued, encouraged the development of different CSPs.
Theoretically, these narratives can be considered as different viewpoints of the actors who make sense of and give meaning to the influence of different past events on the decisions to engage in CSPs. Furthermore, the different narratives can also be considered as different ways of reflecting power dynamics which, in one way or another, influenced the decisions to engage in CSPs (I reflect upon this issue in more detail in section 9.1.3). Adopting a narrative approach, thus, allowed me to explore how actors make sense of and give meaning to the influence of past events on the decisions to engage in CSPs. This approach, I argue, helped me develop a more processual understanding of the emergence of the ‘need’ to form CSPs.

My analysis, thus, reveals that the motives for engaging in CSPs are not simply pre-given, as is widely argued by the existing literature, because different historical situations and events might lead to different decisions to engage in CSPs. In contrast to the studies which seek to depict the motives as pre-given macro or micro factors, my analysis suggests that decision making processes to engage in CSPs are partially influenced by past the decisions of the partners. In this respect, Langley et al. (2013) state, by analysing how past situations and decisions influence current areas of concerns of organisations, we can track and explain why some organisational arrangements are developed while others are not. In the context of CSP research, tracking the historical influence of past events on the decision making processes to engage in CSPs can help us develop a more faithful appreciation of the social complexities which prompt organisations to engage in CSPs. In addition to the historical influences of past decisions and events, my analysis also suggests that decisions to engage in CSPs are also largely influenced by the specific current temporal concerns and ambitions of the parties, which I now turn to discuss in the following sub-section.
9.1.1.2 Influences of the Temporal Wider Current Practices and Aims

My analysis also brings to light a number of processual matters related to how the current organisational issues and aims of each party influence their decisions to engage in CSPs. In particular, the analysis suggests that the decisions to engage in are influenced by the perceived potential effects of CSP projects to address the wider organisational concerns and objectives of the parties.

In the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, various CSP projects are developed to help the parties provide a range of customer services to their clients. ConstructionCo, for instance, tends to seek to engage in CSP projects with KidsCharity which can help the company provide extra customer services to the schools they are building. The managers seemed to argue that they engage in the CSP because CSP projects help the company build good relationships with the schools. Similarly, KidsCharity seeks to develop different CSP projects with ConstructionCo because address some of its temporal goals. In addition, KidsCharity’s managers also tend to view the need to engage with ConstructionCo as part of their approach to create temporal networks with other businesses, which eventually help the charity generate extra income.

The notion of appropriateness of CSP projects to the wider temporal organisational goals of the parties, thus, seems to be a defining element influencing the decision making processes to engage in CSPs. The existing literature provides some insights into how CSPs relate to the wider organisational ambitions of the partners (see Vangen & Huxham (2011) for a brief review). For instance, Berger et al. (2004) state that different sectoral organisations which have common aims tend to develop various types of CSPs in order to address their goals. My analysis contributes to this body of knowledge by revealing how decisions to engage in CSPs
depend on the suitability between CSP projects and the wider temporal organisational projects of the partners. Although CSPs are usually described as undertakings that directly tackle a social issue, my analysis argued that they still bear traces of the wider organisational practices and aims of the parties. Therefore, the decisions to form CSPs are largely influenced by the way organisations perceive and can link CSP projects to their wider organisational projects.

Various narrative accounts emphasised how partners related the decisions to engage in CSPs to their wider organisational goals. The emphasis on the direct links between CSP projects with the wider projects of the parties seems to also suggest that the need to engage in CSPs co-evolves or changes depending on the wider temporal projects of the partners. My analysis, thus, reveals that the need to engage in CSPs might change depending on the wider temporal projects of the partners. Similar to the historical influences on the decision making processes to form CSPs, my analysis reveals that the needs to engage in CSPs are not simply pre-given but are relationally and temporally emerging depending on the wider organisational concerns of the partners. This aspect may also help to explain why some organisations might want to engage in CSPs while others do not. By developing a more processual analysis of the emergence of needs to engage in CSPs, I attempted to track how different temporal social dynamics influenced the decisions to form CSPs.

In addition to the influence of past decisions/events and the current temporal goals and projects of the partners, my analysis further reveals that decisions to engage in CSPs are also partially influenced by the specific framings of the need to engage in CSPs. What is more, a range of power and negotiations dynamics may also largely influence the decision making processes. In the following sub-section, I will discuss how specific framings of needs to
engage in CSPs as well as the effect of various power dynamics and negotiations can influence the decisions to engage in CSPs.

9.1.1.3 Influences of Specific Framing(s) of the Needs, Power Dynamics and Negotiations

Framing emerged as a central theme and activity in the interview accounts on the need to engage in CSPs. Generally, the informants argued that involvements in CSPs stem from framing the need to engage in CSPs. The framings of need to form CSPs seem to emphasise how the partners can generate potential CSP effects at different organisational levels, such as providing extra services, fighting criticism or engaging actors in team building opportunities, to name a few.

My analysis, thus, underlined the importance of framing of the need to engage in CSPs and argued that it is a driving force influencing the decisions to engage in CSPs. This aspect also suggested that partners may frame the need to engage in different ways depending on their wider organisational concerns and aims. In the case of FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership, actors seemed to frame the need to engage in CSPs as part of the potential benefits that might come from CSP projects. The managers of CommunityCharity, for instance, framed the need to engage as part of the potential funding opportunities that could be generated through CSP projects. Similarly, the managers of FoodCo seemed to frame the need to engage in CSPs as part of their desire to develop a more structured and joined-up approach to charitable giving and community engagement.

In this regard, the analysis pointed out that there are both broad framings as well as more specific framings. Broad framings emphasise the potential benefits for the society, while the specific framings seek to underline the specific benefits that each party expects from engaging in CSPs. The mixture of different framings reveals that there is no single one that dominates.
the discourse on the need to engage in CSPs. Rather, decisions might be underpinned by different framings of the need to engage in CSPs.

A variety of different framings also revealed how different managers and employees make sense of and give meaning to the need to engage in CSPs. For instance, the project managers tended to frame the need to engage in CSPs as part of delivering the wider projects, while the CEOs tended to have a more long-term perspective on the need to engage in CSPs as part of various strategically defined aims of the organisations. The framings of the need to engage in CSPs, thus, suggest that decision making processes are influenced by the way the organisations perceive and define the ‘fit’ between CSP projects and their wider organisational ambitions and concerns. Berger et al. (2004) state that achieving ‘fit’ in goals and strategies can motivate partners to continue working in CSPs over time. Vangen and Huxham (2011), too, state that establishing mutual goals and building shared visions are two important elements underpinning the decisions to engage in CSPs. My analysis adds to these insights by reflecting how different framings of the need to engage in CSPs can influence the decision to engage in CSPs. In addition, my analysis also suggests that having specific framings of the need to engage in CSPs is not enough or does not necessarily mean that organisations will engage in CSPs, because various power dynamics and negotiations can influence the final decision to engage or not in CSPs.

Power has become a key concept in organisation studies. Scholars have sought to define and explain power in different ways (Clegg et al., 2006). Yet, what all tend to agree with is that power dynamics largely influence the decision making processes in organisations. My analysis revealed that, in addition to the framings of the need to engage in CSPs, negotiation and power dynamics strongly influenced the decisions to form CSPs. Different narratives
reflected how managerial power has had the final say in the decisions to engage in CSPs. In particular, the narratives suggested that the managing directors are the ones who have the final say in the decision making process to form different CSPs.

In the case of ConstructionCo, actors argued that the CEO is the one who makes the final decision. It is up to him to decide whether the company engages or not in CSPs. This aspect reveals that framings of the need to engage in CSPs are not enough to form a partnership. Rather, various power dynamics can influence the decisions to engage in CSPs. In the case of KidsCharity, narratives also reported that power and negotiation dynamics play a large role in the decision making processes to engage in CSPs. Similar dynamics were noticed in the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnerships. The analysis, thus, emphasised the importance of negotiation and power dynamics in the decisions to engage in CSPs.

In contrast to the studies that depict the ‘motives’ for engaging in CSPs as pre-given factors, my analysis has drawn attention to the different contextual dynamics which might influence the decisions to engage in CSPs. In this respect, the outcomes of the analysis suggest that the ‘needs’ to engage in CSPs are not simply pre-determined, nor are they formed by some disembodied set of macro factors, as is widely assumed in the current CSP literature. Rather, the ‘needs’ to engage in CSPs are processually emerging and socially negotiated between partners at different levels. In the next section, I further discuss the key outcomes of my analysis on the dynamics of CSPs or the processes that construct and sustain partnership workings over time.
9.1.2 Questions Regarding the Organisational Dynamics of CSPs

Regarding the questions on the dynamics of CSPs, my analysis sought to explore the ongoing processes enacting and sustaining CSP workings over time. In particular, taking into consideration the primary questions, the analysis attempted to explore how individual interactions, processes and relations shape the scope and nature of partnership workings. Three interrelated dynamics were identified in relation to the temporal dynamics and relational complexities of CSPs: 1) the heterogeneous processes enacting CSPs, 2) the relational embeddedness of CSP processes within the wider practices of the partners, and 3) the ongoing interruptions and unexpected events which produce a level of novelty in the emergence of CSPs. In what follows, I will discuss each of these dynamics individually in some detail.

9.1.2.1 The Heterogeneous Becoming Nature of CSPs

By definition, process thinking challenges prediction and defies models which seek to explain the emergence of organising processes as linear unfoldings moving through specific steps or stages (Hernes & Weik, 2007; Hjorth et al., 2015). In contrast to the mechanical more static view of the development of organisational phenomena, process thinking approaches seek to explore and analyse the multiple constantly changing patterns of processes that enact and sustain organisational phenomena (Chia, 1999). In the CSP literature, the majority of research seeks to present the development of CPSs in terms of stages or steps. Similarly, CSP scholars usually explain the dynamics of CSPs in terms of the barriers and enablers which shape the development of CSPs.
Although such explanations do have their merits, in as far as they seek to provide a more structured way of understanding what are otherwise complex micro processes, they still help us little in appreciating the bottom-up emergence and enactment of CSPs over time. For authors such as Waddock (1988), CSPs are developed according to some pre-defined plans and goals which guide the actions and interactions between members. Seitanidi and Crane (2009), too, state that the development of CSPs proceeds through three stages: partnership selection, partnership design and partnership institutionalization. Such explanations present the development of CSPs as a straightforward process lacking any sophistication. Issues around differences in cultures and aims are simply presented as barriers which can lead to collaborative inertia (Huxham & Vangen, 2004).

At a managerial level, research within this stream suggests that managers are the only one responsible for the success or failure of CSPs. Long-term success depends on the managerial ability to manage the collaborative processes and actions between the partners (Huxham & Vangen, 2001; Vangen & Huxham, 2003a; Crosby & Bryson, 2007). Other scholars such as Kruckenberg (2015), however, have called for more process-based analysis in order to throw light and capture the micro dynamics that usually lead to the novel enactment of CSPs. For Kruckenberg (2015), CSPs can emerge in a novel manner because of the unpredictable patterns of collaborative actions which cannot be simply pre-planned by managers.

Following Kruckenberg (2015), my analysis sought to examine the heterogeneous becoming processes which enact CSP workings over time. In particular, taking into account the main research questions, I sought to analyse the bundles of constantly changing patterns of actions which establish, un-establish and re-establish diverse CSP arrangements.
The development of CSPs encompasses a multitude of processes which seek to set up specific temporal agreements and arrangements. As we have seen in the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, there are numerous ongoing processes, including negotiations, informal meetings, phone calls, and interactions, which seek to identify and arrange specific programmes. The processes of interaction, email exchanges as well as other forms of collaborations reveal that CSP workings consist of bundles of constantly changing patterns of activities. According to Chia (1999), a key principle in process thinking is heterogeneous becoming. That is to say, organisational phenomena do not consist of a single unidimensional process but are enacted through multiple heterogeneous processes. My analysis revealed that CSP workings consist of a multiplicity of processes which are connected together to enact specific organisational arrangements.

The development of specific CSPs, thus, can emerge in very different ways depending on the mobilization and enactment of different processes. In the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, multiple heterogeneous processes led to the establishment and re-establishments of different temporal agreements and arrangements. Similar dynamics have also been observed in the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership. Before establishing some more formal arrangements, the partners spent several years negotiating and re-negotiating different issues about their CSP interactions.

Both partnerships, thus, illustrate that CSP workings are enacted by a variety of different processes and individual engagements which eventually design and deliver specific projects. Like a ‘rhizome’ (Chia, 1997) these micro processes led to emergence of new processes which resulted in the temporal establishment of diverse CSP arrangements.
The development of CSPs, therefore, can be said to be a complex process shaped by a multiplicity of contextual dynamics. The heterogeneous becoming nature of CSPs also raises important questions about the relational embeddedness of these processes within the wider practices of the partners, which is an aspect that I now turn to explore in the next sub-section.

9.1.2.2 The Ongoing Relational Dynamics Characterising the Emergence of CSP arrangements

My analysis also revealed that the processual becoming of CSPs is relationally defined and embedded within the wider practices of the partners. In other words, CSP processes are partially influenced and shaped by the wider practices of the partners.

A key concept in process thinking is relationality (Mesle, 2008; Garud & Gehman, 2012; Stout, 2012). According to Mesle (2008), relationality reveals that processes are not independent or externally related to each other. Rather, processes are internally related and participate in the constitution of each other (Mesle, 2008). In this regard, Stout (2012) argues that new organisational arrangements are always relationally embedded within wider already existing organisational processes. Whitehead (1927), too, states that each new ‘occasion’ incorporates trances of past ones, which is a process he calls ‘prehension’. This relational dependence reveals how new processes emerge out of other wider past processes. For process organisation scholars, therefore, it is important to emphasise the relational becoming nature of organisational phenomena.

Taking into consideration this key process thinking principle, my analysis sought to reveal how CSP processes emerge from and are embedded within the wider organisational practices of the partners. In the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, the CSP projects are designed to fit their wider current projects and goals. For instance, the children projects
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seek to resemble what ConstructionCo and KidsCharity are already doing. Similar dynamics are also noticed in the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership because the partners seek to align CSP projects with their wider already existing projects.

In this respect, the relational becoming nature of CSPs raises several important questions about the management of the partnerships. In particular, the analysis suggested that due to these relational complexities, actors have to deal with a variety of unexpected issues and problems. What is more, they often have to modify and adjust their plans in order to CSP activities with their wider organisational roles and duties. As we have seen in Chapter 7, actors often had to switch roles and engage in unexpected situations in order to successfully deliver certain parts of the projects.

What is also interesting to note is that the narrative accounts suggested that there is no one central control body that guides and directs the developments of CSPs. In current CSP research, managers are often depicted as the ones responsible for the control and coordination of CSP developments. Authors such as Huxham and Vangen (2001), for instance, state that managers are the ones who are responsible for addressing conflicts in collaborations and developing plans that can help actors achieve the goals of the partnerships. The narrative accounts of my study, however, argued that managers are unable to fully manage and coordinate all aspects of the CSP workings. A number of narratives revealed different personal reflections on the individual and collectives experiences of CSP dynamics. They seemed to challenge the commonsensical notions that CSP are developed according to some pre-defined goals or objectives. Rather, the narratives emphasised how multiple social complexities characterise the non-linear emergence of CSP arrangements. Such accounts
threw light on some of the processual social complexities inherent in the development of CSPs.

Despite the growing literature on the relational dynamics of organisational phenomena (Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Hosking, 2011; Dumlao & Janke, 2012; Garud & Gehman, 2012; Stout & Love, 2013), little research has been undertaken to examine the relational becoming nature of CSPs. Therefore, my analysis sought to reflect upon the relational complexities of CSPs.

In a similar vein, my analysis also attempted to analyse the degree of novelty inherent in the processual emergence of CSPs, an aspect I now turn to discuss in some detail in the following sub-section.

9.1.2.3 Novelty and Unpredictability

In the CSP literature, rarely do scholars talk about the novelty inherent in the development of CSPs. The process of developing CSPs is mainly depicted as a linear unfolding that proceeds through sequences of stages that produce positive outcomes. In contrast to such explanations, my analysis revealed that there is a degree of novelty inherent in the development of CSPs. A number of interviewees reflected upon the influence of different unexpected events and issues on the novel emergence of CSP arrangements. Their reflections provided insights into the diverse contextual dynamics and ongoing interruptions that usually lead the establishment of temporal novel arrangements. A range of narratives also emphasised the need for ongoing negotiations in order to address unanticipated effects in CSP workings.

A degree of novelty, thus, seems to be inherent in the development of CSPs. Novelty is a key concept in process thinking and suggests that nothing is entirely pre-defined by past events.
(Hussenot & Missonier, 2015). According to Whitehead (1927), there is always a degree of self-determination in the emergence of new processes. MacKay and Chia (2012), too, state that novelty helps us understand how intended actions can lead to unintended consequences. The narrative accounts of my study provided different insights into how unpredicted situations and issues produced a degree of novelty in the development of CSP projects.

In the case of the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership, the actors stated that they often had to modify plans and engage in unanticipated actions. For instance, FoodCo had to purchase new equipment because theirs did not fit CommunityCharity’s centre. This in turn also led to several re-arrangements regarding the training sessions as well as the number of people accepted onto courses. Similarly, in the case of the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, the actors stated that besides the ‘children projects’, they had often to come up with new ideas in order to develop more effective projects. As a consequence, the partnership had taken different directions which were not initially planned by the managers. Various ongoing negotiations and unexpected situations led to the establishment of different novel CSP arrangements.

My analysis, thus, suggests that various context-specific and process-related unexpected events and situations can lead to novel emergence of various CSP arrangements over time. MacKay and Chia (2012) state that a key task of process analysis is to show how directed actions can produce novel outcomes. My analysis sought to reveal the degree of novelty in the emergence of CSPs over time. In the case of FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership, I explored how actors reflected the issues and unintended consequences which shaped the novel development of the CSPs. Several actors reported how they had spent years trying to find mutual overlaps. What is more, the lack of direct managerial control led to lengthy
wanderings which did not establish any formal CSP projects. Only after several years did the managers start to identify mutual overlaps and develop some CSP projects.

The analysis also emphasised how during the delivery of the projects actors could develop different understandings about particular activities, which could lead to divergent actions and unanticipated effects. The marketing director of ConstructionCo, for instance, shared a story about how she had to leave work earlier in order to give a lift to a child who was at the training sessions. This unexpected situation, however, did not allow her to return on time to finish the delivery of the sessions.

In contrast to the research which seeks to explain the development of CSPs as a sequences of linear stages, my analysis sought to throw light on how various micro processes could lead to a novel emergence of CSP arrangements. My approach emphasised the importance of taking a more relational and process-based perspective in order to more faithfully appreciate and understanding the novel processual becoming nature of CSPs.

In the next section, I discuss my analysis of the effects and legitimacy of CSPs, thus offering a more sociological and political-informed critique of the outcomes of CSPs.

9.1.3 Questions Related to the Continuity and Legitimacy of CSPs

What are the effects and benefits of CSPs? How are they conceptualised and perceived? How are CSPs legitimised over time? The literature review in Chapter 2 revealed that much of the extant research has sought to measure and explain the objective effects of engaging in CSPs at different levels. Generally, the current literature tends to depict CSPs as instruments or input-out machines which produce particular effects.
In contrast to such approaches, my analysis sought to explore how CSP processes emerge from, are related to and are embedded within wider processes and in so doing to analyse how partnership workings seek to legitimise specific activities, actions and interests. The analysis revealed that CSP projects tend to address key interests and aims of the partners and so legitimise their wider temporal projects and objectives.

A central question in organisation studies concerns how organisational phenomena are sustained over time. According to Hernes (2008), organising processes construct and revolve around particular ‘themes’ or ‘aims’ which enable the continuity of organisational phenomena. For Hernes (2008), the circulation of different themes encourages actors/orrganisations to continue working together and helps them legitimise particular organisational engagements.

Following Hernes (2008), my analysis attempted to analyse how partners construct and circulate different themes which, as we have seen in Chapter 8, not only encouraged them to continue working together but also helped them legitimise particular partnership workings over time. In this respect, the analysis showed that actors attach different meanings to the partnership workings, which enable them to legitimise CSPs in different ways. In the following sub-section, I explore the different meanings attached to CSPs, while in the next sub-section I analyse how these meanings help partners legitimise different CSP workings.

**9.1.3.1 Different Meanings of CSPs**

Regarding the meanings of the partnerships, my analysis revealed that there are different pragmatic, economic as well as more ethical meanings attached to CSPs. Based on these meanings, the partners tend to employ different strategies to legitimise their engagements in CSPs. For analytical clarity, I have divided the meanings into two broad categories. The first
category is a more ethical or idealistic one because it presents CSPs as ethical or idealistic undertakings that seek to help communities and societies. A number of actors depicted CSPs as instruments which can solve social problems. In their view, CSPs can offer solutions to a variety of societal and environmental challenges. Therefore, CSPs are the ‘ethical thing to do’. In both partnerships, CSPs are associated with the notion of common goals between the sectors and the society at large. Often, CSPs were seen as a way to achieve mutually beneficial common goals. The ethical/idealistic meaning of CSPs, thus, seems to emphasise wider norms and values which are supported and embraced by societal members. The partners stated that CSPs are good for society because they improve the quality of life of the city. In addition, CSPs are also presented as way to reveal the ethical and moral responsibility of the organisations.

In contrast, the second category emphasised the more economic or instrumental meanings attached to CSPs. CSPs were widely viewed as opportunities or investments which generate various financial returns. In the other words, the instrumental meanings are concerned with the individual economic benefits for the partners and the potential internal effects on various wider organisational goals. Several actors argued that CSPs help retain employees, develop their skills and increase their productivity. For instance, the HR directors of FoodCo emphasised the potential recruitment opportunities that CSP projects can provide. Others also stated that there are various marketing, CSR, PR and reputation benefits coming from engaging in CSPs. A variety of different instrumental meanings are, thus, often attached to CSPs, which tend to emphasise the diverse individual benefits of CSP projects for each party. CSPs were repeatedly associated with increasing the job satisfaction of employees because they allow them to help children in need. The instrumental meanings of CSPs also suggested
that CSPs can increase the overall performance of the organisations. A similar observation is made by van Tulder et al. (2015) who state that CSPs can have a long-term positive economic impact on partners. They argue that CSPs can help the partnering organisations increase their overall economic performance. Yet, in contrast to their approach, which mainly seeks to measure the effects of CSPs, my analysis did not attempt to assess the objective outcomes of CSP projects. Rather, it sought to explore how actors constructed different meanings of CSPs and how these helped them legitimise their commitments to CSP workings.

The different meanings attached to the CSPs, thus, appeared to present two contrasting versions of partnership workings. The different meanings also reveal how the partners viewed CSPs depending on their perspectives in regard to the individual or societal implications of CSP projects. In addition, my analysis also threw light on how each person described the partnerships depending on his or her individual engagement in different CSP activities.

In relation to the wider literature on the effects of CSPs, my analysis contributed interesting insights to the studies which seek to explain the ways in which CSPs are viewed by the partners and how they perceive the effects of CSP undertakings (Das & Boje, 1993). The outcomes of my analysis are consistent with the studies which suggest that there are different meanings attached to the CSPs, such as ethical, moral or economic. Huxham (1996), for instance, claims that many organisations engage in CSPs for ethical reasons, while others mainly seek to pursue long-term economic benefits. Different organisations might perceive CSPs in different ways and, therefore, might expect different forms of return. In this respect, my analysis revealed that there is no one single meaning attached to CSPs but rather multiple ones depending on the form and scope of specific CSP projects. In other words, the meanings attached to CSPs are not pre-given but are socially negotiated and constructed in the
interactive processes between the partners. In other words, each partner constructs different meanings of CSPs depending on the perceived effects and benefits of CSP projects.

The different meanings also suggest that actors might change their views of CSPs over time depending on their CSP interactions and projects. For instance, in the case of the FoodCo-CommunityCharity partnership, the parties seemed to argue that the initial idea for forming the partnership was an ethical one. Yet, over time the partners realised potential economic benefits and so began to define CSPs as economic opportunities. Meanings of CSPs, thus, change depending on the interactions and the social negotiations between partners.

Furthermore, the analysis also pointed out that each actor’s meanings of CSPs also depended on his/her wider roles and positions. For instance, the CEOs often viewed the aims of CSPs as strategically important while the project managers usually saw CSP projects as part of delivering temporal services. Therefore, the analysis suggested that actors construct different meanings depending on their wider organisational roles.

It is also interesting to note that the participants did not report any negative views or meanings of CSPs. When I asked the actors to reflect upon the negative sides of CSPs, they tended to state that in general there were no negative consequences of CSPs. This might suggest that there was strong managerial influence on actors about the way they perceived and constructed the meanings of CSPs. Or, perhaps, actors might not have wanted to report any conflicts or disagreements about different CSP undertakings. This aspect, however, raised interesting questions regarding the lack of negative meanings and views of CSPs, which require further research.

As far as the key goals of the study are concerned, the analysis pointed out that different meanings are attached to CSPs which can be either more instrumental or ethical. Depending
on the forms of CSPs, diverse contextual dynamics and framings can influence the meanings actors attach to the partnership workings. In this respect, the thesis made contributions to the wider organisation studies which seek to explore how meaning making is influenced by and at the same time influences the emergence of organising processes over time.

The plurality of meanings challenged the more simplistic explanations in the literature which seek to fix the meaning or goal of CSPs. My analysis revealed that various meanings can be constructed and, therefore, no single meaning of CSP can be cemented. By throwing light on the ways different actors constructed different meanings of CSP, I sought to analyse how partners also legitimise their CSPs, which is what I now turn to discuss briefly in the following sub-section.

9.1.3.2 Multiple Legitimisation of CSPs

My analysis also suggested that the partners employ different strategies to legitimise their CSP engagements. Various actors offered different accounts about the legitimacy of CSPs based on the specific ethical and/or economic meanings they attach to CSPs.

In the broader organisation studies literature, two contrasting perspectives can be identified in relation to the legitimisation of organisational practices. Some scholars state that organisations employ definite logics to legitimise specific organisational practices (Purdy et al., 2017). For instance, Egels-Zandén et al. (2015) state that private firms usually legitimise their existence by reporting the positive economic effects of their activities. From this perspective, there are specific underlying logics which organisations use to legitimise their practices (Waldorff, 2013; Nicolini et al., 2016).
Other scholars, on the other hand, claim that legitimisation is a much more complex process because firms can employ different strategies and logics to legitimise their practices (Lindberg, 2014). In other words, there are no definite underlying logics which companies can employ to justify their practices. Rather, there are multiple ways through which firms can construct various logics to legitimise their practices (Lindberg, 2014). From this perspective, multiple forms of persuasion can be used to legitimise particular activities and goals (Nicolini et al., 2016).

My analysis identified several different logics through which the partners sought to legitimise their engagements in CSPs. Multiple views of the benefits of CSPs were presented and constructed in order to give specific reasons for why partnership workings were legitimate tools for addressing societal and specific individual organisational goals for the partners. For instance, some actors claimed that CSPs were useful for retraining employees, while others stated that CSP projects were good for CSR and publicity. Managers often also associated CSPs with various more long-term strategic objectives and the potential effects of CSP projects on the local economy. There were, thus, both broad and specific logics which sought to give various reasons why CSPs were legitimate tools for addressing different goals. This aspect further revealed that there were different ways of framing the benefits of CSPs which could be used to legitimise specific CSP engagements.

In this regard, what is also interesting to note is that in order to legitimise their CSP engagements, partners only reported the perceived positive aspects of CSPs. Actors were not critical of any negative implications of CSPs. Rather, they mainly depicted CSP projects as valuable tools to fight unemployment, poverty and the problems of NEETs. The majority of
accounts centred on the direct relationship between the perceived effects of CSPs and the wider societal benefits of CSP projects.

By exploring the ways through which the partners framed the benefits and needs to continue working in CSPs, the analysis sought to throw light on the ways in which they used different strategies to build the legitimacy of their CSPs. In this regard, the analysis revealed that the legitimisation of CSPs is an ongoing process of constructing multiple arguments about the need to continue working on various CSP projects. The acknowledgment of the existence of multiple ways of legitimising CSPs challenges the more simplistic explanations which suggest that organisations employ straightforward simply logics to legitimise their activities. My analysis revealed that there is no one single way of constructing the benefits of CSPs. Rather, multiple framings may construct different perceived notions of the benefits of CSP engagements and so legitimise different aspects of CSPs.

Furthermore, the analysis also suggested that partners construct different accounts to legitimise CSPs depending on the audiences targeted. For instance, the companies’ websites emphasised particular societal implications of CSPs and so seek to legitimise CSPs to the wider public. On the other hand, the interview accounts presented different more specific reasons for sustaining CSPs. This aspect revealed that different strategies could be used to legitimise CSPs depending on the targeted audiences. Various accounts could be constructed to legitimise CSPs to internal stakeholders, while others could be constructed to legitimise CSPs to the wider public or specific interest groups. A similar observation is also made by Egels-Zandén et al. (2015) who state that legitimisation practices usually target specific groups, such as internal and external stakeholders. My analysis adds to these insights by
revealing the different ways in which the partners legitimised their CSP undertakings depending on the targeted audiences.

The key contribution of the analysis is, thus, in providing various explorations of the ways in which different accounts seek to legitimise CSPs. The study identified a variety of broad as well as more specific accounts and threw light on how they constructed different reasons for the need to sustain the CSPs. In this respect, the analysis offered interesting insights into different discursive elements used to socially construct and legitimise different aspects of CSPs.

The outcomes of the analysis also raise important questions for future research which can explore the differences and commonalities between the employees and managers in regard to the practices of legitimising CSPs: Why do managers tend to emphasise the economic benefits of CSPs while employees the more ethical ones? How can we explain these differences? Do these differences change over time? If yes, why? If not, why not? What are the relationships between the internal and external legitimisation processes? How are CSPs legitimised to different audiences? etc. These questions can extend our understanding of the emergence of CSPs and help us understand the ways in which CSPs are legitimised at different levels.

9.2 Summary

This chapter discussed the analysis of the thesis in a more focused way. In particular, it sought to reveal how my analysis offered a more processual understanding of the emergence of CSPs in relation to the wider literature on CSPs. The chapter argued that a process thinking perspective could provide rich insights into the becoming, non-linear emergence of CSPs.
In the first section, I discussed the outcomes of my analysis on the decision making processes to join CSPs. In particular, I reflected how a variety of different contextual dynamics might influence the decisions to enter CSPs. In the second section, I further discussed my analysis of the ongoing dynamic processes enacting and sustaining CSPs. I argued that my process analysis revealed that CSPs do not follow any linear patterns, as proposed by the wider CSP literature. Rather, CSPs emerge in a novel and non-linear manner. The concepts of heterogeneous becoming, relational embeddedness and novelty were used to explore and reflect upon the multiple dynamics that might influence and shape the scope and nature of CSPs.

Lastly, in the third section, I discussed my analysis of the meanings and legitimacy of CSPs. In particular, I discussed how different accounts sought to legitimise specific CSP activities and how they encouraged the partners to continue working together. Future research can build on these insights in order to advance our understanding of the processual emergence of CSPs.

In the next chapter, I summarise the key contributions of the study and reflect upon the implications of the analysis at different theoretical, empirical and practical levels.
Chapter Ten: Ending

This chapter summarises the key outcomes of the thesis and reflects upon the main contributions, implications and limitations of the study. It also discusses potential future areas for research that can help us advance our process understanding of the emergence of CSPs.

Let me briefly recapitulate what I have done so far. In Chapter 1, I began the thesis by stating the research aims and questions of this study. In Chapter 2, I reviewed the CSP literature and reflected upon the need to develop a process approach to study the processual becoming nature of CSPs. In particular, I argued that a more process-based approach can help us explore the processes that enact and sustain CSPs over time. In Chapter 3, I introduced my process-based theoretical approach and discussed its implications in regard to the main aims of the study. In Chapter 4, I discussed how I generated and analysed the empirical material of the study. In Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8, I presented the key outcomes of the analysis. Chapter 9 aimed at discussing the analyses in a more focused ways, thus linking the outcomes of the analyses to the broader existing literature on CSPs. In this last chapter, I will summarise the key contributions of the study and discuss how they have addressed the main aims of the thesis. The chapter proceeds as follows.

In the first section, I discuss the theoretical, methodological and practical contributions of the study to the existing body of knowledge on CSPs. In the second section, I discuss the limitations of the study and reflect upon the challenges and difficulties of undertaking process-based research. In the third section, I propose areas for future research which can help us advance our process understanding of CSPs. In the fourth section, I briefly discuss my
personal experiences and offer my reflections on the process of undertaking this research, before moving to finally give my concluding remarks in the fifth section.

10.1 Research Contributions

The thesis makes several important theoretical, empirical and practical contributions to the existing body of knowledge on CSPs. This section discusses each of these individually.

10.1.1 Theoretical Contributions

The main contribution of the thesis lies in advancing our process understanding of the emergence of CSPs as social processes. The process thinking lens adopted here allowed me to theoretically conceptualise and empirically analyse how CSPs emerge from, are related to and are embedded within wider existing organisational practices. The approach argued that a more process-based analysis can help us appreciate the social complexities of CSPs. In this respect, my theoretical orientation has sought to re-direct attention to the dynamic processes that enact and sustain CSPs.

A process theoretical orientation emphasises a becoming ontology and so contributes to the studies that seek to offer a more dynamic understanding of CSPs. At a theoretical level, thus, the study emphasised the importance of critically assessing the processes of theorizing CSPs and the issues in regard to seeking to discover the laws or underlying factors that presumably shape CSP processes. According to Vock et al. (2013), the majority of CSP scholars are still mainly concerned with seeking to uncover the driving forces that shape these social phenomena. The main assumption held is that there are external forces that shape CSPs. As the predominant worldview in CSP research, such an orientation seeks to explain the dynamics of CSPs in terms of general laws and factors. Various studies have often sought to
confirm and test hypotheses in order to develop more general theories of the emergence of CSPs

In contrast to such theoretical attempts, my process theoretical orientation sought to provide a more reflexive elucidation of the emergence of CSPs as processes of becoming. From a process perspective, doing research is not simply about observing and explaining the essence of phenomena but is a way of temporally constructing reflections, often imaginatively, on CSPs as social organisational processes. This aspect reveals that research findings and reflections are and always remain partial understandings of CSPs.

From a process thinking perspective, temporal understanding is more important than measurement (Hernes, 2008). According to Hernes (2008), a key aim of process research is to try to understand, as much as possible, what is ‘going on’ rather than discover and explain the presumed underlying factors that are supposed to shape social phenomena. This, however, does not mean that process scholars do not examine different conditions or circumstances that might directly influence the emergence of new phenomena. On the contrary, Hernes (2008) states, process scholars focus on these conditions but view them as bundles of interrelated processes, which allows them to make sense of how they give rise to diverse organisational phenomena. In this regard, Nayak (2008b) argues, process theorising does not seek to put an end to scientific inquiry, here understood as an attempt to uncover the universal laws of nature and/or social phenomena, but to rethink the way we construct temporal understandings of the emergence of phenomena.

Furthermore, the process theoretical orientation adopted here also invited us to rethink the notion of ‘data’ as ‘capta’ (Hernes, 2008). The word ‘data’, Hernes (2008) states, usually assumes ‘neutrality’ in analysing and presenting empirical findings. In other words, there is an
assumption that empirical research is about generating unbiased ‘data’ that is later objectively analysed. Form a process view, however, doing research is also about selection and framing, which are necessary elements to produce temporal meanings of phenomena. Yanow (2006) argues that research is not about capturing what is simply ‘out there’ but rather constructing different meanings and explanations of the phenomena under investigation. Hence, doing research also suggests making selections which influence the way we depict and represent social phenomena.

The concept ‘data’, which we usually refer to as neutral information that can explain the essence of phenomena, is nothing but a socially constructed narrative account which is subject to selection and negotiation. Hernes (2008), therefore, argues that we should not talk about ‘findings’ but particular reflections which seek to throw light on what is ‘going on’. Process-based research, Hernes (2008) states, emphasises the necessity of infinitely making selections and framings which reveal the different ways we can make sense of social phenomena. This, however, should not be understood as relativism or as a way of giving up the notion of having a more ‘concrete’ understanding of social phenomena. Rather, Hernes (2008) argues, it is important to also analyse how our framings influence the way we represent social phenomena. ‘Capta’ rather than ‘data’ better captures this aspect in social science research. The notion of ‘capta’ reveals that no ‘finding’ is possible without selection, which further suggests that having a complete and neutral empirical explanation about phenomena is impossible (Hernes, 2008).

The theoretical implications of my study, thus, emphasise the importance of critically assessing the processes at work in theorising CSPs and the localised understandings these processes construct of CSPs. This theoretical shift towards seeking to explore CSPs as
processes of becoming is both challenging and rich in potential. According to Nayak (2008), the key goal of process theorising is to acknowledge and analyse the dynamic processes of constructing temporal reflections on the becoming nature of social phenomena. Such an orientation also puts the researcher in the world rather than simply assuming that he or she is independent and exist outside the phenomena ‘out there’. Attending to ‘pure process’ (Nayak & Chia, 2011) requires participation rather than observation in co-constructing temporal understandings of social phenomena. As a promising alternative to the traditional forms of theorising, process thinking perspectives can also help us throw light on the wider ethical and political dynamics which influence the way we represent and theorise CSPs.

The theoretical contributions of the thesis, thus, stem from the efforts made to develop a more process-based theoretical orientation to study the social becoming nature of CSPs. In contrast to the predominant normative and managerial approaches in the current literature, my theoretical approach sought to understand how different processes enact and sustain partnership workings over time and how they legitimise particular partnership practices. In this respect, my theoretical approach has also attempted to emphasise how diverse contextual dynamics and unexpected events can influence the novel emergence of CSPs. In the next subsection, I discuss the methodological contributions of the thesis.

10.1.2 Methodological Contributions

The thesis also makes several methodological contributions to CSP research. In particular, it argued that a more narrative approach to empirical enquiry can help to throw light on how various actors make sense of and give meaning to the social complexities of CSPs. So far, narrative-based interviewing methods have rarely been used to explore the social dynamics of CSPs. The primary methodological contribution of the study, thus, lies in offering a more
narrative-based approach to analyse the complexities of CSPs. My analysis offered an investigation of multiple accounts of various practitioners who reflected upon diverse complexities of CSPs.

In Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8, I demonstrated how different actors make sense of CSP dynamics and how their narratives challenge the linear official accounts, which usually present the emergence of CSPs as a straightforward process. By analysing different narratives, the analysis illustrated similarities and differences between the accounts and explored the way they reflected the complex issues characterising the emergence of CSP workings. The chapters revealed how diverse narratives discussed different ambiguities in CSP processes and how they reflected various power dynamics that partially influenced the emergence of CSPs. My analysis, thus, suggested that narratives reported various changes in CSP workings and revealed how actors make sense of CSP activities over time. In this regard, the thesis also attempted to show the ongoing becoming nature of CSPs by reflecting upon the plurivocal narratives offered by the practitioners.

In addition, the narrative approach fitted well with my wider theoretical and empirical concerns because it allowed me to develop a more processual interpretation of the ways in which actors report and discuss the emergence of CSPs over time. The narrative approach also enabled me to make some sense of some of the historical conditions and circumstances that have led to the formation of the CSPs. Therefore, I argued, a narrative approach was suitable for my process approach because it offered interesting insights into the individual and group sense making processes of CSP experiences.

In contrast to the conventional form of research, which usually presents empirical material as straightforward communication of facts, the narrative approach adopted here argued that we
cannot explain the development of CSPs through linear sequences of events. The narratives analysed in the previous chapters revealed that the development of CSPs was quite a complex process characterised with ongoing changes, political dynamics and ambiguities. Various actors described how diverse events and situations influenced and shaped the emergence of CSPs. In this regard, the study revealed the potential positive implications of further using more narrative-based approaches to study CSP workings.

In addition, the narrative accounts also drew attention to the authoring processes used by the actors. Buchanan and Dawson (2007) state that narratives seek to shape meaning and therefore actors might employ different strategies to persuade listeners. Several scholars have emphasised how the authoring processes of narratives might emphasise particular events and exclude others. Reflecting upon these issues around the authoring processes of narratives, I have tried to discuss how different actors reported different aspects of CSPs in relation to their roles and the wider official accounts presented in the collected secondary documents. My analysis revealed that narratives can be and in most cases are indeed theory-laden or politically driven, thus expressing complex relations between different aspects of CSPs. Process research takes a critical stance on narratives in order to examine how they report contrasting and sometimes competing versions of the same events (Dawson & Buchanan, 2005). According to Buchanan and Dawson (2007), therefore, it is important to treat empirical materials critically and not simply perceive them as objective facts. In the context of my research, I treated narratives with a great degree of caution, which enabled me to generate richer analysis of the dynamics of CSPs. The methodological contributions of the thesis, thus, lie in seeking to offer a processual-based narrative analysis of CSPs which, I hope to have shown, can reveal in more detail the complex dynamics of CSPs.
Having briefly summarised the methodological contributions of the study, in the next subsection I will discuss the practical implications of the analysis.

10.1.3 Practical Implications

At a practical level, my analysis suggests that managers are not the sole architects of CSPs. Various contextual dynamics, such as the ones explored in the previous chapters, reveal that CSP workings emerge in a non-linear and novel manner. Therefore, practitioners need to be aware of and pay attention to how unexpected events and contextual dynamics might, in one way or another, influence the novel emergence of CSP processes.

According to Huxham (1996), CSPs are complex phenomena because partners usually hold different views about the role of CSPs. These differences in perception might lead to conflicts and consequently to collaborative inertia (Huxham & Vangen, 2004). Therefore, managers can benefit from developing more flexible strategies which can help them negotiate any issues as they arise during the processes of developing CSPs. Holding a more processual view might help managers to more effectively understand how different contextual dynamics influence CSP workings over time.

Furthermore, the analysis also suggests that paying attention to the relational complexities can help practitioners better understand the emergence of CSPs. Keeping in mind that CSPs are always in the making can help actors develop different ways of work on different aspects of CSPs. Using a range of narrative strategies, managers can also seek to influence the meanings of CSPs and so build a common understanding among employees about the goals of CSP projects.
At another level, being aware of the influence of wider institutional rules and regulations on CSPs can help managers negotiate and clarify institutional issues which might disturb CSP workings. Furthermore, this can help them build more trust between employees and stability in the relationships. A more open and flexible approach to management, the analysis suggests, seems to be a more appropriate way for managing CSP workings over time.

In addition, the analysis also suggests that managers should not simply categorise the effects of CSPs as either ‘good’ or ‘bad’. Rather, they may benefit from analysing how CSPs help them legitimise their wider organisational practices and aims. This does not mean, however, that managers should not try to measure the effects of CSPs. Rather, they can also benefit by analysing how CSP workings can help them legitimise particular engagements.

The potential practical implications of holding a more processual view to CSPs also stem from the ability to develop ‘contextual sensitivity’ to the variety of ongoing processes that influence the emergence of CSPs. A process perspective challenges the traditional understandings of the linear development of CSPs and suggests that managers and employees may benefit by accepting the non-linear becoming nature of CSPs.

In regard to the employees’ engagements in diverse CSP activities, the thesis emphasises the importance of balancing CSP experiences with the wider work duties of actors. The analysis suggests that actors need to be aware of the sometimes complex interrelationships between their CSP engagements and their wider work roles and, therefore, they need to work in a way that does not disrupt their everyday work duties and tasks. Managers can work closely with employees to discuss personal issues and experiences which can help them develop different ways of dealing with employees’ challenges. According to Huxham and Vangen (2005), ongoing open discussions and negotiations seem to be a key element in decreasing ambiguity
around CSP projects. My analysis further adds that open discussions and conversations can also serve as platforms for discussing new ideas which, in turn, can help parties develop more innovative ways of developing CSP projects. Adopting a process perspective, thus, offers a potential for developing a more dynamic understanding the novel becoming nature of CSPs.

In the next section, I discuss the limitations of the study and propose future areas for research.

10.2 Limitations and Areas for Further Research

In this section, I discuss the theoretical and empirical limitations of the study and suggest future research directions which can help us advance our processual understanding of CSPs. In the first sub-section, I focus on the limitations of the thesis while in the second section I discuss the specific topics and areas for future research.

10.2.1 Limitations

Every study has its limitations and mine is no exception. A number of challenges accompany the use of a process thinking perspective to study organisational phenomena such as CSPs. Although process thinking approaches seek to re-direct attention to the complex becoming nature of phenomena, they still cannot avoid talking about entities such as actors, characteristics or features as if they are pre-given. Process scholars recognise these issues and therefore make serious efforts to explain ‘entities’ as effects of ongoing processes (Chia & Holt, 2006). Yet, unable to discuss everything in great detail, they still have to use some entative forms of expression in order to analyse organising practices. This could be considered a limitation for process thinking and process organisation research in particular.

In this respect, process research can be accused of being reductionist, despite the fact that this is the issue it seeks to overcome and address. Trapped in the inescapable necessity to use
tentative forms of expressions, process scholars are unable to fully understand ‘pure process’ (Halewood & Michael, 2008). Organisational actors are often depicted as entities that hold particular views and have certain characteristics. To address this concern, however, process scholars tend to use more versatile non-dualistic phrases (Stout, 2012) to explain how they make sense of and represent social phenomena. In so doing, process scholars hope to be able to emphasise the ‘fluidity’ (Fortwengel et al., 2017) of the becoming nature of social phenomena and so help the reader partially grasp the relational dynamic becoming of organisational phenomena.

Furthermore, process research does not tend to offer generalisations, which can be considered a limitation. Yet, Hernes (2008) states, process analyses offer deep insights into the influence of continent dynamics on the emergence of organisational phenomena. In other words, process studies do not offer universal explanations but rather present insights that help us understand the processual emergence of organisational phenomena.

Another limitation, which can be considered more specific to the study, is the use of only two methods to generate the empirical material. Due to the inability to follow actors as they engaged in CSP activities, I had to employ interviews, along with collecting secondary sources, to generate the empirical material for the study. I could not engage in direct observations, which prevented me from exploring the everyday activities of CSP workings. In addition, I was not able to talk to all people who were engaged in the CSPs, because the key contacts appointed the ones whom they considered more appropriate for the study. If I had had the chance to talk to other senior level managers, perhaps, I could have explored in more detail the different political and ethical issues that influenced the decisions and dynamics of CSPs. In terms of the interview accounts, thus, I only drew upon the narratives that were
offered by the selected employees. A lot of employees who were previously engaged in the CPSs were not interviewed because some of them were not selected, had left the organisations or were no longer engaged in the CSPs. Therefore, I had to rely on the currently engaged employees to analyse the dynamics of CSPs. Nonetheless, I still believe that the generated empirical accounts allowed me to reflect upon the various social complexities of partnership workings. I sought to ask the interviewees a variety of different questions, which enabled me to analyse how they made sense of and gave meanings to different CSP activities.

The use of a narrative-based approach to interviewing has also its limitations. Rhodes and Brown (2005) state that narrative analyses can be quite selective in the sense of allowing researchers to use only specific narratives that fit their wider framework or assumptions. Due to the flexibility of narratives, researchers might edit and use specific accounts to persuade the audience about specific aspects of the phenomena under investigation (Rhodes & Brown, 2005). Being aware of this issue, I sought to be more reflexive about how I used and presented the narratives. In addition, throughout the chapters, I discussed how my interpretations influenced the way I presented the analysis. I made several comments on how I analysed the narratives and how my approach allowed me describe the plurivocal accounts of the dynamics of CSPs. Thus, I did not treat narrative accounts as facts but as ways of making sense of and giving meaning to specific engagements. Following Buchanan and Dawson (2007), I also attempted to be more critical about the accounts which, I hope, revealed my awareness of the issues and challenges of using narrative-based approach to study CSPs.

At another level, the sample size of the study can also be considered a limitation. I used only two case studies, which is a relatively small sample size. Gillham (2000) argues that a small number of cases provides limited details about larger populations. Considering the research
aims of the thesis, however, I had to focus on a small number of cases in order to explore the
processual becoming nature of CSPs. A large sample size would not have allowed me to
explore in detail the processes and the contextual dynamics that enact and sustain CSPs over
time.

Last but not least, a limitation of the study also derives from the inability to analyse CSPs
over time. Process research usually tends to be longitudinal, which allows researchers to
explore phenomena over a long period of time (Pettigrew, 1990). Due to the time constraint of
my PhD programme, I was not able to develop a more longitudinal study of the CSPs over
time. Future research can proceed in this direction by developing longitudinal analyses of
CSPs, which can help us analyse the emergence and change of CSPs over time.

In the next section, I propose future areas for research which can help to advance our
understanding of the becoming nature of CSPs.

10.2.2 Areas for Future Research

Despite the rich insights of my process analysis, I still admit that future research is needed to
expand our process understanding of CSPs. The thesis yields several promising directions for
future research on the processual becoming nature of CSPs.

First, at a theoretical level, the study emphasises the importance of developing other process-
based theoretical orientations which can give new perspectives to analyse different dynamics
of CSPs. The extant research on CSPs is split between approaches that seek to explain the
barriers and enablers of CSPs and others that seek to develop more dynamic micro-based
analyses of the complexities of CSPs. The former tend to explain the development of CSPs as
linear unfoldings moving through specific stages or steps while the latter seek to examine how bundles of processes enact and sustain CSP arrangements over time.

The development of process-based approaches can help us explore the non-linear novel emergence of CSPs and the relational dynamics which influence CSP workings. In other words, process approaches can help us reveal the relational embeddedness of CSPs within wider organisational practices, which in turn can help us throw light on how relational issues that shape CSPs over time.

A process theoretical orientation also promises a better understanding of the ‘translation dynamics’ (Hussenot, 2008) between CSPs and the wider social processes of the partners. Nicolini (2010) states that understanding the emergence of new phenomena requires an analysis of how new processes emerge from other processes and how they interrelate and interact with each other. Processual analyses can generate rich insights into these dynamics and help us explain the dynamics and legitimacy of CSPs at different levels. Furthermore, process analyses can help us track changes over time and so reveal insights into the changing nature and roles of CSPs.

In contrast to the majority of present research on CSPs, which tends to depict these phenomena as machines or tools that produce particular effects, a process perspective can help us raise questions about the ways in which CSPs support and legitimise particular organisational arrangements. As we have seen in Chapter 8, the partners sought to develop CSP projects that replicated what they were already doing. By engaging in CSP workings, they attempted to legitimise or de-legitimise particular arrangements and interests. There was little emphasis on the effects of CSP projects on the end-users (such as NEETs in the ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership or the unemployed people in the case of the FoodCo-
Community Charity partnership). This aspect raises important ethical questions about the potential of CSPs to address societal challenges and the ways CSP projects seek to legitimise particular interests. Future research can drill deeper into these questions and explain the social complexities and dynamics of CSPs.

Second, at a methodological level, future research is needed to capture the messiness of partnership processes. In contrast to the models that seek to explain the dynamics of CSPs in terms of stages, we need methods that can help us study the micro activities that enact and sustain CSPs. That means more ethnographic work is likely to help us analyse the ongoing processes enacting CSPs. Hernes (2008) states that process perspectives encourage us to study the ‘going ons’ of phenomena and so help us appreciate the constantly changing nature of organisational dynamics. In this respect, to study CSPs processually means to analyse CSP processes in situ and to acknowledge the performative nature of the research methods we use to analyse and represent CSP activities. Adopting a process ontology, thus, suggests putting movement, change and flow at the centre of empirical analysis (Langley et al., 2013). In this regard, authors such as Stout (2012) also argue that processual epistemologies further suggest that we will never be able to fully grasp the dynamic unpredictable nature of phenomena. Therefore, we have to admit that we will never build a complete and final theory of the social world but we will always be on the way to theory (Nayak, 2008). Process analyses should not be understood as attempts to discover facts but as a way of offering more faithful reflections on the complexities of social phenomena.

In terms of some specific topics, I have identified several themes that need further research. During the analysis of the interview accounts, I noticed that various identity tensions seemed to play a role in the processes of developing of CSP projects. For instance, in the case of the
ConstructionCo-KidsCharity partnership, the members of ConstructionCo often stated that as ‘business professionals’ they should be leading and guiding the processes. On the other hand, however, KidsCharity’s members seemed to resist such intentions and claimed that they were also professional and, therefore, they should be equally contributing in the development of CSP projects. Identity-tensions, such as who is who or who should be responsible for what, seem to be present in the dynamic development of CSPs. Future research can explore these tensions and analyse how ‘identity work’ influences and shapes the development of different CSP projects.

The outcomes of the analysis also suggest that future research is needed to explore how CSP processes facilitate and/or complicate the wider organisational concerns and processes of the partners. As I briefly explored in Chapter 7, different members reported how they often had to change roles in order to deliver specific aspects of the CSP projects. For instance, the marketing director of ConstructionCo argued that she frequently had to take extra responsibility, such as acting as a teacher or a consultant, in order to successfully deliver the different training sessions for the NEETs. These responsibilities, however, sometimes created conflicts with her wider professional responsibilities. On the other hand, some actors reported that CSP activities improved their experiences and made their jobs more enjoyable. Further research can explore these relational dynamics and analyse how CSP processes influence the wider organisational practices of the partners.

Last but not least, the study suggests that there is limited research on the so called ‘objects’ of CSPs. CSP projects are usually depicted as tools which address particular social issues such as children’s issues, homelessness, poverty etc. However, there is little research on how such ‘issues’ are depicted and conceptualised. Further research is needed to explore such aspects
and analyse how different framings, conceptualisations and understandings influence the ways CSP projects are developed and delivered. By exploring some of the above mentioned topics, future research can extend and enrich our processual understanding of the dynamics of CSPs.

In the next section, I provide my final commentary and reflection on the issues of the undertaking this research study, before concluding the thesis with a final remark.

10.3 Personal Commentary and Reflection

In this section, I want to briefly reflect upon my personal experiences in undertaking this research.

During the last five years, I have learned a lot about the processes of doing social science research. As my first and biggest research study so far, this PhD study allowed me to immerse myself in the project and learn as much as possible about the different ways of doing research. I became familiar with different theories and gained knowledge on different methods used to undertake social science research.

I realised that doing research is not a straightforward process as I initially thought. Rather, there are numerous issues and questions that shape research. At the beginning of my journey, I was not aware of this issue and expected to complete my PhD on time. My experience, however, showed me that doing qualitative research is a complex endeavour which can be judged and assessed in different ways. There are no definite criteria which guarantee success. I was surprised to realise that a single work can be defined by some as ‘good’ while by others as ‘not so good’. That revelation made me think a lot about the criteria used to judge the quality of qualitative research. Nevertheless, these challenges helped me improve myself and rethink my career plans for the future.
In terms of the processes of generating the empirical material, I learned a lot about ‘interviewing’ as a method that generates specific forms of ‘data’. I also learned about the importance of developing ‘contextual sensitivity’ to the interview situation, which seems to be a crucial element in encouraging interviewees to talk about their experiences. Of course, I faced various challenges during the interviews which, however, helped me improve my research skills.

During the process of generating the empirical material, I took numerous notes, which I read multiple times in order to reflect upon my experiences. I came to realise that interpretation is a key element that shaped the way I perceived and represented CSPs. Discussions with my supervisors and colleagues were also helpful in this process.

I also faced some challenges in the processes of conducting the interviews. I re-arranged several interview dates because actors did not turn up due to work related duties (such as being out of town etc.). In many situations, I was unsure what I was doing and felt anxiety about the project. Yet, I did not give up and continued until the end.

I also had to re-organise the thesis several times. I revised each chapter more than a few times until I completed the final version. In this respect, I ought to admit that there is no such thing as a perfect research study or thesis and that everything can be further improved. The completion of this thesis took me five years, during which I experienced countless sleepless nights.

Nonetheless, the overall research experience has been a fantastic opportunity, which I will remember for the rest of my life. The study helped me improve my understanding of CSPs and opened up new ventures for future research. I also learnt to think a bit more critically about CSPs, which I hope will help me achieve some of my personal goals in regard to CSPs.
In writing this brief personal reflection, I want also to emphasise that my analyses are only partial accounts of CPSs and, therefore, cannot fully or completely explain the dynamics of these phenomena. In a world of constant change and becoming, my engagements were only temporal reflections which gave a partial glimpse of CSPs. The study, however, encourages further research, which can help us extend our understanding of the becoming nature of CSPs.

10.4 Concluding Remark

The aim of this thesis has been to analyse the dynamic processual emergence of CSPs. The study has developed an innovative approach based on process thinking which helped to develop a more dynamic understanding of the becoming nature of CSPs. As an alternative perspective to the still predominant structural approaches used to study CSPs, the process perspective adopted here allowed me to re-conceptualise and empirically analyse the processual emergence of CSP processes. In particular, the study re-directed our attention to the ongoing social dynamics and complexities that enact and sustain CSPs.

I hope this thesis triggers the interest of CSP scholars and encourages them to further develop different process analyses of CSPs. At the same time, being aware of the limitations of the study, I also invite the readers to give their critical reflections, which are of no less importance.
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Appendix 2 – A General/Guiding List of Questions Used in the Interviews

1. Could you, please, introduce yourself and your role within your organisation?

2. Could you, please, explain how you became interested in developing cross sector partnerships?

3. Why?

Followed by several secondary questions depending on the answers:

- 

- 

4. How did your relationship develop with the particular organisation?

5. How do you develop the programmes with them?

6. Are there any issues?

Followed by several questions depending on the answers:

- 

7. How do you measure success?

8. What are the benefits of working in CSPs?

Followed by several questions depending on the answers:

- 

9. How do you see your relationship for the future?

Thank you very much!
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