

Opposites Attract

A multiple case study of the relationship between
managers in cross-sector collaborations

Abstract

The new wave of cross-sector collaborations between corporations and civil society organizations (CSOs) differs from the relationships of the past and has grown in popularity and importance. Fundamental differences between the corporations and CSOs make corporate-CSO collaborations (CCCs) complex from a management perspective. This causes uncertainty among the managers involved in these collaborations of how CCCs should be managed. Drawing on CSR and cross-sector collaboration literature, we develop theory about how corporate and CSO managers handle uncertainty in CCCs. Through a multiple case study of ten collaborations in Sweden we highlight the relationship component in CCCs. We propose a link between the collaboration stage and type of relationship between the managers, by showing that more intensive collaborations involve a genuine and personal relationship between the managers while less intensive collaborations are rather dependent on calculating costs and benefits or sharing ideals and values.

Keywords: cross-sector collaboration, civil society organization, corporation, relationship, uncertainty, rationality

Stockholm School of Economics
Master Thesis
M.Sc. in Business & Management
May 2016

Authors:

Hanna Falemo (40699)
Daniel Filipson (50099)

Supervisor:

Stefan Einarsson

Word count: 19976

Acknowledgments

We are deeply thankful to all managers from the corporations and civil society organizations for their participation in this thesis, without your acceptance this study would not have been possible. We would also like to give a special thanks to our supervisor Stefan Einarsson for his supportive guidance and insightful ideas throughout the process. To our friends and family, thank you for your cheerful support and helpful comments.

Hanna Falemo and Daniel Filipson

Stockholm, 16th of May 2016

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose and Research Question	2
1.2 Important Definitions	2
1.3 Thesis Disposition	3
2. Literature Review	4
2.1 A Review of CSR Literature	4
2.2 CSR in the Swedish Context	5
2.3 Cross-Sector Collaborations between Corporations and CSOs	6
2.3.1 Collaboration Continuum	7
2.3.2 Collaboration Value Construct	9
2.4 Uncertainty and Rationalities in Human Interactions	10
2.5 Summary of Theory Section	12
3. Methodology	14
3.1 A Study of the Social World	14
3.2 Methodological Fit	14
3.3 Research Approach.....	15
3.4 Research Design: Multiple Case Study	15
3.4.1 Case Sample	16
3.5 Data Collection	18
3.6 Data Processing and Analysis	20
3.7 Research Quality.....	20
3.7.1 Trustworthiness	20
3.7.2 Authenticity.....	21
4. Empirical Findings	22
4.1 Bonnierförlagen and its Collaborations with Berättarministeriet, Läxhjälpen and Svenska Basketbollförbundet.....	22
4.2 IBM and its Collaborations with Sustainergies and Transfer	23
4.3 SJ and its Collaborations with Friends, Mind and Min Stora Dag	24
4.4 Swedbank and its Collaborations with Friends and Ung Företagsamhet	26
5. Analysis	28
5.1 Collaboration Stages.....	28
5.1.1 Collaborations in the Philanthropic Stage	29
5.1.2 Collaborations in the Transactional Stage	31
5.1.3 Collaborations in the Integrative Stage	34
5.2 Reducing Uncertainty in CCCs	36
5.3 The Complexity of CCCs	38
6. Conclusion	40
6.1 Addressing the Research Question	40
6.2 Going Beyond the Research Question.....	40
7. Discussion	42
7.1 Theoretical Contributions.....	42
7.2 Practical Contributions	42
7.3 Limitations to Contributions.....	42
7.4 Suggestions for Further Research	42

8. References.....44

9. Appendices.....51

 Appendix A. Interview Sample51

 Appendix B. Interview Guide.....52

1. Introduction

In 1998, the United Nations Secretary General stated that *“peace and prosperity cannot be achieved without partnerships involving governments, international organizations, the business community and civil society. In today’s world, we depend on each other.”* Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) further argued that no individual organization or sector has the capabilities to deal with the complexity of socioeconomic and environmental problems on its own, thereby proposing cross-sector collaborations as one part of the solution. Cross-sector collaborations refer to the actions and commitments between organizations from two or more sectors, either the public, corporate or civil society sector, in which organizations commit various resources and agree to work cooperatively towards a common development goal. Civil society organizations (CSOs) have a long history of collaborating with the public sector. In contrast, it was unimaginable for many CSOs to collaborate with corporations until the most recent decades (Ross, 2012). Corporations and CSOs have a tradition of opposing views on social and environmental issues, and as a consequence engaging with the other sector has historically been seen as “sleeping with the enemy” (Rondinelli & London, 2003). Overcoming long-standing stereotypes and prejudices within their respective communities has been a challenge in corporate-CSO collaborations (CCCs) (Austin, 2000a). However, there has been a shift in attitudes in both the corporate and civil society sector as the benefits of collaborating have become more obvious, overshadowing previous preconceptions. CSOs have become more responsive to the needs of corporations’ corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs and are more willing to collaborate in order to achieve shared goals (Jamali & Keshishian, 2009).

Although interaction between the corporate and civil society sector has become more accepted in general, engaging in common activities is not uncomplicated. From a management perspective, CCCs can be difficult to manage due to incongruences between the partner organizations’ strategic objectives (for-profit vs. not-for-profit), governance structures, resources (large vs. small), capabilities and commitments, among other things. These differences can cause situations of uncertainty for managers who are involved in these collaborations (Couchman & Fulop, 2009). At the same time, confusion concerning the roles of partners has emerged, partly because of blurring boundaries between the sectors as CSOs begin to participate in commercial activities while companies take more political stands (Galaskiewicz & Sinclair Colman, 2006; Prakash, 2002; O’Riain, 2000). While partners in CCCs have inherent differences causing uncertainty and complex relationships, these differences can also be sources of benefits and create powerful synergies and change (Makower, 1994; Seitanidi & Ryan, 2007). As a result, CCCs have grown in popularity and importance (Austin, 2000b).

Even if the CCC has gained interest from a broader audience, existing studies neglect to study it as a two-way relationship, leading to literature solely presenting the perspective of the corporation or the CSO in isolation. It has been pointed out by scholars (e.g. Berger et al., 2004; Schiller & Almog-Bar, 2013) that existing literature on CCCs focuses on the business’ perspective, often derived from a CSR point of view (e.g. Carroll, 1999; Garriga & Melé, 2004; Porter & Kramer, 2002; Van Huijstee & Glasbergen, 2010). A limited part of research has dealt with the perspective of the CSO (e.g. AL-Tabbaa et al., 2014; Herlin, 2015; Sanzo et al., 2015; Ählström & Sjöström, 2005). This separation creates biased conclusions as it considers only the needs of one part in a two-part collaboration. For a more realistic view of the collaboration phenomenon, the voice of both partners needs to be raised. Through a multiple case study, we unfold both perspectives and treat the partner organizations as equal counterparts in order to highlight the importance of reciprocity.

One of the prominent researchers of CCCs is James Austin. According to Austin's collaboration continuum, collaborations can be categorized in one of four stages: philanthropic, transactional, integrative, and transformational (Austin, 2000a; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). When a collaboration moves through the continuum, the relationship intensifies, with an increased level of engagement and demand for greater resources and commitment. One limitation in understanding value creation in CCCs is according to Austin & Seitanidi (2014) the difficulty to distinguish among different types of collaborative relationships. Even though Austin provides a useful framework and captures the perspective of both partners, in contrast to most literature in this field, the relationships' impact on collaborations have been underemphasized and needs further understanding. In this study, we intend to develop the understanding of CCCs by focusing on the relationship dimension and add Sjöstrand's (1985) concept of rationalities and uncertainty in human interactions.

1.1 Purpose and Research Question

The purpose of this thesis is to address the gap in CCC literature through a multiple case study of ten collaborations and to answer the following research question:

- *How do corporate and CSO managers handle uncertainty in corporate-CSO collaborations?*

By answering the research question, we contribute to the nascent state of theory of CCCs. For practitioners, this allows managers both in the corporate and civil society sector to make more informed decisions about how to manage their collaborative initiatives. As of today, few partners fully understand what CCCs entail and how to make them successful.

1.2 Important Definitions

To assure that the terminology used in this thesis is clearly understood, we will provide definitions of two key concepts:

Civil Society Sector: The sphere separated from both the state and the market is often referred to as the nonprofit or voluntary sector (Wijkström & Lundström, 2002). The most common term for this sector in Sweden is "*ideell*" sector. We have chosen to use the term civil society sector as it best describes the Swedish term.

Civil Society Organization (CSO): A non-state, not-for-profit, self-governing and voluntary organization in the civil society sector (Salamon & Anheier, 1998). The Swedish term for a CSO is "*ideell organisation*", but it lacks a proper corresponding term in English. CSO, non-governmental organization (NGO), and nonprofit organization (NPO) are terms often used interchangeably, which could lead to confusion as the concepts are overlapping, still they have somewhat different meanings. Austin uses the terms CSO, NGO and NPO synonymously (2007:49). In this thesis we use the term CSO as an umbrella term for the large variety of organizations in the civil society sector.

1.3 Thesis Disposition

This thesis has the following structure:

2. The subsequent **Literature Review** starts off with a review of CSR literature and CSR in the Swedish context. Then, we move into the area of cross-sector collaborations focusing on those between corporations and CSOs in particular. We also present theory concerning uncertainty and rationalities in human interactions. The theoretical section altogether provides the necessary tool for the study to address the identified research gap.
3. In the **Methodology**, the choice of conducting a qualitative study with an abductive approach and a multiple case study design is motivated. We present the methodological choices in data collection and data processing and analysis, and thereafter assess the research quality.
4. In the **Empirical Findings**, the collected data consisting of ten cases is presented.
5. In the **Analysis**, the empirical findings are analyzed with respect to the theoretical framework. First, we focus on the cases according to the collaboration stages and then move on to discuss how managers handle uncertainty in CCCs. Finally, we highlight the complexity present in CCCs.
6. In the **Conclusion**, the research question is answered and the result of the study is presented. We also move beyond the research question to provide additional insights.
7. In the **Discussion**, the theoretical and practical contributions are discussed, with some limitations in mind. Suggestions for further research are also included.

2. Literature Review

In this chapter we present a historical review of CSR literature (section 2.1) and CSR in the Swedish context (section 2.2). Then we move on to literature on cross-sector collaborations between corporations and CSOs (section 2.3) and uncertainty and rationalities in human interactions (section 2.4). Having presented the relevant theory in previous research we conclude by summarizing the concepts (section 2.5) that we will bring forward in the analysis.

2.1 A Review of CSR Literature

In academic literature, the concept of CSR was first mentioned by Bowen (1953) in his book *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. This was the beginning of a new area of research and the concerns he raised are of much importance, even today. In the early stages of CSR research, literature followed two main streams, either social contract theory or moral agency theory.

Social contract theory has its roots in moral and political philosophy and has to do with one's moral obligations towards society. The classical moral and political philosophers Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau played an important part in the development of social contract theory. The theory is based on the assumption that there exists an implicit social contract among the people who form the society. This concept has later been applied to corporations and it is thus argued that there is a social contract between corporations and society (e.g. Eells & Walton, 1961; Elbing & Elbing, 1964; Garriga & Melé, 2004). From this perspective, a corporation is regarded as a citizen and thereby also has some kind of responsibility towards the community. On the other hand, proponents of the moral agency theory argue that corporations have the ability to act as moral agents in society and thus act with moral principles and rules (e.g. French, 1979; Ozar, 1979). More importantly, moral agency theory states that corporations can be held morally responsible for their actions. A critique to moral agency theory is that corporations do not have moral status of their own since they are not human beings.

The dominating concept in business and society literature during 1970s and 1980s was corporate social performance, with conceptual developments by Carroll (1979), Wartick and Cochran (1985), and Wood (1991), among others. Corporate social performance is a multidimensional model that includes both responsibility and responsiveness by incorporating different aspects of responsibility (economic, legal, ethical and discretionary), as well as the analytical process to identify relevant issues, and a set of principles of engagement. However, corporate social performance was criticized for being complex and inadequate for empirical testing since studies aiming to validate the models obtained inconclusive results (e.g. Aupperle, 1984; Clarkson, 1995).

From the 1990s, it became more common to integrate different stakeholders as scholars identified that prior research did not take the different interests, expectations, experiences and evaluations of various stakeholders into account (Wood & Jones, 1995). This wave of research emphasized how different stakeholders were affected by corporate actions, both responsible and irresponsible. Stakeholder literature became increasingly included in business and society research and left a major footprint (e.g. Abzug & Webb, 1999; Andriof & Waddock, 2002; Freeman, 2004; McWilliams & Siegel, 2001; Waddock, 2002).

Recent additions to CSR literature are for example creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2011) and hybrid organizations (Billis, 2010). The first concept, creating shared value, is in essence a business concept which suggests that there are considerable links between a business' strategy and its CSR

efforts, that can lead to competitive advantages (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Porter and Kramer (2011:15) argue that *“the most fertile opportunities for creating shared value will be closely related to a company’s particular business, and in areas most important to the business”*. The second concept, hybrid organizations, implies that organizations do not have to fully belong to one sector of society, e.g. the business sector or the civil society sector (Billis, 2010). An organization can in fact combine the commercial for-profit logic of a corporation with the social logic of a CSO, thus making it a hybrid organization. Social entrepreneurship is an example of the hybrid organization. These organizations address social, cultural and environmental challenges through innovative solutions (e.g. Arend, 2013; Pless, 2012). In contrast to most companies, the goal for social entrepreneurs is not to generate financial profit to the owners but to generate social value through its business operations. Social entrepreneurship has been an established concept in the United States for some time, while this type of business started to gain significant interest among younger generations in Europe in the recent years (Grafström et al., 2015).

As social and environmental issues have become more frequent conversation topics in the corporate world and among its stakeholders, many labels have arisen to capture these concepts. While the term CSR is still well recognized, further additions to the terminology used in corporate communication are for example: sustainability, corporate citizenship, business ethics and stakeholder management (Carroll & Shabana, 2010; Matten & Crane, 2005). Common ground for practitioners and academia is the inclusion of many stakeholders, attention to a wide range of issues, and the openness to do business in new unconventional ways (Ghobadian et al., 2015).

2.2 CSR in the Swedish Context

In the Swedish business society, the term CSR has only been used during the recent decade. Hultén and Wijkström’s book title *200 years of community benefits: 10 years of CSR*¹ (2008) illustrates how CSR has become the zeitgeist when dealing with social issues. For a more recent view of the use of CSR in Sweden, a review by Grafström et al. (2015) showed that 96 percent of the Swedish corporations at OMX Large Cap provided information about their social responsibility on their websites in 2015. In comparison to a previous review by the same authors in 2006, they noted that sustainability has become the most commonly used label to present these efforts, and that the term CSR is being abandoned (Grafström et al., 2015).

In contrast to the Swedish heritage of businesses’ community involvement, Anglo-American corporations have used CSR terminology and taken an active role in civil society debate for quite some time (Jutterström & Norberg, 2011). One of the most prominent CSR activities carried out by corporations in the United States is charity, emerging from the tradition that wealthy Americans should engage in philanthropy (Maignan & Ralston, 2002). However, not everyone was in favor of these kinds of actions. For example, Friedman (1962:112) criticized this claiming that *“if the corporation makes a contribution, it prevents the individual stockholder from himself deciding how he should dispose of his funds”*.

Charitable giving in Sweden is different from that in Anglo-American and many other European countries (Lundström & Wijkström, 1997). Sweden has in many ways been the symbol for the welfare state, with egalitarian social policies, extensive welfare services and redistribution of wealth (Vamstad &

¹ Translated from the Swedish title: *200 år av samhällsnytta: 10 år av CSR*.

von Essen, 2013). In fact, there are two opposing views on the topic of charitable giving in Sweden (Vamstad & von Essen, 2013). One view is that charitable giving to social developmental purposes should be funded through Sweden's taxation system, which has among the highest tax levels in the world. The opposing view takes a more moral perspective and argues that it is admirable to share one's wealth with the less fortunate, e.g. through donations. During the 20th century the institution of the welfare state was perceived as modern and promising (Vamstad & von Essen, 2013). But in the following decades, Sweden was influenced by American cultural patterns (Schröter, 2005).

Jutterström and Norberg (2011) mention the concept of *implicit CSR*, referring to execution of CSR practices without labelling it as CSR. Implicit CSR is especially common among corporations in Scandinavia, but is also present among other firms in Europe. This can be a symptom of the Swedish culture where it is not desirable to brag (Daun, 1989). In the past, North American firms have generally been keen to talk about their CSR work while European corporations have been more focused on execution (Maignan & Ralston, 2002). As the competition among companies became global and more intense, European firms adopted the Anglo-American viewpoint and started to articulate their CSR work publicly to a greater extent (Jutterström & Norberg, 2011). At that time, Swedish corporations could take advantage of their implicit CSR traditions and already established practices, e.g. responsibility for environment and employees, in order to communicate their CSR efforts. Swedish companies are according to several reports leading within social responsibility and have been successful in global CSR initiatives and rankings (AccountAbility, 2007; Gjølborg, 2009).

2.3 Cross-Sector Collaborations between Corporations and CSOs

Differences that have been cemented historically between the corporate and civil society sector have led to limited interactions between the sectors, and have traditionally kept them apart. There is also a sharp separation in academia between the fields of, e.g. law, business and social work (Googins & Rochlin, 2000). Despite these fundamental differences, many corporations and CSOs have in recent years realized the benefits with collaborating, and even find cross-sector partnerships as a necessary tactic (Murphy & Bendell, 1999).

The field of CSR consists of a large body of research, as the sections 2.1. and 2.2. indicate, while CCC is a much narrower and novel area of research. Both the number and importance of CCCs has increased during the past decade (Andreasen, 1996). This has fueled the development of CCC literature, with the focus on attaining more knowledge about how these cross-sector collaborations work. Literature on CCC is still in its early stages and the lack of a unified framework has resulted in scattered contributions. In order to provide a comprehensive view of the existing academic landscape of CCCs, representative authors and their methodologies are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. REPRESENTATIVE AUTHORS AND METHODOLOGIES IN CCC LITERATURE			
Conceptual Papers	Case Studies & Small Samples	Large Samples	Mixed Methods
Bryson et al., 2006; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Galaskiewicz & Sinclair Colman, 2006; Dahan et al., 2010	Ashman, 2001; Austin, 2000a, 2000b; Berger et al. 2004; Dorado et al., 2009; Jamali & Keshishian, 2009; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b; Lister, 2000; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009		Rondinelli & London, 2003

From reviewing CCC literature, no studies using data from large samples were found. It was however not unexpected, since such a study would have many practical challenges due to the immaturity of the theoretical field in combination with a high level of heterogeneity among collaborations and partners.

Another observation was the limited amount of research prior to 2000. A common theme for the studies represented in Table 1 was the researchers' emphasis on the need for additional case studies of CCCs in order to gain new insights.

Austin's book *The Collaboration Challenge* (2000a) was written for business and nonprofit leaders who want to partner effectively to create mutual benefits and positive social impact. Austin set the foundation of a conceptual framework for the emergence of CCCs, where the *collaboration continuum* and the *collaboration value construct* are essential components. His conceptualization has been acknowledged in cross-sector collaboration literature and has been built further on by scholars (e.g. Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b; Schiller & Almog-Bar, 2013; Seitanidi & Ryan, 2007). Austin's theory is useful when analyzing the perspective of both partners in a CCC, which is the intention of this study.

Critique on Austin's conceptualization include unclear distinction between the collaboration stages (Wymer, 2001), oversimplification of complex partnerships (Jamali & Keshishian, 2009), lack of attention to the actual social outcomes (Seitanidi, 2010), and absence of differentiation among the forms of interaction within collaboration stages (Seitanidi & Ryan, 2007). A book review of *The Collaboration Challenge* in the academic journal *Voluntas* implied a higher practical than theoretical contribution (Wymer, 2001). Researchers have found his work useful, while many has also emphasized the importance of developing and refining the framework in further research (e.g. Berger et al., 2004; Galaskiewicz & Sinclair Colman, 2006; Glasbergen et al., 2007; Wymer, 2001).

2.3.1 Collaboration Continuum

The collaboration continuum serves to identify what stage a collaboration is in and how it may evolve over time. In its original form, it consisted of three stages: *philanthropic*, a charitable donor and recipient relationship, *transactional*, with more active engagement and two-way value flow, and *integrative*, a joint venture strategically important to both organizations (Austin, 2000a). Austin and Seitanidi later extended the framework with a *transformational* stage, focused to "co-create transformative change at the societal level" (2012a:736). As a collaboration moves along the continuum, a higher level of commitment is required from both partners. Deeper collaboration generally comes with greater opportunities for co-creation of value, but it also increases the complexity. A collaboration relationship can move through the stages by progressing over time, but does not necessarily have to go through all stages sequentially. A collaboration can even regress to a previous stage by accident or because of conscious actions. Hybrid collaborations, placed in different stages simultaneously, may also exist (Austin, 2000a). In Table 2 below there is an overview of the collaboration continuum and its key parameters.

TABLE 2. COLLABORATION CONTINUUM					
Relationship Stage	Philanthropic		Transactional		Integrative
Level of Engagement	Low	⇒	⇒	⇒	High
Importance to Mission	Peripheral	⇒	⇒	⇒	Strategic
Magnitude of Resources	Small	⇒	⇒	⇒	Big
Scope of Activities	Narrow	⇒	⇒	⇒	Broad
Interaction Level	Infrequent	⇒	⇒	⇒	Intensive
Managerial Complexity	Simple	⇒	⇒	⇒	Complex
Strategic Value	Modest	⇒	⇒	⇒	Major

Source: Austin, 2000b

In the philanthropic stage, resources deployed and points of interaction are limited (Austin, 2000a). The collaboration is relatively simple to manage and inhabit a low level of importance to the organizations' mission. Benefits are easy to identify, and in general, the CSO increases its funding while the corporate partner enhance its image as a community supporter and gets access to the organizational capabilities it lacks to address a certain issue (Austin, 2000a, Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). In short, *"the business is the funder and the nonprofit is the doer"* (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a:738).

In the transactional stage, the resource exchange is carried out by specific activities, such as cause-related marketing, event sponsorships, highly developed employee volunteer programs, name and logo licensing, or paid service agreements (Austin, 2000a; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). This type of collaboration has a closer link to business operations (Austin, 2000a), and resources deployed are often specialized in turn creating a complementary function (Waddell, 2000). The transaction between the partners moves from being monetary to nonmonetary (e.g. skills and competencies), producing a deeper relationship (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). The partner interaction is broadened and intensified, and the relationship has a higher degree of mutuality (Austin, 2000a). Complexity in the transactional collaboration is higher, but the nature and magnitude of the benefits have the potential to grow significantly (Austin, 2000a).

In the integrative stage, the partners' mission, people, and activities are more synchronized and, the collaboration is characterized by a higher degree of collective efforts (Austin, 2000a; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). Integration between the partners intensifies and the organizational culture is affected by the other's culture. More intense interaction demands an increased level of engagement and greater resources (Austin, 2000a). Resources are to a greater extent derived from key assets and core competencies. Intangible assets, e.g. trust, learning, knowledge, communication, transparency, conflict management and social capital, grow in significance as they have intrinsic value to the organizations, and individuals are enablers for the integrative collaboration. (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a) Collaborations in the integrative stage experience a higher degree of complexity, requiring implementation of processes and procedures, which ultimately makes the alliance institutionalized (Austin, 2000a).

In the transformational stage, the uttermost stage in the continuum, partners agree on a social issue relevant to both (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b; Waddock, 1989). They also put emphasis on producing change through social innovation that improve the lives of others (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a), and the end beneficiaries take a more active role in the transformation process (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a). The objective is ultimately to create disruptive social innovations (Christensen et al., 2006; Kanter, 1983). As the social problems addressed by transformational alliances are often more complex or urgent, the need for involvement from other organizations rises, resulting in multiparty, multisector collaborations. Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) claimed that the transformational stage was rather theoretically than empirically based and that such collaborations rarely exist in practice.

Similar conceptualizations as the collaboration continuum have been proposed by other scholars, although somewhat different in terms of content and focus. Just as the case for CCC literature in general, there is no standardized framework and researchers therefore often develop their own labels and theoretical concepts. Bryson et al. (2006) have in one end of their continuum organizations that have little interaction when dealing with a public challenge that exceeds their capabilities, similar to the philanthropic stage. In the middle, they place organizations that exchange information or make coordinated efforts to pool their capabilities to address the problem, similar to the transactional stage.

At the other end, one finds organizations that have “merged into a new entity to handle problems through merged authority and capabilities” (Bryson et al., 2006:44), as in the integrative stage. Rondinelli and London (2003) present a continuum moving from low-intensity “arm’s-length” relationships, e.g. corporative contributions and donations or marketing affiliations similar to activities in the philanthropic stage, to moderate-intensity “interactive collaborations”, e.g. CSO certification of business practices or corporate support for specific CSO projects and similar to the transactional stage, to high-intensity “management alliances”, such as CSOs and corporations working together to prevent pollution or environmental damage by changing products and processes, which is similar to the integrative stage. Moreover, in their systematic review of community involvement literature Bowen et al. (2010) developed a “continuum of community involvement” with three proposed strategies, from “transactional engagement”, corresponding to the philanthropic stage, to “transitional engagement” which lacks a proper definition as it is rather seen as a transition to “transformational engagement”, which has traits from the integrative and transformational stages with references to joint problem-solving, decision-making and sense-making. Googins et al. (2007) propose a continuum of company relationships with stakeholders moving from unilateral, similar to the philanthropic stage, to mutual influence, related to the transactional stage, to partnerships and alliances, comparable to the integrative stage, and finally multiorganization, with relationships striving to achieve social change and further motivated the need for Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) to add the fourth, transformational, stage.

2.3.2 Collaboration Value Construct

In all cross-sector collaborations there is some type of exchange between the corporation and the CSO. Austin (2000b) argues that it is important to take a closer look at the collaborations’ value proposition. The collaboration value construct is used as a conceptual framework for understanding more clearly how value is created through cross-sector collaborations (Austin, 2000a). It builds upon resource dependency theory and social exchange theory. Resource dependency theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) argues that it is resource scarcity that motivates organizations to act in order to attain these needs. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) raise the concern that one receiving part might lose power and autonomy to the resource provider. In contrast, social exchange theory deals with reciprocity and the resource asymmetry that can occur when partners perceive an unequal exchange of value (Oliver, 1990).

The collaboration value construct focuses on the value creation process in CCCs. Value can either be created through independent actions of one of the partners, i.e. sole creation, or it can be created through the partners combined actions, i.e. co-creation. Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) suggest that greater value is created when collaborations start to co-create value, generally the case for collaborations in the integrative or transformational stage. There are four dimensions of the collaboration value construct: *value definition*, prior to entering a collaboration, and *value creation*, *value balance*, *value renewal*, during the collaboration.

Value definition relates to the collaboration benefits each partner identifies on beforehand. The expected benefits serve as a guidance in the collaboration’s initial phase. The more specific one can set forth the expected benefits to the partner and to the society, the greater guidance the collaboration will have. Some of the benefits CSOs generally define before entering a collaboration with a corporation are financial resources, goods and services, access to networks, technical expertise, and greater name recognition (Austin, 2000b; Dahan et al., 2010; Googins & Rochlin, 2000). From the corporate perspective, the benefits from a CCC can be an improved image and reputation, improved employee

morale, talent management, opportunities to develop employees' skills, and enrichment of corporate values and culture (Austin, 2000b; Dahan et al., 2010; Porter & Kramer, 2011). In addition, Googins and Rochlin (2000) state that collaboration with CSOs can help corporations to access new markets and unique data.

Value creation is important in all collaborations. According to Austin's (2000b) framework, value can be created in three different ways. Firstly, value is created when an organization provides the other partner with resources. For example, when a corporation provides financial resources to a CSO, and the CSO gives a sense of "doing good" to the corporation. This generic resource transfer is common in philanthropic collaborations. Secondly, value can be created through exchange of core competencies that the recipient partner, potentially, can leverage. For example, a corporation can provide knowledge and expertise in areas such as financial analysis or technology, and the CSO can provide expertise in their area, such as how to manage people and relationships. This two-way value flow is typical for collaborations in the transactional stage. Lastly, value can be created jointly, which is common in integrative and transformational collaborations. (Austin, 2000b) For example, goods and services are produced by combining both organizations' competencies and resources. Research on CCCs suggests that each partner benefits from a collaboration when one part brings either resources, capabilities or other assets that the other partner cannot easily gain on its own (Dahan et al. 2010). It is in fact in the combination of resources, capabilities and knowledge the real value lies for both partners.

Value balance means that benefits must flow in both directions in a CCC. If the exchange becomes unbalanced it can damage the partners' motivation to continue investing in the collaboration. The importance in addressing power imbalances have been mentioned in several studies (Bryson et al., 2006; Herlin, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; Seitanidi & Ryan, 2007). On the contrary, Schiller and Almog-Bar (2013) found in their study evidence that CSOs weak positioning in relation to corporations may be a strategic choice and suited for the CSO's organizational culture and daily practices. A weaker positioning allows the CSO to satisfy corporations' wishes to a greater extent, possibly leading to an increased number of partners and thus a larger pool of financial resources.

Value renewal is important as perceived collaboration benefits might erode over time, i.e. transferred skills become internalized by the recipient partner. Therefore, it is necessary not to fall into complacency but to seek new opportunities to renew the value in the collaboration. (Austin, 2000b)

2.4 Uncertainty and Rationalities in Human Interactions

In his theory concerning rationalities in human interactions, Sjöstrand (1985) uses uncertainty as a key concept. Uncertainty refers to the *"perceived difference between the amount of information and kind of information required to perform a task on the one hand, and the amount and kind of information possessed on the other hand"* (Sjöstrand, 1997:9). This implies that uncertainty cannot be determined by an objective quantity, but is a personal experience that is highly subjective. Experiencing uncertainty is therefore a "psychological state" of the involved individual (Downey & Slocum, 1975). Uncertainty can be dealt with at many levels at the same time, leading to an individual, interactional and collective process (Sjöstrand, 1997). The individual process deals with the basic capabilities possessed by the individual when dealing with uncertainty, while the collective process concerns the attempts to organize and institutionalize trust. In this thesis, the focus is on the interactional process which in addition to an individual's own action also considers the actions of others, both those experienced and expected.

Dealing with uncertainty is seen as an “interpersonal phenomenon” constantly present in human interactions, and not solely based on individual activity (Sjöstrand, 1997).

Sjöstrand (1985) argues that uncertainty is always present in business and when interacting with other people. Humans have a strong aversion for uncertainty, and therefore seek different solutions, or rationalities, in order to manage this uncertainty. Managerial uncertainty has traditionally been assumed as reducible, since managers are able to acquire and access more, better and newer information and possess considerable calculative competencies, making uncertainty into a statistically determined measurable risk. Sjöstrand (1997) poses that uncertainty can only be reduced up to some point, regardless of the information available or calculation technique at hand, since some level of genuine uncertainty will always remain. Genuine uncertainty is based on the fact that nobody really knows what will happen in the future. In fact, the need for managers can partly be explained by the presence of genuine uncertainty, leading to unexpected events and situations needed to be handled ex post, as organizations would else be self-regulating (Sjöstrand, 1997). At the same time, all humans including managers have limited and varying capacity to process information. The limitation of human computation contradicts the classical view in managerial literature of *homo oeconomicus*, which considers the human being as rational and calculative. Instead, people should be regarded as multi-rational actors. Sjöstrand (1997) means that the concept of *homo complexicus* is more appropriate to explain the nature of human beings in modern society, admitting that people use different rationalities, also non-calculative, to deal with uncertainty. To reduce uncertainty in human interactions managers can so forth have Sjöstrand’s (1997) four types of relationships, *calculative*, *ideal-based*, *genuine* and *coercive*, where the three latter refer to non-calculative rationalities. See Table 3 for an overview of the different rationalities and their most important qualities.

TABLE 3. BASIC RELATIONSHIPS IN HUMAN INTERACTIONS			
Type of Relation	Information Locus	Interaction Purpose	Reproduction Content
CALCULATIVE	Price	Exchange	Capital
IDEAL-BASED	Text	Redistribution	Ideals, Values
GENUINE	Position	Reciprocity	Trust
COERCIVE	Physical Resources	Repression	Order

Source: Sjöstrand, 1997

In calculative relationships, individuals do not generally know each other, apart from their position and function and there is an on/off momentary transaction. It is purely self-interested or self-oriented as the person tries to maximize his or her own benefit in certain ways (Sjöstrand, 1985). It can for example be done by calculating costs and benefits (Sjöstrand, 1997). This anonymous relation makes individuals interchangeable and not unique (Sjöstrand, 2000). Since they do not rely on any particular interaction of exchange, they are interested in other types of information, such as prices or the characteristics of products and services. Calculative relationships are usually of shorter duration, fragmental or occasional. In practice, it is difficult to have a purely calculative rationality, except perhaps in very simple and transparent situations, due to the complexity of accessing all information and interpreting it correctly (Sjöstrand, 1997).

The second type of rationality is based on ideal-based relationships, where individuals share ideals and values to reduce uncertainty (Sjöstrand, 1985). These common affiliations help build trust and bridge geographical, human or temporal gaps and distances in the interaction (Sjöstrand, 2000). The ideals and

values unite people who are not acquainted with each other and offer a shared context. It can also help to provide a social or cultural identity (Sjöstrand, 2000).

The next type of rationality refers to the genuine relationships between human beings, dealing with uncertainty from a positional and status perspective. Genuine relationships are close and with known others. They can be either biologically determined, e.g. in the form of family or kinship, or built on love or friendship (Sjöstrand, 2000). Some researchers have found the family relationship the most fundamental one for human beings and in many ways it functions as a prototype for other relationships (e.g. Aldrich & Whetten, 1981; Haralambos, 1980; Kelley et al., 1983). Genuine relationships have an emotional tie and high levels of trust and authenticity (Sjöstrand, 1993). Involved actors are usually regarded as special and irreplaceable, although the actual relationship has also been found important in itself (Sjöstrand, 1997). Interactions are frequent and both partners have a mutually strong influence over the relationship. Other traits include a broad variety of exchanges and that the relation is long-lasting.

The last type of rationality to regulate uncertainty is the coercive relationship, based on physical force or violence (Sjöstrand, 1997). Coercive relationships are usually not discussed in management contexts as they rarely should exist, with the exception of obvious areas concerned with such aspects, e.g. in the military or police (Sjöstrand, 1997). However, Sjöstrand (1997) means that this type of rationality is actually present in organizations, and in its latent form, e.g. threat or blackmail, is even fairly common.

Sjöstrand (2000) mentions that managers in an organization do not solely rely on one type of rationality in practice, but have different rationalities to varying degrees although one is probably more dominant. He further emphasizes that empirical studies are needed to provide more definite information about the proposed theoretical constructs. There are only few references to Sjöstrand's (1985) concept of rationalities in particular, but some scholars have confirmed the presence of different interactions and forms in organizations (e.g. Reed et al., 2005). The calculative rationality is still considered the most acknowledged and important way of dealing with uncertainty in managerial literature and textbooks (e.g. Greenley, 1989; Tichy, 1983; Asch & Bowman, 1989), but Sjöstrand (1997) stresses the need to add non-calculative rationalities based on relationships, especially when calculations are difficult or impossible to make. In cross-sector collaborations literature, little attention has been given to relationship theories. These theories become relevant when the two counterparts get to know each other and put a meaning to the relationship.

2.5 Summary of Theory Section

CSR literature and practices have changed over time and social and environmental issues have gained increased attention internationally. In a Swedish context, the state with its extensive welfare services has historically played an important role in addressing many of society's social issues. Today, the weaker welfare state in Sweden leaves a vacuum of responsibility for the corporate and civil society sector to address many of the social and environmental issues. Anglo-American cultural patterns have also influenced Swedish corporations to increase their communication of CSR efforts. Corporations and CSOs are now collaborating to a larger extent and both have realized the benefits of collaborating across sectors. Yet, many questions remain unanswered in literature regarding the format for CCCs.

Austin's (2000a) collaboration continuum provides a useful framework for making a rough differentiation of CCCs by dividing them into four different stages: *philanthropic*, *transactional*,

integrative and *transformational*. The collaboration value construct is helpful in understanding the value creating process. In the study of CCCs many scholars including Austin (2000a) oversimplifies the relationship dimension and do not acknowledge different forms of interaction among the partners involved. Sjöstrand (1985) argues that uncertainty is always present in interpersonal interactions and that humans act in ways to reduce their uncertainty. Much of the managerial literature regards humans as rational and calculative. Sjöstrand (1997) claims that humans are in fact not always rational and that they can have different rationalities, including non-calculative, to deal with their uncertainty: *calculative*, *ideal-based*, *genuine* and *coercive*. We will dig deeper into the CCC phenomenon by using Austin's conceptualization, through the lens of managers' rationalities.

The existing literature uncovers a research gap in understanding the relationships in CCCs. We intend to address this by answering our research question: *How do corporate and CSO managers handle uncertainty in corporate-CSO collaborations?*

3. Methodology

In this chapter we discuss the methodology of our study, by presenting the research process and motivating our methodological choices. We begin by describing our perspective on theory and research (section 3.1), then we present, the methodological fit (section 3.2), research approach (section 3.3), research design (section 3.4), data collection (section 3.5), data processing and analysis (section 3.6). Lastly, we comment on the research quality (section 3.7).

3.1 A Study of the Social World

This thesis studies the social world, allowing multiple views of reality. According to the hermeneutic philosophy an objective reality does not exist, only subjective interpretations of it. We have chosen a hermeneutical approach since we are interested in the managers' own understanding and interpretation of the collaborations.

Social entities can be treated as either objective entities or social constructions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The two contrasting perspectives are objectivism and constructionism, and can be viewed through the lens of two central fields in social science: organization and culture. Objectivism states that the organization and culture are pre-given and tangible and hold the characteristics of an object. Constructionism challenges these social entities as external realities that acts on and constrains people and instead poses that they are in an emergent reality in constant construction and reconstruction. (Bryman & Bell, 2011) Our view is that the understanding of social reality is constructed from individuals' experiences and therefore this study takes the perspective of constructionism.

The epistemological considerations address the question of what is regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline. One of the key issues concerns whether natural science methods should be applied when studying the social world (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Constructionism rejects practices and norms in the natural science model, especially positivism, in favor for interpretivism, i.e. *"the way individuals interpret their social world"* (Bryman & Bell, 2011:27). Information is acquired through a process based on an individual's past experiences, personal views, cultural background etc. The individual then constructs his or her interpretation of the information that makes up his or her knowledge.

3.2 Methodological Fit

As previously mentioned, this study investigates how corporate and CSO managers handle uncertainty in CCCs. By studying the collaborations in-depth we can provide guidance for the actors involved by making them understand mechanisms affecting the relationship, and potentially help them improve present and future collaborations. After evaluating the various research strategies, a qualitative research strategy was chosen in order to shed light on the phenomenon of CCCs. The qualitative research method is suitable for delivering deep insights of certain situations (Merriam, 1994), and is helpful when answering *how* and *why* questions (Yin, 2003; Pratt, 2009). Qualitative studies emphasize words, rather than quantification, in the collection and analysis of data (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Pratt (2009) argues that one of the greatest problems with qualitative research is the lack of an accepted "boilerplate". There is no theoretical agreement on the qualitative methods and for determining the quality in its studies. There are many ways to conduct good qualitative research, although not all ways are necessarily good ones.

A fundamental difference between the qualitative and quantitative research strategy is based on the relationship between theory and research, emerging from the state of existing literature. As stated in the literature review, the field of CCCs is relatively unexplored and the need for further research has

been continuously emphasized by academics. Edmondson and McManus (2007) suggest a qualitative research strategy to deal with this nascent state of prior research. A qualitative strategy allows openness to data, making it possible to create new constructs and identify patterns.

3.3 Research Approach

When conducting this study, we used an abductive research approach. Abductive research is an iterative process making the investigators move back and forth between data and theory, and is a mix of the inductive and deductive research approach. An inductive process begins with the research object and collection of data, and thereafter theory is generated based on the findings (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Having a strict inductive approach is difficult in practice as it implies that researchers have no sense of the direction of the study when initiating it. On the contrary, a deductive approach starts with already existing theory which the researcher uses to formulate hypotheses, and data is thereafter collected and analyzed to confirm or reject the hypotheses (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Since existing theory on CCCs is limited it was difficult to project what variables would emerge from the data. Hypothesis testing of specific relationships between variables in the form of a deductive research approach should therefore be avoided (Edmondson & McManus, 2007). In order to create a suitable research approach, we took advantage of appropriate aspects from both the inductive and deductive process.

Throughout the process we had a close tie to both theory and data. Before data collection began, we were not certain what to expect or find. By reading prior research about cross-sector collaborations in general and CCCs in particular, we got inspiration on how these collaborations can be studied. When we went to collect data we were especially guided by the theoretical framework developed by Austin (2000a), yet we kept an open mind to let unexpected views and opinions emerge. As the data collection progressed, we realized that there were aspects of the collaborations that earlier research underemphasized and oversimplified, namely the relationship between the partners. This made us go back to literature and search for theory that could provide further explanation about such relationships. We came across Sjöstrand (1985), whose conceptualization proved to be a suitable complement to Austin (2000a) in order to complicate the collaborative relationships and contribute to a more realistic view of the phenomenon. Through this abductive process we were able to study a complex matter and gather rich empirical data in a structured way, while simultaneously keep theory on close distance and result in a relevant theoretical contribution.

3.4 Research Design: Multiple Case Study

Empirical evidence was gathered through a multiple case study, composed of ten cases. Case studies are detailed, empirical descriptions of certain aspects of a phenomenon, often based on several data sources (Yin, 2003). A case study design gave us the opportunity to study and understand CCCs from the perspective of both partner organizations. In comparison to other methodologies, this research design focuses on understanding the dynamics present within the particular cases (Eisenhardt, 1989), in turn allowing a deeper exploration of the collaborative relationship we intended to study. The case study design allows researchers to look at many different variables, where the empirical findings can be presented in a qualitative way (Merriam, 1994). Additionally, researchers are able to view evidence from different perspectives, e.g. analyzing data within a case, searching for patterns across cases, or through the eyes of multiple investigators (Eisenhardt, 1989). This is a major strength when investigating a complex and dynamic matter such as the CCC.

Case studies can involve single or multiple cases (Yin, 2003). Careful consideration led us to the conclusion that multiple cases would be more beneficial for the study of CCCs. A clear advantage in using multiple cases is that comparisons across cases, resulting in either similarities or differences, provide valuable insights. This increased our chances to reach conclusions to a greater extent than if using only a single case. In addition to these analytical benefits, Yin (2003:53) highly recommends researchers, who have the possibility, to prefer multiple cases since single cases are vulnerable as you put “all your eggs in one basket”. Another argument involved the increased opportunities for robust theory building when involving multiple cases. While single case studies can offer a rich description of the specific phenomenon (Siggelkow, 2007), the multiple case study is more solid and will generate theory more legitimate and with a higher generalizability, all else being equal (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Yin, 2003). The larger and more diverse set of data simply makes conclusions deeply grounded in varied empirical evidence, which contributes to higher confidence in the results. Using multiple cases also addresses the critique that the intensive use of empirical evidence in case studies may result in theory which is overly complex. By only retaining the relationships that are replicated across some or all of the cases the researchers can “scale off” the uniqueness in a given case, in turn creating theory which is less complicated (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007).

There is no ideal number of cases, but Eisenhardt (1989) suggests between four and ten cases. Although we placed our study around the upper limit, by studying ten different collaborations, our sample was well-thought through. The literature review in Section 2.3 illustrated an absence of large samples in this field stressing a need for a broader understanding of CCCs by studying many entities. To some extent we address this, although the sample is not large enough to be generalizable. However, we were aware that many cases could result in high complexity and large volumes of data (Eisenhardt, 1989). Other drawbacks with using the case study design is the difficulty in identifying the most important and the simply idiosyncratic relationships due to the lack of quantification, e.g. regression analysis, and the potential risk in generating too narrow theory unable to take to a general level (Eisenhardt, 1989). With this in mind, we were still confident that a multiple case study was the best choice for our study.

3.4.1 Case Sample

When selecting the cases for this study we used theoretical sampling, as recommended when using the case study design (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). According to Glaser and Strauss (1967:45) theoretical sampling is *“the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges.”*

Our case selection was a process in several steps. In order to increase our chances to get access to enough information concerning CCCs and the relationships we decided to contact the corporate partners first. This was a strategic choice as we believed that getting the corporate partners on board as soon as possible would ease practical challenges in accessing and collecting data. To qualify for the study the corporations needed to (1) have one or more collaborations with a CSO, (2) have their office in the Stockholm area, due to the limited time and financial resources for the study, and (3) be willing and able to allocate time to figure in the study. We approached 25 companies by e-mail that we assumed could fulfill these three basic criteria.

After considering all corporations that replied with a positive response to our request, we decided to move along with four organizations; Bonnierförlagen, IBM, SJ and Swedbank. Intentionally we chose a

set of companies that were operating within different industries, and preferably also differed in age, country of origin, size, and type of ownership (see Table 4). This was a conscious choice with regards to the theoretical sampling, meaning that we found these corporations as relevant “door openers” to find collaborations particularly suitable for creating relationships and logics among constructs likely to offer theoretical insights. We commenced by meeting these corporations for a shorter pre-study interview in order to assess their suitability for participating in the study. When this was confirmed, we took the opportunity to do a background interview where we asked the corporate representative to provide us with a brief overview of their collaborations with CSOs.

TABLE 4. CHARACTERISTICS OF CORPORATIONS						
Corporation	Founded	Country of Origin	Employees	Industry	Core Business	Ownership
Bonnierförlagen	1804	Sweden	250	Media	Book Publishing	Family owned
IBM	1820	USA	400 000	Information Technology	Software, Hardware, Consulting	Shareholders
SJ	1887	Sweden	4 500	Transportation	Train Operator	State-owned
Swedbank	1820	Sweden	13 500	Finance	Financial Services	Shareholders

In the next step, we made a selection of what specific CSO partners to include in the study. A brief overview of these organizations can be found in Table 5. To obtain a sufficient number of cases, we decided to study two to three collaborations for each corporation with regards to their current portfolio of collaborations and the time possible to allocate by the managers in both partner organizations. Consciously we looked for a spread among both corporations and CSOs as a variety of collaborations could deliver interesting insights for the phenomenon.

TABLE 5. CHARACTERISTICS OF CSOs				
CSO	Founded	Employees	Volunteers	Purpose
Berättarministeriet	2011	14	Yes	Decreasing socio-economic segregation through reading
Friends	1997	52	Yes	Working against bullying and discrimination
Läxhjälp	2007	3,5	No	Tutoring for students in upper secondary schools with grades below average
Mind	1931	7	Yes	Promoting mental health and gives support to persons in distress
Min Stora Dag	2000	14	Yes	Making very sick childrens' dreams come true
Sustainergies	2009	4	Yes	Raising awareness around sustainability through a platform for students and organizations
Svenska Basketbollförbundet	1952	13	Yes	Promoting and developing the basketball sport in Sweden
Transfer	2000	2	Yes	Connecting schools and working life through inspirational lectures from professionals
Ung Företagsamhet	1980	115	No	Enhancing children and youths' interest in entrepreneurship

3.5 Data Collection

Each case in this study relies on multiple data sources. Secondary data was collected from websites, press releases and internal documents, such as company policies. These sources were used when gathering information about the individual organizations, which was both useful during sampling and when preparing for the interviews. However, they provided a low level of detailed information about the specific collaborations. For insights on the collaborations and the partners' relationship, in-depth interviews were our primary data source. As proposed by Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007), conducting interviews is a highly efficient way to gather rich empirical data in case studies.

To investigate how corporate and CSO managers handle uncertainty in CCCs, it was essential to interview those persons who were deeply involved in these collaborations. Not only being a way to secure fruitful empirical evidence, using numerous and knowledgeable informants that view the phenomenon from different perspectives also limits bias (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007).

In this multiple case study, investigating ten different CCCs, we did not aim to interview several people at each organization. This choice was made for two reasons. Firstly, after the pre-study interviews we got the impression that only a small group of people were involved in these collaborations which limited the amount of people with deep insights. Secondly, we prioritized the amount of cases prior to the amount of interviews in each organization. A potential pitfall if we would have studied only one collaboration at each corporation would be the risk to assess its "frontier collaboration" and thus not consider less successful collaborations, potentially producing biased results.

The interviews were conducted with the key person or persons with responsibility for the collaborations, at both the corporation and the CSO. The informants were assumed to be the voice of the organization when speaking about the collaboration. We conducted 18 interviews in total, four pre-study interviews with the corporations and 14 main study interviews including both corporations and CSOs. For the number of interviews conducted at each organization and the interviewees' work titles, see Table 6. For a more detailed interview list, see Appendix A.

Corporate Partner	Interviews	Title Interviewee	CSO Partner	Interviews	Title Interviewee
Bonnierförlagen	2	CSR Manager	Berättarministeriet	1	Director & Co-founder
			Läxhjälpen	1	Director
			Svenska Basketbollförbundet	1	Marketing & Communications Manager
IBM	2	Corporate Citizenship & Corporate Affairs Manager	Sustainergies	1	Managing Director & Co-founder
			Transfer	1	Head of Operations
SJ	2	Head of Partnerships + Customer Market Manager (2 persons)	Friends	1	Head of Sales & Partnerships
			Mind	1	Secretary General
			Min Stora Dag	1	Head of Marketing & Fundraising
Swedbank	2	Head of Public Affairs Swedish Banking	Friends	1	Secretary General
			Ung Företagsamhet	1	CEO
Interview Total	8			10	

The pre-study interviews began in January 2016. They were unstructured and had the purpose to provide an overview of the corporations' collaborations with CSOs in order to refine the study, as well as giving the companies the opportunity to ask questions about the thesis. In short, we aligned the

demands and expectations of both parties. The interviews were held in-person and were between 30 and 60 minutes long.

The main study interviews began in February 2016, and were in-depth interviews that addressed the specific collaborations. All interviews were held in-person, at the interviewee's office or at a café, and lasted between 60 and 120 minutes. The interviews were semi-structured using open-ended questions to explore key elements in the collaboration yet avoid steering the interviewee. We developed an interview guide with predetermined questions, but before each interview we revised it with consideration to information from the background search or, in the case of the corporations, from the pre-study interview. The interview guide was designed with inspiration from previous studies in the researched area. In particular, we found Austin's (2000a) framework to be a useful source for developing questions that dealt with the CCC phenomenon. Important to mention is that it was not our intention to test Austin's framework, but rather understand the components in it in order to look for new aspects of the collaborations to investigate.

In addition to the open-ended questions, we created questions where the respondents had to grade certain aspects of the collaboration on a scale from one to six. The purpose with this was to make the respondents take a standpoint and describe aspects of the collaboration in a more direct manner. These questions were for example *"How close to the perfect collaboration is your collaboration with Organization Y²?"* (Very far from perfect to Very close to perfect) and *"Whom benefits the most from this collaboration?"* (Organization Y or Your organization). Following the questions, we encouraged the interviewees to comment and elaborate on their answer. Interesting findings were rather collected from this reflection than the quantification itself, which motivated why we do not present the individual scale answers in the empirical section. The full interview guide can be found in Appendix B.

During the interview the respondents were able speak freely and develop their answer in any direction, producing rich and reflective answers. However, it was important not to let the interviewees depart significantly from the outlined questions, since it could compromise the standardization of the interview process and affect the quality of the measurements negatively (Bryman, 2012). The interviews followed the same format for both the corporations and the CSOs, except that the interviews with the corporations were generally longer since we discussed several collaborations, focusing on one collaboration at a time. Each main study interview began with us introducing ourselves and providing the interviewees with a brief background to our study. Thereafter, we posed basic questions about the interviewees' background, current work title and asked them to provide us with a short presentation of the organization. The purpose of this was to establish trust between us and the interviewees before moving on to the more specific questions regarding the collaborations. We also asked for their permission to record the interview and to use the interviewees' names in the study. Our requests were accepted by all interviewees. Both investigators participated in all 18 interviews. In the main study interviews, one of the investigators was assigned to be in charge of the interview and ask the questions. The other investigator was observing, taking notes, keeping track of time and able to add any follow-up questions that surfaced due to the respondents' answers.

² Organization Y referred to the partner organization.

3.6 Data Processing and Analysis

A first step of data processing was to condense the data to make it stronger (Miles et al., 2014). All interviews were recorded, and transcribed shortly after the interview. The interview transcripts provided us with comprehensive documentation of every interview. As all interviews were conducted in Swedish, all quotations included in the thesis were translated. The translations were carefully checked and revised to avoid misinterpretations but a risk of losing underlying meanings still remains. The second step of data processing was to code the collected data. According to Miles et al. (2014:72) a code is *“a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data”*. First, we coded the data individually and then we compared our coding worksheets. The inter coder reliability, i.e. the coding agreement between the two coders, was close to 80%. Since we wanted to ensure that both of us had similar interpretations of the data we thereafter discussed the constructs we had coded differently. In case we did not reach consensus in any coded construct, we disqualified it. We worked our way towards a complete agreement of our coded data. Through a thematic analysis, we were able to identify patterns based on the data. As recommended when conducting a multiple case study, we performed both within-case and cross-case analysis (Eisenhardt, 1989). We first analyzed the data within each case and discussed it thoroughly to fully understand each collaboration, and then moved on to search for cross-case patterns.

3.7 Research Quality

Because this thesis studies the social world according to constructionism and interpretivism, we have chosen to use Lincoln and Guba's (1985) criteria for evaluating qualitative research: trustworthiness and authenticity.

3.7.1 Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is in turn made up of four criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985):

- *Credibility*
- *Transferability*
- *Dependability*
- *Confirmability*

These criteria correspond to the traditional reliability and validity aspects often used to assess research quality. The reliability and validity standards assume absolute truths of the social world, while Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue for, and allow in their criteria, several accounts of social reality.

The first part of obtaining credibility in the findings is to ensure that the research is carried out according to good practice. In this study, this was achieved by advising several sources on qualitative research in general and multiple case studies in particular in the process of the study design and execution. This made us aware of recommended alternatives as well as potential pitfalls. For transparency, the methodological choices are also motivated and presented thoroughly in the thesis (section 3.2 to 3.6). The second part of obtaining credibility deals with the confirmation of research findings by the members of the social world to make sure that it was correctly understood by the investigators. The primary technique used in this study was triangulation (Denzin, 1970), as we used multiple sources of data and multiple investigators to confirm findings. To some extent, we also used respondent validation, as some

of the managers who were interviewed were contacted afterwards and asked to clarify certain sequences of the interview.

Transferability refers to the possibility of applying the findings to other contexts. As qualitative research focus on depth rather than breadth, e.g. by studying a small group, qualitative findings usually have a contextual uniqueness emerging from the social world being studied. To make it possible for others to judge whether the findings can be transferred to other milieux, Geertz (1973) recommends researchers to provide “thick description”, i.e. rich accounts of the details of a culture. This thesis includes thick description as it presents both the development of the Swedish CSR arena, characteristics of the individual organizations, and the circumstances in the specific collaboration cases. By clarifying these aspects, we hope to equip others with sufficient details of the social world being studied to make a fair reasoning around the applicability of the findings in other contexts.

Dependability implies that researchers should keep a complete record of all phases in the research process to be able to provide sufficient evidence and re-confirm the findings. To assure this, extensive records have been kept from the beginning to the end of this thesis, including voice memos from the interviews, interview transcripts, field notes, coding sheets, e-mails, a database of all sources, and so on.

Confirmability means that even if complete objectivity is impossible in social research, the researchers have acted in good faith. In this study, we have had to overall objective to establish confirmability by not letting personal values or preferences affect the study and jeopardize its quality.

3.7.2 Authenticity

Just as for trustworthiness, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest several criteria under the umbrella of authenticity:

- *Fairness*. Are different viewpoints among members of the social setting fairly represented by the research?
- *Ontological authenticity*. Are members helped by the research to better understand their social milieu?
- *Educative authenticity*. Are members helped by the research to better appreciate the perspectives of other members in their social setting?
- *Catalytic authenticity*. Have members been triggered by the research to engage in action to change their circumstances?
- *Tactical authenticity*. Have members been empowered by the research to take steps necessary for engaging in action?

These authenticity criteria emphasize the wider impact of research, which have been seen as a controversial way to determine research quality. Using fairness in this study was an important component, as the intention was to give an accurate view of reality and allow incongruence among the managers. The interviewed corporate and CSO managers had a positive attitude to participate in it, as it offered time for reflection of their collaboration, and also expressed a great interest in the findings, both concerning their own and others' collaboration. This proves the importance and authenticity of the study and that it helps managers comprehend their social setting and take action.

4. Empirical Findings

In this chapter we present the empirical findings from our qualitative study on CCCs. The empirical data is based on interviews with corporate and CSO managers and is presented case by case. In order to provide a comprehensive view, the cases are categorized according to the corporate partners: Bonnierförlagen (section 4.1), IBM (section 4.2), SJ (section 4.3) and Swedbank (section 4.4).

4.1 Bonnierförlagen and its Collaborations with Berättarministeriet, Läxhjälpn and Svenska Basketbollförbundet

Bonnierförlagen is Sweden's largest book publishing group and was founded in 1804. The company is wholly owned by the Bonnier family, which has been running it for seven generations (Bonnierförlagen, 2016b). In 2015, Bonnierförlagen published 600 new book titles and sold approximately 13 million books (Bonnierförlagen, 2016a). Bonnierförlagen works to promote the joy and desire to read, especially among children and young people. They believe that reading not only gives people more knowledge, but also allows people to take part in society. A few years ago, the CSR manager at Bonnierförlagen realized they had a scattered CSR engagement and started to focus their CSR efforts to a few areas. In this study we take a look at Bonnierförlagen's collaborations with Berättarministeriet, Läxhjälpn and Svenska Basketbollförbundet.

Berättarministeriet was founded in 2011, and its Co-Founder and Director initiated the collaboration with Bonnierförlagen the same year. Berättarministeriet runs writing workshops for children and young people aged between 8 and 18 in socio-economically disadvantaged areas. Their mission is to decrease socio-economic segregation through reading. (Berättarministeriet, 2016) As the schools' financial resources in these areas are limited, Berättarministeriet's activities are free of charge. Berättarministeriet also develops school curriculum programs that equip teachers with learning methodologies and inspiring ways to teach. The collaboration with Bonnierförlagen is pro-bono, meaning that there is no monetary transaction involved and the focus is rather on taking advantage of core competencies. The Director & Co-founder at Berättarministeriet said, *"In the contract they [Bonnierförlagen] have agreed to publish two publications for us every year. They do it to break-even, which is the production cost. All exceeding sales go to Berättarministeriet. They do that and much more, including book fairs, shows and things like that. They are more active than what we have a contract for. It is a matter of trust."* The two organizations have other activities together as well, such as company volunteering for Bonnierförlagen's employees. Although no direct financial resources are involved, the collaboration demands extensive amounts of resources, primarily in terms of time from Bonnierförlagen's employees as they carry out the writing school with coaching, editing etc. Both partners perceive their counterpart as very engaged in the collaboration and it is well-anchored in both organizations. The Director and Co-Founder at Berättarministeriet said that everyone in their organization know the editors at Bonnierförlagen by name while the CSR manager at Bonnierförlagen mentioned that many people in the organization have been involved in the writing school during the course of the collaboration and it is therefore very well-known.

The collaboration with Läxhjälpn began around year 2011, when the Director at Läxhjälpn contacted Bonnierförlagen with an inquiry if they could donate books to the youths taking part in Läxhjälpn's tutoring. Läxhjälpn's tutoring program provides homework help for students in the 8th and 9th grade, who are far from or on the verge of not meeting the admission requirements for high school. They collaborate with schools where students' grades are far below the national average, i.e. where their

services are the most needed. Young, honorary university students are employed as tutors and act as positive role models and mentors for the pupils. (Läxhjälp, 2016) Thanks to funding from the business sector, Läxhjälp is able to conduct free homework for thousands of pupils and create salaried jobs for hundreds of university students. The CSR manager at Bonnierförlagen stated, *"It [Läxhjälp] is such a good organization that achieves great results, so we thought, 'We want to help them as much as we can.' It is actually quite unselfish in this case."* Bonnierförlagen and Läxhjälp's collaboration activities include book gifts and participation at the book fair. Naturally, the collaboration demands small amounts of resources from the organizations. In contrast to all other collaborations in the study, they have no formal contract thus it is dependent on the sporadic communication between the Director at Läxhjälp and the CSR manager at Bonnierförlagen.

Bonnierförlagen has been the national sponsor of Svenska Basketbollförbundet (SBBF) since 2011, when they searched for alternative ways to find new target groups of readers. SBBF is the Swedish Basketball Federation and works to promote and develop the basketball sport and make it accessible to everyone in Sweden. Its priority areas are to facilitate basketball competitions, training and development as well as national team activities. Their vision is to become *"Sweden's most available national sport"*. (Svenska Basketbollförbundet, 2015) SBBF is known for equality, both between gender and social groups, which are characteristics that are very attractive to Bonnierförlagen. The partners have tried out many different types of activities, in which some have been more successful than others. The CSR Manager at Bonnierförlagen stated that *"We try to learn all the time and take with us what worked well and what worked less well and develop the things that worked well. Trial and Error."*, when talking about how value is generated over time. Bonnierförlagen provides SBBF with financial support, and arranges reading contests, book lotteries at basketball games and participation at the book fair. In return, SBBF offers advertising space on the national team shirts, signs around the basketball arenas etc. While the collaboration is well-anchored in SBBF's organization, it is more established on management level in Bonnierförlagen than among the employees.

4.2 IBM and its Collaborations with Sustainergies and Transfer

IBM is an American multi-national information technology and consulting company with more than 400,000 employees worldwide, including a Swedish branch employing more than 2,000 people (IBM, 2016b). IBM has a strong tradition of empowering their employees to serve their communities through its volunteering program but also focuses on identifying new opportunities to apply its technology and experience on societal problems, mainly through different so-called "grant programs" (IBM, 2016a). We study IBM's collaborations with Sustainergies and Transfer.

Sustainergies was founded in 2009 and is a platform for companies, students and universities interested in sustainability issues. Their methods involve student consultants, case competitions, recruitment to internships and part-time jobs, workshops, mentorship programs etc. (Sustainergies, 2016) Their collaboration with IBM formally began in 2014 as they applied for one of IBM's grant programs (Technology Roadmap) in which they would receive expertise and support from IT consultants to improve their website. The following year, Sustainergies took on a couple of IBM interns part-time to receive additional technical skills. However, it required quite extensive mentoring from Sustainergies as the interns had limited previous work experience. The collaboration was limited to these two projects, and the resource demand was low and consisted mainly of expertise and consultancy hours. IBM does not provide Sustainergies with any financial support, and the time horizon for their collaboration is

regulated in the contract specific for each project. The interaction level therefore shifts depending on whether or not they have any ongoing project. However, both organizations keep in touch regularly, and occasionally reach out to each other informally for professional advice. The anchoring in IBM is limited to the consultants and interns directly involved and the level of engagement is therefore either high or low depending on who is considered. The Managing Director & Co-founder at Sustainergies further mentioned the fluctuation of engagement throughout IBM: *“The people involved are extremely engaged. But we also know that we are not a high profile collaboration. We are not Friends Arena, and we never will be. Given the circumstances, they are very engaged, but we also know that we are a small player and will always be a small player.”*

IBM’s other collaboration is with Transfer, an organization delivering lectures to schools from work life. Transfer is all about transferring knowledge between the business community and schools by providing insights and inspiration to students. Professionals, from a variety of industries, sign up at Transfer’s website to become lecturers. Transfer then connects schools who have made a lecture request with these professionals. (Transfer, 2016) The collaboration with IBM began around 2012 when a number of IBM employees signed up to become inspirational speakers through Transfer. Approximately five to ten IBM employees do an inspirational lecture each year. The collaboration also involves a minor yearly financial support to Transfer. Furthermore, Transfer received a grant program from IBM (Marketing Strategy Roadmap). Although this collaboration is more known among IBM employees the engagement level is low. The Corporate Citizenship and Corporate Affairs Manager at IBM expressed that she feels Transfer are *“pretty unengaged in a way. (...) A prerequisite is that they show that they have ambitions both with themselves and with the collaboration. It is also a prerequisite that is needed. I miss that a little bit.”* The communication and interaction between the two parties is very occasional.

4.3 SJ and its Collaborations with Friends, Mind and Min Stora Dag

SJ is a state-owned railway company in Sweden, and it mainly operates regional and long-distance personal railway travel. Each day 100,000 customers travel with SJ on one of the 1400 train departures to and from the 160 railway stations all across Sweden. (SJ, 2016) Until 2011 railway traffic was regulated and SJ had monopoly on personal railway transport, but today it operates in an open market. The government’s overall objective for SJ is to create value which includes demands on sustainability, efficiency, profitability, development capacity and environmental and social responsibility. We investigate SJ’s collaborations with Friends, Mind and Min Stora Dag.

The collaboration between SJ and Friends began in 2015. Friends’ vision is a society where children and young people grow up feeling safe and secure and where all people are treated equally regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, disability, sexual orientation or age. Friends works closely with schools, preschools and sport associations to spread knowledge and tools so that those working with children and young people are better equipped to address issues of bullying, harassment or acts of intimidation. (Friends, 2016) The scope of activities in this collaboration is moderately broad. SJ’s train staff carry Friend’s “hello pin” on their uniform, and Friends has seminars for SJ employees to increase the knowledge about their work against bullying and discrimination and to promote a broader engagement in SJ’s organization. SJ provides financial support to Friends’ organization and offers Friends’ employees to travel by train at reduced costs. There is both a top-down and a bottom-up approach in this collaboration at SJ, since it was proposed by both the management team and the train staff. Both partners are engaged in the collaboration, but the managers expressed that they have not been able to

set aside enough time for it. The collaboration is well-anchored in both Friends' and SJ's organization. The communication between the managers at SJ and Friends takes place on a regular basis and is at times more intense.

The collaboration with Mind is rather new as it had only been going on for about six months at the time of the study. Mind is an old organization, founded in 1931, with the aim to promote mental health. Today, Mind operates a 24-hour suicide prevention hotline and online chat for people in mental distress. It also operates a helpline for parents and elderly people. (Mind, 2016) The connection between Mind and SJ is special. *"In 2014, 90 people committed suicide in front of trains. The number has increased and it is one of the most common suicide methods. It is something that affects the work environment of a train driver in an absolutely terrible way."* said the Secretary General at Mind. The only activity SJ and Mind have done together, so far, is a marketing campaign for Mind on board SJ's trains. Both partners indicate future plans for the collaboration but the format is still undefined. The Secretary General at Mind mentioned that having lectures and educating SJ staff on mental health is a potential future activity. In this collaboration SJ also supports Mind financially, but the magnitude of resources involved is relatively limited from both SJ's and Mind's perspective. *"It [the collaboration with Mind] is a smaller collaboration, in terms of the resources we have allocated to it and what we will gain from it."* said the Head of Partnerships at SJ. The collaboration is not very well-known in SJ's organization and it has not been anchored with top management. Meanwhile, the Secretary General at Mind expressed the anchoring in his organization clearly: *"It is very well-anchored. I mean we are a small organization, we are seven employees and have a board of directors of ten people, and those are the ones needed to make decisions."* The interaction between the partners has been frequent in its initial stage and the engagement level is high. On a more personal level the Head of Partnerships at SJ stated that their relation with Mind is good, but they have not had the time to get to know each other fully yet.

Lastly, we look at SJ's collaboration with Min Stora Dag, which is a CSO that makes dreams come true for children and youngsters in Sweden with serious illnesses and diagnoses. During 2015, 3000 children took part of an activity together with Min Stora Dag, as a needed break from the daily life with sickness. (Min Stora Dag, 2016) Activities include attending pop concerts, sport events, circus shows or other special events. The collaboration with SJ began in 2010 as a collaboration with SJ Prio, SJ's membership program. SJ Prio members receive membership points when they purchase a train ticket, and this collaboration enables members to donate their collected points to Min Stora Dag to finance their travelling with children to and from various events. Other activities have been customer-oriented events with the intention to collect points for Min Stora Dag to use at SJ. The partners have discussed possibilities to perform other types of activities but have not yet agreed on anything that suits well for both organizations. Due to the limited extent of activities, the magnitude of resources involved is small since it only involves the donation of travelling points and administration of that process. SJ provides no financial support to Min Stora Dag. This collaboration is anchored with top management at SJ, but not everyone in SJ's organization knows about it. The communication between the managers takes place on a regular basis, however, the relationship can become deeper. The Head of Partnerships at SJ spoke about the level of engagement and said, *"When talking to them [Min Stora Dag] it [the engagement] is very high but they have been passive and it depends on several things. They have changed some staff, and we have changed some staff (...) We need to re-define how our collaboration should proceed."*

4.4 Swedbank and its Collaborations with Friends and Ung Företagsamhet

Swedbank has its roots in the Swedish savings bank tradition which dates back to 1820. Swedbank is a bank with strong local presence all across Sweden and it is also heavily involved in the local community. Swedbank offers financial services to both consumers and businesses, and only in Sweden they have over 4 million customers in those segments. (Swedbank, 2016) Before we take a closer look at Swedbank's collaborations with Friends and Ung Företagsamhet, we will share a text called "*Growth is the Foundation*" that we were able to take part of, that describe why Swedbank is engaged in CSR and with CSOs:

We are Sweden's largest bank. No one has greater influence over the Swedish people's economy. This puts us in a position of significant trust and, in addition, a position where we can have a great influence in society. That influential position gives us the opportunity to do something about problems we see in the world. If we do something about the problems in the world, we help people with things that really matters to them. If we can help people with what really matters to them, then more people will get a healthy, growing economy. In a growing society, we grow too.

The collaboration between Swedbank and Friends has been going on since 2005, but it intensified in 2012 when Swedbank donated the name rights to the national football arena, involving a major and long-term commitment to support Friends financially until year 2023. As stated in the section about the collaboration between SJ and Friends, Friends work to prevent bullying, harassment and acts of intimidation. On a national level, the partners do not carry out any activities together but the collaboration serves to benefit brand value and brand recognition for both. "*It creates value that they [Friends] do what they are supposed to, and when they say that the financing from Swedbank enables that, it strengthens our brand. It strengthens both our brands.*" said the Head of Public Affairs at Swedbank. Although the financial resources involved in the collaboration are extensive in monetary terms, the collaboration requires few other types of resources. Neither does Swedbank demand anything specific in return from Friends other than reports on how they use the money. The perceived engagement has increased somewhat over time, but levels are still not particularly high. This collaboration was initiated and managed in a top-down approach, and is well-anchored in both organizations due to the large public exposure of the arena. The partners have regular follow up meetings about three to five times per year, but otherwise little interaction is needed to run the collaboration.

The other collaboration Swedbank has is with Ung Företagsamhet (UF), also known as Junior Achievement in English, which provides educational programs in entrepreneurship for students in elementary and high school. The elementary school program prepares the students on a basic level of what it entails to be an entrepreneur and have their own company. The high school program gives students the opportunity to start and run their own business during an academic year. (Ung Företagsamhet, 2016) The programs are designed to stimulate creativity and entrepreneurship and to give students insight into business conditions. Swedbank and UF have a long history together. On a regional level they have collaborated since the 1990s while a national agreement has been in place since 2010. The collaboration between Swedbank and UF has a bottom-up approach, and they have a broad portfolio of activities based on the capabilities of the organizations. On a national basis, Swedbank participates in the UF fair and the national UF competition, while UF attends Swedbank's seminars in Almedalen during the politician's week. More regional activities refer to co-produced lectures in schools, concerning for example entrepreneurship or financial literacy. Swedbank also has a discounted bank

offering for UF companies. However, acquiring customers is secondary to Swedbank. The Head of Public Affairs stated, *“We know, from reading Skolverket’s reports, that youths who go through UF’s program become managers to a greater extent, and they have higher salaries. If they become customers at Swedbank we are very happy with it. So there are several dimensions to it and if we can contribute to making people entrepreneurs in the future we are very happy.”* The collaboration involves great magnitudes of resources, both consisting of the financial support from Swedbank to UF’s organization, but also in terms of human resources to manage all activities. Both partners perceive a high level of engagement and the collaboration is deeply anchored in the organizations, both at various organizational levels and across different units. To some extent, Swedbank and UF have become intertwined as their operations go hand in hand and they view each other as natural partners that both benefit from collaborating.

5. Analysis

In this chapter we continue where the theoretical framework from section 2.5 left off and apply the empirical findings from chapter 4. The first part of the analysis (section 5.1) deals with the different collaboration stages and unfolds patterns that emerged across the cases. The second part (section 5.2) digs deeper into the relationships between the collaboration partners and a matrix illustrating the link between collaboration stage and type of relationship is presented. In the last part (section 5.3) we elaborate further on the complexity present in CCCs.

5.1 Collaboration Stages

In this chapter, the ten collaborations are further analyzed according to their collaboration stage affiliation. In order to determine the stage for each collaboration, we used four parameters from Austin's (2000b) continuum (from Table 2): level of engagement, magnitude of resources, scope of activities and interaction level. Based on the collected data we put a value on these parameters respectively, each corresponding to a certain collaboration stage, i.e. philanthropic, transactional or integrative. The transformational stage was not included since it is similar to the integrative stage concerning these parameters, but move one step beyond the integrative stage by obtaining major internal and external change through disruptive social innovations. As this type of system change was not evident in any of our cases, no transformational collaboration was found. This points towards Austin and Seitanidi's (2012a) argument that transformational collaborations are very rare.

The four variables allowed us to make an initial categorization, and move on to search for patterns in and across these collaborations beyond the components of Austin's framework. When a collaboration had values derived from different collaboration stages in different parameters, the most frequently corresponding stage would be the assigned one. Table 7 illustrates how the collaborations have been categorized.

Collaborations	Level of Engagement	Magnitude of Resources	Scope of Activities	Interaction Level	Collaboration Stage
Bonnierförlagen - Berrättarministeriet	High (I)	Big (I)	Broad (I)	Intensive (I)	<i>Integrative</i>
Bonnierförlagen - Läxhjälpen	Moderate (T)	Small (P)	Narrow (P)	Infrequent (P)	<i>Philanthropic</i>
Bonnierförlagen - SBBF	Moderate (T)	Medium (T)	Broad (I)	Moderate (T)	<i>Transactional</i>
IBM - Sustainergies	Moderate (T)	Medium (T)	Moderate (T)	Moderate (T)	<i>Transactional</i>
IBM - Transfer	Low (P)	Small (P)	Narrow (P)	Infrequent (P)	<i>Philanthropic</i>
SJ - Friends	Moderate (T)	Medium (T)	Moderate (T)	Intensive (I)	<i>Transactional</i>
SJ - Mind	High (I)	Small (P)	Narrow (P)	Moderate (T)	<i>Philanthropic</i>
SJ - Min Stora Dag	Low (P)	Small (P)	Narrow (P)	Infrequent (P)	<i>Philanthropic</i>
Swedbank - Friends	Low (P)	Big (I)	Narrow (P)	Infrequent (P)	<i>Philanthropic</i>
Swedbank - UF	High (I)	Big (I)	Broad (I)	Intensive (I)	<i>Integrative</i>

(P) = Philanthropic Stage, (T) = Transactional Stage, (I) = Integrative Stage.

5.1.1 Collaborations in the Philanthropic Stage

At Christmas time in 2011 the autobiography *I am Zlatan Ibrahimović* was released. In the book Zlatan tells his own story about his youth in Rosengård and how he became one of the best football players in the world. The book was published by Bonnierförlagen and it sold so many copies it was considered the Christmas gift of the year. Among the many children who read this book was Maria Arneng's son. *"Suddenly he read a book from cover to cover without putting it down and then I thought that this reflected reality for many of our students. The desire to read increased because Zlatan is his idol and football his big passion. I thought that he has this in common with many of our students. Many of whom also had similar childhood as Zlatan, and experience social exclusion."*, said Maria, who is also the Director at Läxhjälp. She contacted Bodil Unenge, CSR Manager at Bonnierförlagen, and asked her if they would be willing to donate the Zlatan book to Läxhjälp's 400 pupils as a Christmas gift. From that day the collaboration took form and Bonnierförlagen has continued to give away Christmas books since.

The first group of collaborations, being in the philanthropic stage according to Austin's (2000a) collaboration continuum, consists of the abovementioned Bonnierförlagen-Läxhjälp, together with IBM-Transfer, SJ-Mind, SJ-Min Stora Dag, and Swedbank-Friends. The collaborations in the philanthropic stage had a narrow scope of activities consisting of one or two activities. Relatively small amounts of resources were involved in these collaborations, and the partners had a donor and recipient relation. The limited effort required to participate in these collaborations was reflected in the expectations on the outcome, they were either very low or unclearly defined. The CSR manager at Bonnierförlagen mentioned that they *"had no expectations for own benefits in this case"*. Compared to other stages, the partners in philanthropic collaborations perceived a lower level of engagement.

The collaborations in the philanthropic stage were loosely anchored in the corporate partners' organization, and the active support for the collaboration was limited to a small group of people. This was evident among all of the corporate partners in the philanthropic collaborations, except for the collaboration between Swedbank and Friends which was well-known both internally and among the general public. In contrast to the corporations, it was very easy for the CSOs to anchor the collaborations in their organization due to their small size.

The personal connection between the corporate and CSO managers was not very prominent in the philanthropic collaborations. For example, the Secretary General at Friends meant that the formal contract with Swedbank did not make the collaboration very dependent on personal connections. Although the personal relation was not obvious in these collaborations, the managers had established trust for each other and several times the interviewees pointed out the significance in having trust for their counterpart. However, levels of trust were varying among the collaborations and some were more personally focused while others were limited to trust for the organization as a whole.

Due to the limited scope of activities and interaction in the philanthropic collaborations, the decision-making process was fast and of a simple nature. When discussing the power relations it became evident that the corporations had more decision power, further reinforcing the donor and recipient relationship.

“Right now it feels like we have more power and the reason is that they [Transfer] want money from us.” said the Corporate Citizenship and Corporate Affairs Manager at IBM. It seemed like the dependency on resources coming from the corporate partner, e.g. money, goods and services, resulted in an imbalance where the CSO was identified as the weaker part. However, it was also claimed that the organizations remained independent and did not involve their partner in day-to-day operations. This minimized potential conflicts and power issues were therefore absent in practice. There was a mutual respect of not interfering with the other organization’s business. The Secretary General at Friends stated that, *“it is not that one part has more ‘power’. Once again, we do not try to govern Swedbank and they do not try to govern us.”*

The value generated in the philanthropic collaborations was for the CSOs based on financial resources and the benefits of associating with the corporate partners’ brand. When speaking about the value in collaborating with Swedbank, the Secretary General at Friends said that *“the value for us is that we can be out there and work, to change, and make a difference”*, showing the importance of financial resources. The Head of Operations at Transfer spoke about the benefit of associating with IBM: *“Having them as a partner, is very important towards other partners and prospective partners. To say that ‘we have IBM as a partner’, is valuable since everyone knows about them.”* Ultimately, financial resources allowed the CSOs to carry out their mission and associating with a stronger brand made it easier to acquire and retain other partners. Head of Partnerships at SJ said, *“All these organizations think it is good to have SJ as a partner. They get credibility, both towards the public and in the search for new partners. Then it is more powerful to have SJ as a partner than a mom and pop operation.”* The value for the corporations were on the other hand primarily based on feeling of doing something good and the potential positive impact on the brand by associating with a CSO. The managers also expressed the symbolic value in making a statement to employees and customers about supporting a certain issue. This confirmed Austin’s (2000b) view that philanthropic collaborations tend to have a generic resources transfer.

In all philanthropic cases, there was a consensus among the managers that the collaboration was more beneficial for the CSO than the corporation in terms of value. However, the corporate managers did not raise any concern about this. In a sense, this was not surprising, as the philanthropic term implies a degree of voluntariness making corporations provide altruistic support with little expectations on their own benefit. The Head of Partnerships at SJ meant that by supporting Min Stora Dag *“We really do something great. It feels good to go to bed at night.”*

In this group of collaborations, no future plans for the collaborations were explicitly expressed. The collaborations were more or less static, except SJ and Mind’s collaboration which was recently initiated and still in its “starting blocks”.

5.1.2 Collaborations in the Transactional Stage

Entering an SJ train, you might notice the little pin on the staffs' uniform saying "hello". This is the first time in SJ's more than 100 years long history that any accessories have been added to the formal uniform. How did this happen?

"We were looking for a larger charity or CSR organization that is well-known and that we wanted to be associated with", said Krister Svensson who is Head of Partnerships at SJ. But the first phase of discussions involving Friends' and SJ's management was slow and he continued, *"We had a dialogue but nothing happened for several reasons"*. But when a new internal policy was initiated at SJ to encourage the train staff to say "hello" and look passengers in the eyes, an employee mentioned a CSO having a clothing pin saying "hello" and proposed they should do something together. That organization was Friends, and suddenly collaboration was back on the table. SJ was happy with the initiative involving both management and train staff. Meanwhile, Friends looked for a partner with the intention to lower their travelling costs. A formal agreement was eventually set up and the first activities took place.

This group of collaborations, in the transactional stage of Austin's (2000a) collaboration continuum, consists of Bonnierförlagen-SBBF and IBM-Sustainergies, in addition to the SJ-Friends collaboration that was just mentioned. Partners in the transactional stage had a more extensive collaboration and were engaged in several different activities together. Being engaged in more activities comes with more resources needed to carry them out. The resources provided by the corporate partners took different forms, such as financial and human resources, goods and services. In contrast to the philanthropic collaborations, the organizations delivered core competencies to a greater extent. Another difference between the two stages was the existence of a two-way value flow. Not only were the corporations able to provide their core competencies, e.g. IT consultants or train tickets, but the CSOs also offered unique capabilities, e.g. access to new target group. This represents a core competencies exchange, a type of value creation characteristic for transactional collaborations (Austin, 2000b).

The level of engagement, that was recognized by both corporate and CSO managers, was higher in the transactional collaborations than in the philanthropic. Still, the managers experienced some commitment issues disturbing the collaboration, but not to the extent of hindering it from continuing. The collaborations remained well-anchored in the CSOs, but compared to the philanthropic collaborations they were better anchored within the corporate partners. However, the collaborations were not fully established and known across their whole organizations. They were for example limited to certain organizational units or levels.

Although more people were involved in these collaborations it was still easy to manage them from both the corporate and CSO perspective. As for large corporations in general some decisions, especially those of a more strategic character, required further approval from the corporations' top management. This sometimes prolonged the decision-making process and put demands on internal politics. According to the Head of Sales and Partnerships at Friends, this was evident in the case of the SJ-Friends collaboration:

Decisions are made very fast here, Lars and I talk to each other in the hallway and then it is done. While at SJ, they have so many organizational layers and decision-making is very different. You have to adapt to that and understand that decisions are not made as fast. Some things can go really fast but if you go for something large-scale it has go through certain steps.

Despite the occasional demand for top management involvement, most of the operational decisions regarding the collaboration were taken informally through a discussion between the corporate and CSO manager. The Head of Sales and Partnerships at Friends continued, *“Decisions are taken by me and Krister either by e-mail or at the meetings, where we can have some ideas and then we say ‘let’s do it’. If it is not decisions that needs further approval, but most of the decisions can be taken just between the two of us.”* The Marketing and Communications Manager at SBBF had a similar experience of the decision-making process: *“All operational decisions are taken between me and Bodil. But if it is more strategic decisions, then it is the CEO at Bonnierförlagen who takes them, together with me. It simply depends on who I meet.”*

Similar to the philanthropic collaborations, it was evident that the corporate partner possessed more power in the relationship, both according to the corporate and CSO managers. The CSOs were more willing to satisfy their partner in order to increase the likelihood of a prolonged contract and gain further support from the corporation. In the end, it was the corporate partner who controlled the most essential resources in the collaboration. But as the following quotes indicate, the imbalance did not seem to be an issue for any partner but rather something they considered natural:

In a way, we have all the power but at the same time we have a contract that evens out the power. I wish they [Friends] were stronger and expressed more clearly what they want and what they desire. But we have not taken advantage of the ‘power’ either or had very high demands on them. -Head of Partnerships, SJ

The fact that we are the receiving part, it is us they sponsor, SJ will thus have more weight in the decision-making. As a partner, we sometimes need to be more conformable. It comes down to getting a prolonged contract and further commitment. -Head of Sales & Partnerships, Friends

They [Bonnierförlagen] have more power than us in the collaboration. I mean, they can just say ‘Goodbye, we will do something else now’. They are our biggest sponsor so of course we are trying to ensure they are happy all the time. -Marketing & Communications Manager, SBBF

For all transactional collaborations, trust for the partner was on a high level. The managers had established a friendly, yet professional, relationship. There was a great sense of respect for the partner, both with regards to the level of competence of specific people but also as a representative of the organization. Sharing values and ideals were explicitly expressed in this type of collaboration. It created a strong sense of organizational trust, and made the managers find common ground in a natural way. Recognizing common values made managers proud of the collaboration and found the partner as a valuable reflection of their own organization. The four quotes below shed light on the importance of trust and sharing a common set of values:

One part is that Sanna is extremely good at what she does, she is very good at building trust, and then Philip is exceptionally good at what he does. It shows, his competence shines through and he creates great solutions. Of course that builds trust, too. -Managing Director & Co-founder, Sustainergies

I think that their organization [Sustainergies], what they do and what they accomplish is very valuable and fits well with our values. -Corporate Citizenship & Corporate Affairs Manger, IBM

Our values are close to each other. Having clear values around diversity and equality is part of our unique selling point. In advance, many people were wondering 'Wait a minute, books and basketball, how do that go together?' But we have found a common set of values. It took a few years. -Marketing & Communications Manager, SBBF

They [Friends] also have the same set of values. Not at least the 'hello', it was formulated in different ways but the meaning is the same. We identified the need to be more open and more compassionate from two different perspectives. We ended up with the same word [hello]. -Head of Partnerships, SJ

In addition to the exchange of core competencies creating a direct value, the managers brought up other types of benefits generated by the collaboration. One thing that was mentioned in all three cases was the positive impact the collaboration had on the brands, such as improved brand value or employer branding. In line with Jutterström and Norberg (2011) the companies saw value in communicating their CSR efforts, moving away from implicit CSR. Another value that was prominent according to the managers in these collaborations was the emphasis on “the greater good”. These partners were more aware of the bigger picture, i.e. not only the benefits for the partners but also the benefits for society as a whole:

It creates many different types of values. One is that we have the opportunity to influence the development of society. Then, it is also about personal values, in terms of development of these consultants. And then it's also a matter of branding for IBM. -Corporate Citizenship & Corporate Affairs Manager, IBM

For us it creates value that we can find these people and reach out and talk about books with them and through their coaches in most cases we can make them talk about books with children and youths. Additionally, it is also a pure advertising value that our logo is being exposed, but that is hard to measure. -CSR Manager, Bonnierförlagen

The interviewees indicated long time horizons for the collaborations, and it did not seem that any of them would end any time soon. Although the partners had a positive attitude to their collaboration, it was not clearly defined how they would develop going forward.

5.1.3 Collaborations in the Integrative Stage

In 2015, more than 26,000 students were able to start their own company and get a sneak peek of the life as an entrepreneur through UF's educational program. As a result of this yearly program thousands of young UF entrepreneurs enter Swedbank's bank offices each autumn to set up bank accounts for their new business ventures. For many of these students this is their first bank visit and it requires them to have their documents in order and ability to pitch a feasible and well thought through business idea. UF operates from Luleå in the northern part of Sweden to Malmö in the south. So does Swedbank. For the two partners, entrepreneurship and banking is a great match. Marita Ljung, Head of Public Affairs at Swedbank's Swedish branch, emphasized the need for UF's programs: *"It is a social problem in the sense that not enough people start their own company, and that youths do not learn about entrepreneurship in school but about employment."*

The final group of collaborations consists of Bonnierförlagen-Berättarministeriet and Swedbank-UF. Both collaborations had a broad scope of activities they do together. The partners were also deeply involved in each other's activities. The collaborations were visible at several different arenas and the partners often invited their counterpart to special events. There was a high level of resources involved in these collaborations, appearing in different forms. Swedbank provided financial support to UF on top of other resources dedicated to the collaboration but for Bonnierförlagen-Berättarministeriet, there was no monetary transaction involved. What distinguished integrative collaborations from the two previous collaboration stages was their focus on creating value together. In both collaborations, the partners combined and leveraged upon each other's resources and capabilities, resulting in co-creation of value. This represent joint value creation, which according to Austin (2000b) is especially common in integrative collaborations. Both parties acknowledged high value coming from the collaboration, both direct and indirect. It was not obvious that one part benefited more from the collaboration than the other, instead they both identified great benefits from collaborating.

Both cases were characterized by a very high level of engagement throughout the organizations. As the CEO at UF said, *"It feels like this is genuine and something they [Swedbank] are very interested in. When I travel around the country I often meet people from Swedbank and they are so incredibly excited about UF. It is great to hear."* In contrast to previous stages, the integrative collaborations were well-anchored also in the corporate organization both vertically and horizontally. This may be an effect of the collaborations demanding involvement from a wide range of employees in the organizations:

It [the collaboration with Berättarministeriet] requires that people at different departments here in the organization want to participate, otherwise there would not be anything. It really is a prerequisite.
-CSR Manager, Bonnierförlagen

UF is one of those things where there is an engagement at a local level, where the bank office manager is often part of the UF board or is very engaged, or that the bank office is very engaged in UF's matters. So you have the local involvement and maybe you attend the regional UF competitions, and then you have the national UF competition. So it goes from a local, to a regional, to a national engagement. -Head of Public Affairs, Swedbank

Decisions regarding the collaborations were taken together through mutual discussions. Although we tried to push the interviewees in who was the stronger party, we found no evidence of any part having more decision power.

The relationship between the managers in charge at each partner organization was deep and personal. It appeared that the relationships in integrative collaborations had gone beyond a simple professional relationship. Both collaborations had been going on for some years and it occurred that the relationships had also evolved over time, from being acquaintances to having closer personal ties. Not only did the corporate and CSO managers have a strong personal chemistry, they also had a high degree of mutual understanding. These close collaborations and interactions allowed both managers to collaborate more effectively which had positive effects on the collaboration. Below we will present a few quotes that illustrate this, both from the corporate and the CSO perspective:

It [the collaboration with Swedbank] is dependent on individuals and we have collaborated with Marita earlier when she was State Secretary for Annie Lööf [from Centerpartiet] and she understands us in a really good way. We can see that we are drifting away from the marketing department towards CSR and community involvement in a completely different way where we understand each other better. (...) There is a Marita-effect at play here creating a better understanding for us. She came from Centerpartiet which is one of our strongest advocates party-wise politically. It has certainly influenced the type of relationship we have and how the collaboration works, at least at a national level. We are like teenagers in love, from our side anyway. You need to check with Marita if she is in love, too! -CEO, UF

It [the relation to UF] is very good. It is very good at the national level and I also know it is very good on a regional level. There are certainly a few regions where it doesn't work for some reason. Sometimes it's the chemistry that creates difficulties. Otherwise it is a good collaboration. -Head of Public Affairs, Swedbank

Bodil, she is super cool. (...) Clear and direct. And incredibly charming, funny and happy all the time. And her curly hair is just wonderful. When we met it was love at first sight. You fall in love with her immediately. She likes getting things done, so she suits us perfectly. It's a perfect match. Everything can be worked out. She is also straightforward. She can sometimes say 'no, that is not a good idea' if it isn't. And she is 99.9% right. (...) She is an amazing person, it makes a great deal for us. That we are in the right place. -Director & Co-founder, Berättarministeriet

It is a lovely relationship. Dilsa and I have worked together for quite some time now. We have established a good way to handle our communication. We can help each other in many different situations. But it [Berättarministeriet] is a more agile organization, they are not that many people working there. Dilsa is the fixed point, and then people come and go. I have ongoing contact with them and I know many of them as well. But she is the foundation of the organization. (...) Because it was Dilsa, who is so determined and energetic, you really got a guarantee that things will get done. -CSR Manager, Bonnierförlagen

All parties in these collaborations implied a long time horizon and they will likely remain close partners for many years to come. All partners thought their collaboration was one of a kind and did not think it was possible to carry out the activities with another partner. Terminating it would generate negative short and long-term consequences for both organizations. The CEO at UF gave a colorful description of what would happen if the collaboration with Swedbank would come to an end: *"For both organizations it would probably feel like we would lose a body part. At least a pinky finger or something."*

5.2 Reducing Uncertainty in CCCs

While Austin's (2000a) framework provides useful classification of CCCs it has been criticized for oversimplifying reality. As illustrated by the ten investigated cases, collaborations can take many different forms, as they address different social challenges, carry out different types of activities, involve partners from different industries etc. Although the partners had decided to collaborate on a certain cause, they often failed to align expectations and set clear goals. The study revealed that managers experience uncertainty both before entering the collaboration and during it. This uncertainty was manifested in many different ways, for example, managers had doubts concerning the outcome and trouble finding a proper format for collaborating. In order to reduce the uncertainty associated with the collaborations, managers had different rationalities in line with Sjöstrand's (1985) theory. While some managers of the CCCs articulated the benefits and costs, others emphasized shared ideals and values, or highlighted the genuine relationship. Considering this, Austin's (2000b) collaboration value construct appeared to miss out on a component when explaining how value is defined, created, balanced and renewed in CCCs. A relationship dimension proved to be important in understanding the collaborations. Throughout the ten collaborations, examples of dominant calculative, ideal-based and genuine rationalities were found, as seen in Figure 1. All collaborations in the study had a high degree of voluntariness, and no partner were forced to collaborate. Therefore, no coercive relationships to any degree were identified. Even though the dominant rationality varied across collaborations, an interesting pattern emerged.

FIGURE 1. TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP AND COLLABORATION STAGE COMBINED

Type of Relationship	<i>Genuine</i>			Bonnierförlagen-Berättarministeiet Swedbank-UF
	<i>Ideal-Based</i>	Bonnierförlagen-Läxhjälpen SJ-Mind	Bonnierförlagen-SBBF IBM-Sustainergies SJ-Friends	
	<i>Calculative</i>	IBM-Transfer SJ-Min Stora Dag Swedbank-Friends		
		<i>Philanthropic</i>	<i>Transactional</i>	<i>Integrative</i>
		Collaboration Stage		

A calculative rationality (Sjöstrand, 1985) tended to be dominant when managers made an apparent calculation of the benefits and costs associated with the collaboration, which was the case in three out of five philanthropic collaborations. The calculative rationality is very useful in business as it allows managers to make decisions that can be proven beneficial for their organization based on the information at hand. It became obvious that CSOs were more calculative in their approach as it was easier for them to identify the benefits with collaborating with a corporate partner. For example, CSO managers referred to its financial support, lowered operating costs and the benefits with being associated with a well-known and respected company, making it easier when approaching other

potential corporate partners. Although the corporate partners in the same collaborations also had a calculative rationality, they had more trouble making a detailed computation as their benefits had a large portion of “soft values”, such as improved reputation and brand value. The dominance of the calculative rationality was therefore more apparent among the CSO partners. The dominant rationality in the two additional philanthropic collaborations was ideal-based, as sharing ideals and values was more important than calculating the benefits. At the same time as the partner organizations were very different, they identified a common set of values giving the collaboration guidance.

The ideal-based rationality (Sjöstrand, 1985) was dominant in all transactional collaborations. Even though there were many structural differences between CSOs and corporations they found compatibility in shared values. They were unified in addressing a certain social issue which overshadowed potential challenges and bridged uncertainties in the collaboration. The fact that the organizations shared ideals and values helped the managers put the collaboration into a shared context and create a cultural identity. It also helped bring the two organizations and the people involved closer to one another. It was important that both “lived their values”, as this established trust in the collaboration. However, all partners, even those who did not have dominant ideal-based rationality, pointed out the importance of being able to acknowledge the partner’s values and not interact with organizations that directly contradict or interfere with the own organization’s values.

What distinguished integrative collaborations from the transactional stage from a relation point of view was the emphasis on friendly and close relations, creating a dominant genuine rationality (Sjöstrand, 1985). Although the organizations had a high degree of shared values in this stage, the personal connection between the managers involved was more prominent. As partners were not biologically related, we refer to Sjöstrand’s (1993) definition of the genuine relationship as a friendship kind, not family. In both integrative collaborations, the emotional tie between the managers was strong and there was a great sense of respect and trust for the partner. The managers spoke about their collaboration in a warm fashion, describing their relationship in a personal and rich way. They often mentioned their point-of-contact’s first name when talking about the collaboration and thought it was difficult to discuss the collaboration without taking it to a personal level. They further stated that the collaboration’s success was to a great extent due to the people managing it, as they were highly committed and engaged. The strong connection between the managers made them opportunity oriented as they naturally thought about how they could involve the counterpart in new activities.

Managers in all three collaborative stages found their partner more or less unique, for example in terms of target group, business model, operations etc. However, the majority stated that they were not dependent on that specific partner and that it would be possible to replace it with another player to achieve similar results. On the contrary, managers in the integrative collaborations stated that their partner was irreplaceable and stressed the uniqueness of their partnership. Since the collaboration activities were highly integrated in the organization of both the corporation and the CSO, terminating the relationship would have severe consequences for both. This conclusion is in line with Sjöstrand (1993), who argues that both the people involved in a genuine relationship and the relationship itself is unique and not interchangeable with others. While the strong personal bond enhances trust and commitment among the managers it also increases the risk that the collaboration becomes too dependent on individual people. It is hard to say what would happen to these collaborations if a key manager would move on to another role or quit. It is likely that these collaborations would last due to their co-creation character. However, the relationship between the partners will change somehow if

someone leaves and someone new steps in. The genuine relationship has been built up may be eroded. In the end, integrative collaborations are difficult to replace, both with regards to the co-created activities generating value as well as the special personal relation between the partners.

5.3 The Complexity of CCCs

This section elaborates further on the results from studying CCCs by combining the theoretical frameworks by Austin (2000a) and Sjöstrand (1985). The intention is to address certain aspects that deserve to be commented on.

Even if this thesis has categorized the CCC cases into a certain collaboration stage on the collaboration continuum and assigned them a dominant rationality, it is important to point out that a collaboration often has characteristics from several collaboration stages and rationalities. Inspired by Goodrick and Reay (2011), we can propose that corporate and CSO managers in CCCs have a “constellation” of rationalities, implying that different types of relationships to handle uncertainty can coexist. The constellation term refers to the combination of constructs in a recognizable pattern. CCCs are complex and dynamic entities that are often subject to change due to changes in the organizations (e.g. structure, employee turnover) or in its environment (e.g. new social and environmental challenges). Not all CCCs were easy to categorize and simultaneously, collaborations in the same collaboration stage could be very different.

According to Austin’s (2000a) conceptualization the collaboration between SJ and Mind was in the philanthropic stage. This collaboration was an outlier among other philanthropic collaborations as it showed potential to move up along the collaboration continuum if the partners continue to invest in it. The collaboration was recently initiated and therefore less static and established than other collaborations in the study. They had little experience of working together and the managers did not yet fully know each other. However, the organizations had a special bond due to the connection between suicide and trains and the managers saw great potential for a continued collaboration. They had interesting ideas for future collaboration activities, and if executed, they would probably qualify to the transactional or even integrative stage. In this sense, it seemed like SJ and Mind would grow out of the philanthropic stage they were currently placed in and go beyond the donor-recipient relation in a near future.

Another aspect that needs some attention concerns the collaboration stages in relation to each other. Collaborations in one stage are not necessarily better than those in others per se. In fact, different types of collaborations are suitable for different types of organizations. However, the integrative collaborations generated value on many dimensions for both partners and managers were more aligned and satisfied with the collaboration. Power was more balanced than in other stages, which might be desirable. But not all collaborations have the potential, or the intention, to develop into an integrative collaboration. It requires more effort and the two organizations need to create new business opportunities together. It also demands an ambition and willingness among both managers that are involved in the collaboration to push the development of the collaboration forward. The study can also conclude that a collaboration does not have to progress to other collaboration stages over time.

Although this was not a longitudinal study, we attempt to comment on the time aspect since the sample included collaborations of different durations. We cannot determine if it requires a long-term relationship in order to develop a genuine relationship. However, we can make the conclusion that a

collaboration that have been ongoing for a couple of years, corresponding to a long-term collaboration, does not necessarily mean that an ideal-based or genuine type of relationship have been developed between the partners. This means that neither the collaboration nor the relationship naturally becomes more personal or intense as time passes, or as Barrett et al. expressed: *“Cross-sector partnerships do not happen; they are built”* (2002:46).

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis is to address the research gap in CCC literature. Existing literature underemphasizes reciprocity and the relationship dimension in CCCs. This chapter is divided in two parts, the first part (section 6.1) addresses the research question and the second part (section 6.2) goes beyond the research question.

6.1 Addressing the Research Question

The research question was: *How do corporate and CSO managers handle uncertainty in corporate-CSO collaborations?* The study has revealed that collaborations between corporations and CSOs can be very different, and are often both complex and dynamic in nature. Many times these collaborations miss out on setting clear goals and aligning expectations, making managers have little sense of direction for the collaboration. This causes uncertainty among managers how these should be managed. In order to reduce uncertainty, managers have different rationalities to varying degrees, with one rationality often being dominant.

In this study it appeared to be a pattern between the type of rationality the managers had and collaboration stage. In the philanthropic collaborations, the stage most heterogeneous, managers had a dominant calculative or ideal-based rationality. In those which the calculative rationality was dominant, it was easier for the CSO managers than for the corporate managers to evaluate the cost versus the benefits as resources were more tangible. In the transactional collaborations, the corporate and CSO managers had a dominant ideal-based rationality helping them establish organizational trust and a shared context. They were united in addressing a particular social issue which clearly stated their standpoint and reflected their values. This helped them bridge uncertainty coming from the lack of information and guidance. In addition to shared ideals and values, managers of collaborations in the integrative stage also had a strong personal connection making the genuine rationality dominant. The managers involved had a genuine concern for the partner organization that went beyond simply calculating what they could do for them or how the collaboration could become a competitive advantage. Another important factor was the high level of personal trust between the individual corporate and CSO managers, making them very confident to handle all potential challenges. The organizations' operations were also perceived to complement each other exceptionally well. By answering the research question, this thesis creates a better understanding for CCCs and provides a view of the phenomenon that more adequately mirrors reality.

6.2 Going Beyond the Research Question

In this section, we intend to take a broader perspective of the society in which CCCs are present and share insights moving beyond the research question. In this study, it became obvious that the civil society takes a more important and active role in society than in the past. The role of the state has weakened and CSOs take greater responsibility for many social challenges. In turn, CSOs strengthen their position in society and are able to set new demands on the corporate sector. In the long run, it might help to even out the power imbalance between corporations and CSOs.

Among both corporate and CSO managers, there was a common opinion that collaboration with the other sector should be of a "give-and-take" nature. Even if this was not the case in practice for all collaborations, it symbolizes a shared understanding that it is no longer desired to have purely philanthropic collaborations by only giving money to the CSOs. Although this sets out an optimistic view

for future interaction between the sectors, it increases the demands for engaging in such collaborations. The aspiration for ambitious collaborations involving for example employees or customers may lead to difficulties in the allocation of resources, either human or financial, especially for CSOs that generally have very limited resources already. As collaborations tend to become more extensive and complex, it pressures the partner organizations to tailor their collaborations to fit the unique conditions and desires. This further prevents standardization and limits the possibility to implement established practices, in turn requiring managers to have high levels of creativity and management competence to make collaborations happen.

7. Discussion

This chapter presents the thesis' theoretical contributions (section 7.1) and practical contributions (section 7.2), as well as the limitations to the contributions (section 7.3). Suggestions for further research (section 7.4) are also discussed.

7.1 Theoretical Contributions

Throughout the thesis, we have emphasized the importance of relationships in CCCs. The main theoretical contribution of our study is the integration of Sjöstrand's (1985) theory on rationalities to Austin's (2000a) collaboration continuum. It became evident in our study that the relationship between the CSO and the corporate managers was an important component. By adding a relationship dimension we address the previous theoretical oversimplification of the relationship dimension in the study of CCCs. By doing so we also address the question of how relationships may differ between stages of the collaboration continuum.

Additionally, our study applies Sjöstrand's (1985) theory about uncertainty and rationalities in human interactions to an empirical context and confirms the view of humans as complex and not fully rational.

7.2 Practical Contributions

On a more practical level, this thesis serves to improve the knowledge among managers involved in CCCs. Assessing a collaboration according to both the collaboration continuum and rationalities can give managers valuable insights on the status of their collaboration and enhance long-term planning. Before entering a collaboration managers are recommended to consider the non-tangible aspects that a collaboration entails, namely the relationship to key people in the partner organization. Sharing ideals and values helps to bridge inherent differences between CSOs and corporations. It is easier to find suitable activities in collaborations where the managers have identified a common set of values making the collaboration natural. Establishing a solid personal relationship may help reduce uncertainty and build confidence in the collaboration. However, developing a deeper personal relationship requires commitment and engagement.

7.3 Limitations to Contributions

Our analysis and conclusions are based on interviews with corporate and CSO managers and are therefore dependent on their interpretations of the collaborations. The study is based in Sweden, an interesting context for studying CCCs due to the long tradition of social responsibility and since there are few studies on Swedish CCCs, but the generalizability of the contributions to other countries, cultures and traditions is imponderable. Since we only met the corporate managers twice and CSO managers once we only got a "snapshot" of the ten collaborations. It would have been insightful to follow the collaborations for a longer period of time.

7.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The results of the study indicate that CCCs are influenced by personal relationships among the managers of CSO and corporations, and time. Future research should pay greater attention to the time dimension in collaborations. All human relationships evolve over time, thus it can be assumed that a longitudinal study might capture the collaborative relationships more comprehensively. Additionally, further studies may investigate if and how CSR managers' institutional logic differ from other managers' logic within the

corporate organization. Since ideals and values proved to be important for CSR managers, it raises the question whether they have a market logic or have a logic more similar to that in CSOs.

8. References

- Abzug, R. and Webb, N. (1999). "Relationships between Nonprofit and for-Profit Organizations: A Stakeholder Perspective". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(4), 416-431.
- AccountAbility. (2007). *The State of Responsible Competitiveness 2007*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.accountability.org/images/content/0/7/075/The%20State%20of%20Responsible%20Competitiveness.pdf> [2016-05-04]
- Aldrich, H. and Whetten, D. (1981). "Organization Sets, Action Sets and Networks". In P. Nystrom and W. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Design* (pp. 395-408). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- AL-Tabbaa, O., Leach, D. and March, J. (2014). "Collaboration Between Nonprofit and Business Sectors: A Framework to Guide Strategy Development for Nonprofit Organizations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(3), 657-678.
- Andreasen, A. R. (1996). "Profits for Nonprofits: Find a Corporate Partner". *Harvard Business Review*, 74(6), 47-50.
- Andriof, J. and Waddock, S. (2002). "Unfolding Stakeholder Engagement". In J. Andriof, S. Waddock, B. Husted and S. Sutherland Rahman (Eds.), *Unfolding Stakeholder Thinking* (pp. 19-42). Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf.
- Arend, R. J. (2013). "A Heart-Mind-Opportunity Nexus: Distinguishing Social Entrepreneurship for Entrepreneurs". *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2), 313-315.
- Asch, D. and Bowman, C. (Eds.), (1989). *Readings in Strategic Management*. London: Macmillan.
- Ashman, D. (2001). "Civil Society Collaboration with Business: Bringing Empowerment Back in". *World Development*, 29(7), 1097-1113.
- Aupperle, K. E. (1984). "An Empirical Measure of Corporate Social Orientation". In L. E. Preston (Ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy* (pp. 27-54). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Austin, J. E. (2000a). *The Collaboration Challenge: How Nonprofits and Businesses Succeed through Strategic Alliances*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Austin, J. E. (2000b). "Strategic Collaboration Between Nonprofits and Businesses". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 69-97.
- Austin, J. E. (2007) "Sustainability through Partnering: Conceptualizing Partnerships Between Businesses and NGOs". In P. Glasbergen, F. Biermann and A. P. J. Mol *Partnerships, Governance and Sustainable Development: Reflections on Theory and Practice* (pp. 49-67). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Austin, J. E. and Seitanidi, M. M. (2012a). "Collaborative Value Creation: A Review of Partnering Between Nonprofits and Businesses. Part 1: Value Creation Spectrum and Collaboration Stages". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(5), 726-758.
- Austin, J. E. and Seitanidi, M. M. (2012b). "Collaborative Value creation: A Review of Partnering Between Nonprofits and Businesses. Part 2: Partnering Processes and Outcomes". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 929-968.
- Austin, J. E. and Seitanidi, M. M. (2014). *Creating Value in Nonprofit-business Collaborations: New Thinking and Practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Barrett, D., Austin, J. E. and McCarthy, S. (2002). "Cross-Sector Collaboration: Lessons from the International Trachoma Initiative." In M. R. Reich (Ed.), *Public-Private Partnerships for Public Health*

- (pp. 41-65). Harvard Series on Population and International Health. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Berger, I. E., Cunningham, P. H. and Drumwright, M. E. (2004). "Social Alliances: Company/Nonprofit Collaboration". *California Management Review*, 47(1), 58-90.
- Berättarministeriet, (2016). *Om oss*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.berattarministeriet.se/om-oss/> [2016-05-12]
- Billis, D. (2010). *Hybrid organizations and the third sector*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bonnierförlagen, (2016a). *Bokbranschen i Sverige*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.bonnierforlagen.se/om/bokbranschen-i-sverige/> [2016-05-12]
- Bonnierförlagen, (2016b). *Bonnierförlagen – In English*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.bonnierforlagen.se/in-english/> [2016-05-12]
- Bowen, F., Newenham-Kahindi, A. and Herremans, I. (2010). "When Suits Meet Roots: The Antecedents and Consequences of Community Engagement Strategy". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 297-318.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2011). *Business research methods* (3rd ed). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryson, J., Crosby, B. and Stone, M. (2006). "The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature". *Public Administration Review*, Volume 66 Issue Supplement s1, 44-55.
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). "A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance". *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). "Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct". *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268-295.
- Carroll, A. B. and Shabana K. M. (2010). "The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review of Concepts, Research and Practice", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 85-105.
- Christensen, C. M., Baumann, H., Ruggles, R., and Sadtler, T. M. (2006). "Disruptive Innovation for Social Change". *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 96-101.
- Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). "A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance". *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92-117.
- Couchman, P. K. and Fulop, L. (2009). "Examining partner experience in cross-sector collaborative projects focused on the commercialization of R&D". *Innovation*, 11(1), 85-103.
- Dahan, N. M., Doh, J. P., Oetzel, J. and Yaziji, M. (2010). "Corporate-NGO collaboration: Co-creating New Business Models for Developing Markets". *Long Range Planning*, 43(2), 326-342.
- Daun, Å. (1989). *Svensk mentalitet: Ett jämförande perspektiv*. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The Research Act in Sociology*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Dorado, S., Giles, D. E. and Welch, T. C. (2009). "Delegation of Coordination and Outcomes in Cross-Sector Partnerships". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(3), 368-391.

- Downey, K. H. and Slocum, J. W. (1975). "Uncertainty: Measures, Research and Sources of Variations", *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(3), 562-578.
- Edmondson, A. C. and McManus, S. E. (2007). "Methodological Fit in Management Field Research". *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1155-1179.
- Eells, R. and Walton, C. (1961). *Conceptual Foundations of Business*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). "Building Theories from Case Study Research". *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. and Graebner, M. E. (2007). "Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges". *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.
- Elbing, A. O. and Elbing, C. J. (1964). *The Value Issue in Business*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Freeman, R. E. (2004, September). *Stakeholder theory and corporate responsibility: Some practical questions*. 3rd Annual Colloquium European Academy of Business in Society, Gent, Belgium.
- French, P. A. (1979). "The Corporation as Moral Person". *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 16(3), 207-215.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Friends, (2016). *Om oss*. [Online] Available from: <http://friends.se/om-oss/om-friends/> [2016-05-12]
- Galaskiewicz, J. and Sinclair Colman, M. (2006). "Collaboration between corporations and nonprofit organizations". In R. Steinberg and W. W. Powel (Eds.), *The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook* (pp. 180-206). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Garriga, E. and Melé, D. (2004). "Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1-2), 51-71.
- Geertz, C. (1973). "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture". In C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ghobadian, A., Money, K. and Hillenbrand, C. (2015). "Corporate Responsibility Research: Past – Present – Future". *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 271-294.
- Gjølborg, M. (2009). "Measuring the immeasurable? Constructing an index of CSR practices and CSR performance in 20 countries". *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 25(1), 10-22.
- Glasbergen, P., Biermann, F. and Mol, A. P. J. (2007). *Partnerships, Governance and Sustainable Development: Reflections on Theory and Practice*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goodrick, E. and Reay, T. (2011). "Constellations of Institutional Logics: Changes in the Professional Work of Pharmacists". *Work and Occupations*, 38(3), 372-416.
- Googins, B. K., Mirvis, P. H. and Rochlin, S. A. (2007). *Beyond Good Company: Next Generation Corporate Citizenship*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Googins, B. K. and Rochlin, S. A. (2000). "Creating the Partnership Society: Understanding the Rhetoric and Reality of Cross-Sectoral Partnerships". *Business and Society Review*, 105(1), 127-144.
- Grafström, M., Göthberg, P. and Windell, K. (2015). *CSR: Företagsansvar i förändring* (2nd ed). Stockholm: Liber.

- Greenly, G. E. (1989). "Does Strategic Planning Improve Company Performance?", In D. Asch and C. Bowman (Eds.), *Readings in Strategic Management*. London: Macmillan.
- Haralambos, M. (1980). *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*. Slough: University Tutorial Press.
- Herlin, H. (2015). "Better Safe Than Sorry: Nonprofit Organizational Legitimacy and Cross-Sector Partnerships". *Business & Society*, 54(6), 822-858.
- Hultén, P. and Wijkström, F. (2008). *200 år av samhällsnytta: 10 år av CSR*. Stockholm: Sparbanksakademin.
- Huxham, C. and Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to Collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage*. New York: Routledge.
- IBM, (2016a). *IBM Grant Programs*. [Online] Available from: https://www.ibm.com/ibm/responsibility/initiatives/grant_programs.shtml [2016-04-29]
- IBM, (2016b). *IBM Svenska AB*. [Online] Available from: <http://www-05.ibm.com/se/ibm/sweden/> [2016-05-12]
- Jamali, D. and Keshishian, T. (2009). "Uneasy Alliances: Lessons Learned from Partnerships Between Businesses and NGOs in the context of CSR". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(2), 277-295.
- Jutterström, M. and Norberg, P. (2011). *Företagsansvar - CSR som managementidé*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The Change Masters: Innovation for Productivity in the American Corporation*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Kelley, H. et al. (1983). *Close Relationships*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Le Ber, M. J. and Branzei, O. (2010a). "(Re)Forming Strategic Cross-Sector Partnerships: Relational Processes of Social Innovation". *Business & Society*, 49(1), 140-172.
- Le Ber, M. J. and Branzei, O. (2010b). "Value Frame Fusion in Cross Sector Interactions". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(1) Supplement, 163-195.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lister, S. (2000). "Power in Partnership? An Analysis of an NGO's Relationships with its Partners". *Journal of International Development*, 12(2), 227-239.
- Lundström, T. and Wijkström, F. (1997). *The nonprofit sector in Sweden*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Läxhjälpen, (2016). *Vad vi gör*. [Online] Available from: <http://laxhjalpen.se/vadvigor/> [2016-05-12]
- Maignan, I. and Ralston, D. A. (2002). "Corporate Social Responsibility in Europe and the U.S.: Insights from Businesses' Self-Presentations". *Journal of International Business Studies*. 33(3), 497-514.
- Makower, J. (1994). *Beyond the Bottom Line: Putting Social Responsibility to Work for Your Business and the World*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Matten, D. and Crane, A. (2005). "Corporate Citizenship: Toward an Extended Theoretical Conceptualization". *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 166-179.
- McWilliams, A. and Siegel, D. S. (2001). "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theory of the Firm Perspective". *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 117-127.

- Merriam, S. (1994). *Fallstudien som forskningsmetod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. and Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Mind, (2016). *Om oss*. [Online] Available from: <https://mind.se/om-oss/> [2016-05-12]
- Min Stora Dag, (2016). *Min Stora Dag – In English*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.minstoradag.org/om-oss/in-english/> [2016-05-12]
- Murphy, D. F. and Bendell, J. (1999). "Partners in Time? Business, NGOs and Sustainable Development". *Discussion Paper-United Nations Research Institute for Social Development*, 109, 1-71.
- Oliver, C. (1990). "Determinants of Interorganizational Relationships: Integration and Future Directions". *Academy of Management Review*, 15(2), 241-265.
- O'Riain, S. (2000). "States and Markets in an Era of Globalization". *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 187-213.
- Ozar, D. T. (1979). "The Moral Responsibility of Corporations". In T. Donaldson and P. Werhane (Eds.), *Ethical issues in business: A philosophical approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pless, N. M. (2012). "Social Entrepreneurship in Theory and Practice—An introduction". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 317-320.
- Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R. (2002). "The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy". *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12), 56-68.
- Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M.R. (2011). "The Big Idea: Creating Shared Value". *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1-2), 62-77.
- Prakash, A. (2002). "Beyond Seattle: Globalization, the Nonmarket Environment and Corporate Strategy". *Review of International Political Economy*, 9(3), 513-537.
- Pratt, M. G. (2009). "For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research". *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 856-862.
- Reed, J., Jones, D. and Irvine, J. (2005). "Appreciating Impact: Evaluating Small Voluntary Organizations in the United Kingdom". *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 16(2), 123-141.
- Rondinelli, D. A. and London, T. (2003). "How corporations and environmental groups cooperate: Assessing cross-sector alliances and collaborations". *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(1), 61-76.
- Ross, S. R. (2012). *Expanding the pie: Fostering Effective Non-Profit and Corporate Partnerships*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- Salamon, L. M. and Anheier, H. K. (1998). "Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally". *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 9(3), 213-248.
- Sanzo, M. J., Álvarez, L. I., Rey, M. and García, N. (2015). "Business-Nonprofit Partnerships: Do Their Effects Extend Beyond the Charitable Donor-Recipient Model?". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(2), 379-400.

- Schiller, R. and Almog-Bar, M. (2013). "Revisiting Collaborations Between Nonprofits and Businesses: An NPO-Centric View and Typology". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(5), 942-962.
- Schröter, H. G. (2005). *Americanization of the European Economy: A compact survey of American Economic influence in Europe since the 1880s*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Seitanidi, M. M. (2010). *The Politics of Partnerships – A Critical Examination of Nonprofit-Business Partnerships*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Seitanidi, M. M. and Crane, A. (2009). "Implementing CSR Through Partnerships: Understanding the Selection, Design and Institutionalisation of Nonprofit-Business Partnerships". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(2) Supplement, 413-429.
- Seitanidi, M. M. and Ryan, A. (2007). "A critical review of forms of corporate community involvement: from philanthropy to partnership", *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12(3), 247-266.
- Selsky, J. W. and Parker, B. (2005). "Cross-Sector Partnerships to Address Social Issues: Challenges to Theory and Practice". *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 849-873.
- Siggelkow, N. (2007). "Persuasion with Case Studies". *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 20-24.
- SJ, (2016). *Om SJ*. [Online] Available from: <https://www.sj.se/sv/om/om-sj.html> [2016-05-12]
- Sjöstrand, S-E. (1985). *Samhällsorganisation: en ansats till en institutionell ekonomisk mikroteori*. Lund: Doxa.
- Sjöstrand, S-E. (Ed.), (1993). *Institutional Change: Theory and Empirical Findings*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Sjöstrand, S-E. (1997). *The Two Faces of Management: The Janus Factor*. London: Thomson Learning.
- Sjöstrand, S-E. (2000). "The Organization of Nonprofit Activities". *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 11(3), 199-216.
- Sustainergies, (2016). *Om oss*. [Online] Available from: <http://sustainergies.se/omoss> [2016-05-12]
- Svenska Basketbollförbundet, (2015). *Vision, värdegrund och övergripande mål*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.basket.se/Forbundet/Visionvardegrundochovergripandemal/> Last updated: 2015-06-18.
- Swedbank, (2016). *Om Swedbank*. [Online] Available from: <https://www.swedbank.se/om-swedbank/> [2016-05-12]
- Tichy, N. (1983). *Managing Strategic Change*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Transfer, (2016). *Om oss*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.transfer.nu/om-oss-30451843> [2016-05-12]
- Ung Företagsamhet, (2016). *About us*. [Online] Available from: <http://ungforetagsamhet.se/om-oss/junior-achievement-sweden> [2016-05-12]
- Vamstad, J. and von Essen, J. (2013). "Charitable Giving in a Universal Welfare State—Charity and Social Rights in Sweden". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(2), 285-301.
- Van Huijstee, M. and Glasbergen, P. (2010). "Business–NGO Interactions in a Multi-Stakeholder Context". *Business and Society Review*, 115(3), 249-284.

- Waddell, S. (2000). "Complementary resources: The win-win rationale for partnership with NGOs". In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development* (pp. 193-206). Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf.
- Waddock, S. (1989) "Understanding Social Partnerships. An Evolutionary Model of Partnership Organizations", *Administration & Society*, 21(1), 78-100.
- Waddock, S. (2002). *Leading Corporate Citizens: Vision, Values, Value Added*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Wartick, S. L. and Cochran, P. L. (1985). "The Evolution of the Corporate Social Performance Model". *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 758-770.
- Wijkström, F. & Lundström, T. (2002). *Den ideella sektorn: organisationerna i det civila samhället*. Stockholm: Sober Förlag.
- Wood, D. J. (1991). "Corporate Social Performance Revisited". *Academy of Management Review*, 16(4), 691-718.
- Wood, D. J. and Jones, R. E. (1995). "Stakeholder Mismatching: A Theoretical Problem in Empirical Research on Corporate Social Performance". *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 3(3), 229-267.
- Wymer, W. W. (2001). "Book Review – The Collaboration Challenge: How Nonprofits and Businesses Succeed through Strategic Alliances by James E. Austin". *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 12(3), 297-299.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ählström, J. and Sjöström, E. (2005). "CSOs and Business Partnerships: Strategies for interaction". *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 14(4), 230-240.

9. Appendices

Appendix A. Interview Sample

Name	Organization	Title	Pre-Study Interview	Main Study Interview
Bodil Unenge	Bonnierförlagen	CSR Manager	2016-01-28 (In-person, Head Office, 30 min)	2016-02-25 (In-person, Head Office, 70 min)
Carl von Essen	Mind	Secretary General		2016-02-24 (In-person, Head Office, 65 min)
Cecilia Nykvist	UF	CEO		2016-03-22 (In-person, Head Office, 90 min)
Dilsa Demirbag Sten	Berättarministeriet	Director & Co-founder		2016-02-23 (In-person, Head Office, 65 min)
Emil Breman	Transfer	Head of Operations		2016-02-17 (In-person, Head Office, 85 min)
Johannes Wohler	SBBF	Marketing & Communications Manager		2016-03-18 (In-person, Espresso House, 60 min)
Krister Svensson + Stina Axi	SJ	Head of Partnerships + Customer Market Manager	2016-01-27 (In-person, Head Office, 60 min)	2016-03-11 (In-person, Head Office, 120 min)
Lars Arrhenius	Friends	Secretary General		2016-02-26 (In-person, Head Office, 60 min)
Maria Arneng	Läxhjälp	Director		2016-02-26 (In-person, Wayne's Coffee, 120 min)
Marie-Louise Schöldtz	Min Stora Dag	Head of Marketing & Fundraising		2016-04-07 (In-person, Head Office, 60 min)
Marita Ljung	Swedbank	Head of Public Affairs Swedish Banking	2016-02-02 (In-person, Head Office, 30 min)	2016-03-01 (In-person, Head Office, 75 min)
Markus Danell	Sustainergies	Managing Director & Co-founder		2016-03-15 (In-person, Head Office, 75 min)
Susanna Salwén	IBM	Corporate Citizenship & Corporate Affairs Manager	2016-01-25 (In-person, Head Office, 60 min)	2016-03-23 (In-person, Head Office, 90 min)
Åsa Carlsson	Friends	Head of Sales & Partnerships		2016-02-29 (In-person, Head Office, 75 min)

Appendix B. Interview Guide

Introduction & Background

- The interviewee's background
 - Education and previous working experience?
 - Work title?
 - How long have you worked in your current job position?
 - Outside of work are you actively involved in any CSO?
- Background to the organization and CSR
 - Could you please describe your organization and what you do in your role?
 - How is the organization financed?
 - Is the organization operating in other locations outside Stockholm?
Local/Regional/National/International
 - How does your organization define CSR and what does it mean in practice?
 - How do you think "Organization Y" defines CSR? (Organization Y is the organization who they collaborate with).
 - What have been the major trends within CSR in your industry during the past couple of years?

General view on collaboration

- What is a collaboration for you?
- Could you please describe what a perfect collaboration would be like for you?
 - How close to the perfect collaboration is your collaboration with "Organization Y"?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<i>Very far from perfect</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Very close to perfect</i>
- How many collaborations do you have with other organizations at present?
- Could you please describe how your organization work with collaborations in general?
 - If, not elaborated upon, ask:
 - What is the time horizon?
 - What is the focus of your collaborations?
 - How closely connected are the collaborations to your mission?
 - How do you select whom to collaborate with?
 - What is important in a possible partner?

Specific view on the collaboration with "Organization Y"

- Could you please describe your collaboration with "Organization Y"?
 - Who took the initiative to collaborate?
 - What is the time perspective of this collaboration?
 - What activities do you do together?
 - What problem(s) does this collaboration aim to solve?
 - What resources are required in order to meet these objectives?
 - How anchored is this collaboration in your organization?

- What differences do you see between you and “Organization Y”?
 - What are the effects of this?
- What similarities do you see between you and “Organization Y”?
 - What are the effects of this?
- How would you describe your relationship with “Organization Y”?
- How is your trust level for “Organization Y”?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<i>Very low</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Very high</i>

 - Has your trust for “Organization Y” changed over time? If yes, why?
 - Is there anything that has affected your trust for “Organization Y” positively or negatively?
 - What role does trust have in the collaboration with “Organization Y”?
- Could you please describe the communication with “Organization Y”?
 - If, not elaborated upon, ask:
 - Is it mail, phone calls, text messages or in-person?
 - Is it formal or informal?
 - Is it regular or irregular?
 - How does a typical phone call or meeting with “Organization Y” look like?
- Approximately, how many hours per month do you work with “Organization Y”?
 - Do you think this is too much or too little?
 - How engaged do you perceive “Organization Y” to be in the collaboration?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<i>Very unengaged</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Very engaged</i>
- What prerequisites are needed for the collaboration with “Organization Y” to work?
- What valued did you see in the collaboration with “Organization Y” before you entered it?
- What risks did you see in collaborating with “Organization Y” before you entered it?
- How are the goals for the collaboration set?
 - Are they set independently or agreed upon together?
 - Tell us more about how this was done.
- Could you please describe how the collaboration creates value?
- What have you learned from the collaboration?
- What makes “Organization Y” unique?
- Is “Organization Y” replaceable?
- Could you please describe how the evaluation of the collaboration works?
- Has the collaboration met your initial expectations?
- Have you run into any problems during the collaboration?
- What do you contribute with in this collaboration?
- Whom benefits the most from this collaboration?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<i>Organization Y</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Your Organization</i>

 - Do you have any reflections about this?

- How is the power balance divided in this collaboration?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<i>Organization Y</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Your Organization</i>

- Do you have any reflections about this?
- How is value created in this collaboration over time?
- What would happen if the collaboration were to end?
- Are there any other stakeholders who are important for this collaboration?