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ABSTRACT

Collaborative arrangements between the public, private and other sectors are emerging as a popular means of delivering official development assistance programs (ODA). A common modality for these collaborations is public-private alliances (PPAs). While the success of these arrangements is well publicised, the reality is that failure rates are high, ranging from 30-70 per cent, and their performance is widely debated. A significant reason for these frequent failures may be the poor understanding of the dynamics of PPA establishment. More fundamentally, the lack of a comprehensive integrated theoretical framework results in fragmented research and simplistic approaches to alliance design.

This thesis develops an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Alliance Establishment in ODA programs. The Theoretical Model provides researchers, practitioners and stakeholders working in PPA development with a better understanding of the processes of alliance establishment. It presents an integrated framework which can be used to make better decisions and reduce the high rates of failure and the poor performance that currently affect these popular ODA modalities.

Using Grounded Theory methodology, this research employs the rich experiences, background and perceptions of senior managers and participants directly involved in PPA establishment to identify five core categories associated with alliance establishment: 'Processes and Process Issues'; 'Alliance Type'; 'Alliance Relationships'; 'Alliance Leadership'; and 'Modifiers'. The results of this analysis, together with supplementary
comparative analyses and research, the insights and understanding from relevant previous studies, and the academic and technical literature have been combined to develop an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA. This substantive model conceptually shows the interaction between the five core categories leading to alliance establishment. It also highlights the complex, non-linear and context-specific nature of alliance establishment and the particular importance of the 'Conception' stage of alliance formation.

From a theoretical perspective, this work has added to the body of knowledge on PPA establishment in three ways. It develops an Integrated Model of PPA Establishment. This research identifies and explains the importance of 'Conception', 'Alliance Type', 'Alliance Leadership', and 'Modifiers' in PPA establishment. It highlights the importance of 'Alliance Relationships' as a central focus of alliance establishment. In practical terms, the Integrated Theoretical Model conceptualises the processes of alliance establishment and identifies significant processes, factors and issues which need to be considered and resolved by practitioners during PPA design and formation. From a research perspective, the Integrated Theoretical Model provides a framework which can be used as a tool for further study of PPA establishment.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As commitments to overseas aid for developing countries increase, the formal involvement of the private, non-government and other sectors in official development assistance (ODA) interventions continues to gain importance (AusAID, 2011a, pp. 4, 14, 18). One of the more popular modalities for involving these groups in ODA is through public-private alliances (PPAs). Despite the popularity of PPAs for ODA delivery there is wide debate concerning their effectiveness and failure rates are high. This may be due, at least in part, to a lack of understanding of the dynamics of PPA creation and an absence of a theoretical framework to guide ODA practitioners in establishing these inter-organisational relationships (Park and Ungson, 2001, p. 37). The aim of this thesis is to study the major factors and processes associated with PPA establishment and to develop an integrated theoretical model to clarify the way in which they potentially interact to influence the nature of the resulting alliance.

1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

According to the "Millennium Development Goals Report, 2011" (UNDP, 2011, pp. 4-7) in 2008, 22.4 per cent of the world's population (1.2 billion people) were living on less than US$ 1.25 per day. At the same time, there were 8.1 million deaths among children under five; nearly a quarter of all children in the developing world were underweight; 2.6 billion people lacked access to sanitation and nearly 2.6 million people in the developing world became infected with HIV. In September of 2000, the developed countries adopted the United Nations Millennium Declaration, aimed at reducing extreme poverty through series of time-bound targets, with a deadline of 2015 (AusAID, 2011b, p. 5; AusAID, 2012, pp. 4-7). These targets have become known as the Millennium Development Goals. They range from
halving extreme poverty to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education. The main way that these Millennium Development Goals are being addressed is through ODA.

ODA, defined as the flows of funding from developed countries with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective (OECD, 2003), has been steadily increasing. In 2009 this was US$ 119.6 billion (OECD, 2010). This figure is expected to increase as developed countries increase their ODA commitments to meet their agreed targets of 0.7 per cent of gross national income (GNI) against the current average of around 0.31 per cent of GNI (OECD, 2010). Australia's ODA commitment is set to increase from 0.33 per cent of GNI or around AU$ 4.3 billion (2010-11) to 0.5 per cent of GNI (or around AU$ 8.5 billion) by the financial year 2015-16.

Overseas aid and development donor countries, including Australia, increasingly recognise that the formal involvement of the private, non-government and other sectors will be of increasing importance if the full impact of this increasing ODA is to be achieved (Lob-Levyt, 2001; Sachs, 2001; Hart and Shipley, 2005, pp. 10-13; Ministry of Foreign Affairs Denmark, 2006; Runde, 2006, pp. 1-4; AusAID, 2011a, pp. 4, 14, 18).

There appears to be two major reasons for the increasing involvement of the private sector in ODA. Firstly, there has been declining investment over time from the public sector in aid-related areas such as research and development (R&D) but with a corresponding potential investment in these areas by the private sector. For example, Spielman and von Grebmer (2004, pp.1-2) report that in agricultural R&D, public-sector institutions accounted for approximately 94 per cent of the US$ 12.1 billion spent annually in developing countries during the mid 1990s. Yet during this period, the growth rate of expenditure in this area
slowed dramatically in many of these developing countries. Against this trend, private-sector investment increased world-wide, accounting for approximately 35 per cent of global investment in agricultural R&D or US$ 11.5 billion per annum during the mid 1990s.

Secondly, as the international aid program becomes more complex, the involvement of the business and private sector in areas such as research and development, infrastructure development, public health, service delivery, community and rural development and skills development is also becoming more important (AusAID, 2006, pp.7, 36, 39, 40, 49; AusAID, 2011a, pp. 4, 14, 18). A review of the Australian official aid program conducted in 2005 and 2006 found that:

The challenges facing the Asia-Pacific region will continue to evolve and become more complex. New policy responses will be required and new expertise and players will be called on by the aid program to play a role, for example on pandemics, on infrastructure financing or on improving political governance. At the same time, a broader cross-section of Australian society is engaging with the region at government, business, professional and community levels. The aid program can benefit from and promote this engagement to strengthen the effectiveness of aid to the region. The government will work to further integrate and broaden Australian engagement in development in the Asia-Pacific region. This will centre on policy coherence and whole-of-government approaches to aid delivery, and on broadening participation beyond government (AusAID, 2006, p. 62).

Private sector involvement in ODA is typically through collaborative arrangements including grant-making from donors, procurement of goods and services by donors or through strategic alliances, including public-private alliances (PPAs) (Duncan et al., 2005a, p. 1.17 - 1.18; Duncan et al., 2005 b; Runde, 2006; Herling, 2008; Devlin and Moguillansky, 2009; McDonnell et al., 2009; Moran et al., 2009; Grace, 2010; Moran et al., 2010; Grace et al., 2011 ). In the ODA and general literature, the term PPA is commonly used to cover a broad
range of inter-organisational arrangements. PPAs include public-private partnerships (PPPs) but also a wider range of arrangements between public, private and other organisations.

1.2 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Despite the popularity and much-publicised success of many PPAs, there is considerable debate in the literature regarding the effectiveness and performance of PPAs in ODA programs (Leisenger and Schmitt, 2000; Buse and Waxman, 2001; Weber and Kremer, 2001; Widdus, 2003; Dlamini et al., 2004; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004; Ziemba, 2005; Holden and Brown, 2007) and the general PPA literature reports high failure rates ranging from 30 to 70 per cent (Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-368; Park and Ungson, 2001, p.37; Zaman and Mavondo, 2009). Each member of an alliance brings its own culture, values, modes of operation, responsibilities and constituents along with unique and specialised skills, and the management of these dimensions across partners in public-private alliances is complex and can be difficult to maintain (Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615; Bhaskoran and Gligorovska, 2009, p. 45; Mc Donnell et al., 2009, pp. 1-2; Zaman and Mavondo, 2009; San-Carranza and Longo, 2012, p.331). In addition, organisations are often more concerned with their individual interests and there is poor alignment with the collaborative interests of the alliance (Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-368; Park and Ungson, 2001, p 37). Thus this poor performance of PPAs may be due, at least in part, to a lack of a theoretical understanding of the mechanics of PPA creation and implementation, and an absence of empirical research to guide ODA practitioners in establishing these inter-organisational relationships (Park and Ungson, 2001, p. 37). In the absence of this crucial information and an appropriate integrated theoretical framework, those seeking to establish
PPAs rely on past experience, outmoded models, recipes for alliance creation and they are prone to repeating the mistakes of the past.

Given the predicted increases in ODA funding, renewed calls for increased aid effectiveness, (AusAID, 2011b, pp.19-26; AusAID, 2012, pp. 20-28) and the relatively poor performance and sustainability of PPAs in general, the lack of research on PPA establishment and alliance success or failure is surprising. Although the increasing popularity of strategic alliances, including public-private alliances, has resulted in the generation of a large body of literature regarding all aspects of PPA establishment, implementation and operation, these perspectives view strategic alliance formation in terms of purpose and process (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, p. 91; Gulati, 1998, pp. 294-295, p. 310). They focus on the 'what' and the 'why' but not on the 'how' of strategic alliance formation and provide little theoretical underpinning that can be used by practitioners to create potentially sustainable PPAs.

1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The current study commenced with my frustration as a practitioner in the Australian ODA program in attempting to come to terms with the mechanics of establishing PPAs in ODA programs. ODA practitioners are being encouraged to ensure the increased participation of the private and other sectors in ODA program designs. They are being held responsible for the performance, in terms of meeting objectives, and impact of these interventions. However, the current lack of academic literature and research to provide an integrated theoretical underpinning for understanding the establishment of PPAs makes this very difficult. Given the relatively poor performance of PPAs and the complexities of bringing together culturally different organisations for a "common purpose", the lack of empirical and technical-based
integrated theoretical studies of public-private alliance establishment in the ODA sector to guide for government agencies, potential partners and practitioners is a potential constraint to the effective expansion of Australian ODA. This is particularly so in the establishment phase of PPAs where Noble (2002, pp. 328-340) noted that although this stage is of critical importance, it is an area that has received little attention from social researchers to date.

The objective of this thesis is to develop an integrated theoretical model of PPA establishment in ODA. It does this by seeking to answer two research questions:

(a) What are the main concerns of the partners responsible for the establishment of PPAs involved in official development assistance programs?

and

(b) What are the social and decision making processes that the key managers use to resolve these concerns during the establishment of a PPA in the ODA sector?

1.4 RESEARCH APPROACH

Most of the research into PPAs has been conducted using surveys, formal questionnaires or case studies using propositions or testing of hypotheses developed from the literature or researchers perceptions. These approaches ignore the rich information and background data that is available from senior managers and other participants who have been directly involved in PPA establishment. For the current study, I have adopted a constructivist approach. Thus, this research is based on the views, perceptions and experiences of senior managers involved
directly in the establishment of PPAs in ODA initially using Grounded Theory methodology, but also using comparative analysis for supplementary work.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The results of this study begin to fill an important gap in the theoretical and practical understanding of the major factors and social processes involved in PPA establishment.

In practical terms, this study has developed an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment which can be used as a framework by researchers, practitioners and others in designing and implementing PPAs. This Conceptual Model is grounded in the views, perceptions and understandings of those with practical experience in the establishment of alliances. It can guide practitioners in their thinking surrounding this important process. The Integrated Theoretical Model identifies the important factors to be considered in PPA establishment and how these interact with each other and the general environment in which PPAs operate. It also highlights five key intervention points where practitioners and other stakeholders can intervene to influence the nature of the resulting alliance relationship and thus potentially affect the nature and success of the alliance.

From a theoretical viewpoint, the Integrated Theoretical Model developed in this study provides an initial explanation of the way in which the major concerns of those involved in alliance establishment, and the social processes used to resolve these concerns, interact and come together in the complex and context-based process of PPA establishment. Thus, the Theoretical Model provides a starting point for additional research (identified throughout the
thesis and brought together in Chapter Eleven) and a potential research framework for future studies.

1.6 THESIS STRUCTURE AND SYNOPSIS

This thesis is organised into eleven chapters (refer Fig. 1.1):

**Figure 1.1 Thesis Structure**

- **Chapter 1**: Introduction
- **Chapter 2**: The Nature and Significance of Public-Private Alliances in Overseas Development Assistance Programs
- **Chapter 3**: Research Design, Methodology and Methods used in this study
- **Chapter 4**: Processes/Process Issues
- **Chapter 5**: Alliance Type
- **Chapter 6**: Alliance Relationships
- **Chapter 7**: Alliance Leadership
- **Chapter 8**: Modifiers
- **Chapter 9**: Bringing it all Together – the Development of an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA
- **Chapter 10**: The Integrated Theoretical Model in Practice – A Comparison of the Establishment of Three Public-Private Alliances in ODA Programs
- **Chapter 11**: Implications of Research, Limitations and Areas for Further Research

- **Background to the study; research issues; setting the context**
- **Definition of PPAs; structure, characteristics and performance of PPAs; classification and initial analysis of the literature; identification of research gaps**
- **Research strategy, design, methodology and methods used in the study; description of Grounded Theory and comparative analysis**
- **Five core categories developed from the Grounded Theory analysis**
- **Description of the core categories and their relationship to the extant literature**
- **Development of an integrated theoretical model based on the Grounded Theory analysis, supplementary research and relevant literature; utility of the model and limitations**
- **Practical significance and implications of the Integrated Theoretical Model by relating it back to PPAs used in this study**
- **Research implications, limitations, areas for additional research and conclusion**
Chapter One, the current chapter, provides an introduction and background to the research topic and sets the context for this study.

Chapter Two, 'The Nature and Significance of Public-Private Alliances in Official Development Assistance Programs', presents an introduction to PPAs in the context of ODA. After a "false start" considering what the ODA literature often refer to as public-private partnerships (PPPs), I change tack to work on public-private alliances (PPAs). The reasons for this and the consequences for this study are discussed. A working definition of PPAs in ODA is subsequently developed and their structure, character, history and utility as a modality for delivering ODA interventions, and variable performance and potential failure are considered. A substantial body of literature has developed around strategic alliance in general and public-private alliances specifically. In Chapter Two an attempt is made to classify this literature, discuss the characteristics of the various classifications and then discuss this literature in the context of the aim of my work; that is, a detailed technical understanding of PPA establishment to guide practitioners and stakeholders. Chapter Two concludes with a consideration of the unresolved research issues and gaps that underpin the justification for the current study and the associated research questions. A central tenet of Grounded Theory methodology, the predominant methodology used in this study, is that the researcher should not bias the analysis by delving too deeply into the associated theoretical literature too early in the investigative process. Thus, in this chapter I do not review in detail those studies which have relevance to the aims and objectives of this study. This existing research is considered in detail in subsequent chapters of the thesis.

The research strategy, design, methodology and methods used in this study are detailed in Chapter Three, 'Research Design, Methodology and Methods used in this Study'. Grounded
Theory methodology is used to identify the key concerns of managers and senior staff and the processes associated with the establishment of PPAs in ODA. Grounded Theory has evolved and developed significantly since its inception by Glasser and Strauss in 1967 and there are now a number of "schools" of thought regarding Grounded Theory methodology. In this study, the more constructivist approach adopted by researchers such as Charmaz (2005, 2006) has been followed. This approach places more emphasis on the values, beliefs, feelings and ideologies of the individuals and resulting consideration of hidden networks, relationships and social dynamics rather than the positivist focus on formal research methods and processes inherent in the Orthodox Grounded Theory developed by Glasser and Strauss (1967). The principles and rationale associated with methodology are elaborated in this chapter. The results of the Grounded Theory analysis identified the need for supplementary research to further study several key elements highlighted by the Grounded Theory analysis and to allow a better understanding of the complexities of the establishment process. This subsequent research was carried out using comparative analysis. For this comparative analysis, the theoretical model developed in Chapter Nine was use as an analytical framework.

The Grounded Theory analysis identified five key factors of importance in the establishment of PPAs in ODA and these are detailed in Chapters Four to Eight (Chapter Four, 'Processes and Process Issues'; Chapter Five, 'Alliance Type'; Chapter Six, 'Alliance Relationships'; Chapter Seven, 'Alliance Leadership'; and Chapter Eight, 'Modifiers'). Each of these chapters describes an individual key factor (core category); its dimensions and characteristics and the context in which it was perceived by the study participants (that is, managers and senior staff of the PPAs used in this study). The core categories are also considered in relation to relevant literature and results of previous research. This is to locate these factors in the body
of established knowledge on PPAs, to add additional depth and understanding to the current study, and to identify areas where the current research is adding significantly to the understanding of PPA establishment and PPAs in general. For some core categories, additional research was required for a more detailed understanding of the significance or influence of this factor in PPA establishment. In these cases the supplementary research is also discussed in relation to the core category. Examples of the methods and processes used to analyse the data and the evolution of the core categories are detailed in the associated appendices.

The five core categories identified in this study and the Grounded Theory analysis, allowed the development of an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment thus filling an important gap in the current PPA body of established knowledge. The 'Integrated Theoretical Model' is discussed in detail in the seminal chapter of this thesis, Chapter Nine, 'Bringing it all Together - the Development of an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA'. This substantive model is based on the five core categories and conceptually shows the complex interaction between the five core categories leading to alliance establishment. The Integrated Theoretical Model draws on the current Grounded Theory and comparative analysis research, the experiences of the study participants and insights from relevant previous studies and the academic and technical literature. In this respect the model is truly integrated, however is has several limitations and these are discussed. The implications of the model both practically and academically, its limitations and the need for additional associated research are also considered.

In Chapter Ten ('The Integrated Theoretical Model in Practice - a Comparison of the Establishment of Three Public-Private Alliances in ODA Programs') three contrasting PPAs
which were used in this study are revisited using the Integrated Theoretical Model as a framework to:

(a) demonstrate the Integrated Theoretical Model in practice;

(b) give greater clarity as to how the core categories interact to influence the alliance relationship and subsequent outcome; and

(c) to demonstrate the five intervention points where practitioners and stakeholders may intervene to potentially alter the nature of the alliance and the alliance outcome.

The aim of this is to analyse the decisions and processes which were involved in establishment of these PPAs, the consequences of these, and the way in which they may have been potentially modified to alter the alliance outcome.

Chapter Eleven, 'Implications of the Research, Limitations and Areas for Further Research' is the final chapter of this thesis. In this chapter the implications of this work are considered from practical and theoretical perspectives. Whilst a useful and robust methodology, Grounded Theory is not without limitations. For example, the theory developed in this study is substantive theory, applicable only to the area of inquiry from which it has been induced, that is, the alliances included in this study (Glasser and Strauss in 1967). These and other limitations arising from other aspects of this study are highlighted and further discussed. Finally, this chapter identifies a range of areas where additional research is required to add depth to the model and to develop further understanding of the attributes and their dynamics.
1.7 CONCLUSION

In order to meet their commitments associated with the Millennium Development Goals, developed countries are eager to increasingly utilise the resources and expertise of the private sector. PPAs are a popular modality used by international donors for involving the private sector in ODA programs. The use of these is likely to increase as ODA budgets continue to increase. While PPAs are popular and much publicised, the reality is that failure rates may be as high as 30 to 70 per cent and their effectiveness has been widely debated. A significant reason for this high failure rate may be the poor understanding of the dynamics of PPA establishment and the lack of an integrated theoretical model to guide practitioners in PPA establishment and to provide a framework for researchers in this area.

This chapter has provided an introduction to PPAs and their role in ODA, the background to the research problem to be addressed by this thesis and the context in which the study takes place. The overall structure of this thesis and an overview of each of the chapters have also been presented.

In the next chapter I develop a working definition of PPAs in ODA and discuss their structure, characteristics, utility in ODA programs and their general performance. I explore and categorise the substantial volume of literature on PPAs with a particular emphasis in PPA establishment. This literature is examined to identify major research gaps and unresolved issues associated with PPA establishment and these are used to frame research problem and research questions developed and discussed in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER 2: THE NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE ALLIANCES IN OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter One I gave a background to this study, identified the research problem to be addressed and provided the context in which the study takes place. This chapter's purpose is to describe the nature and structure of PPAs in ODA; to briefly explain their history and evolution; to discuss their importance as a modality for ODA delivery; and to overview the relevant body of established knowledge in this area. I do this firstly by developing a common understanding of PPAs in ODA; secondly by proposing a working definition of PPAs in ODA and discussing the nature and perceived performance of these arrangements; and thirdly by critically over viewing the extensive literature which has developed in the in the area of PPAs with a view to identifying major gaps and unresolved issues relevant to this area of study.

Initially the focus of this thesis was on what the ODA literature commonly refers to as public-private partnerships (PPPs). However, it soon became apparent that confusion regarding the nature of PPPs, their origins in 'New Public Management' and the general lack of research regarding PPP establishment were serious limitations to the objectives of the current study. This chapter commences with a discussion of PPPs in ODA and these limitations.

After a "false start", I revisited the public-private arrangements commonly used in ODA, but this time using the inter-organisational relationship (IOR) literature as a starting point. This
led to the focus of the current study on public-private alliances (PPA) as a modality for delivering official development assistance programs (ODA), and the identification of a richer and more relevant literature on PPAs. A working definition of PPAs is developed together with an examination of PPAs as a form of inter-organisational relationship and a consideration of the specific characteristics of PPA in ODA programs. This chapter continues with a brief consideration of the history and utility of PPAs followed by a discussion on the performance of these arrangements and the potential reasons for the variable performance and failure of many of these structures.

A huge body of literature has developed on all aspects of PPAs. This ranges from non-technical commentaries on PPA effectiveness through reports on individual case studies, to academic literature and technical studies which seek to explain the basis for PPAs, the behaviour of PPAs and the behaviours of individuals and organisational partners within PPAs. In the third part of this chapter I categorise and overview this literature. A basic 'requirement' of Orthodox Grounded Theory (the predominate methodology used in this study) is that the researcher should not become immersed in the extant literature pertaining to the area of study in order to avoid potential bias during the grounded theory analysis. Although this "requirement" has been relaxed as Grounded Theory methodology evolves, I was mindful of the need to keep an open mind in the early stages of data collection and Grounded Theory analysis. Therefore, in this chapter, I critically overview the extant literature on PPAs with the express objective of identifying major research gaps and unresolved issues with a particular focus on the establishment of PPAs, underpinning theory and establishment processes.
The chapter concludes with a discussion of these major research gaps and unresolved issues specifically related to PPA establishment and which form the basis of this current study.

2.2 PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS (PPPs) IN ODA PROGRAMS

Arrangements involving the public and private sectors are commonly referred to in the ODA literature and by practitioners as public-private partnerships. However, the concept of PPPs has become confused and ambiguous and most of the PPPs associated with ODA interventions in developing countries are inconsistent with the contemporary idea of these structures (Fig. 2.1) (Mitchell-Weaver and Manning, 1991/92, pp. 45-48; Wang, 2009, p.779).

PPP as an approach to economic development had its origins in America and the UK during the late 1970's as part of the 'New Public Management' (NPM) movement (Mitchell-Weaver and Manning 1991/92, pp. 45-48; Carroll and Steane, 2000, p. 38; Osborne, 2000, p.1;
English, 2006, p.1). This movement was focussed on increasing the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the public sector. Public-private partnerships, with their prime roles of attracting private financing for public projects; construction, maintenance and operation of infrastructure; procurement-related services; and provision of government services were seen as one means of achieving these goals (Grant, 1996, p.1; Jacobs, 1996, p.133; Osborne, 2000, p. 38; Hughes, 2003, p.1-5; Wettenhall, 2003, p.77; Blake, 2004, p.15; Zhang, 2005, p. 631; Pessoa, 2007, p. 312; Wang, 2009, p. 781). These PPPs encompassed the key concepts of risk sharing, partnership, seeking common solutions, shared vision, social responsibility and had a significant focus on governance and contractual relationships (Domberger et al., 1997, p. 777; Jacobs, 1996, p.133; Domberger and Fernandez, 1999; Börzel and Rise, 2002).

Thus, the literature on PPPs is characterised by ambiguity regarding the definition and nature of PPPs and the focus of the technical literature is on governance, strategy, NPM and the delivery of government services. This was not helpful to the objective of my thesis; the study of the major factors and social processes associated with PPA establishment. Rather than enter into the debate over PPP structure and appropriateness, I revisited the organisational relationships between the public, private and other sectors in the delivery of ODA starting from the broad inter-organisational relationship literature. This led me to the body of literature on public-private alliances (PPAs), inter-organisational relationships which appear to closely match the nature and structure of the relationships which form between the public, private and other sectors in the ODA space. It is on PPAs that this thesis is based. In the following sections of this chapter, I attempt to develop a working definition of PPA in ODA, discuss the history and nature of these relationships and overview and analyse the established knowledge of relevant literature on PPAs.
2.3 DEFINITION OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE ALLIANCE

2.3.1 PPAs as Inter-organisational Relationships

Public-private alliances belong to a form of IOR called strategic alliances (Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-369, 391-392; Golicic, Foggin and Mentzer, 2003, pp. 57-59; Bannerman et al., 2005, pp. 22-24; McDonnell et al., 2009, p. 2). Strategic alliances are differentiated from other forms of IOR (such as joint ventures) by their "strategic nature". That is, they extend beyond the mere sharing of information or similar consortia activities and have been "established for a variety of reasons relating to the inability of one of the partners to solve an important problem" (Eckel and Hartley, 2008, p.614; Augustine and Cooper, 2009, pp. 37-38; Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos, pp.1116-1117).

Partly as a result of the variety of different perspectives through which strategic alliances (SAs) have been viewed, no unanimously-accepted definition exists (Sorensen, 1999, p. 2; Bannerman et al., 2005, pp. 22-24; Cousens et al., 2006, pp. 32, 34-36; Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos, 2011, p. 1108). Commonly-used terms include alliance, joint venture, partnership, dyad, network, cluster, web, consortium, confederation and syndicate (Bannerman, et al., 2005). A useful definition, which incorporates the views of many authors (Parkhe, 1991, pp. 581-582; Gulati, 1998, p. 293; Flood, 1999, pp. 153-154; Sorensen, 1999, p. 2; Hong, 2001, p. 392; Kumar, 2003, p. 205; Bannerman et al., 2005, pp. 22-24; Standifer and Bluedorn, 2006, p. 209; Stephens et al., 2009), has been adapted from Parkhe (1991):

Strategic alliances are relatively enduring inter-organisational arrangements, involving flows and linkages that utilise resources and/or governance structures.
from autonomous organisations, for the joint accomplishment of individual goals linked to the corporate mission of each of the sponsoring organisations.

According to Sorensen (1999, p. 2) the partners of SAs need not have common goals; but it is important that the goals are known and it is agreed that the different goals can be fulfilled within the same SA. He believes that the very essence of SAs is that the partners are attractive to others in terms of resources and that they have access to the resources and capabilities of each other. They are generally socially oriented and willing to trust each other and they are open-minded and willing to share information.

The characteristics and critical dimensions of SAs are broad (Bannerman et al., 2005, pp. 22-24) but generally include the following:

(a) Reciprocity - Alliance relationships are collaborative and reciprocal;

(b) Economic Space - Alliances exits in a given space, both geographically and temporally (fixed duration);

(c) Coupling - The coupling between participants in alliances can take different forms either spatially (that is, based around function or activity) or legally (that is, the legal structure on which binds the alliance together); and

(d) Control - SAs are self-governing within the context of the type of alliance and the constraints of national legal and regulatory frameworks. They also operate under shared or agreed management control.
In addition, strategic alliances can take many forms including two organisations contributing equally to create a product or one organisation providing services to another without fee. They can also include a spectrum of organisation types (for example, private for-profit, non-profit, government and civil society organisations) and service types (technical, advocacy). The combination of attributes and the overall goals define the alliance and the activities it will perform (Bannerman *et al*., 2005, pp. 22-24; McDonnell *et al*., 2009, p. 2).

What differentiates public-private alliances from other types of strategic alliances is the involvement of both private and public organisations in the relationship. To define PPAs thus requires a consideration of the terms 'public' and 'private'.

### 2.3.2 Definitions of Public and Private

Public and private organizations can be distinguished on the basis of whether an organization is owned and/or funded by government (Fottler, 1981; Walmsley and Zald, 1973). Perry and Rainey (1988) suggest an integrated typology for judging if an organization is more or less public according to three criteria: “ownership”, “funding” and “mode of social control” (that is, the degree to which the organization is controlled by either the market or government processes). This typology continuum has advantages over traditional rigid definitions in that it accommodates the ambiguity arising from the blurring of traditional public and private sector boundaries. In this typology, an organization is regarded as public or private on the basis of the degree of public ownership, the degree of public funding and the degree to which the organizational domain is controlled by market transactions as opposed to external government and political processes. While these definitions go a long way towards delineating organizations which are clearly ‘public’ and ‘private’, they do not really address
the status of ambiguous organizations such as NGOs, industry associations and social sector organizations. In the ODA sector, these later organizations are often important partners in PPAs.

Almost all writers in the ODA literature agree that PPAs involve some form of collaborative arrangement between at least one public player and one private player (Leisenger and Schmitt, 2000; Lucas, 2000; Reid and Pearse, 2003, pp. 9-12; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p.8; Hartwich et al., 2005 p.1; Thamrin, 2005, p. 29; Holden and Brown, 2007;). Most writers also agree that 'public' refers to government; however the term 'private' can refer to several kinds of actors. Some writers use the term 'private sector' as referring to only for-profit companies; others use it more broadly to include other institutions such as NGOs, social institutions and industry associations (Thamrin, 2005, p.29; Ziemba, 2005, p.10). Holden and Brown (2007) define private sector as “for-profit” commercial entities. The definition excludes charitable foundations that have been established by the private sector such as the Gates Foundation and the Welcome Trust, not-for-profit non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and institutions within civil society. This view is supported by other authors such as Lucas (2000); Reid and Pearse (2003); Widdus (2003) and Danida, 2006, p. 13). The difference between public and private sector organizations is important because public organizations have their own distinctive service ideologies Jacobs (1996, p. 142). Public officials operate services with reference to the constraints imposed by the democratic representative system of government. There is no direct replication of private structures and processes within the public sector. While there is some debate over what constitutes a private partner, most authors agree that in addition to public and “for-profit” commercial partners, PPAs can involve a wide range of other partner such as NGOs, industry associations and social sector organizations Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 4).
2.3.3 A Working Definition of PPA

In the ODA literature, the term PPA is commonly used to cover a wide variety of arrangements. These range from small collaborations between industry and governments through to legally independent organizations such as the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Widdus, 2001 pp.716-717; Widdus, 2003; Hartwich et al., 2005 p. 10-11). It is often unclear exactly what the PPA concept covers (Marsilio et al., 2011, pp. 764, 776). Activities as diverse as corporate philanthropy, research collaboration between private sector enterprises and universities, co-regulatory arrangements to implement voluntary codes of conduct, corporate social responsibility projects and contracting out of public services such as water supply are lumped under the heading of PPAs (Ridley, 2001a,b,c; Richter, 2004; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004 p.8; Thamrin, 2005 p.9; UNRISD (2006)).

I have developed the following working definition of PPA for this project based on Parkhe's (1991) definition of strategic alliances and a consideration of the literature of the definitions of 'public' and 'private' organisations:

Public-private alliances are relatively enduring inter-organisational arrangements, involving flows and linkages that utilise resources and/or governance structures from a collaborative relationship between at least one public (government) organization and at least one for-profit commercial (private) organization, for the joint accomplishment of individual goals linked to the corporate mission of each of the sponsoring organisations.

In this definition, multiple public and private partners are common, as are partnerships including NGOs, industry associations, social sector organizations, philanthropic trusts and other appropriate partner organizations (refer Fig. 1.2) (Runde, 2006, p. 1-4). This
definition also includes the inter-organisational structures referred to in the ODA literature as public-private partnerships (PPPs) (Börzel and Rise, 2002, pp. 1-2).

2.4 THE STRUCTURE OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE ALLIANCES IN ODA

Official Development Assistance is defined by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as:

"Flows of official financing administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 percent (using a fixed 10 percent rate of discount). By convention, ODA flows comprise contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries ("bilateral ODA") and to multilateral institutions. ODA receipts comprise disbursements by bilateral donors and multilateral institutions"

(OECD, 2003).

By definition, PPAs in ODA will have either donor (developed country) partners and/ or CGIAR partners1, recipient government partners and private sector partners as a minimum. However, they may also include a range of other potential partners such as other levels of government, NGOs, industry and grower associations. In contrast, the principle partners in non-ODA PPAs are less well defined and may include private sector organisations in partnership with a wide range of public sector institutions, often in less formal alliance relationships. Thus a review of the available literature indicates that PPAs in ODA and non-ODA sectors may differ in some important ways (refer Table 2.1). These differences may

---

1 The CGIAR (the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) is a strategic alliance that in comprised of organisations involved in agricultural research for sustainable development with the donor that fund such work. The donor may include developed country governments and international and regional organisations. The work is carried out by the 15 International Agricultural Research Centres that comprise the CGIAR consortium (CGIAR, 2012).
be reflected in the results of the research carried for this project. They may also affect the applicability of the results of this study to PPAs more generally. This issue is discussed in more detail in Chapter Eleven.

Table 2.1 Some Significant Differences between ODA and Non-ODA PPAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>ODA PPAs</th>
<th>Non-ODA PPAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Generally donor or donor/recipient government dominated</td>
<td>Set by initiator or like-minded individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Donor or partners who convince donor to initiate</td>
<td>Individuals, core group of like-minded or partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Partially or fully identified by donor</td>
<td>Core group of individuals, open to other or by invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Generally dominated by donor</td>
<td>Set by core partners or a management committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Generally formal</td>
<td>Formal or informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Generally appointed or influenced by donor</td>
<td>May emerge from the partners, elected or appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Other partners have minimal involvement in alliance management; implementation manager often contracted.</td>
<td>Management committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A generalised structure of PPAs in ODA is presented in Fig. 2.2 and is based on the PPAs used in this study. These PPAs have a group of core partners generally comprised of donors, the private sector, government organisations and sometimes CGIAR centres (which have a direct relationship with the donor) and may form a management or steering committee. The implementer (typically a managing contractor, an implementing agency or an individual identified by the core partners) may or may not be a formal partner in the alliance but is often not part of the core group. Implementers are the executing organisations/individuals and are effectively a bridge between the donor and the other partners, particularly the secondary partners. Their focus is on the strategic, reporting and accountability requirements of the donor, the objectives of the alliance and the requirements and dynamics of the other partners.
The secondary partners (typically lower levels of government, NGOs, industry and grower associations, philanthropic trusts and smaller commercial partners) often become involved with the alliance later in the establishment phase and have less involvement in the inception, strategy and management of the alliance. They are generally not part of the core group and often deal with the alliance through the implementers. Thus they often have a distant relationship with the donor and sometimes the other core partners.

**Figure 2.2 Generalised Structure of PPAs used in this Study**

Examples of PPAs in ODA programs include:

**Alliance for Off-grid Renewable Energy (AMORE) (USAID, 2010)**

AMORE is an alliance between USAID, the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao, Kingdom of Netherlands, Mirant Philippines Corporation, Philippines Department of Energy, Shell Solar and Sunpower. The alliance aims to provide solar-powered compact fluorescent
light and street lamps in the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao in the southern Philippines.

Alliance for Continuous Improvement in the Central American Workplace (USAID, 2007a)
This initiative aims to improve the lives of workers and communities by increasing the competitiveness of the apparel and textile sector in Central America and the Dominican Republic. The alliance partners are Development Alternatives Inc.; Gap Inc.; International Textile, Garment, and Leather Worker's federation; Social Accountability International; Timberland; and Wal-Mart.

Strategic Alliance Partnership (SAP) (Haile and Roy, 2006)
The key objective of the SAP is to support the improvement of health and education for the rural Afar (Ethiopia) community, by setting up and strengthening systems of basic-service delivery and building capacities for dialogue and networking. The partners of SAP are the Afar Pastoralist Development Association, Oxfam Great Britain, SNV (Netherlands Development Organisation) and DFID (UK Department for International Development).

2.5 THE HISTORY AND UTILITY OF PPAS IN ODA

PPAs have been used in the delivery of ODA for many years and since the mid 1990s have been popular with international donor agencies such as GIZ, DFID and USAID (Pessoa, 2008, p. 311; Jordan and Bird, 2009, p.2).

They have been used particularly in the health sector (for example, Merck’s donation and distribution of Mectizan in 1987) (Lob-Levyt, 2001; Ridley, 2001a,b,c). Following early success with a number of high-profile partnerships, the World Health Organisation (WHO)
made a conscious decision to increase its commitment to working with the private sector (Buse and Waxman, 2001). In 1993, the World Health Organisation Assembly called on WHO to mobilize and encourage the support of all partners in health development, including non-governmental organizations and institutions in the private sector, in the implementation of national strategies for health. By 2001, the initiative on PPAs for health had identified nearly 70 global health partnerships and they were a central feature of the global health landscape. PPAs are now the method of choice for the funding of health delivery programs in developing countries (Reid and Pearce, 2003, p.9). Holden and Brown (2007, p.10) report that an additional 47 PPAs were established through DFID in the five years from 2002 to 2007 alone. Among the most prominent of the PPAs in health are the Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV), International Aids Vaccine Initiative (IAVI), Malaria Vaccine Initiative (MVI) and the Global Alliance for TB Drug Development (GATB) (Lob-Levyt, 2001, pp. 771-772).

Although PPAs are most frequent in the health sector, they are becoming increasingly common in sectors such as environment, product development, finance, governance and agriculture aid interventions (Spielman, 2009; Grace, 2010). In their use of the partnership model, other bilateral and multilateral donors have chosen to use PPAs, among them DFID (UK), GIZ (Germany) and the Inter-Americas Development Bank. The Swedish, French, Spanish and Japanese development agencies have also expressed an interest (Danida, 2006, pp. 8-9; USAID, 2006). The literature now cites hundreds of references to PPAs in ODA in a wide range of sectors including:

- Irrigation management (Kurian et al., 2004)
- Pharmaceutical research, development, manufacture and distribution (Lucas, 2000; Ziemba, 2005; Holden and Brown, 2007; Kettler and Modi, 2007; USAID, 2007b,c; Wheeler and Berkley, 2001)

- Health (Lucas, 2000; Buse and Waxman, 2001; Dlamini et al., 2004; CIDA, 2007)

- Agricultural research (Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004; Hartwich, Gonzalez and Viera, 2005; CIDA, 2007; Holden and Brown, 2007)


- Water supply (DFID, 2004; UNDP, 2004; CIDA, 2007)

- HIV/AIDS (USAID, 2007b,c; Ziemba, 2007)

- Urban environment (DFID, 2004; USAID, 2006b; CIDA, 2007; UNDP 2007b)


- Governance (USAID, 2006b, USAID, 2007d,e,f)

- Education (USAID, 2006b)

- Environment (USAID, 2006b)

- Information technology (USAID, 2006b)

- Agriculture (Owens and Eweg, 2002; Thamrin, 2005; USAID, 2006b, CIDA, 2007; JICA, 2007; USAID, 2007c,d,e,f).

The increasing commitment of many ODA donors and agencies such as the United Nations, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the Danish Aid Agency (Danida) and the UK aid agency (Department for International Development (DFID)) to PPAs for sustainable development in ODA resulted from the World Summit for Sustainable Development which was held in Johannesburg, South Africa in 2002 (Danida, 2006; USAID, 2006c). By early 2005, more than 300 PPAs were registered with the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNSIRD) alone.
Since that time there has been a rapid increase in formal collaborations between public research organizations and private companies (particularly PPAs) in the area of innovation development for a wide range of economic activities (Lucas, 2000, p. 1; Reid and Pearse, 2003; Kurian et al., 2004, p.134; Hartwich et al., 2005, p. 29; Holden and Brown, 2007, p. 10). This growth is due in part to the fact that the commercial sector has been increasingly challenged to show greater social responsibility (Reid and Pearse, 2003, p. 11).

This increasing trend in the establishment of PPAs for delivery of ODA is well demonstrated through the case of the United States aid agency, USAID. In 1970, the US government was the largest source of fund for the United States ODA program, with 70% of resource flows to the development world coming from government sources (USAID, 2006c, p. 8; USAID, 2007a,d,f). By 2007, about 85% of the US funds moving into the developing world were from the private sector (business, NGOs, universities, foundations, churches, private charities, migrant and Diaspora communities) (USAID, 2006c, p. 8). Much of these funds were used to deliver programs through PPAs. For example, since the devastating tsunami of December 2004, USAID has formed 18 alliances with the private sector in affected countries, leveraging more than $US 17 million in private sector funds from partners including Mars Inc, Chevron Corporation, Microsoft, The Coca-Cola Company, Prudential, Deutsche Bank, IBM, 3M and Conoco Phillips (USAID, 2007a,d,f).

Alliances appear to be most justified where traditional ways of working have a limited impact on a problem; the specific desired goals can be agreed by potential collaborators; there is a relevant complementary expertise in each sector; the long-term interests of each sector are fulfilled (that is, there are benefits to both parties); and the contributions of expertise and resources are reasonably balanced (Widdus, 2003, p. 718). These new partnerships are
unique in several respects (Wheeler and Berkley, 2001). They focus on funding high-risk and high-cost projects to convert basic scientific discoveries into useable products and rather than linking with a single company, they interact competitively with many companies. Finally, driven by a defined goal and mandate, they have established themselves as independent legal entities outside existing international and philanthropic organizations.

The advantages of PPAs relative to other forms of collaborations (for example, contracts and consultancies) come from their participative and multi-stakeholder nature which combines the different skills, expertise and other resources in a framework of defined responsibilities, roles, accountabilities and transparencies to achieve a common goal that is difficult to achieve through independent action (Reid and Pearse, 2003, p. 9; Widdus, 2003). Strategic alliances are broader than the mere sharing of information or similar consortia activities. As business relationships become more complex, organisations realise that many benefits can be obtained from long-term relationships (Golicic et al., 2003, p.57; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615).

A relatively new and diverse body of theoretical and empirical literature suggests that PPAs are a constructive means of enhancing the production of goods, services and technologies that would not otherwise be produced by either sector acting alone (Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 3). When structured appropriately, PPAs can generate significant benefits for private firms and public institutions while also serving the interests of resource-poor or vulnerable households in developing countries. For example, in the case of agricultural research, Leisenger and Schmitt (2000, pp. 5-6) suggest that PPAs can combine specific strengths, such as the power of governments to create a supporting research environment. This can combine the exceptional ability of National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS)
to tap in-depth grassroots knowledge and expertise, the ability of Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) centres to give access to cutting edge research, and the resources of the private sector to make goods and services available.

In the case of private sector organisations the benefits of alliance participation may include:

- access to new/emerging markets (Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 3; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615);
- exercise of constructive influence in the development of legal and regulatory regimes (Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 4; USAID, 2007a,d,e);
- participation in important local, regional and global forms on pro-poor research (Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p.3);
- improve corporate image and reputation (Bale, 2001; Buse and Waxman, 2001; Ridley, 2001a,b; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 4; Danida, 2005, FAO, 2006; Holden and Brown, 2007, p. 6);
- incentives to enter high risk markets and technologies (Bale, 2001; Kettler and Modi, 2001 p 10-11; Widdus 2001 pp. 714-716; Webber and Kremer 2001; Wheeler and Berkley, 2001; Thamrin, 2005; Holden and Brown, 2007, pp. 5, 7-8); and

For public sector agencies these advantages include:

- access to new, cutting-edge scientific expertise, knowledge and technologies held by the private sector (Anderson and Thompson, 1999, p. 11-16; Quick, 2000; Ridley 2001a; Reid and Pearce 2003; Thamrin, 2005, p. 26; Hartwich et al., 2005; Danida, 2006; USAID, 2006a,b,c; Holden and Brown, 2007, pp. 3, 6; USAID, 2007a,c,d,e);
- mechanisms for developing, marketing and distributing final products (UDAID, 2006a,b,c; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 4; UNDP 2004, p. 2; Widdus, 2001);
- financial resources that are otherwise increasingly difficult to obtain (Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 3);
- additional resources (Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615);
- cost and risk sharing (Anderson and Thompson, 1999, pp. 11-16; UDAID 2007a,c,d,e; Holden and Brown, 2007, p. 13);
- access to new/extended networks (UDAID, 2007a,c,d,e); and
- access to intellectual property (USAID, 2007a,c,d,e).

Collectively, however alliance relationships may result in:

- improvement of the technical/research capacity of organisations (Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615);
- innovative approaches to problem solving (USAID 2007a,c,d,e);
- addressing problems that cannot be solved by a single actor (Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004, p. 4);
- pooling of resources/synergies (Hong, 2001, p. 392; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615; Zaman, 2009);
- increased efficiency and reduced transaction costs (Flood, 1999, pp. 153, 156; Hong, 2001, p. 392; Kumar, 2003, pp. 25-26; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615; Jordan and Bird, 2009, p. 4; Zaman and Mavondo, 2009);
- development of new opportunities (Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615);
- power, influence and credibility due to increased critical mass (Flood, 1999, pp. 153, 156);
organisational learning and development of new skills and capabilities (Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615; Zaman, 2009);

increased speed of product development and distribution (Flood, 1999, pp. 153, 156);

access to new networks and markets (Flood, 1999; pp, 153,156);

capacity to access transboundary and transnational opportunities (Flood, 1999, 153, 156; Reid and Pearse, 2003, p. 11); and


Thus PPAs are widely used in the delivery of ODA programs and they can have individual advantages for the partners, and collective advantages and synergies for the combined alliance. However, the performance of PPAs can be variable and it is notoriously difficult to evaluate.

2.6 THE VARIABLE PERFORMANCE OF PPAS IN ODA

Many of the problems associated with evaluating PPAs are discussed by Murray (2000, p.278-284) and include:

- outcome indicators which fully reflect objectives are difficult to design;
- lack of agreement on definitions;
- poor connection between goals and outcomes;
- interpreting the results is difficult; and
- psycho-social issues (subjective interpretation and the bias of people when they know that they are being evaluated ).
In addition, PPA performance can be measured on at least two dimensions; achievement of objectives and performance in terms of delivery modality. PPAs may be successful in either or both dimensions.

Despite this difficulty the success of PPAs in ODA is widely reported in the literature. A range of examples of perceived success of these PPAs is presented in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2  Examples of Successful PPAs Reported in the ODA Literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPA Description</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania Rural Irrigation (pumping of water from a Senegal River tributary)</td>
<td>Internal Rate of Return of 103 per cent</td>
<td>Warner and Kahan (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netmark Alliance (USAID) (alliance with 47 private sector partners to provide treated mosquito nets for Africa for malaria control)</td>
<td>15 million bed nets distributed with 30-70 per cent lower cost of net treatment</td>
<td>Anon (2006a,b; 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Development Alliance (EDA)</td>
<td>Agriculture and livelihood development service to 210,000 ex-combatants and refugees in Angola; 45 per cent reduction in food insecure individuals; 500 micro-loans</td>
<td>Anon (2006a,b; 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Creation Alliance</td>
<td>Creation of 50,000 new businesses in Tanzania and Kenya and generation of $52 million per year in new profits and wages</td>
<td>Anon (2006a,b; 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa Water Initiative</td>
<td>9,000 latrines installed and 825 bore holes drilled to give access for 450,000 people to clean water</td>
<td>Anon (2006a,b; 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Program for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR)</td>
<td>8,000 projects in 127 countries; 67 disease control tools developed of which 38 are for direct disease control; potential elimination of three tropical diseases</td>
<td>Lucas (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Drug Therapy (MDT)</td>
<td>Leprosy eliminated in 7 out of 9 provinces in Zambia</td>
<td>Dlamini et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although PPAs are popular with aid donors and may have high potential benefits, not all of the evidence is positive (Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-368; Asante and Zwi, 2007; Pessoa, 2008, p. 311). There are numerous reports of poor performance against objectives and even alliance failure. For example, the much publicised Joint Forest Management program in India has now failed with less than 20 per cent of constructed dams functioning due to siltation (Kurian *et al.*, 2004). The Global Alliance for Vaccines has failed to achieve a balance between the strategic interests of the donors and private sector and the needs of the public (Muraskin, 2004). Public-private partnerships in water infrastructure in Africa have been ineffective due to commoditisation of water and higher pricing (Muller, 2003). The Public-Private Partnership for Anti-Retroviral Drugs in HIV/AIDS in Botswana was successful on a small scale but was problematic on scaling up (Ramiah and Reich, 2005).

The general PPA literature reports failure rates of these arrangements ranging from 30 to 70 per cent (Dyer *et al.*, 2006, p.1; Zaman and Mavondo, 2009; Saz-Carranza and Longo, 2012, p. 332). This is alarming given the increasing popularity of PPAs as a modality for the delivery of ODA and the current investment in overall international aid spending (USD $119.6 billion per annum and increasing).

In the non-technical and case study literature, the reasons given for the poor performance and failure of PPAs include power and control exercised by donors and the private sector (Buse and Harman, 2004, p. 49); limited commitment of the parties (Hartwich *et al.*, 2005, p.1);
commercial-in-confidence and intellectual property issues (Blake, 2004, p.15); inequitable redistribution of resources, profit motives of the private sector, restrictive trade practices and limited transparency and accountability (Asante and Zwi, 2007, p. 5). However, Park and Ungson (2001, p. 37), in a study of alliance failure, concluded that one of the main root causes of poor performance and failure was the inherent instability of these structures. This results from trying to bring together individual organisations which may be trying to maximise their individual interests instead of the alliance collaborative interests. In addition, each member in an alliance brings its own culture, values, modes of operation, responsibilities and constituents along with unique and specialised skills (Barringuer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-368; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615; Augustine and Cooper, 2009, pp. 38-39; Bhaskoran and Gligorovska, 2009, p. 45; Mc Donnell et al., 2009, pp. 1-2; Zaman and Mavondo, 2009). As a result of the complexities involved and the need to bring together the corporate cultures of two or more organisations, PPAs can be difficult to maintain and manage (Dyer et al., 2006, p. 39; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp. 614-615; Mc Donnell et al., 2009, pp. 1-2; Zaman, 2009).

Despite the large body of evidence surrounding alliance instability, poor performance and failure, few studies, if any, have been carried out to provide a comprehensive view on how the complexities of alliance formation can be better managed (Park and Ungson, 2001, p.37). The management dimension of alliance relationships during PPA establishment is inherently difficult but critical to the success of these arrangements. The lack of a comprehensive framework of alliance establishment and the management of alliance relationships has lead to a fragmentation of the research in this area. This has encouraged a simplistic view of alliance establishment which has contributed to alliance failure (Park and Ungson, 2001, p 38; Saz-Carranza and Longo, 2012, p. 332).
2.7 THE PPA LITERATURE

The increasing interest in strategic alliances, including public-private alliances, has resulted in the generation of a huge literature covering a wide range of aspects. This literature can be grouped into four broad categories: the general literature; case studies; manuals and checklists; and academic/technical literature including reports of research and empirical studies (Fig. 2.3).

Figure 2.3 A Classification of the Public-Private Alliance Literature

Since the focus of this Thesis is studying the major factors and processes associated with PPA establishment, in this literature review I focus on the academic and technical literature and provide only a brief overview of the other three categories of literature (Fig 2.3). Within the academic literature, I concentrate on the most relevant sub-category of literature, 'PPA Attributes, Processes and Dynamics'. In keeping with the principles of Grounded Theory as
developed by Glasser and Strauss (1967), I have not carried out a detailed review of literature at this early stage. The aim of this initial literature review is to scan the established body of literature on PPAs to identify relevant areas of the academic and technical literature and to sensitise myself to these areas and to the types of relevant research that have been conducted by other researchers. This literature is reviewed and analysed in detail in subsequent chapters as appropriate to relevant areas of this study.

2.7.1 General Literature

The general literature represents, by far, the majority of literature currently available on PPAs in ODA. Much has been written in the general literature on the general operation, effectiveness, and problems associated with PPAs. In the ODA sector, most of the literature on the topic consists of promotional material and basic descriptive case studies Mitchell-Weaver and Manning, 1991/92, p. 1). It takes a variety of forms such as articles, editorials, information sheets and critiques in non-academic journals, aid and development sector magazines, websites and in the general press.

The main characteristic of this category is that it is anecdotal and represents the experiences and often biased views and values of the authors and is not based on empirical studies or sound rigorous scientific analysis. This category includes general descriptions of PPA programs and evaluations of these (particularly in the health sector) and suggests critical success factors for the establishment and operation of PPAs in ODA (Grant, 1996, pp. 27-28; Leisenger and Schmitt, 2000, p.7; Maurice, 2001; Quick, 2001; Thamrin, 2005, p. 58; USAID, 2006a,b,c; Holden and Brown, 2007, p.10). The literature contains many criticisms of PPAs, and issues and challenges associated with these arrangements (Leisenger and Schmitt, 2000, p.6-7; Buse and Waxman, 2001; Burnett, 2001 pp. 6-9; Ridley, 2001a,b; Reid
and Pearse, 2003, pp. 9, 12; Buse and Harmer, 2004; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004 p. 11-24; Hartwich et al., 2005, p.8; Thamrin, 2005; USAID, 2006a,b,c).

### 2.7.2 Case Studies

Case studies of established PPAs in areas such as water and sanitation in Africa (Danter et al., 2003; Muller, 2003), AIDS in Tanzania and other parts of Africa (Hartwig et al., 2005), public health in Korea (Mahoney, 2005) and local economic development in South Africa (Franceys and Weitz, 2003) have demonstrated the effectiveness of PPAs in delivery of ODA interventions but have also highlighted a number of challenges and issues associated with this mode of intervention. These challenges and issues include conflict in the division of responsibility between the partners; tension between corporate goals and public objectives; lack of transparency, accountability and inappropriate influence by private partners undermining public policy. While providing an excellent description of the practical application PPAs in ODA, and highlighting the challenges and issues associated with aid delivery using PPAs, these studies add little to the theory or formal understanding of the management processes which go on within these organizations.

### 2.7.3 Manuals and Checklists

Many of the major donor country development agencies, for example, the UK Department for International Development (DFID); US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark; (Danida); have developed manuals, handbooks, toolkits and checklist for PPA establishment (DFID, 2003; USAID, 2004; Herzberg and Wright, 2006; USAID, 2006c; Danida, 2007; USAID, 2007a; GIZ, 2008). These documents are practical guidelines for working with the private and other sectors in the formation of PPAs in ODA and are based on consultant's recommendation, the experience of practitioners.
and stakeholders, perceived "best practice", lessons from "successful" models and anecdotal evidence of success. In the case of USAID, these guidelines are quite prescriptive and are built into formal agreements between the potential partners.

Whilst these documents attempt to capture successful experience and to provide guidance on "how to establish alliances", they are quite rigid and recipe-like in approach, they take no account of context or variations in operating environment, and they do not have a robust theoretical underpinning. They thus provide little value for the current study.

2.7.4 Academic/Technical Literature

The proliferation of strategic alliances as a widespread phenomenon has led to a wealth of research and study into these relationships at both the strategic and organisational level (Gulati, 1998). These studies, aimed at providing insights on dynamics, operation and performance of alliances, are essentially of three major types (Gulati, 1998; Bannerman et al., 2005). First are those studies aimed at providing a theoretical explanation for the formation of strategic alliances. The second group is comprised of studies of partner and industry-level factors that compel these organisations to enter alliances. Third are those studies which focus on the processes of alliance formation and development, attributes of the partners that influence the decision made during the establishment and development of the alliance, and the characteristics of the alliance.

2.7.4.1 Theoretical Studies

This group of studies considers strategic alliance formation from a range of theoretical perspectives (Emery and Trist, 1973; Astley and Fombrun, 1983; Boisot, 1986; Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Baum and Oliver, 1991; Doz and Prahalad, 1991, pp. 149-151; Parkhe, 1993; Glaister and Buckley, 1996, p. 307; Salk and Shenkar, 2001; Bannerman et al., 2005, p. 18).
These include economic theory (Hennart, 1991; resource-related (Cool and Henderson, 1998), strategic choice theory (Chen and Ross, 2000), stakeholder theory (Donaldson and Preston, 1995), learning theory (Doz and Prahalad, 1991), institutional theory and agency theory (Teo, Wei and Benbasat, 2003). These perspectives can be conceptualised as lying along a continuum from an economic rationale (transaction cost economics) at one end to a social/behavioural rationale (institutional theory) at the other (Barringer and Harrison, 2000, p. 382; Bannerman et al., 2005 p. 13). Examples of the theoretical studies literature include:

**Economic Theory**

Economic theory considers strategic alliances as being motivated by the pursuit of product rationalisation, economies of scale, vertical linkages and risk sharing (Glaister and Buckley, 1996, pp. 304-307; Bannerman et al., 2005 pp.13-14; Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos, 2011, pp. 1113-1114). In particular, transaction cost economics proposes engagements in strategic alliances to minimise the sum of production and transaction costs (Kogut, 1988, pp. 320-321; Oxley, 1997, pp. 387-389; Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 369-372; Luo, 2001, pp. 445-446). Economic theory suggests that it may be advantageous for an organisation to engage in alliance activity if the alliance can provide production efficiencies or lead to reduce transaction costs not attainable by the organisation on its own (Doz and Prahalad, 1991, pp. 145-149).

**Resource-related Theory**

There are two dominant resource-related perspectives in the literature: resource dependency theory and resource-based theory (Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-368; Luo, 2001, pp. 446-447; Bannerman et al., 2005, p. 14; Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos, 2011, pp. 1114-1116). According to resource dependency theory, organisations engage in exchanges with
other organisations to obtain critical resources, resulting in inter-organisational dependencies (Barringer and Harrison, 2000, 372-374). Resource-based theory argues that competitive advantage comes from having unique resources that can create value in the marketplace (Glaister and Buckley, 1996, pp. 304-307; Bannerman et al., 2005, p. 14).

**Strategic Choice Theory**

Strategic choice theory proposes that the fundamental economic rationale for organisations engaging in strategic alliances is to improve their relative market power and competitive position (Kogut, 1988, pp. 321-322; Glaister and Buckley, 1996, pp. 304-307; Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-368; Luo, 2001, pp. 446-447; Bannerman et al., 2005, p. 15). These motivations include extended access to markets, increased speed to market, expanded production and service offerings, and countering or negating the strategic motives of competitors.

**Stakeholder Theory**

According to this theory, organisations are vehicles for co-ordinating stakeholder interests (Donaldson and Preston, 1995, pp. 66-68; Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 376-378; Bannerman et al., 2005, p. 15; Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos, 2011, pp. 1114-1116). Organisations are conceptualised as co-operatives of stakeholders and they form strategic alliances to co-ordinate the co-operative interests of two or more stakeholder groups to achieve common objectives.

**Learning Theory**

With learning theory, organisations form strategic alliances as a means of learning and expanding their knowledge and competence base (Doz and Prahalad, 1991, p. 154; Glaister

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory argues that organisations are pressured to conform to prevailing institutional, business and social norms to increase their appearance of legitimacy (Doz and Prahalad, 1991, p. 150; Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 380-381; Bannerman et al., 2005, pp. 16-17; Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos, 2011, pp. 1114-1116) Membership of a strategic alliance is one way of pursuing this and may also provide access to other potentially beneficial opportunities and relationships.

Social Network Theory

Social network theory proposes that other theoretical perspectives attempting to explain strategic alliances (especially economic ones) ignore the rich social contexts in which organisations are embedded (Bannerman et al., 2005, p. 17). This theory holds that social networks of prior relationships can influence the creation of new relationships, affecting their design, evolutionary path, and ultimate success (Koka and Prescott, 2002, pp. 796-799; Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos, 2011, pp. 1114-1116).

With the possible exception of the strategic choice perspective, Barringer and Harrison (2000, pp. 368-395) and Bannerman et al. (2005, p. 19) suggest that each of the above theories presents a useful and unique perspective on the formation of strategic alliances but the rationale of each focuses on limited concepts. No single theory, therefore, is sufficient by itself to fully explain the complexities involved in relationship formation and what drives organisations to collaborate. Only together do they cover the range of motivations found in
practice. Blending the theoretical paradigms together may provide an even more useful means of understanding the formulation of strategic alliances (Doz and Prahalad, 1991, pp.145-145; Zhao, 1999, p. 33; Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 392-396; Bannerman et al., 2005, P. 19; Li et al., 2010, pp. 143-146).

While providing a useful theoretical perspective for PPAs, these studies contribute little to an understanding of the processes of PPA establishment and are therefore not considered further in this thesis.

2.7.4.2 Studies on Motivation to Join Alliances

Researchers and academics have examined the environmental conditions and contingent factors that explain the formation of IORs and more specifically, strategic alliances. These studies provide useful insights into the conditions leading to the formation of these structures and have the potential to assist with decisions regarding alternative organisational designs and incentive schemes for different kinds of transactions. A recurring theme of the majority of these studies is the simple concept of whether IORs make sense and whether or not the advantages of entering into these relationships outweigh the disadvantages (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, p. 91; Sorensen, 1999, p. 1; Barringer and Harrison, 2000, pp. 367-368).

For example, some authors are of the view that the core of strategic alliances is that companies seek to match their existing resources and capabilities with those of other organisations to develop new opportunities (Sorensen, 1999, p. 2; Andrews, 1980). The key driver of an alliance is the economic growth of the company. Prior to 1980, this was achieved through internal processes within the company. Business conditions post-1980, resulting from factors such as technological advancement, globalisation, multiple technologies required to produce modern products and the speed of innovation have made it
virtually impossible for companies to stay competitive if they want to do everything in house (Sorensen, 1999, pp. 2-10).

According to Stephens et al. (2009, p. 505), alliance formation can be seen as a risk reduction strategy and is often found in highly uncertain situations (such as mineral exploration) or creative industries (e.g. research and development). In these cases, alliances can provide access to resources (such as operational knowledge and access to new markets) when the alternative of purchasing them through the market is not possible or when integrating them into the organisation's operations is too costly.

The views of Stephens et al. (2009) are supported by those of Ring and Van de Ven (1994, pp. 91-101) who suggest that to understand how cooperative IORs emerge initially it is important to appreciate how organisations can make present commitments to engage in uncertain future courses of action and their sources of security that lead them to believe that their representations and commitments are congruent and will be enforceable. They note that cooperative IORs may emerge out of a wide range of starting conditions including pre-existing friendships, institutional mandate, resource dependence, search by one organisation for partners, and "brokering by other third party organisations” such as corporate sponsors or investment bankers. The importance of existing relationships is continued by Gulati (1998, p. 294) who observed that many new opportunities for alliances were presented to firms through their existing set of alliance partners.

Based on a review of literature from 1960 to 1990, Oliver (1990, pp. 242-248) identified six critical contingencies of relationship formation to explain the motivation for IOR establishment. The contingencies are: necessity; asymmetry; reciprocity; efficiency; stability;
and legitimacy. These contingencies are consistent with the work of previous authors who have attempted to examine the basis for alliance formation. However, Oliver (1990) notes that although each of these six contingencies may be a sufficient cause of relationship formation, commonly they may interact, occur concurrently or relationship formation may be based on multiple contingencies. This view is supported by Barringer and Harrison (2000, pp. 367-368) who state that while individual paradigms are useful, each is also insufficient to capture the complexities involved in relationship formation. Organisations tend to have a portfolio of reasons for alliance formation, such as cost minimisation, risk sharing and learning rather than just one reason.

In a study of PPAs in developing-country agriculture Spielman et al. (2007, pp. 1-10) concluded that these alliances are increasingly viewed as an effective means of conducting advanced research, commercializing new technologies and deploying new products for the benefit of small-scale, resource-poor farmers, food-insecure consumers and other marginalised groups in developing countries. They suggest that there are a range of motivations for formation of these alliances including the potential to overcome impediments posed by market failure, institutional constraints and systemic weaknesses in agricultural research by building on complementarities, exploiting synergies, and distributing costs and risk between the public and private sectors.

The relative importance of 16 strategic motivations across five alliance partner and alliance characteristics were examined by Glaister and Buckley (1996, p. 328) for alliance formation by UK, western European, USA and Japanese partners. These researchers found that in general, the main strategic motives for alliance formation were intrinsically linked to the market and geographic expansion aspirations of the partner organisations. They also
concluded that some of the often suggested motives for alliance foundation proposed in the literature such as risk reduction associated with new projects, reduce production costs associated with economies of scale, and reduced production costs associated with location, appear to be not particularly important motivating factors (Glaister and Buckley, 1996, p. 328).

These considerations of the motivations to establish strategic alliances provide useful insights into the conditions leading to the formation of these structures however most have ignored the importance of process. Although knowing the inputs, structure and desired outputs of a relationship provides a useful context for studying process, these factors give little indication as to how a relationship might unfold over time (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, p. 91). For this reason the 'motivation to join alliances' literature is not used extensively in this thesis.

2.7.4.3 Studies on PPA Attributes, Processes and Dynamics

The third major group of academic and research studies focuses on individual attributes, processes and dynamics of the alliance as it forms and the resulting characteristics. In the literature classification used, there are three sub-groups: frameworks and models used to generalise the establishment process; individual organisation attributes and factors; and alliance dynamics and attributes. In general, these studies deal with a diverse array of characteristics, but there is little attempt to integrate these into systems approaches.

(a) Models and frameworks

A large number of studies have developed lists, frameworks and models to clarify, conceptualise and evaluate the complexity of strategic partnership formation (Kaasalainen et al., 2002). They consider the key attributes and principles, processes or evolutionary stages
associated with the development of these IORs. These studies often consider the
development of IORs from a wide range of perspectives including relationships, exchanges,
collaboration, trust, organisational theory, management theory and innovation.

In general, lists represent an attempt by authors to identify and articulate a range of attributes
or principles that characterise successful partnership development. These are often identified
from studies of the literature or on the basis of limited case study research. The lists present
useful information on requirements for successful collaborations and alliance but add little
value to the understanding of the establishment and development dynamics of these
relationships (Limmerick and Cunnington, 1993, pp. 89-107; Hailey, 2000, pp. 318-321;

Frameworks identify the stages of development of collaboration and alliance development
but often in a static, lineal way. These frameworks describe these development stages but
generally do not consider 'environmental context', the relationship between stages or the
influence of external factors (Bossink, 2007, pp. 4088-4090). The frameworks provide a
good basis on which to study inter-organisational development but like lists provided little
understanding to the dynamics of alliance development or the overall establishment and
development processes.

A range of authors have considered the establishment and development of IORs and alliances
in terms of a sequence of processes, each with associated sub-processes (Zajac and Olsen,
1993, pp. 139-141; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, p. 96; Osborne and Murray, 2000, pp. 71-81;
130; Lesage, 2006, p. 3). Conceptually, these sequences are quite similar but the models vary
in terms of the number of stages and the description. Authors such as Lesage (2006), Bossink (2007) and George and Farris (1999) have found that successful alliances go through a consistent pattern of consecutive stages, though not all organisations go through all sub-processes. Organisations that jumped over one or more of the sub-processes generally had to go back and redo them or were confronted with delays, problems and failure.

Evolutionary models consider IOR establishment and development in terms of a series of potential evolutionary stages. These stages vary in 'complexity' along the evolutionary chain in terms of level of engagement, managerial complexity and strategic and implementation complexity (Doz, 1996, p. 55; Ford et al., 1998, pp. 30-34; Austin, 2000; Huxham and Vanger, 2000, pp. 293-298; Shachaf, 2003). For example, Austin (2000) views his stage one organisations as little more than charitable donor relationships whereas his level three organisations may be joint ventures. These models are conceptually quite similar but they vary in terms of the number of number of potential stages and also in terms of the 'focus of complexity' between stages. For example, inertia (Ford et al., 1998), trust (Huxham and Vanger, 2000) or learning (Doz, 1996). A feature of the evolutionary models is that organisations can move up or down through the stages (or even jump stages) depending on the nature of the relationship, the stage of maturity and a range of other factors and influences. In most of these life cycle models (Doz, 1996; Ford et al., 1998; Austin, 2000; Huxham and Vangar, 2000, Shachaf, 2003) the influence of selected external and overlaying factors (such as experience, resources, commitment, trust and learning and development) which interact with process are considered to be critical to the nature, functioning and effective management of the alliance relationship.
Overall, these models provide a useful conceptualisation of the processes of alliance establishment and development. In general, the process models discussed above do not consider the influence of any of the factors external to the processes and process issues on alliance formation. Although evolutionary models do tend to include a consideration of external and overlaying factors, these are limited in scope and reflect the foci and/or research interests of the researchers. For example, the focus of Huxham and Vanger (2000, p. 300) was predominatly trust. Thus, even evolutionary models do not capture the complexity of the alliance establishment process or integrate the range of 'environmental' and operating factors that impact on alliance establishment.

(b) Individual Organisation Attributes and Factors

This sub-group of studies concentrates on the attributes of the individual partners that influence the decisions made during the establishment and development of the alliance. Examples of these studies are as follows:

Relationship Magnitude and Relationship Structure Types

Golicic et al. (2003, pp. 58-63) introduced the concept of relationship magnitude as a precursor to relationship structure types and to clarify the distinction between the two using both the literature and exploratory study research. On the basis of the psychology literature, they draw an analogy between relationships involving people and those between organisations in developing an alliance. Initial interactions take place on an interpersonal level and, over time, become more personal, progressing towards greater intimacy. The notion of differing levels of intimacy within the one type of relationship provides the concept behind relationship magnitude.
Organisational Capabilities

Since alliances are formed to pursue corporate strategies, alignment between alliance activities and organisational capabilities should increase alliance performance (Zaman and Mavondo, 2009, pp. 1-5). These authors report that alliance outcomes are likely to be enhanced when partners have superior organisational capabilities. Aligning organisational capabilities of the partners with the management of the alliance relationship leads to higher overall alliance outcomes. They suggest that the greater the degree of fit between alliance dynamics (for example, trust, commitment, cooperation, communication and conflict management) and organisational capabilities, the higher the alliance outcomes.

National Cross-cultural Differences in Relational Risk Perception

While strategic alliances tend to reduce risks, Simon and Vidot-Delerue (2011, p. 9) propose that they also generate risks (relational risk) due to dual control of the relationship and the uncertainty about the partner and its changing goals was advanced by. They define relational risk as "the probability and consequences of not having satisfactory cooperation". Their findings support the long-held view that cultural values significantly affect manager's perception of risks. The relationship between national culture and risk perception depends on the type of risk. Further, it is difficult to dissociate the various dimension of national culture that together shape the manager's mindset. The analysis also suggests that the effects of cultural values should not be overstated (Simon and Vidot-Delerue, 2011, p. 14).

The Influence of the National Culture of Organisations on Various Relational Issues

Bhaskaran and Gligorosvska (2009, p. 44) explored the influence of the national culture of organisations in strategic alliances on various relational issues. This study consolidated knowledge from three streams of literature: national culture; organisational culture; and
business-to-business relationships. Bhaskaran and Gligorosvska (2009, p. 58) concluded that the relationship between organisations and partners is a highly complex phenomenon. Inter-organisational relationships are the outcome of complex interactions between relational paradigms, national culture of the organisation, organisational characteristics and the operating environment.

**Diversity in Partner's Characteristics**

A multilevel typology of inter-organisation diversity, focussed on organisational learning and adaptation as critical processes that dynamically moderate diversity's impact on alliance longevity and effectiveness, was developed by Parkhe (1991, p. 579). According to Parkhe (1991, p. 580) inter-organisational diversity can severely impede the ability of companies to work jointly and effectively since many alliance partners have yet to acquire the necessary skills to cope with partner differences. He suggests that dissimilarities between partners can make effective alliance interaction difficult. The more similar parties are in an alliance, the more favourable the outcome.

The studies on partner attributes provide an understanding of the impact of these characteristics on alliance establishment and the development of alliance relationships. Again, these studies have ignored the importance of process and the potential interactions between different characteristics. Thus the overall contribution of these individual studies to a holistic understanding of alliance establishment is limited.

**(c) Alliance Dynamics and Attributes**

This sub-group of academic/technical literature includes studies on elaboration of the alliance establishment and implementation process and studies on a range of alliance attributes
characteristics and factors affecting the establishment, development and implementation processes. These studies are considered in greater detail in subsequent chapters of this thesis. Examples include:

**Formal and Informal Rules**

A social rules framework was adopted by Eckel and Hartley (2008, p. 616) to study operating cultural norms in strategic alliances by documenting the formal and informal rules embedded in organisational life. Social rule systems theory holds that the members of organisations develop rules for regularising their work and mitigating confusion and conflict. The central finding of this study (which involved academic alliances) was that paying attention to the relational aspects of partnership development and maintenance is at least as important as the physical objectives, determining financial structures and managing operations. This study suggests that the alliances significantly depend on establishing a set of principles grounded in a common culture.

**Shared Temporal Mental Models**

A mental model theory was used by Standifer and Bluedorn (2006, p. 903) as a framework to study managerial teams in alliances. A 'mental model' is a systems organised knowledge structure that allows participants to explain and predict system behaviour and thus aid effective interaction among the partners. They further introduced a temporal perspective that would involve shared meanings about time and temporal matter among team members, with a particular focus on temporal considerations for coordination; namely entrainment and its components of cycle, pace, dominant rhythms and time orientation. These authors concluded that the effectiveness of coordinated interactions among the partners can be
increased through a collective temporal perspective as part of a shared interaction-related mental model (Standifer and Bluedorn, 2006, pp. 907-923).

**Types of Alliance**

A number of authors divide alliances into two types: voluntary and non-voluntary (Oliver, 1990, pp. 247-249, 259-260; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, pp. 101-102; Stephens, *et al.*, 2009, pp. 502-503; Stephens, 2011, p. 10). With voluntary alliances, the relationships and the conditions under which the alliance establishes and develops are mutually acceptable to all of the parties (Stephens *et al.*, 2009, p. 502). In contrast, non-voluntary alliances are formed on the basis of coercion, pressure or less than acceptable relations for at least one of the parties involved in the alliance (Oliver, 1990, pp. 247-249). One of the main non-voluntary partnerships discussed in the literature is the constrained choice alliance or 'cupid' alliance (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Kanter, 1994; Stephens *et al.*, 2009; Stephens, 2011). A 'cupid' alliance results when an interested party, the 'cupid' organisations forces a relationship between 'target' organisations in order to broker an alliance that will benefit the 'cupid' organisation (Kanter, 1994, pp. 98-99). The 'cupid' organisation keeps the other potential partners apart thus controlling the flow of resources between them. According to the literature, organisations considering joining inter-organisational alliances make three main choices: whether to enter into the alliance (Gulati, 1995a, pp. 105-106; Khanna *et al.*, 1998, pp. 205-208; Kogut, 1988, pp. 320-322); whom to partner with in forming the alliance (Geringer, 1991, pp. 43-45, 53-55; Podolny, 1994, pp 479-82); and how the alliance should be governed (organised and implemented) (Barney and Hansen, 1994, pp. 177-179, 188-189; Zaheer *et al.*, 1998, pp. 142-146, 153-156). These three choices define real difference between voluntary and constrained choice alliances.
Alliance Leadership

A range of studies have highlighted the importance of leadership in the establishment and operation of strategic alliance and studied this aspect from varying perspectives. The importance of leaders/drivers, those persons or groups who can foster collaboration and create and maintain trust and confidence between participants in networks and alliances, has been underlined by Sökjer-Petersen (2010, pp. 4-5). These individuals are driven by passion and not by money and the leadership often develops informally on the basis of personal respect, high status and productive and successful relationships with other in various networks (social capital).

Previous researchers have examined the unique challenges, characteristics and roles associated with leadership of alliances. These roles include 'arousing interest', 'getting others to commit to the project', 'operate as a learning community' (Lesage, 2006, pp. 1, 4, 9, 11, 18-19) and 'alignment of disparate skills and interests' (Judge and Ryman, 2001, p. 73; Kendrick, 2006, p. 22), while the leadership characteristics include attributes such as 'vision' (Lesage, 2006, pp. 1, 4, 9, 11, 18-19), 'strong interpersonal skills' and the ability to 'manage technical aspects' (Kanter, 1994, p. 107; Kelly et al., 2002, p. 32; Todeva et al., 2004, pp. 18-19) and 'management philosophy' (Davis et al., 1997, pp. 32-34). Challenges associated with alliance leadership include factors such as 'cannot control the action of the partners' (Kendrick, 2006, p. 22). Research into the dynamics of leadership focuses on the interaction of leadership characteristics to others and with the other contextual elements of alliance such as alliance type. These include 'entrainment of mental models' (Standifer and Bluedorn, 2011), 'contextual versus transformational leadership' (Ellis, 1996, pp. 8-9; Osborn, et al., 1998, p. 621), 'recruitment of additional partners' (Sökjer-Petersen, 2010, pp. 11-13) and 'transformational versus transactional leadership'(Broussine and Miller, 2005, p. 379).
Alliance Drivers and Enablers

Researchers have considered a range of factors that influence the nature, functioning and effective management of the alliance relationship through their influence across the establishment and implementation process. For example, Austin (2000, p.69), in addition to his evolutionary model of alliance development, also identified a set of alliance "drivers" that influence the nature and functioning of the alliance relationship and a set of alliance "enablers" that contribute to the effective management of the relationship. Other overarching factors in this category of studies include culture (Kelly et al., 2002, pp. 15-16, 19; Albors and Hidalgo, 2007, p. 12; Grachev, 2009, p. 229; McDonnell et al., 2009, p.5; Reinfeld, 2009, p. 170), communications (Kelly et al., 2002, p.15; Mander, and Bobongie, 2010, p. 43), organisational factors (Ford et al., 1998, p. 29; Todeva and Knoke, 2004, pp. 13-16; Albors and Hidalgo, 2007, p. 12; ), operating environment (Waldman and Yammarino, 1999, p. 279; Shachaf, 2003, p. 95; Todeva and Knoke; 2004, p. 10-12) and industrial factors (Todeva and Knoke, 2004, p. 12-13).

Alliance Relationships

A wide body of literature on relationships has developed across a range of disciple areas and from a large number of perspectives. However, while the importance of relationships and relationship interactions in alliance establishment is alluded to by a number of researchers (Kogut, 1988; Shamdasani and Sheth, 1994; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Gulati, 1998; Todeva and Knoke, 2004; Stephens et al., 2009; Stephens, 2011), there are relatively few structured studies which focus on these areas. These studies can be grouped into studies of relationship types; relationship characteristics; relationship dynamics; relationship dysfunctions; and relationship performance.
An example of the relationship type studies is the study of Willis (2008, pp. 227-230) who studied Guanxi relationships and on that basis identified three forms of relationships, formal, informal and hidden relationships.


Relationship dynamics which have attracted the interest of researchers include relationships as a governance mechanism (Khalid, 2002, p. 1), interactions between partners (Halinen et al., 1999, pp. 782-784), phases of alliance development (Kanter, 1994, p. 99), social networks (Olk and Elvira Rojo, 2001, pp. 128-129) and alliance motivations (Stephens et al., 2009, p. 514).

A range of alliance relationship dysfunctions have been studied in detail. These include competing networks (Willis, 2008, pp. 239-243), power imbalance ((Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p. 35), opportunistic behaviour (Bucklin and Sengupta, 2003, pp. 36-37) and conflict between partners (Bucklin and Sengupta, 2003, pp. 36-37).

According to Provan and Sydow (2008, pp. 10-12), relationship performance can be measured at three levels; structural indicators (those that focus on the connection between organisations); process indicators (focus on actions and activities; and outcome indicators (those that focus on innovation, financial performance, non-financial performance and
survival). Other authors such as Shamdasani and Sheth (1995, pp. 7-11) have suggested that relationship performance should be measured in terms of how well satisfied are the parties and are they likely to continue the relationship.

Like the preceding theoretical research, studies on motivations to join alliances and those on partner attributes; studies on individual alliance factors and attributes impacting on alliance establishment add significantly to the understanding of the role of these individual elements in the establishment process. However since these studies are focussed on individual or selected groups of attributes they fail to address the complexity of this process associated interactions or impacts of multiple elements in these systems.

### 2.8 UNRESOLVED ISSUES AND GAPS

The lack of a robust, integrated, theoretical understanding of PPA establishment to assist researchers' and practitioners to create effective and sustainable alliances is highlighted by the preceding review of extant literature. General literature gives a good background to the nature and history of PPAs. Case studies provide an assessment of the success or failure of many of these arrangements and associated learnings, but add little to a theoretical understanding of the processes associated with alliance formation. Manuals and checklists document the experiences and perceptions of donors and others involved in alliance creation, but again add little to the understanding of the mechanics of PPA establishment.

The academic and technical literature reports a large number of studies of IORs and, more specifically, strategic alliance and public-private alliances through a wide variety of lenses. Theoretical studies, including economic theory, resource theory and learning theory, have
considered the motivation and complexities of relationship formation from a range of theoretical perspectives. Motivation to form alliances has also been considered on the basis of a wide range of environmental and contingent factors such as matching organisation capabilities, risk reduction and existing relationships. A wide range of partner and alliance attributes and behaviours, such as relationship magnitude, organisational capabilities and studies of factors impacting on these processes have been conducted but generally with specific foci or points of view.

In general, these perspectives view strategic alliance formation in terms of purpose and process (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, p. 91; Gulati, 1998, pp. 294-295, p. 310). They focus on the 'why' and the 'what' but not on the 'how' of strategic alliance formation (Gulati 1995; Gulati and Westphal, 1997). In addition, these studies concentrate on specific aspects of alliance establishment and development. Although there appears to be no lack of explanations for poor alliance performance in the literature, most of these are based on anecdotes and perceptions and they are fragmented in their approach to analysis (Park and Unson, 2001, p.38).

A major gap in the current understanding of PPAs is coherent studies that attempt to bring all of the elements of alliance establishment together into an integrated theoretical model, thus capturing the potential complexities and interaction inherent in alliance establishment (Mitchell-Weaver and Manning, 1991/92; Grant, 1996; Jacobs, 1996; Gulati, 1998; Park and Ungson, 2001, p. 38; Ridley, 2001; Widdus, 2003; Reid and Pearce, 2003; Hartwich et al., 2004; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004; Dyer, et al., 2006, p. 3; San-Carranza and Longo, 2012, p. 331). This lack of a comprehensive integrated theoretical framework of alliance formation has led to fragmented research and encouraged simplistic and linear models of
PPA establishment which may have contributed to their failure at implementation (Park and Ungson, 2001, p. 38). These views are supported by the work of Noble (2002) who conducted an orthodox grounded theory methodology study of the main professional concerns of managers responsible for the establishment and maintenance of PPPs involving local governments and private sector firms and to explain the social processes that those managers use to resolve these concerns over the life of a PPP project (Noble 2002, pp. 328-329). He concluded that the establishment phase of PPAs is of critical importance but is an area that has received little attention from social researchers to date.

2.9 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I started with the proposition that public-private partnerships, the term commonly used by the ODA community to describe arrangements between the public, private and other sectors in the delivery of aid and development projects, was unhelpful in the context of this thesis. The PPP literature is often associated with ambiguity over definitions and focuses on New Public Management, the delivery of government services, and governance arrangements rather than relationships between the participants. This literature provides little value with respect to an understanding of the theoretical understanding of the formation of these relationships. Using the inter-organisational relationships literature as a starting point, I suggest that the public-private alliance literature is a more relevant to the current study.

PPAs have been used by the ODA community for over 20 years as a popular modality for the delivery of international aid interventions, and the use of these relationships is increasing. Despite their popularity and the highly publicised success of many PPAs, their overall
performance is quite variable and failures are common. The PPA literature, while extensive, concentrates on general information, case studies and manuals for PPA design. The existing academic and technical literature in this area concentrates on the 'why' and 'what' of alliance formation, but not the 'how'. These studies are fragmented and there is a lack of a comprehensive integrated theoretical framework of alliance formation. Thus this chapter has identified a major gap in the current academic and technical literature: coherent studies that attempt to bring all of the elements of alliance establishment together into an integrated theoretical model, thus capturing the potential complexities and interaction inherent in alliance establishment.

The aim of the current research is to address this major gap which is a significant potential constraint to an understanding of alliance establishment that can be used by practitioners and researchers to create better alliances. In the next chapter, 'Research Design, Methodology and Methods used in this Study' I develop the research questions, research design and methodology use in the current study to address this research gap. Chapter Three also considers the rationale for the current study, the reasons for the choice of methodology (Grounded Theory) used in the research design, the theory behind this methodology, and the application of this methodology in the research associated with this study.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODOLOGY AND METHODS USED IN THIS STUDY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter I developed a working definition of PPAs in ODA and discussed the characteristics and nature of these arrangements. I also overviewed the extant literature on PPAs and identified the research gap which this study addresses. This chapter develops and discusses the rationale for the research design, methodology and methods used in the current research.

I begin with a research strategy developed to fill the major research gap identified in the previous chapter and associated research questions to be answered by this study. A suitable research design begins with the choice of a research paradigm and this choice governs the selection of an appropriate research methodology and methods (Sarantakos, 2005, pp. 29-31, 35-39; Cresswell, 2007, pp. 15-16). This chapter next discusses the justification for the choice of a qualitative research approach and the research paradigm which underpins this work.

The current study was essentially carried out in two stages. In the first stage, the main focus of this work was on the identification of the main concerns of the partners seeking to establish PPAs in ODA and the social and decision-making processes associated with these. This chapter continues with a discussion of the reasons for the choice of the principle research methodology used in this study, Grounded Theory, together with a description of the key principles of this methodology. I then proceed with details of the methodology and its application in the current study.
The second stage of this study was additional research on two alliance attributes identified by the participants ('Alliance Type' and 'Alliance Partner Class') which required additional investigation in order to add robustness to the resulting analysis and the theoretical model which was developed from the data. In this chapter, I discuss the reasons for the use of comparative research methodology to further investigate some specific alliance attributes and detail the use of this methodology in the current study.

This chapter concludes with a consideration of the limitations of methodology and methods, including researcher bias.

3.2 RESEARCH STRATEGY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research gap which this study aims to address is the lack of empirical integrated theoretical studies bringing together the elements of alliance establishment but also capturing the potential complexities and interactions associated with this process. This research provides an integrated theoretical understanding of the 'how' of PPA establishment to underpin the development of an integrated theoretical model of PPA establishment for use by ODA practitioners for use by researchers as a framework for future studies.

I do this by designing research to answer two research questions:

(a) What are the main concerns of the partners responsible for the establishment of PPAs involved in overseas development assistance programs?

and
What are the social and decision making processes that the key managers use to resolve these concerns during the establishment of a PPA in the ODA sector?

To date, most of the studies reported in the academic and technical literature have relied upon surveys and questionnaires to test propositions and hypotheses developed on the basis of literature reviews, observations or the interests of individual researchers. The approach I take in this study is to use the experiences, views and perceptions of participants who have been directly involved in the establishment of a range of PPAs in ODA programs. These individuals can collectively provide rich information on alliance attributes and the social processes of alliance formation on which to build a theory and conceptual understanding of PPA establishment.

3.3 THE CHOICE OF AN INTERPRETATIVE RESEARCH APPROACH

Denzin and Lincoln (2005, pp. 21-28) suggest that qualitative research can be considered as a process with five phases. These phases are: Phase 1 - The Researcher; Phase 2 - Interpretive Paradigm; Phase 3 - Research Strategies (Methodology); Phase 4 - Methods of Collection and Analysis (Methods); and Phase 5 - Interpretation and Evaluation.

The first phase considers the perspectives brought to the area of study by the researcher. These perspectives are influenced by a range of characteristics including gender, background and ethnicity (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, pp. 21-22).
In the context of qualitative research, a paradigm can be defined as a "fundamental image of the subject matter within a science" (Ritzer, 1980). It is a 'cluster' of beliefs and dictates which for scientists in a particular discipline influence what should be studied, how research should be done and how results should be interpreted (Barron, 2006, p. 212). A paradigm is "the broadest unit of consensus within a science and serves to differentiate one scientific community from another" (Ritzer, 1980). Paradigms are comprised of philosophical assumptions; epistemologies and ontologies; research methodologies and premises ((Creswell, 2003, p. 19; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 22; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006, p.194) as referred to in Phase 2 on the qualitative research process. The choice of paradigm has implications for the choice of methodology and methods used for data collection in an individual research study. Each paradigm influences the choice of methodology as a result of three main (researcher) factors: how they perceive reality; how they perceive human beings; and what they perceive as the nature of science (Sarantakos, 2005).

Social researchers generally agree that any instance of social enquiry is based upon the dual fundamental principles of epistemology and ontology (Barron, 2006, p. 202). The qualitative researcher adopts a philosophical stance based on the assumptions associated with ontology and epistemology (Creswell, 2007, p. 17-18). Epistemology is concerned with the possibility, nature, sources and limits of human knowledge, that is, whether or how we can have knowledge (Sumner, 2006, p. 72). Under epistemological assumptions, social researchers try and get as close as possible to the participants being studied. Ontology is the study of the essential nature of reality and its characteristics (Creswell, 2007, p. 16). With ontology, the main concern is with the existence of, and social relationship between different aspects of society, such as social actors, cultural norms and social structures (Barron, 2006, p. 202).
There are many paradigms put forward in the literature (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, pp. 22-25; Sarantakos, 2005). Examples of some of the major paradigms and their assumptions are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1  Some Major Interpretative Paradigms and Their Assumptions (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm/Theory</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Form of Theory</th>
<th>Type of Narration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivist/Post-positivist</td>
<td>Internal, external validity</td>
<td>Logical-deductive, grounded</td>
<td>Scientific reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist</td>
<td>Trustworthiness, credibility, transferability, confirmability</td>
<td>Substantive-formal</td>
<td>Interpretive case studies, ethnographic fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>Afrocentric, lived experience, dialogue, caring, accountability, race, class, gender</td>
<td>Critical, standpoint</td>
<td>Essays, stories, experimental writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>Afrocentric, lived experience, dialogue, caring, accountability, race, class, gender</td>
<td>Standpoint, critical, historical</td>
<td>Essays, fables, dramas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marxist</td>
<td>Emancipatory theory, falsifiability, dialogical, race, class, gender</td>
<td>Critical, historical, economic</td>
<td>Historical, economic, socio-cultural analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Cultural practices, praxis, social texts, subjectivities</td>
<td>Social criticism</td>
<td>Cultural theory-as criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer Theory</td>
<td>Reflexivity, deconstruction</td>
<td>Social criticism, historical analysis</td>
<td>Theory as criticism, autobiography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three major interpretative paradigms which underpin qualitative research are generally cited in the qualitative research literature: positivist/post-positivist; interpretivist/constructivist; critical/transformative (Sarantakos, 2005, p. 33; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 22; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006, p. 196). Table 3.2 presents an overview of these three paradigms together with a comparison of some of the terms and language used when describing them.
Table 3.2  An Overview of the Three Major Paradigms Referred to in the Common Literature (adapted from Sarantakos, 1998, p. 33; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006, p. 196)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positivist/Post-positivist</th>
<th>Interpretivist/Constructivist</th>
<th>Critical/Transformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
<td>Critical theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Phenomenonological</td>
<td>Neo-marxist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Feminist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>Interpretivist</td>
<td>Critical Race Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory verification</td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>Freirean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal comparative</td>
<td>Multiple participant</td>
<td>Participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Meanings</td>
<td>Emancipatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Social and historical</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Grand Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neopositivism</td>
<td>Theory generation</td>
<td>Empowerment issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Positivism</td>
<td>Symbolic interaction</td>
<td>Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Positivism</td>
<td>Psychoanalysis</td>
<td>Change-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnology</td>
<td>Interventionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociolinguistics</td>
<td>Queer theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Race specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict School of Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marxism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feminism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of these three major paradigms is discussed by a range of authors including Sarantokos (2005, pp. 35-39) and Denzin and Lincoln (2005, pp. 22-25):

### 3.3.1 The Positivist/Post-positivist Paradigm

Positivists and post-positivists adopt a 'scientific' approach to research which has the elements of being reductionistic, logical, an emphasis on empirical data collection, cause and effect oriented, and deterministic based on prior theories (Creswell, 2007, p. 20). They believe that the social world is real, is independent of human consciousness, objective, measurable and rests on order. This approach views human beings as rational individuals governed by social laws.
Researcher adopting this paradigm will usually view inquiry as a series of logically-related steps, believe in multiple perspectives from participants rather than a single reality, espouse rigorous methods of qualitative data collection and analysis and write their qualitative studies in the form of scientific reports resembling quantitative approaches. Their research often aims to verify pre-conceived hypotheses and those generated from prior studies and the literature (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 125-126; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006, pp. 194-195; Williams, 2006, pp. 229-230; 2006, Creswell, 2007, p.20).

3.3.2 The Interpretivist/Constructivist Paradigm

Interpretivists/constructivists adopt a perspective wherein reality is understood as being socially constructed (Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Hepburn, 2006, pp. 38-40). This perspective emphasises understanding rather than explanation (Charmaz, 2006, p. 126). In this paradigm, people are seen as 'constructed' through social interaction rather than through genetic programming and biological maturation (Hepburn, 2006, pp. 38-40). Thus the way to understand "different 'others' in by 'standing in their shoes', 'looking through their eyes' and feeling their pleasure or pain" (Taylor and Medina, 2013)

Researchers adopting this paradigm can be contrasted to positivists/post-positivists in that they do not believe that science is value-free. They believe value neutrality is not possible or necessary. Rather they believe science requires an inductive approach that proceeds from the general to the more abstract. These researchers argue that the basis for explaining social life is through understanding people and how they make sense of their life (Sarantakos, 2005, pp. 35-39; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006, p. 195).
From an Interpretivist/constructivist viewpoint, the goal of social research is to rely as much as possible on the participant's views of the situation. Rather than starting with a theory, the researcher generates or inductively develops a theory of pattern or meaning. In practice, the questions used for data collection become broad and general so that the participants can construct meaning from discussions or interactions with other people. With this paradigm, researchers recognise that their own background shapes their interpretation and they 'position themselves' in the research to acknowledge how their interpretation flows from their own personal, cultural and historical experiences. The researcher's intent is to make sense of the meanings others have about the world (Creswell, 2007, pp 20-21).

### 3.3.3 The Critical/Transformative Paradigm

In the critical theorist's paradigm, science is about removing the false beliefs about society and the power systems that dominate and oppress people in societies (Fay, 1987, p. 27; Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006, p. 195). It is concerned with empowering human beings to transcend the constraints placed on them by race, class and gender: constraints that prevents individuals from realising their full potential and give them a false consciousness (Creswell, 2007, p. 27).

With critical theory, themes that might be explored include the scientific study of social institutions and their transformation through interpreting the meanings of social life; the historical problems of domination, alienation, and social struggles; and a critique of society and the envisioning of new possibilities. For example, critical researchers might design a research project to study changes in how people think; encourage people to interact, form
networks, become activists, and action-oriented groups; and help individuals examine the conditions of their existence. The end goal of the study might be social theorising (Creswell, 2007, p. 27).

Critical theory research falls into two broad categories: methodological, in that it affects the way in which people write and read; and substantive (for example theorizing about the role of the state and culture in advanced capitalism). Critical theorists recognise that within this paradigm their personal values mediate their research findings rendering them value-laden.

The current study proposes neither to verify existing theories nor to collected measurement data. This study aims to identify the issues associated with the establishment of PPAs in ODA and to develop theory to explain the decision making during this stage. In circumstances where existing information is limited and the aim of the work is to understand and explain process, Sarantakos (2005, pp. 35-39) suggests the use of an interpretative paradigm since these research approaches potentially yield large amounts of data rich in participants’ perceptions and experiences. Noble (2002, pp. 57-65) is of the view that this form of data collection and analysis can be beneficial in identifying unknown variables, themes and processes that may be valuable in developing an explanatory theory of events and social processes in the area under study.

These views are further supported by Mackenzie and Knipe (2006, p. 195) who state that interpretivists/constructivists do not generally begin with a theory (as with positivists), rather they “generate or inductively develop a theory or pattern of meaning”. This approach also assumes that the information can be drawn from the participants. Thus for this research project, I chose an interpretivist/constructivist approach. This is in contrast to hypothesis
testing (deductive) methodologies in which theory is used to develop hypotheses to be tested through observation (Babbie, 2005, pp. 324-25; Harding, 2006, pp. 131-32).

In this context, constructivism needs to be contrasted with a related but different approach, constructionism. Unfortunately in the literature the two terms are used inconsistently. Constructionism focuses on the phenomena that are created through the social interactions of a group (i.e. the focus is on the group) whereas constructivism focuses on an individual's learning and experience that takes place through their interactions in a group (Crotty, 1998, pp. 57-59; Charmaz, 2005, pp. 508-512; Hepburn, 2006, pp. 38-40). As one author puts it "constructivism is primarily an individualistic understanding of the constructionist position" (Crotty 1998, p. 58). On one level, my approach may be considered constructionist as it seeks to move away from the formal positivist focus on Grounded Theory processes to a more constructionist focus on the phenomenon. However, my real position is a focus on the individuals in this study: their perceptions of the phenomenon; their 'experiences' and their view of the world; the biases of the researcher and the development of conceptual categories arising through MY interpretation of the data. This is also consistent with the views of authors such as Charmaz (2005) who consider themselves as having a constructivist approach to grounded theory (Charmaz, 2005, p. 507-513).
3.4 THE CHOICE OF A QUALITATIVE APPROACH

Traditionally, primary research has been categorised as either qualitative or quantitative, though the distinction is not always clear cut (Bryman, 2001, p. 20). Quantitative approaches focus on numerical data and statistical analysis with an emphasis on producing objective, reliable, reproducible, valid data (Garwood, 2006, pp. 250-251). An advantage of quantitative research is that the data obtained can be subject to considerable statistical analysis, generalisations can be made outside of the sample under investigation and it allows the testing of hypotheses. Quantitative methods are best used when more is known about the subject area so that hypotheses and research questions can be easily formulated and tested (Garwood, 2006, pp. 250-251).

Qualitative approaches are characterised by an emphasis on participants' interpretation and understanding of their social world and the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, pp. 10-11; Sumner, 2006, p. 249). These qualitative approaches are best used when little is known of the area of research and so hypotheses cannot be easily generated for testing (Garwood, 2006, p. 251). The two approaches are underpinned by different ontological and epistemological assumptions: quantitative approaches generally being associated with objectivism and positivism; and qualitative approaches with constructionism or interpretivism (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, pp. 10-12; Hewson, 2006, p. 237; Garwood, 2006, pp. 250-251).

In circumstances where the aim is develop a complex and detailed understanding of a process and where discovery is an important aim of the research, several authors recommend the use of a qualitative research approach (Sarantakos, 2005; Sumner, 2006, p. 249; Creswell, 2007,
Such an approach is capable of yielding significant levels of data rich in an informant's perceptions and experiences. This type of data can be beneficial in identifying unknown variables, themes and processes that may be valuable in developing an explanatory theory of events and social processes in the area under study (Sarantakos, 2005; Silverman, 2004, 2006). Since the information regarding the processes of formation of PPAs is lacking in studies carried out to date, I adopt a qualitative approach for this research in keeping with current studies objectives of identifying the key concerns of the partners and social and decision making processes used in the establishment of PPAs. This is contrast to quantitative approaches where the emphasis is on perspectives imposed by the researchers own preconceptions and definitions developed from the literature (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, pp. 10-12; Barron, 2006, pp. 212-213; Sumner, 2006, p. 249).

Having chosen a qualitative research approach, the next step is to identify the research paradigm.

3.5 METHODOLOGY

Within the interpretivist/constructivist research paradigm a number of research strategies and methodologies could be used (Silverman, 2006, pp. 43-47). These include, *inter alia*, case studies, phenomenology and grounded theory approaches (Creswell, 2007, p. 6-10).

For this study, I selected a Grounded Theory approach (as described by Strauss and Corbin, 1998 and Charmaz, 2006) as the methodology. This choice was based on a number of considerations. Firstly, Morse (1994, p. 223) as a result of a review of qualitative research strategies, considers Grounded Theory as the method of choice where the phenomenon under
investigation is a process. Secondly, Grounded Theory methodology is an inductive, theory-generating methodology in which theory is generated or derived from the empirical data collected (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 143; Connell et al., 2001; Elliot and Lazenbatt, 2004; pp. 48-49). Thirdly, Grounded Theory is well established, and has been used in similar approaches to research carried out by other workers (Conrad, 1978; Noble, 2002; Pitney and Parker, 2002; Martin, 2004; Parker, 2004; Pitney and Ehlers, 2004; Rafii et al., 2004; Newton and Ellis, 2005; Jefferson, 2007; Camargo, 2008).

Other qualitative approaches, such as case study and phenomenology were not chosen due to their different foci. For example, case study research involves the study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a bounded system (that is, a setting or a context) (Creswell, 2007, p. 73). The emphasis in a case study is on thick description rather than conceptualization of a process (Yin, 1994). Phenomenology describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or phenomenon. Phenomenologists describe what all participants have in common as they experience a phenomenon such as grief (Creswell, 2007, p. 57). Although a phenomenology emphasizes the meaning of an experience for a number of individuals, the intent of Grounded Theory study is to move beyond description and to generate or discover a theory (or action or interaction) (Creswell, 2007 pp. 62-63).

Grounded Theory is a systematic inductive approach to the study of social life that attempts to generate theory from data through the constant comparing of unfolding observations (Pettigrew, 2000, p. 256; Pitney and Parker, 2002, pp. 170-71; Pitney and Ehlers, 2004; Morse, 1994; Rafii et al., 2004; Burden and Roodt, 2007). The foundation question in Grounded Theory is: “What theory or explanation emerges from an analysis of the data
collected about this phenomenon?” This methodology aims to move beyond description and to generate or discover a theory, an abstract analytical schema or a process generated from or ‘grounded’ in data from the participants (Glasser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Baker et al., 1992; Jefferson, 2007). A central feature of Grounded Theory is that it allows the emergence of concerns and issues of significance to the participants rather than those of the researcher (McCallin, 2003, pp. 204-205; Martin, 2004, p. 2). Consistent with this approach, no formal or pre-conceived research questions guide this methodology and the research question is allowed to gradually emerge from the data relevant to the chosen social phenomenon. This is to prevent ‘contamination’ of the analysis with preconceived theories (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, pp. 12-13; Pettigrew, 2000, pp. 256-57; Creswell, 2007, pp. 62-68).

Grounded Theory as developed by Glasser and Strauss in 1967 and further developed by Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) is a positivist and interactionist approach. It can be described as an approach that attempts to combine an interpretivist/constructivist approach with a positivist concern for a “systematic set of procedures” in doing qualitative research (Babbie, 2005, pp. 324-25). Grounded Theory reflects the philosophy of the theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism (Charmaz, 2006, p. 7). This perspective assumes that interaction is inherently dynamic and interpretive and addresses how people create, enact and changer meanings and actions (Marshall, 1998, pp. 655-657). Symbolic interactionism is based on three premises Nelson, 1998):

- humans act towards things on the basis of the meaning they ascribe to those things;
- the meaning of such things arises from the social interaction that one has with others and society; and
• these meanings are modified through an interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things that they encounter.

Researchers using this perspective investigate how people create meaning during social interaction, how they present and construct identity and how they define situations of co-presence with others.

Since 1967, Grounded Theory has evolved considerably as a methodology (McCallin, 2003, pp. 203-205). Strauss in 1987 and Strauss and Corbin in 1990 further developed these techniques which led to conflict between Glasser and Strauss over the original philosophy of the technique. While Glasser saw Grounded Theory as an exploratory method, to be followed by later verification studies, Strauss and Corbin viewed it as a combination of theory generation and verification (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, pp. 12-13). Both groups also disagreed on aspects of coding, data comparison and interpretation. Grounded Theory methodology which has evolved from Orthodox Grounded Theory (OGT) (Glasser and Strauss, 1967) uses a more exhaustive series of substantive questions of the data to guide the analysis and allows more flexibility in the extraction of information from the data than OTG (McCallin, 2003, pp. 204-205; Darkenwald, 2007, pp. 63-77; Silverman, 2006; Parker, 2004, pp. 7-8; Babbie, 2005, pp. 417-418).

Several workers have criticized OGT and its positivist variants as too prescriptive and structured (Layder, 1998; Dey, 1999; Atkinson and Coffey, 2004; Emerson, 2004; Charmaz, 2006 pp. 131-136). They view these more positivist approaches to Grounded Theory as erasing the social context from which the data emerges, minimising the influence of the researcher and often ignoring the interaction between the grounded theorist and their research
participants. Charmaz and others (Charmaz and Mitchell, 2001, p. 160; Charmaz, 2005, pp. 508-10; Charmaz, 2006; pp. 130-134.) advocate a more constructivist approach to Grounded Theory as opposed to Strauss and Corbin’s systematic analytical procedures which must be followed. This social constructivist approach emphasises flexible guidelines, a focus on theory development that depends on the research views, learning about the experience within embedded, hidden networks, situations and relationships and making visible hierarchies of power, communication and opportunity (Charmaz, 2005, pp. 508-10; Creswell, 2007, pp. 65-66). These authors place more emphasis on the views, values, beliefs, feelings, assumptions, and ideologies of individuals that on the methods of research. Moreover for Charmaz, a Grounded Theory procedure does not minimize the role of the researcher in the process. The researcher makes decisions about the categories throughout the process, brings questions to the data, and advances personal values, experiences and priorities.

As a result of my own experiences as a practitioner, my views more closely align with the constructivist approaches of Charmaz (2005, 2006) to Grounded Theory. My major focus on the views, values, beliefs, feelings assumptions and ideologies of the individual actors working in PPAs within the ODA with a lesser focus on Grounded Theory processes and procedures are in keeping with the philosophy of the constructivist approach. The methodology used in this study follows the approaches taken by Charmaz (2006) and others (Hall and Callery, 2001; Bryant, 2002) which emphasises how the participants view the situation and a focus on theory development rather than the prescriptive and rigid approaches taken in the more Orthodox Grounded Theory approaches as developed by Glasser and Strauss (1967) and Strauss and Corbin (1990). In keeping with the constructivist view of Grounded Theory, the methodology used in this research features:
• less concern over validation of procedures and resulting theory;
• less concern about pre-reading of existing research;
• inclusion of myself in the analysis and interpretation of the data;
• more reflection with regard to the data rather than methodology; and
• interpretation of the data rather than emancipation from social conditions.

Glasser and Strauss (1967, p. 32) point out that Grounded Theory is capable of generating what they label “formal” or “Substantive theory”. Substantive theories are those developed to explain one specific area of empirical inquiry, whereas formal theories apply to more general areas of inquiry. In Glasser and Strauss’s view, substantive theories are used to build formal theories. In this study the aim is to generate substantive theory which focuses on the establishment phase of PPAs involved in ODA.

3.6 METHODS

The research was carried out in two stages (Figure 3.1). The first stage was aimed at identifying the key issues which the partners of PPAs consider during the establishment phase and the generation of a conceptual model to explain the relationship between these key issues Grounded Theory study). The second stage of the study (comparative analysis) was designed to:

• Gather additional data to allow further development of the dimensions of the core categories and sub-categories; and
• Develop an in-depth understanding of the core categories using the theoretical model as an analytical framework.
Figure 3.1  Research strategy used in this study

INITIAL RESEARCH QUESTIONS  
(section 3.2)

GROUNDED THEORY RESEARCH (Phase 1)  
(section 3.6.1)
• Phase 1 aimed at addressing research questions and identifying Core Categories
• 5 Public-Private Alliances (table 3.3) and Appendix A
• 25 semi-structured interviews carried out across senior manager from different partner types across the 5 PPAs (refer Appendix A)
• Grounded Theory (GT) Analysis identified five Core Categories which were used to develop a preliminary Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA establishment (fig 3.2)
• GT Analysis identified 2 areas (Alliance Type and alliance partner type) where additional clarification/information was required

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS (Phase 2)  
(section 3.6.2)
• Phase 2 aimed at providing clarification and more information on ‘Alliance Type’ and ‘alliance partner class’, and adding additional depth to the dimensions of the Core categories and sub-categories
• 7 Public-Private Alliances (Appendix G) of which 4 tended towards Constrained Choice Alliances and 3 tended towards Voluntary Alliances
• 50 semi-structure interviews carried out across senior manager from different partner types across the 5 PPAs (refer Appendix G)

ADD ADDITIONAL DEPTH TO CORE CATEGORIES AND FINNESS INTEGRATED THEORETICAL MODEL OF PPA ESTABLISHMENT
3.6.1 Grounded Theory Study

Data collection, data analysis and theory generation were carried out using Grounded Theory procedures as described by Charmaz (2006), Strauss and Corbin (1998) and Silverman (2006).

3.6.1.1 The General Grounded Theory Process

The established research procedures for Grounded Theory are summarised by Silverman (2006, p. 96) as follows:

- Use a process of ‘theoretical sampling’ of successive sites and sources, selected to test or to refine new ideas as they emerge from the data.
- Code data line by line to show action and process.
- Raise significant codes into analytical categories for purposes of comparison through three methods: ‘open coding’ (breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualising and categorising data), ‘axial coding’ (putting data back together in new ways after open coding by making connections between categories), and ‘selective coding’ (selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development).
- Check and fill out categories through theoretical sampling and integrate categories into a theoretical framework.
- Stop data collection when categories reach ‘theoretical saturation’, for example when a ‘core category’ emerges around which the researcher can integrate the analysis.
• Developing these categories into more general analytical frameworks with relevance outside the setting (‘formal theories’).

The procedures followed in data collection and analyses in this study are highlighted in Fig. 3.2.
Research Problem, Target PPAs, Opening Interview Questions

Conduct Interviews

Modify Interview Questions

Theoretical Sampling

Open Coding (breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualising and categorising)

Axial Coding (putting data back together in new ways by making connections between categories)

Selective Coding (selecting the core category, relating it to others, filling in those which need further refinement)

Constant Comparative Method
- compare new codes and classifications with existing ones
- integrate new categories and their properties
- re-examine earlier data
- finesse theoretical framework
- delimit theory
- write theory

New Categories Emerging

Yes

Develop Theoretical Framework

Locate Within Current Management Literature

Substantive Theory

No

Sensitizing concepts and general disciplinary perspectives

Figure 3.2 Data collection and analysis procedures (Grounded Theory) used in this study
A description of the major aspects of these procedures is as follows (note: numbers in brackets refer to components of Fig. 3.2):

Review of Literature and Openness of the Researcher

A guiding principle of Orthodox Grounded Theory is that the researcher should avoid immersing themselves in the literature of the field of inquiry before they have developed the core elements of their own grounded theory (Noble, 2002, p. 275; Strauss and Corbin, 1998, pp. 12-13, 97, 99). This is to avoid the potential for a researcher to begin the research with a preconceived theory in mind and the tendency to ‘force’ the data to fit with preconceived notions gained as a result of studying the existing literature. In the case of this project, I restricted the initial literature review and associated study of the literature to sensitizing concepts, general literature regarding IORs and PPAs, literature on general disciplinary perspectives and Grounded Theory methodology as per the recommendations of Strauss and Corbin (1998, pp. 12-13) and Charmaz (2006, pp. 10-14). Once the Grounded Theory was developed an analysis of the existing literature was used to locate new theory developed in this area within the existing body of established PPA literature.

Data Collection (1)

Grounded Theory strategies can be used with a variety of data collection methods (Charmaz, 2006, p. 10). Interviews were the major form of data collection for this study although background documents and reports were coded and used in the analysis where they added significant insight into the formation of the PPAs. Semi-structured interviews were used to allow the generation of rich data, corroboration of information and data gained from other interviews and sources, to allow greater insights into the data and to gain potential access to other data sources (Yin, 2003; Fontana and Frey, 2005; Silverman, 2006, pp. 109-110).
After initial selective coding, theoretical sampling was used to gain greater insights into emerging categories. During this stage questions were modified for each interview to make them more relevant or to draw out more detail.

**Coding (2)**

The first stage of coding is open coding. Open coding is the analytical process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 101). In open coding, the data is broken down into smaller analytical pieces.

The second stage of coding is axial coding. Axial coding is used to bring the fractured data back together again in a coherent whole (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60-61). It is the process of relating categories to their subcategories and is termed 'axial' because coding occurs around the axis of a category, linking categories at the level of properties and their dimensions (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 123).

The third type of coding is selective coding. With selective coding the researcher begins to code in relation to major categories identified in axial coding. Selective coding is the process of integrating and refining categories prior to theory formation (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p.143). During selective coding, the researcher moves from open coding to coding based around the major categories emerging from the data and using data gathered using theoretical sampling.

As the Grounded Theory process proceeds the focus of coding moves from open coding to axial coding, and then to selective coding, as the research progresses. In practice, the three
Theoretical Sampling (3)

The aim of theoretical sampling is to seek data pertinent to developing the emerging theory (Charmaz, 2006, p. 96). In theoretical sampling the focus changes from developing categories to focussing on data to develop the properties of major categories identified in axial and selective coding. The researcher jointly collects codes and analyses the data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them in order to develop the theory as it develops (Glasser and Strauss, 1967, p. 45). The important principle is that the emerging theory governs the process of data collection.

Constant Comparative Method (4)

The constant comparative method (as described by Strauss and Corbin, 1998) is a procedure for interpreting empirical data and is applied to the data to develop inductive theory (Conrad, 1978). This involves coding the data to identify theoretical concepts, labels and categories while at the same time constantly comparing codes to codes, categories to categories and so on in an effort to define the basic properties of a category and to clarify the relationships between categories and so enrich the basic properties of a category and to clarify the relationship between categories and so enrich and integrate the emerging theory (Glasser and Strauss, 1967, p. 102). This method consists of four stages: comparing incidents applicable to each category; integrating categories and their properties; delimiting theory; and writing the theory (Glasser, 1969, p. 220). This procedure becomes a method of constant comparison when researchers take care that they compare codes over and over again with codes and classifications that have already been made (Flick, 2006, p. 37). Material that has already
been coded is continually integrated into the further process of comparison. Thus the 'systematic circularity' of this process is an essential feature.

**Theoretical Saturation (5)**

Collection of new data continues until “theoretical saturation” is reached (Glasser and Strauss, 1967, pp. 61-62; 111-113). This is the point at which additional data confirms the existing analysis but does not add anything significantly new to the categories in terms of dimensions, conditions or interactions (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 136; Charmaz, 2006, pp. 96-122; Birks and Mills, 2011, P. 70). Theoretical saturation is also the point at which the categories are well developed in terms of properties and dimensions and the relationships amongst the categories are well established and validated (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 212). In practice, this occurs when the researcher repeatedly sees the same categories, dimensions and properties emerging from the data during analysis and no new theoretical insights or dimensions arise.

**Memos**

Memo writing is a crucial part of Grounded Theory methodology (Straus and Corbin, 1998, pp. 217-219). This is a pivotal intermediate step between data collection, theory formulation and writing of papers because it prompts the researcher to analyse the data and codes early in the research process (Charmaz, 2006, p. 72). In the early stages memos are used to record what is happening in the data. They are used to expand on codes and to focus further data collection. In the later stages of the process, memos describe how categories emerge and change, identify beliefs and assumptions, make comparisons, capture the thinking behind the relationships between categories and assist with the development of the emerging theory.
Examples of the memos generated during this study are presented in Appendix K.

### 3.6.1.2 Participants and Data Collection

The initial PPA for commencement this study was chosen on the basis of the 'fit' to the definition of PPA developed for this study (refer Chapter Two), accessibility of partners for discussion and interview, preparedness of partners and management to participate in the study and recommendation from colleagues and external parties. As the research progressed, an additional four PPAs were included in the project. These additional four PPAs were chosen on the additional basis of maximising the differences between the PPAs in terms of models and in terms of the major categories that were emerging from the data. This was to maximise the opportunity for the emergence of additional categories and to allow for greater depth of data regarding category dimensions and properties (Conrad, 1978; Strauss and Corbin, 1998, pp. 203-215). These five PPA represented five different sectors as described in Table 3.3 (A description of each of these PPAs is provided in Appendix A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPA Identifier</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Extension, Information Exchange and Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants within PPAs were identified using purposive sampling (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995) and were managers or senior staff who had either been directly involved in the establishment of the respective PPA or who had an intimate knowledge of the establishment of the PPA. This was to ensure that participants were able to describe their personal
experiences and perceptions and could relate their perception of the rationale behind the establishment of the PPA. For each PPA, participants were identified that represented each of the major partners and partner ‘classes’ (for example, public sector and private sector).

Interviews were the major form of data collection for this study although background documents and reports were coded and used in the analysis where they added significant insight into the formation of the PPAs. The overall objective of these interviews was to gain the first hand perceptions and experiences of the manager and senior staff of a range of partners in the establishment of each of the PPAs included in the study and to gather data to answer the research questions which underpin this study.

Semi-structured interviews were used to allow the generation of rich data, corroboration of information and data gained from other interviews and sources, to allow greater insights into the data and to gain potential access to other data sources (Yin, 2003; Fontana and Frey, 2005; Silverman, 2006). A set of open-ended core questions (Appendix B) was used to ‘seed’ each interview and to "guide" the interview in order to ensure that the discussion focussed around issues and processes associated with answering the core research questions (that is, to maintain some structure around the interview). For Example, "What other factors/issues did you consider when thinking about entering into a PPA?" In keeping with Grounded Theory Methodology, questions were modified slightly for each interview to make them more relevant or to draw out more detail on the basis of theoretical categories identified during axial coding (that is theoretical sampling: refer Figure 3.2). For example "Can you identify an individual or group responsible for the initiation of the alliance? If so, what were their major characteristics that contributed to the establishment of the alliance?" This was particularly so after the first 15 interviews as the data collection and analysis moved towards
axial coding, selective coding and theoretical sampling. Interviews of 40-60 minutes duration were conducted face-to-face wherever possible or by telephone, due to the geographic spread of the participants. In practice many of the interview questions yielded information about factors of concern and processes used to resolve them. These interviews were carried out over the course of 12 months. Rich data was obtained from the participants during the interview process. All interviews were digitally recorded and later transcribed prior to transfer to NVivo 8 software for analysis.

In this study, theoretical saturation occurred after 25 participant interviews representing partners in five public-private alliances. At this stage five major categories had emerged from the data and the dimensions and properties of these categories were re-occurring without any new information or insights.

### 3.6.1.3 Data Analysis and Theory Development

In keeping with the procedures described by Charmaz (2006) and Strauss and Corbin (1998), data collection and analysis were carried out simultaneously. Words, lines and section of transcript which had a distinct and discernible meaning were given labels (codes) to reflect this meaning. For example the section interview "I know him from way back when I was planning Director for the department so we knew each other by name" was coded as 'previous relationship'. For each participant a 'Preliminary Code Association Diagram' was developed (examples of these are provided in Appendix C). These diagrams were used as an aid in visualising the association of the codes for each participant relative to the establishment of the associated PPA and to give a preliminary indication of emerging trends. They were also used for preliminary comparison of the data from each participant's interview.
Following the completion of the first five interviews from the first PPA initial axial coding was carried out. By this stage, several hundred codes had been identified. These were grouped into categories and subcategories and the linkages between them were identified on the basis of the properties and dimensions of these categories. Axial coding allowed the identification of codes (concepts) having major significance or representing common themes (referred to as categories). The concepts identified from the open coding of the first 15 interviews were grouped into categories and sub-categories (an example of an early iteration is given in Appendix D) with the associated codes providing the dimensions and properties of the categories and subcategories. After several iterations of axial coding the number of major concepts was reduced to 12 and these are detailed in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Categories and sub-categories resulting from open coding of the first 15 interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Brief Description/examples</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conception          | Concepts associated with the inception of the PPA (e.g. core problem/issue, drivers for PPA, incentives) | • Drivers for change  
                      |                                                                                      | • Initiator  
                      |                                                                                      | • Initiation |
| Bringing others on board | Identifying potential partners, making then aware of the proposal and gaining initial support (e.g. convincing, motivation to enter partnership, timing, reaching interim agreement, partner contributions, acknowledgment of partner strengths) | • Initial interest  
                      |                                                                                      | • Negotiating the detail  
                      |                                                                                      | • Gaining initial support  
                      |                                                                                      | • “The Partners”  
                      |                                                                                      | • Other consideration |
| Establishment       | Gaining commitment, setting the ground rules and moving forward (e.g. management structures, ground rules, strategic fit, sharing the vision, flexibility and resilience, principles-based) | • Sorting out the detail  
                      |                                                                                      | • Strategy/objectives  
                      |                                                                                      | • Flexibility/formality |
| Implementation      | Getting the PPA up and running (e.g. risk management, sustainability of funding, joint problem solving, partner organisation politics) | • Risk management  
                      |                                                                                      | • Funding  
                      |                                                                                      | • Processes  
                      |                                                                                      | • Partner specific  
<pre><code>                  |                                                                                      | • Growth/evolution |
</code></pre>
<p>| Success             | Concepts associated with the perception of success (or failure) (e.g. sense of affiliation, satisfaction with |                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Leadership/driver</strong></th>
<th>Concepts associated with the prime drivers of the PPA inception and establishment (e.g. <em>importance of individuals, steering, coach</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power dynamics</strong></td>
<td>The distribution, use/abuse and management of power and power relationships (e.g. <em>dominant partner, uneven power, control/influence, exercise of power</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions for success</strong></td>
<td>Concepts believed to contribute to the success (or failure) of the PPA (e.g. <em>transparency, respect, experience, existing relationships</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External factors</strong></td>
<td>External factors out of the control of partners but impacting on the PPA (e.g. <em>government regulations, stakeholder politics, cultural differences</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side effects/unanticipated benefits</strong></td>
<td>Unplanned events, consequences or benefits arising the PPA (e.g. <em>new skills development, potential for scaling up, new partnerships, new opportunities</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing conflict and challenges</strong></td>
<td>Management of conflict between the partners and challenges to the establishment of the PPA (e.g. <em>game playing, conflict of interest, meeting partner expectations, conflicting goals, delays in developing agreements</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages of partnership</strong></td>
<td>The disadvantages and problems associated with membership of the PPA (e.g. <em>loss of control, freedom to operate, restriction on publications</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following initial axial coding the process moved into selective coding and the use of theoretical sampling (on the basis of the main categories emerging from the data). Care was taken to compare all new data with existing data, categories and relationships using the constant comparative method. As axial and selective coding continued and based on the data obtained from theoretical sampling, the relationship between the emerging categories was 'mapped' using diagrams (refer Appendix F). During these stages codes and categories were modified, collapsed and combined (refer Appendix E for an example of an advanced iteration of grouping of codes) and finally five core categories emerged (refer Appendix J). The
category relationship diagrams also evolved (Appendix F) until the theoretical model presented in Chapter Nine was developed.

### 3.6.1.4 Limitations of Grounded Theory and the Methodology used in this Study

A limitation of Grounded Theory methodology is that the outcome of the research may have applicability only to the area of inquiry from which it has been induced and may thus be very specific (Glasser and Strauss, 1967, pp. 32-34; Goulding, 1999, 00.18-19; Noble, 2002, pp. 4; 86-87). This study aims to develop a substantive theory (rather than a general theory) of the main concerns of the partners and the social and decision making processes of the key managers in the establishment of PPAs in ODA. Like other grounded theories this substantive theory may be modified as other researchers conduct additional work which may modify this theory thus adding to its explanatory power and general applicability.

Grounded Theory is challenging to implement and as described by Strauss and Corbin (1998) relies upon prescribed and structured analytical procedures which must be closely followed by the researcher. While Glasser and Stauss (1967) and Staruss and Corbin (1998) provide a great deal of detail on the rationale and background behind grounded theory they provide little detail on implementing the process at an operational level leaving much to the discretion of the individual researcher (Allan, 2003, pp. 1-8). Fortunately, Charmaz (2006) with her more constructivist approach provides much more detail to guide the novice researcher in this regard. However, a limitation of this study may still be my experience with the finer details of Grounded Theory procedures.
A further limitation is the use of interviews as the major data source for this study is the associated potential for researcher influence and bias which may be later recovered and introduced into the Grounded Theory analysis. To minimise this potential bias, semi-structured interviews were use in which open-ended questions were used to "seed" the interview, thus allowing the participants to respond with a minimum of input and guidance from the researcher. In the later stages of the Grounded Theory phase (and subsequently for the comparative analysis), the questions were more focussed and more likely to have associated bias. In these cases, additional, general questions were included and constant comparisons were conducted quickly after data collection to look for inconsistencies. In the comparative studies, a second set of semi-structured interview questions were developed and this data was used to 'compare with and verify' the results of the Grounded Theory analysis including the search for additional or contradictory categories which might point to problems with the initial methods or analysis. All that said, as a researcher moves from a positivist approach to a constructivist one, the researcher becomes part of the 'construction' and interpretation of meaning from the data and is not a contamination Holstein and Gubrum, 2004, p. 157; Charmaz, 2005, p. 509; Hammersley, 2006, pp. 17-18). Thus the question becomes "not whether or not the interview procedures contaminate data, but how the interview generates useful information about the phenomenon of interest" (Holstein and Gubrum, 2004, p. 157). While, I was committed to avoiding bias in the interview, data collection and analysis process, some external influence on these processes is inevitable, however in the constructivist approach conceptual categories arise through the researcher's interpretation of the data rather than emanating directly from the data or the methodologies used (Hammersley, 2006, p. 17-18). That is, the theoretical analyses "are interpretative renderings of reality, not objective reporting of it (Charmaz, 2005, p. 510).
3.6.2 Additional Studies of Some Key Attributes Associated with the
Conceptual Model (Comparative Analysis)

Two alliance attributes which were of potential importance emerged from the Grounded
Theory analysis and the conceptual model but required additional analysis and clarification
(Chapters Three, Four, Seven and Eight). The first of these was 'Alliance Type' (a sub-
category within the core category 'Processes/Process Issues') (refer Chapter Five). The
second was 'Alliance Partner Class' and was alluded to indirectly by the study participants
(Chapter Eight). These were further studied using the Conceptual Model developed in
Chapter Nine as a framework for comparative analysis.

3.6.2.1 Comparative Analysis

Qualitative research emphasises the development of generalisations by the systematic
comparison of cases in terms of their similarities and differences (Jupp, 2006, p. 33).
Comparative analysis is the item-by-item comparison of two or more comparable
alternatives, processes, sets of data, systems or the like (Anon, 2010). There is no one
comparative method since all research techniques can be used to facilitate comparison
(Marshall, 1998, p. 102). In order for there to be a meaningful comparative analysis there
must be a frame of reference and grounds for comparison (Walk, 1998, p. 1). The frame of
reference is the context which the cases are placed; it is the umbrella in which they are
grouped. Grounds for comparison are the rationale behind the choice of cases to be
compared.

In this instance I carried out additional studies were carried out using comparative analysis
and the Integrated Theoretical Model (Fig. 3.3 and Chapter Nine) as a framework since each
of the key attributes ('Alliance Type' and 'Alliance Partner Class') were comprised of a number of cases and the aim was to further analyse and clarify these in the context of the impact on alliance establishment.
Figure 3.3  A Theoretical Model of the Establishment of Public-Private Alliances in Overseas Development Assistance Programs
3.6.2.2 Participants and Data Collection

From the Grounded Theory analysis and the relevant literature, two types of alliance were identified as being of interest; constrained choice alliances and voluntary alliances (these are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five). Six additional PPAs were identified; four constrained choice alliances and two voluntary alliances; which met the criteria used for choosing PPAs in the grounded theory analysis. In addition, one of the PPAs used in the Grounded Theory analysis (a voluntary alliance) was also included in the comparative study due to its ease of access and to increase the number of voluntary alliances used in the study to three. A brief description of each of the PPAs used in the comparative analyses is presented in Appendix H.

Five alliance partner classes (donor, government, private sector, implementer and secondary partner) were chosen on the basis that they represented a good spread of 'class' types and potential variability in terms of characteristics such as power, influence, size, organisational objectives and drivers for joining the alliance. Participants from each of the five partner classes and for each of the two alliance types were selected for interview resulting in the matrix of study participants shown in Table 3.5. Appropriate participants were deemed to be managers or senior staff who had either been directly involved in the establishment of the respective PPA or who had an intimate knowledge of the establishment of the PPA.

Table 3.5 Matrix of Study Participants Used in the Comparative Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Partner Class</th>
<th>Constrained Choice Alliances (4)</th>
<th>Voluntary Alliances (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid Donor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection was carried out as per the methods detailed in the Grounded Theory phase of the research. A new set of questions was used in the semi-structured interviews. The open-ended questions were developed on the basis of the core categories from the theoretical model and the requirements of the supplementary research questions (refer Appendix H). In this case, the emphasis of the interviews was on gathering information to add to the dimensions of the merging Core Categories and to gain insights into the two areas needing additional clarification; 'Alliance Type' and 'alliance partner class'. For example, "How much choice did your organisation have with regard to who to partner with, management structures, governance and strategic management?" was used to further explore 'Alliance Type'. "What other individual factors were important during the establishment of the alliance?" was used to add depth of understanding regarding the modifier 'individual factors. However, some general questions such as "What prompted the idea for this alliance and how did it start" were included to ensure that theoretical saturation had been obtained and no new categories were arising.

3.6.2.3 Data Analysis

Interview transcripts were coded using the same methods applied to the data in the Grounded Theory analysis phase of this study. Codes were combined as appropriate, refined and then grouped under the Core Categories, categories, sub-categories and sub-groups associated with the Integrated Theoretical Model in tables. The data in these tables were then compared to identify differences and commonalities. This was carried out first for 'Alliance Type', secondly for 'Alliance Partner Class' and finally for 'Alliance Type by 'Alliance Partner Class'. An example of a comparative analysis table for these comparisons is given in Appendix I.
This study aims to address the lack of empirical studies which bring together the elements, potential complexities and interaction associated with alliance establishment into a coherent model. It does this by answering two research questions:

(a) What are the main concerns of the partners responsible for the establishment of PPAs involved in overseas development assistance programs?

and

(b) What are the social and decision making processes that the key managers use to resolve these concerns during the establishment of a PPA in the ODA sector?

Using the experiences and perceptions of managers and senior staff that have first hand or detailed knowledge of the establishment of PPAs in ODA, I utilise a qualitative approach and Grounded Theory methodology to identify the main concerns of the partners responsible for the establishment of PPAs and the social and decision making processes that the key managers use to resolve these concerns during the establishment of a PPA in the ODA. Grounded Theory is also used to development of an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA establishment. The justification for the research strategy, approach, research paradigm and methodology are detailed in this chapter. Grounded Theory methodology is an inductive, theory-generating methodology in which theory is generated or derived from the empirical data collected (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 143). The original methodology as developed by
Glasser and Strauss (1967) has 'evolved' over time and I used a more constructivist approach as advocated by Charmaz (2005, 2006) and others in this study.

The Grounded Theory analysis identified five key issues of prime concern to the participants in establishment of PPAs in ODA. Each of these five key issues was of critical importance to the establishment of the PPAs studies and they were all elevated to the level of core categories during the Grounded Theory analysis. These core categories are: 'Processes and Process Issues'; 'Alliance Type'; 'Alliance Relationships'; 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Modifiers'. Each of these is described individually and in detail in Chapters Four through Eight. Using the Grounded Theory analysis, an integrated theoretical model of PPA establishment was developed and I discuss the development of this model, its features and implications in Chapters Nine and Ten. This Integrated Theoretical Model shows the relative relationships between the core categories and the potential complexities and interactions between the elements. It also provides a framework of PPA establishment for use by practitioners and other researchers and these potential uses are further discussed in Chapters Nine, Ten and Eleven.
CHAPTER 4: PROCESSES AND PROCESS ISSUES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, I developed and discussed the rationale for the research strategy, design, methodology and methods used to address the major research gap identified for this study. The key principles of the major methodology used in this research, 'Grounded Theory' were discussed and its application in the current study was detailed. As a result of the Grounded Theory analysis, five core categories were developed from the data.

In this chapter, I describe the features and significance of the first of the five core categories developed from the Grounded Theory analysis; 'Processes and Process Issues'.

The chapter commences with a definition of 'Processes and Processes Issues' and then goes on to describe its dimensions, properties and characteristics. I continue by relating the findings of this study to the existing relevant literature to locate these in the current body of established knowledge on PPAs. The major areas of agreement or disagreement with previous research are also identified.

This chapter ends with a consideration of the implications of these findings for this study and PPA establishment more generally.

---

2 I have used capitals for core categories and categories, and lower case for lower-level sub-categories as a convention throughout this thesis.
4.2 THE CORE CATEGORY 'PROCESSES AND PROCESS ISSUES'

When asked about their main concerns in establishing PPAs, most of the study participants readily identified a range of key steps associated with alliance establishment. For example³:

*I think that we had a lot of choice in terms of the design of the alliance because the donor would define the results that it wants but gave us leeway to determine how to carry it out......*[P8]⁴

*We should follow a very good organisational structure. That's the most important thing. because if there is no concrete organisational structure which has defined functions then there will be no smooth facilitation or no smooth activities that will be done........*[P10]

*I guess it was just catalysed by the donor that had experience in developing these kinds of partnerships in the past in other parts of the world and they saw this model as probably the one that would deliver..........*[P5]

*I guess the biggest effort in this has been setting up an organisational structure where everyone feels genuinely as an equal partner in it and I guess the structure of governance of the alliance is quite critical in that...... *[P5]

---

³ Note that text in italics is direct quotes or sections of quotes from participant interviews.
⁴ The number in brackets identifies the respective PPA from which the quote has been sourced. Refer Appendices A and G for more information on these PPAs.
During data analysis these key steps and associated issues were grouped into three sub-processes: 'Conception', 'Bringing the Partners on Board' and 'Sorting out the Detail' which make up the core category 'Processes and Process Issues' (Appendices E, F and J). 'Processes and Process Issues' are essentially the key steps that the potential alliance partners and embryonic relationship progress through on the way to alliance establishment (Fig. 4.1).

The PPAs included in the study were quite similar in that they all proceeded linearly through all three main establishment processes. However, the rate at which they progressed through each stage and the sub-processes within each process varied between alliances and there was considerable overlap and bluring of the boundaries between each process.

The relationships between these three processes and their subcomponents is detailed in Fig. 4.1 and each is subsequently described in detail as follows.
4.2.1 Conception

Conception represents the initiation of the alliance and is the first of the alliance establishment processes. Data from the interviews suggests that there are four sub-categories associated with PPA conception: 'drivers for initiation', 'initiator', 'initiation decision' and 'alliance initiation'.
The process of Conception begins with a driver for change, for example an identified need, a focus issue, an opportunity or a donor priority or strategy. Examples of drivers for change are given by the following extracts from two participant interviews:

*It all started with a presidential directive. It’s a goal; it’s a government objective, ok.* [P2]

*So, it was really driven, I guess, by a desire to capture the private sector IP values for the public domain.* [P3]

An ‘initiator’ (generally a donor agency, key individual or core group of partners) then makes a decision to initiate the process of PPA formation to address one or more 'drivers for change'. In ODA programs, donor agencies or their proxies (e.g. CGIAR Centres) are often the alliance initiator on account of their major roles in the management and administration of ODA programs and their responsibilities for developing and driving developed country aid strategies. This was evident in responses from study participants such as:

*The (Developing Country) Government asked us (the donor) to take the initiative for a development project that was province-wide. This PPA was an initiative of the donor.* [P6]

*The donor made a scope of work for the project and put it out to bid.* [P6]

The alliance is 'conceived' when the initiator elicits an initiation decision. These 'initiation decisions' generally occurs in one of three ways:
(a) A donor may decide to initiate an alliance;  

It was catalysed by the donor, that had had experience in developing these kinds of partnerships in the past in other parts of the world............[P5]

(b) An individual or group of core partners may convince a donor to initiate and alliance;  

....we have this formal Memorandum of Intent between the (developing Country Government) and the (Donor). The private firm came here so we said, okay, we can partner. So it's just really the right time.....[P2]

.....the partners persuaded or proposed to the donor that they give us a bit of money to look at the feasibility of the alliance, and so on for such an idea. So they raised a small project...........[P3]

(c) A core group of partners may initiate and alliance (generally by forming a steering or management committee) and invite a donor to become a partner or invester (before, during or following conception).

.....so I told him...let us organise the (growers group).......so we sent some communication regarding a meeting of growers. Let's form an association so that in every district we will have better acces to production technologies....[P10]
So the main stakeholders were sitting together, there were five, the government, industry, the company, the university and us (the donor). So it is actually initiated by these five main stakeholders... [P5]

The analysis shows that the 'initiation decision' is very important in this step. For example:

A group of people came together at the right place at the right time when the industry was in a desperate state, So there was, I think, some key individuals and an industry in a desperate state........ [P5]

'Drivers for initiation', 'initiator' and 'initiation decision' interact during the early stages of alliance establishment to affect planning, strategy development and other activities associated with the embryonic alliance or precursor to an alliance. This influences the 'Alliance Type' which is essentially one in which the donor or other key individual exerts a high degree of power and control over the formative stages of the alliance (constrained choice alliance) or, alternatively one where the potential alliance partners have significant input into the early alliance planning and strategy (voluntary alliance). In subsequent analysis, 'Alliance Type' was found to be of such major significant to alliance establishment that it was elevated to the status of a core category and is considered in more detail in Chapter Five. The occurrence of the core category 'Alliance Type' within the core category 'Processes and Process Issues' and the sub-category 'Conception' is somewhat "untidy" but it serves to demonstrate that PPA establishment in complex and difficult to conceptualise in a linear one dimensional model.
4.2.2 Bringing the Partners on Board

Following conception, the initiator works to identify suitable partners, gains their interest and support the partners, negotiates contributions and roles and responsibilities, and brings them on board the potential PPA. This process has been called 'Bringing the Partners on Board'. 'Bringing the Partners on Board' has four sub-categories: 'the partners' (issues associated with the partners); 'initial interest' (in the concept); 'gaining support' (of the representative organisations); and 'negotiation' (Fig. 4.2).

Figure 4.2 The Category 'Bringing the Partners on Board'

The Partners

Following 'Conception' the initiator(s) goes about recruiting the other alliance partners. 'The Partners' includes a range of factors associated with the members who make up the alliance (refer Appendix J). Partners may be part of the initial group which forms the alliance, they may be invited to join at a later date or they may independently seek to join the alliance as it develops. The skills sets, capacities, complimentarity, natural fit, size and contribution are amongst the wide range of characteristics and dimensions that comprise this sub-category:
We needed a range of competencies, fine, but we also needed partners who could actually sign up and do things quickly and reliably. So we decided then to have full partners who were supposedly committed to the aims and objectives of the PPA........ [P3]

.....credibility, visibility, accessibility, that's really important. Because it's no good if these partners are thousands of miles away and you only see them at the start of a project or at the end of a project. But they were highly visible, highly accessible, good regular contact, communication. Strong supporters. They're the key ones...[P9]

This category is comprised of three sub-groups: 'types of partners'; 'partner characteristics'; and 'selection of partners' (Fig. 4.3).

**Figure 4.3  The Components of the Sub-Category 'The Partners'
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A wide range of partners is involved in the alliances used in this study. Participants categorised partners across a range of 'partner types' including, partner class (for example,
public, private and government), core or secondary, formality (informal or formal partners), national or international. These potential partners exhibited a diverse range of 'partner characteristics' including quality, profile, reputation, expertise, experience and potential to contribute to the alliance.

In the case of PPAs dominated by donors, partners were often approached and invited to join the alliance or approached the alliance with a request for membership. Where the alliance was initiated by a group of 'core partners', invitation was also common, but in this latter case the alliance was often open; accepting members through open invitation:

And then we tried to include as many stakeholders as possible. So from those five main partners, there are now 22 partners in the alliance.....[P5]

Potential partners were selected by the initiator or core management group based on partner type and partner characteristics such as natural fit, acceptance by other partners, complementary skills set and strategic fit. For alliances initiated by donors, due diligence and formal selection processes often also played a major role in partner selection:

So we pick our partners now based very much on their track record of past performance....[P6]

Initial Interest

'Initial interest' describes the interest of the potential partners in joining the PPA following approach by the initiator or awareness of the existence of the PPA (refer Appendix J). An example of 'initial interest' is provided by the following extract:
He must have been very convincing because they immediately liked the approach that the public sector partner was going to develop......[P1]

The study participants identified four main factors (sub-groups) that influence the initial interest of potential partners in alliance membership; 'awareness of alliance'; 'initial approaches'; 'motivation to join alliance'; and 'partner priorities' (Fig. 4.4).

Figure 4.4 The Components of the Sub-Process 'Initial Interest'

'Awareness of alliance' and 'initial approaches' are essentially the ways in which potential partners become informed about the alliance. In some cases the potential partners were invited (either formally, informally or by open invitation) to join. In other cases, partners became aware of the alliance, most often through work of mouth from associates or from existing members of the alliance. The way in which the partners become aware of the alliance is important in that this provides the initial information on which they decide whether or not to further pursue alliance membership. Once potential partners become informed of the
alliance, either through invitation or general awareness, then 'motivation to join alliance' and 'partner priorities' become important in the decision making process.

The participants cited a wide range of motivations for joining the alliances in this study including access to resources and capacity, capacity building and learning, networking and relationship building and new opportunities. For example:

So without them we might be having a very hard time until now. So basically financial support for one.....because we are still developing. And second also, they have helped us with international certification which is very expensive and difficult for us alone......[P6]

In addition to motivation to join, fit with the individual partner priorities (for example commercial agenda) was also of prime importance:

The major reason with this business profit they're going to support the two products that I will be importing...I already did my maths. My accountant did our maths and this will be a good help to us so we decided to import the products. Secondly, also is my belief that this will help the poorer people, but that's only secondary because I'm a businessman...[P8]

Gaining Support
Potential partner approach and initial interest often occurs at a middle manager level or from single representatives of a potential partner organisation. Thus following 'initial interest', it is usually the case that internal and external support needs to be gained from within the potential
partner organisation and from other stakeholder groups (referred to in this thesis as 'gaining support') (Fig. 4.3). This includes 'selling' the concept to senior management or the organisation as a whole and obtaining 'buy-in' from major stakeholders. For example:

\[
\text{I started work on my side with the management of the private sector organisation. He did the same for the public side working with the management of the public sector organisation.} [...][P3]
\]

'Gaining Support' is made up of two sub-groups: 'stakeholder/partner organisations' (external to the organisation) and 'support/buy-in' (internal to the organisation) (Fig. 4.5).

**Figure 4.5 The Components of the Sub-Category 'Gaining Support'**

'Stakeholder/partner organisations' refers to the external stakeholders and other groups from which the potential alliance partners is seeking support for them joining the alliance and these can vary quite widely between PPAs. These groups include community, government and other partners of the alliance.
but a lot of work had to be done through the various government ministries to actually get the alliance going - and those guys couldn't actually get an agreement between themselves.

We had to have letters of support from the stakeholders. Of course we had many discussions with them. So it wasn't simply a case of putting their name on paper....we had to virtually prove that this project was going to be funded by the donor.

'Support/buy-in' is about gaining support from within the organisation, for example promoting the alliance within the partner organisation and gaining commitment and support from senior management.

So, I suggested that since I have a background in PPAs why don't we go into this type of approach and we can attract more people and more organisations into our fold. I said it will be in our interest to adopt this approach. And the management of the company understood what I was proposing and said ok go for it.

Negotiation

After gaining the organisation's support and the support of relevant stakeholders the partners move into a phase termed 'Negotiation'. This includes initial agreement on the basis for collaboration; addressing significant concerns; overcoming hesitation; and gaining initial commitment (refer Appendix J). As an example:
For us it's important to have [another partner] doing research on problem solving in poor farmer's fields on a small scale. So that was definitely the development push by us...we definitely encourage them in this......[P1]

'Negotiation' has four sub-groups: 'contributions'; 'roles and responsibilities'; 'negotiations'; and 'commitment' (Fig. 4.6).

Figure 4.6 The Components of the Sub-Category 'Negotiation'

The first two sub-groups, 'contributions' and 'roles and responsibilities' form the basis of the initial negotiations between the partners. 'Contributions' includes the agreed levels of resources, effort and other factors that partners agree to contribute to the alliance but it is also about ensuring clarity about the exact nature and level of these commitments. 'Roles and responsibilities' are the agreed obligations and expectations about who will be responsible for what. In donor-dominated alliances these negotiations are quite formal and the participants used descriptions such as "clear about the level of support", "assigned responsibilities" and "expectations". For other alliances this is less so and terms such as "partner contributions" and "understanding responsibilities" were more common.
From there we looked at what either side in the partnership, basically what service shall they provide? What shall the donor do, what is their role with the government?....[P7]

And the different members who will be assigned in this particular structure must have to do their part - know their tasks and functions.....[P10]

As the negotiations continue the partners reach agreement on their contributions and roles and responsibilities with respect to the alliance and come to a common understanding.

So with that in mind we are now going to sit down with the donor and try and work out how we could support each other....we're going to mesh it together.....[P8]

'Negotiation' ends with the commitment by several or all of the partners to form a PPA (e.g. "in the months that followed there was a proposal developed and finally the donor agreed to fund this activity")......[P4]

although this commitment may vary (full, partial or variable) depending on the partner and the alliance:

They were committed, they said yes we see potential here, and it grew from there....[P7]
4.2.3 Sorting out the detail

Following commitment the partners move into a phase of 'sorting out the detail' of the PPA. During this stage the initiator and the partners work out the basis on which the PPA will establish and operate. In some cases, particularly constrained choice alliances, much of the detail is 'imposed' by the initiator:

*The implementer...........defines the terms under which potential partners can participate and the rules of engagement between the partners and the alliance, as well as the partners on the ground with local government and private practicioners......*[P8]*

With other cases the partners have a high level of input into this stage of alliance formation and establishment:

*We work with specifically designed proposals in which the partners not only have buy-in, but they actually have valued contribution.....*[P6]*

The details to be addressed in this stage could be grouped under three headings (sub-categories): 'strategy/objectives', 'principles of operation', and 'formality' (Fig. 4.7).
Strategy/Objectives

'Strategy/objectives' refers to the development of, and commitment to, the PPA strategy and the establishment of clearly identified goals and objectives (Appendix J). This includes development of agreed objectives and a strategy for the alliance; a consideration by individual partners of the alignment between the alliance objectives and strategy and their individual organisational objectives and strategies and 'real' commitment to the alliance objectives and strategies. For example:

So the strategy tends to be through the management forum and it, on occasions, can be an informal discussion of strategy but on occasions it actually becomes quite a formal recommendation......[P5]

'Strategy/Objectives' is comprised of two sub-groups: 'planning' and 'goals/objectives' (Fig. 4.8).
'Planning' describes the process of strategic planning for the alliance and includes the role of the partners in the planning process as well as the planning and outcomes:

So in 2001 the steering committee members defined the constitution, the goals and the objectives of the alliance so that it became a truly regional network and the agenda was aligned with that of the donor....[P11]

'Goals/objectives' includes the types of goals and objectives and the alignment of these to form the alliance goals and objectives:

Whatever the objective is, it will not be easy to attain. So I think that we have a common goal to address the different problems of the industry and that, I think, is the binding force for the group........[P10]

The current research shows that the development of the alliance goals and objectives and gaining support for these can be a difficult process, fraught with potential conflict as the
partners try to align their own corporate goals to develop shared, flexible goals and objectives which the partners can commit to:

...there are a lot of important issues of strategy and I guess this is because there are a lot of politics in this industry. So there were a lot of touchy and difficult issues associated with developing a strategy for the alliance. I felt it was a bit of an acid test for the organisation.......[P5]

Principles of Operation

'Principles of operation' is an important part of the establishment process in which the partners negotiate and develop a shared understanding and agreement on the foundations on which the PPA is built. It includes the 'ground rules' under which the partners agree to operate; the alliance structure; roles and responsibilities; and the composition, structure and role of management and other committees. The degree of consideration given to this stage varies widely between PPAs. Two examples serve to demonstrate this:

It’s very clear that – there is a defined set of principles and those principles are discussed reasonably regularly and changed and it’s just that as a partner you’re agreeing to sign up to these principles.........[P5]

So we said "let’s start” and we sorted out the detail later...... [P3]

'Principles of operation' included a wide range of factors which could be grouped under four sub-groups: 'alliance model'; 'alliance management operations'; 'alliance characteristics'; and 'alliance implementation' (Fig. 4.9).
'Alliance model' describes the status and dynamics of the alliance model as an organisational structure. With alliances in which the donor has a predominate influence a prior model is often replicated or modified to form the new alliance:

I guess it was just catalysed by the donor......they had experience in developing these kinds of partnerships in other parts of the world and they saw this model as being probably the one that would deliver the best results for everyone.....[P7]

In other cases, the alliance model is still evolving:

In the beginning we had some ideas on what we would like to do......but it has been, and still is a process of natural evolution.......[P5]
The capacity of the alliance model to be scaled up was also of importance to the study participants:

*We wanted to do more, we wanted to do much more....but you have to start from something small.......*[P7]*

'Alliance management operations' describes the types of management systems and processes which are developed and agreed upon and these vary widely but particularly between constrained voluntary (which tend to be collegiately managed) and constrained choice alliances (which tend to be highly structured and process-oriented) (discussed further in Chapter Five). 'Alliance characteristics' describe the features of the emerging alliance. These also tend to vary widely between voluntary alliances (for example, open communication and culture of respect) and constrained choice alliances (timeliness, action-focused) (discussed further in Chapter Five). 'Alliance implementation' pertains to the actual implementation and establishment of the alliance and includes the various roles and responsibilities of the partners in the initiation process and description of operational aspects of the implementation (for example, engagement with the private sector):

*...there are a very clearly sort of defined set of principles and those principles are discussed reasonably regularly, and these drive the implementation.....when you become a member you're agreeing to sign up to these principles............*[P5]*
In 'principles of operation', decision made regarding the 'alliance model' (for example, replicated or modified), 'alliance management and operations' and 'alliance implementation' ultimately have a large influence of the 'alliance characteristics':

*Co-operation and participation are the most important characteristics of this alliance. The way we have achieved this is a good organisation structure, a yearly work plan, clear definition on tasks and functions and clarity on the activities to be done.......*[P10]*

**Formality**

'Formality' pertains to the legal structure, formalisation of agreement and capacity of the partners to handle diversity and change and is closely related to the sub-category of 'principles of operation'. The following extracts from participant interviews demonstrates this:

*The PPA is a forum in which the members agree that what we get out of the partnership is agreeing to common principles. The PPA doesn’t force anybody to work together, it doesn’t stop people doing their own work within their own agencies but it helps guide us along the same direction.........*[P5]*

*It didn’t work well for the simple reason that in the beginning we haven’t signed a piece of paper and over time peoples perceptions change and sometimes to do the staff......... [P3]*

'Formality' has three sub-groups: 'agreements'; 'structure' and 'arrangements' (Fig. 4.10).
Participants in the study identified formality as an important factor because of its relationship with flexibility in terms of alliance implementation:

*We did not want the structure to be that formal, we did not want everything put in writing....so we said that we should be very flexible.....*[P7]*

Three aspects of formality were identified; 'agreements'; 'structure'; and 'arrangements', with the degree of formality varying within types, both within and between alliances. For example, individual PPAs may have formal agreements in place, but a fairly loose organisational structure and formal arrangements for conducting business. Thus 'agreements' describes the types of legal or written agreements between the partners. In donor-dominated models these were generally formal agreements in place. 'Structure' refers to the organisational structure, and the degree of the formality of the alliance structure often varied with implementer. 'Arrangements' describes the ways of conducting business. Government agencies generally preferred formal arrangements for conducting business. For example:
So, it has a quite formal structure but a relatively informal set of principles to guide operations...........[P5]

So, the formality of structure and in the way they run things, these are relatively formal and
this impacts on the alliance implementation....... [P10]

Overall alliance establishment 'ends' with the formation of stable alliance relationships. Thus
'Alliance Relationships' is the 'end point' of the establishment processes and process issues
(Fig. 3.1). However, 'Alliance Relationships' is itself of such importance that it forms a core
category and is discussed in detail in Chapter Six.

The core category 'Processes and Process Issues' captures the social and organisational
processes and associated issues of alliance establishment readily identified by the study
participants. I have conceptualised these as a series of linear steps comprised of three
processes: 'conception'; 'bringing the partners on board'; and 'sorting out the detail'; ending in
a fourth process 'Alliance Relationships' which has been elevated to the level of a core
category (Chapter Six). While these processes and process issues were features of all
alliances included in this study, my conceptualisation understates the complexity and multi-
dimensionality of alliance establishment in practice.

4.3 THE EXISTING BODY OF PPA LITERATURE ON ALLIANCE PROCESS
CONCEPTUALISATION

A large number of other studies have developed frameworks and models to conceptualise,
represent, clarify and evaluate the complexity of strategic partnership formation (Kaasalainen
et al., 2002). These consider the key attributes and principles, processes or evolutionary stages associated with the development of IORs. The outputs of these studies are of three main types: frameworks; process models and evolutionary models.

4.3.1 Frameworks, Process Models, and Evolutionary Models

Frameworks

Frameworks identify the stages of development of collaboration and alliance development but often in a static, linear way. These frameworks describe the alliance development stages but generally do not consider 'environmental context', the relationship between stages or the influence of external factors. The frameworks provide a good basis on which to study inter-organisational development but provide little understanding to the dynamics of alliance development or the overall establishment and development processes. An example of such a framework is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 The Inter-organisational Innovation Process of Sustainable Building (Bossink, 2007, p. 4088)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Interaction patterns of building innovation in sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Autonomous innovation</td>
<td>Organisations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• innovate autonomously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• manage their innovation portfolio and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• protect their innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Networking</td>
<td>Organisations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• choose or are forced to innovate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• prefer to work with well-known partners and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• realise an influential position in the innovation network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exploration</td>
<td>Organisations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• explore the cost and revenues of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• determine which expertise is needed and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• develop a cooperative portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formation</td>
<td>Organisations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | • negotiate over the costs and revenues  
|   | • enter into contracts and  
|   | • develop innovation plans  
| 5. Organisation | Organisations:  
|   | • establish a joint organisation  
|   | • establish control bodies and  
|   | • develop an architectural blueprint  
| 6. Planning | Organisations:  
|   | • allocate expertise  
|   | • facilitate cooperation and communication and  
|   | • start innovation development  
| 7. Co-innovation | Organisations:  
|   | • coordinate innovation realization  
|   | • renegotiate over the costs and incomes and  
|   | • sell to the market and meet profitability targets  
| 8. Dismantling | Organisations:  
|   | • dismantle the joint organisation  

**Process Models**

Frameworks identify the stages of development of collaboration and alliance development but often in a static, linear way. These process models are essentially a sequence of processes, each with associated sub-processes. Conceptually, these sequences are quite similar but the models vary in terms of the number of stages and the description. Authors such as Lesage (2006), Bossink (2007) and George and Farris (1999) have found that successful alliances go through a consistent pattern of consecutive stages, though not all organisations go through all sub-processes. Organisations that jumped over one or more of the sub-processes generally had to go back and redo them or were confronted with delays, problems and failure.

Examples of process models include those proposed by Ring and Van de Ven (1994) (Figure 4.11); Tzokas and Saren (2004) (Figure 4.12) and Kaasalainen et al. (2002) (Figure 4.13).
Figure 4.11  Process Framework of the Development of Cooperative IORs
(Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, p. 97)
Figure 4.12  The relationship life cycle (Tzokas and Saren, 2004, p. 130)
Whilst the process models capture the stages of alliance formation, they generally commence at 'introduction of the partners' or 'negotiation' and ignore the critical stages of alliance 'Conception'. These models do not consider the complexities and interactions which take place during alliance formation and they are simplistic in their nature.

**Evolutionary Models**

Evolutionary Models consider IOR establishment and development in terms of a series of potential evolutionary stages. These stages vary in 'complexity' along the evolutionary chain in terms of level of engagement, managerial complexity and strategic and implementation complexity. For example, Austin (2002) views his stage one organisations as little more than...
charitable donor relationships whereas his level three organisations may be joint ventures.

These models are conceptually quite similar but they vary in terms of the number of number of potential stages and also in terms of the 'focus of complexity' between stages (e.g. inertia (Ford et al., 1998), trust (Huxham and Vanger, 2000) or learning (Doz, 1996; Ariño and de la Torre, 1998, p. 308). A feature of the evolutionary models is that organisations can move up or down through the stages (or even jump stages) depending on the nature of the relationship, the stage of maturity and a range of other factors and influences. Examples of evolutionary models include those of Ford et al. (1998) (Figure 4.14) and Doz (1996) (Fig. 4.15).

Figure 4.14  The processes of relationship change and development in business relationships (Ford et al., 1998, p. 29)
The evolutionary models are more complex in terms of their conceptualisation of alliance formation but, again, they generally commence at the post-conception stages. While they do consider some of the complexity of alliance formation and the interaction of internal and external factors, they generally do so from 'fixed' lenses such as learning, experience, change, resources or commitment.

The model of alliance formation proposed by Lesage (2006) (Fig. 4.16) bridges process and evolutionary models and considers the very early stages of alliance initiation (termed 'Conception' in the current study).
Using an ethnographic approach from the observation of two case studies, Lesage (2006, p. 3) identified three main cooperative processes in the development and cooperation of small firm networks. These three processes are: a visionary process which describes the construction of a collective vision through sense-making and dialogue; a "communitary" or identity-based process which describes the team building and emergence of a learning community through trials and collective exploration; and a complementary or complementarity-based process which describes learning and knowledge creation through bridge-building and collective exploration. The visionary process starts from an initial vision. Potential members of the alliance share information and negotiate for intermediate objectives, leading to cognitive
agreements to cooperate (Lesage, 2006, p. 9). This process also involves the passage from an initial and individual vision, which is often supported by the initial trigger of the project, to the definition of a shared more collective vision in which each member has a part. In this model, each process builds upon the others and, in particular, the complementary process cannot really start before the group defined a collective vision and that the necessary learning took place within the group. In the case studies, several attempts to start exploration before getting enough cohesion and coherence were made but failed. The author suggests that an entrepreneurial group (which did not exist as a team beforehand) operated along a process of cooperation as a learning community, in a way trying to generate an "intrapreneurial competence". The intrepreneur is expected to be as 'visionary' (providing cohesion) and 'mediating' (providing coherence) to manage the group and 'generate actions'.

4.3.2 The Core category 'Processes and Process Issues' in Relation to the Existing Body of Literature on PPA Process Conceptualisation

The core category 'Processes and Processes Issues' developed is comprised of a sequence of processes and sub-processes ('conception', 'bringing the partners on board' and 'sorting out the detail') through which the embryonic alliance moves on its way to establishment (in this case the development of stable relationships). Together, these processes and sub-processes essentially fit together to form a basic conceptual model of alliance establishment (Fig. 4.17). This basic model is further discussed and enhanced in Chapter Nine to develop and integrated conceptual model of alliance establishment.
While the model of 'Processes and Process Issues' developed in this study is broadly consistent with the models developed by previous researchers (especially Lesage, 2006), it differs from these in three fundamental respects:

(a) The 'Processes and Process Issues' model starts at conception (that is, at the very earliest stages of alliance initiation) and considers this stage to be of fundamental importance to the establishment process.
The conception stage of the 'Processes and Process Issues' aligns in many respects with the visionary process of the model developed by Lesage (2006) (Fig. 4.16). Both commence with a trigger (called a 'driver for change' in the Theoretical Model) and an initiator (termed an intrapreneur by Lesage) who come together for the initiation of the alliance. While the 'visionary stage' of Lesage's model focuses on the transition from an individual (or group of individuals) vision to a vision shared by the partners and in which all can participate, the current study (as developed from the experiences and perceptions of alliance establishment participants) focuses on the role of the initiator in the initiation process and the resulting alliance types. In the current study some alliance followed the establishment process as described by Lesage. These alliances were characterised by a collegial approach to decision making and partner participation in the visioning and establishment processes leading to voluntary-type alliances. However, in many cases, the initiator (often a donor) drove the process of alliance initiation including decisions on partners, alliance strategy and objectives and alliance structure and governance leading to constrained choice-type alliances. In these cases, the partners did not necessarily share in the 'vision' for the alliance or the visioning processes. Instead the partner's roles were very much restricted to operational functions, implementation activities and contribution towards alliance objectives and outcomes. In this latter scenario, the other partners' role in the alliance was more akin to that of a contractor or service provider than that of a 'real' partner.

(b) The current study considers these processes as leading to the development of a stable alliance relationship and not just to implementation, execution of commitments or production of deliverables.

Previous work aimed at developing process models of alliance establishment and development has concentrated on a series of stages leading to implementation and the ongoing
functions and operations of the alliance. Evolutionary models have been developed around single or multiple foci of alliance formation such as alliance learning (Doz, 1996, p. 64; Ford et al., 1998, p. 29). The hybrid model of Lesage (2006) is built on three processes: (i) a visionary process; (ii) a team building/learning process; and (iii) a learning/knowledge process. In Lesage's model processes (i) and (ii) come together to influence process (iii) in successful alliances.

In this study, the processes lead to the development of stable alliance relationships. These stable alliance relationships were of such significance to the alliance establishment process that they formed one of the five core categories identified in this study. The dimensions and importance of stable alliance relationships ('Alliance Relationships') is considered detail in Chapter Six.

(c) My representation of 'Processes and Process Issues' acknowledges the complexities of alliance establishment, the interaction of internal and external factors and the multi-dimensionality of these processes.

The conceptualisation of 'Processes and Process Issues' presented earlier in this chapter is consistent with many of the process and evolutionary models developed by other authors. That said, I recognise that this representation of these processes understates the multidimensional nature of alliance establishment, overlaps between processes, the simultaneous operation of processes and sub-processes, the differences between alliance with respect to sub-processes and the interactions between internal and external factors affecting alliance establishment. Examples of these complexities include the contrasting and often extreme qualities of sub-processes and process issues described by different stakeholders from different alliances:
- 'initiated by donor' or 'initiated by like-minded individuals' ('Conception')
- 'targeted partners' or 'alliance open to new partners' ('Bringing the Partners on Board')
- 'negotiated agreement' or 'common understanding' ('Bringing the Partners on Board')
- 'focussed alliance' or 'working together' ('Sorting Out the Detail').

These are considered in further detail in subsequent chapters of this thesis.

**4.4 IMPLICATIONS OF THESE FINDINGS**

The establishment of PPAs is often portrayed by donor organisations, ODA practitioners and other researchers as a fairly simplistic and process-driven. This has resulted in a recipe-type approach to alliance formation (Chapter Two) or the transplanting of 'successful' models to new situations. The complexities of alliance establishment processes, the variability of processes and process issues between alliances, the context-specific nature of ODA programs (for example countries and sectors) and the interaction of a wide range of internal and external factors make it extremely unlikely that a single unified model of alliance establishment could be developed. Clearly, greater attention needs to be given to these complexities, alliance-specific factors, and the way in which these influence the alliance establishment outcome.

Even with these limitations, a uni-dimensional model of alliance establishment is not without utility and a theoretical model of alliance establishment is developed later in this thesis (Chapter Nine) and this is discussed in further in Chapters Ten and Eleven.

The consideration of alliance formation and the establishment of stable alliance relationships is a departure from the focus of previous research in this area. Alliance relationships were a high priority for study participants with respect to alliance establishment and this factor was
elevated to a core category. Alliance relationships are discussed in detail in Chapter Six and considered further in Chapters Nine, Ten and Eleven.

One of the most significant features of the consideration of 'Processes and Process Issues' is the importance of the process 'conception'. This process has been ignored by most other researchers but it is of critical importance in that much of what happens in this process fundamentally affects other processes or flows on through the establishment process. One author, Lesage (2006) has considered the conception stage of alliance establishment but he sees this stage ending in the transfer of the alliance vision (developed by the initiating individual or group) to the alliance partnership. In the current study, the results indicate that in the alliances studied, conception could result in the transfer of the vision from the initiators to the partnership, particularly in the case of alliances initiated by a group of key partners or stakeholders. However, in those cases where the alliance was driven by a donor or strong individual, targeted at the needs of the initiator, and with the partners motivated to join the alliance through provision of resources or other incentives, this was generally not the case. In this later scenario, the alliance vision and strategy often continued to be driven by the donor or strong individual throughout establishment. Thus 'conception' is a key to alliance establishment and must be given appropriate consideration.

4.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided a detailed description of the dimensions, characteristics and properties of the core category 'Processes and Process Issues'. The core category is itself comprised of three sub-processes: 'conception'; 'bringing the partners on board' and 'sorting out the detail'. A linear model has been developed to conceptualise this core category and this model is consistent with the work of other authors on process and evolutionary models of alliance establishment.
While this model is useful, I recognise the limitations of this conceptualisation in representing the complexities of alliance establishment. In Chapter Nine, I develop a more integrated theoretical model of alliance establishment and discuss the utility and implications of this approach in more detail in Chapters Ten and Eleven.

The current study has highlighted the importance of the stage of 'conception'; a process often ignored or given only brief attention by other researchers. 'Conception' is of critical importance in that the outcomes of this sub-process have significant consequences for all other processes and factors affecting alliance establishment. The conception process influenced the 'type' of alliance 'adopted' by the embryonic alliance.

Essentially there were two extremes of alliance type: one in which the initiator exerted considerable power and control over alliance strategy, partner selection, operations and management; and one in which the partners collegiately developed the alliance strategy and operational protocols and featured consensus and partner engagement. The literature refers to the former model as 'constrained choice alliances' and the latter as 'voluntary alliances'. 'Alliance Type' was found to be of such significance that it was elevated to a core category, even though it occurs within the core category of 'Process and Process Issues'. 'Alliance Type' is discussed in detail in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5: ALLIANCE TYPE

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, I defined the first of the core categories developed from the Grounded Theory analysis; 'Processes and Process Issues' and described its dimensions, properties and characteristics. These were then related to the current body of exiting literature on PPAs.

This chapter describes the second of the five core categories identified by this study; 'Alliance Type'. Study participants did not directly identify different types of alliances. They did, however, identify three groups of components which collectively describe alliance types. The chapter commences with a description of these three components, readily identified by the study participants. These components are then used to develop a typology for 'Alliance Type'.

I continue with a definition of 'Alliance Type' and then go on to describe its dimensions, properties and characteristics. The findings of the current study regarding 'Alliance Type' are located within the extant literature and major differences from previous research are identified and discussed.

The importance of 'Alliance Type' relative to other core categories and factors associated with alliance establishment was not initially clear. Following the Grounded Theory study, additional research was carried out on 'Alliance Type' using the theoretical model of alliance establishment described in Chapter nine as a framework for comparative analysis (Chapter Three). The results of this comparative analysis are presented and related back to the initial
research on 'Alliance Type'. These results not only reinforce the importance of 'Alliance Type'; they also support the typology which was developed from the data.

This chapter ends with a consideration of the implications of these findings for this study and for PPA establishment more generally.

5.2 THE CORE CATEGORY 'ALLIANCE TYPE'

As discussed in the previous chapter, the three sub-processes of 'Conception'; 'drivers for initiation', 'initiator' and 'initiation decision' combine to influence the type of embryonic alliance or alliance precursor which results (Fig. 5.1). This core category also picks up the early stages of planning, strategy development and other activities associated with the establishment of the nascent alliance.

Figure 5.1 The Core Category 'Alliance Type' within the Process 'Conception' ('Processes and Process/Issues')

The study participants did not directly identify alliance types. Rather, they identified issues which fitted into three sub-groups: 'initial influence'; 'initiator role in the development of
objectives and strategies'; and 'initiator role in establishment, management and operations' (Fig. 5.2).

**Figure 5.2** The Components of 'Alliance Type'

'Initial influence' is the degree of control that the initiator exerts on the initiation process. There are two extremes; initiator-dominated initiation and initiator-facilitated initiation:

*So (the donor) has initiated the formation of the alliance whose members are from the national agricultural research system in each country. And we identified how this network can work together to give the seniority of a common problem in the region.....*[P11]*

*The farmers decided to group together and form an alliance. They elected a Board of Management to draft by-laws and different polices needed to run the organisation..........*[P10]*

Likewise the initiator may adopt either a dominant or more collegiate approach to the development of alliance objectives and strategies and alliance establishment, management and operational control:
...the steering committee members redefined the constitution, goals and objectives, so that it became a truly regional driven network.............[P11]

There was a framework that the donor had set up and within which the alliance was designed and operated.............[P6]

So in terms of managing the alliance on a day-to-day basis this is the activity of the donor and the Chief of Party.............[P6]

It's a forum in which the members agree on common principles that we will adhere to in the work that the alliance does..........[P5]

The study participant responses under each of the three sub-categories of 'Alliance Type' were used to develop a typology with two extremes, "initiator-imposed" and "partner-driven" alliances (Fig. 5.3).

**Figure 5.3**  A Typology of Alliance Types in Relation to the Categories 'Initial Influence', 'Initiator Role in Objectives and Strategies' and Initiator Role in Establishment, Management and Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Initial Influence</th>
<th>Initiator Role in the Development of Objectives and Strategies</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Establishment, Management and Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Initiator-Imposed&quot;</td>
<td>Donor directs initiation</td>
<td>Donor sets objectives and provides direction</td>
<td>Donor guidelines, requirements and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Partner-Driven&quot;</td>
<td>Partner/core group initiation</td>
<td>Steering committee develops objectives</td>
<td>Steering committee and coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of steering committee</td>
<td>Shared objectives</td>
<td>Management team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This typology closely aligns very closely with the existing literature on alliance types where 'initiator-Imposed' alliances are referred to as 'Constrained Choice Alliances' and 'Partner-Driven Alliances' are known as 'Voluntary Alliances'. In reality, few, if any, of the alliances studies were purely constrained choice or voluntary alliances as described in the literature by authors such as Stephens et al. (2009) (refer section 5.3). The alliances included in this study often had features of both constrained choice and voluntary alliances (in terms of initial influence; initiator role in the development of objectives and strategies; and initiator role in establishment, management and operations) but had a tendency towards either constrained choice or voluntary alliances. In this respect, pure constrained choice and pure voluntary alliances as described by Stephens et al. (2009) can be considered as Weberian Ideal Types (Marshall, 1998, pp. 292-293; Comombo, 2006, pp. 141-142). Thus, in practice the pure forms rarely, if ever, exist but alliances show a tendency towards one form or the other.

In order to avoid confusion between the pure forms of constrained choice and voluntary alliance (ideal types) as described in the literature and the actual alliances observed in this study the later are referred to as constrained choice-type alliances and voluntary-type alliances in the remainder of this thesis.

### 5.3 THE EXISTING BODY OF PPA LITERATURE ON ALLIANCE TYPES

An extensive literature on alliance type in relations to strategic alliance establishment and implementation has developed (Oliver, 1990, pp. 247-249, 259-260; Kanter, 1994; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, pp 101-102; Gulati, 1995a; Khanna et al., 1998; Kogut, 1988; Stephens, et al., 2009, pp. 502-503; Stephens, 2011, p. 10). The extant literature essentially divides alliances into two types: voluntary and non-voluntary (Oliver, 1990, pp. 247-249, 259-260;
Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, pp 101-102; Stephens, et al., 2009, pp. 502-503; Stephens, 2011, p. 10). With voluntary alliances, the relationships and the conditions under which the alliance establishes and develops are mutually acceptable to all of the parties (Stephens et al., 2009, p. 502). In contrast, non-voluntary alliance are formed on the basis of coercion, pressure, or less than acceptable relations for at least one of the parties involved in the alliance (Oliver, 1990, pp. 247-249).

One of the main non-voluntary partnerships is the constrained choice alliance or 'cupid' alliance (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Kanter, 1994; Stephens et al., 2009; Stephens, 2011). A 'cupid' alliance results when an interested party, the 'cupid' organisations forces a relationship between 'target' organisations in order to broker an alliance that that will benefit the 'cupid' organisation (Kanter, 1994, pp. 98-99). The 'cupid' organisation keeps the other potential partners apart thus controlling the flow of resources between them. 'Cupid' organisations do not directly participate in the brokered alliance themselves. Constrained choice alliances are most easily characterised by the lack of partner choice and decision-making associated with whether or not to join the alliance, with whom to partner and the governance structures of the alliance. According to Stephens et al. (2009, p. 503) and Stephens (2011, pp. 10-12) 'cupid' alliances are quite common and they can occur any time a powerful organisation is motivated to force a relationship between other organisations that have significant resources dependencies on the cupid.

Organisations considering joining inter-organisational alliances make three main choices: whether to enter into the alliance (Gulati, 1995a, pp. 105-106; Khanna et al., 1998, pp. 205-208; Kogut, 1988, pp. 320-322); whom to partner with in forming the alliance (Geringer, 1991, pp. 43-45, 53-55; Podolny, 1994, pp. 479-82); and how the alliance should be governed
organised and implemented) (Barney and Hansen, 1994, pp. 177-179, 188-189; Zaheer et al., 1998, pp. 142-146, 153-156). It is these three choices that the real difference between voluntary and constrained choice alliances becomes apparent.

**Whether to Enter Into an Alliance**

Organisations choose to enter into alliances for a range of reasons and these are discussed in detail in Chapter Two. Alliance formation can be seen as a risk reduction strategy, for example, in highly uncertain industries such as mineral exploration, investment banking or creative industries (Hagedoorn, 1993, pp 372-374; Gulati, 1998, pp. 298-299; Khanna et al., 1998, pp. 193-195; Kogut, 1998, pp. 320-324). They can provide access to resources when the alternatives to purchasing them through the open market are not possible and/or when integrating them into the organisations is too costly (Kogut, 1988; pp. 320-322; Hagedoorn, 1993; pp.372-374; Khanna et al., 1998, 193-195).

One of the major factors relating to the decision on whether or not to engage in particular alliance is the concept of ‘embeddedness’ as proposed by Granovetter (1985, pp. 481-483, 487-493) and further developed by Uzzi (1996, pp. 675-677; 1997, pp. 36-38), Sydow and Windeler (1998, pp. 265-269), Sydow et al. (1997/98, p. 50); and Gulati (1995b, pp. 621-628; 1998, pp. 95-98). Embeddedness refers to the degree to which individuals or organisations are involved in a network of existing relationships (Gulati, 1988, 296-298; Stephens, 2011, p.12). It is limited at one end by a lack of social relations and at the other by an overly restrictive set of relations. Embedded social relationships are a key to encouraging trust and discouraging opportunistic behaviour and thus play an important role in the way organisations interact (Granovetter, 1985; pp. 487-493). There are two types of embeddedness: relational and structural (Gulati, 1998, pp. 296-98).
Relational embeddedness emphasises the direct interaction between individuals within a relationship (Gulati, 1998; pp. 296); the prior and current direct ties they have with other organisations. It provides information on likely behaviours and produces trust (Granovetta, 1985, pp. 487-93; Uzzi, 1996, 675-77).

Structural embeddedness refers to the social exchanges resulting from the membership of an organisation within an alliance network (Stephens, 2011, p. 7). It gives rise to the way in which the partners in a network provides access to information about other through indirect ties (Gulati, 1998, pp. 296-98). With structural embeddedness, focal organisations are connected to potential partners to whom the focal organisations are not directly connected. On one hand, structural embeddedness can reduce uncertainty by allowing access to important information about others through indirect ties (Gulati, 1995b, pp. 643-645; Gulati et al., 2000; pp. 212-13).

Such reputational information may give organisations more confidence that a new partner may be trustworthy. However, a tendency to exclusively select partners from the same embedded network can reduce the potential to partner with organisations outside of the network (Uzzi, 1996, 675-77). When an organisation is embedded within a network of organisations that serves as a source of information on potential alliance partners, structural embeddedness may deter the organisation from behaving opportunistically because of the potential reputational ramifications (Gulati, 1998, pp. 296-98).

In voluntary alliances the strategic decision of whether to enter into an alliance is made in two stages: whether to seek the complementary resources through partnership and an
exploration of possible alliance partners (Stephens et al., 2009, p. 510). Partners with direct
ties, organisations with similar status, or organisations with trust and reputational capital in
the organisations' structurally embedded networks provide information that helps resolve the
decision as to whether to partner at all. Organisations may choose to partner again if prior
trustworthy partners are available (Gulati, 1995a, pp. 91-96; Gulati, 1995b, pp. 643-645)
because it reduces relational risk. Alternatively, they may elect not to partner at all if it
requires creating new relationships in which trust has not yet been established (Todeva et al.,

In cupid alliances, the cupid organisation holds the resources that the target organisations
cannot otherwise make or buy. The target organisations still face the decision as to whether
or not to enter into an alliance to obtain the resources. However, they do not have the option
of a two-step process, since they are not free to explore alternative possibilities for partners.
For cupid alliances in which the target parties have no prior experience with each other, they
will not have the benefit of risk and uncertainty reduction through prior ties (Stephens et al.,
operational performance or decrease it given the relative lack of knowledge of each other.

The lack of structural embeddedness in this situation reduces access to information that
would otherwise be available from indirect ties. If cupids broker with organisations that have
both prior ties and structural embeddedness these problems are likely to be fewer. Cupids,
however, are most likely to be found where the partners lack valuable resource
complementarities that would have drawn the organisations together voluntarily.
With Whom to Partner

Choosing a partner is a critical process and may potentially mitigate some of the risks associated with the loss of independence on the part of individual partner organisation which may be encountered upon entering into an alliance (Zhang, 2005, p. 631; Stephens, 2011 p. 6). In the case of voluntary alliances, individual partners are generally free to make decisions regarding with whom to partner. These decisions are based on a range of factors (refer also Chapter Two) including:

- organisations seeking complementary partners must determine the specific task-related skills and resources they may need from the other partners, as well as the relative priority among these needs (Geringer, 1991, p. 54).

- they also generally seek compatible partners who will provide them with knowledge of local markets and offer unique experience and capabilities (Stephens et al., 2009, P. 506).

- organisations are more likely to select alliance partner with similar status (Podony, 1994, p. 458; Li and Berta, 2002, p. 339. This is because: (i) they are more likely to have compatible operating systems; (ii) they are better able to signal the quality of their outputs; and (iii) they are more likely to exhibit increased levels of fairness and commitment in sharing both the cost and benefits of an alliance.

- the greater the market uncertainly, the more that organisations partner with those with who they have transacted in the past (Podony, 1994, p. 458; Gulati, 1995a, pp. 621-727; Gulati, 2000, p. 203-204).

- the positions that organisations hold within their social networks (Gulati, 1998, pp. 293-294; Insch and Steensma, 2006, p. 327).

- the resources that the other partners can provide (Das and Teng, 2000, pp. 493-496). Firms with greater resources will look to alliances for complementary resources.
• organisations seeking long-term alliances will seek partners with substantial capital and infrastructure stability as well as the required resources (Solesvik and Westhead, 2010, p 841).

• organisations tend to form alliances with others in the same industry (Shumate and O'Connor, 2008, p. 14).

• organisations most closely imitate the strategic behaviour of, and tend to partner with, other organisations who occupy the same strategic group or niche rather than other organisations within the same industry (Garcia-Pont and Nohria, 2002, pp. 317-318).

In the case of cupids, the partners have already been selected by the cupid organisation, and the target organisation must either accept or reject that choice (Stephens et al., 2009, p. 511). The decision for the target organisations then becomes one of whether or not with the recommended organisations. If the target organisations accept the alliance, the only remaining latitude in the decision making process is in negotiating the governance mechanisms. They must use the process of negotiating the alliance as a source of information regarding the relational and performance risks associated with each partner, and also negotiate the governance provisions to reduce this risk. Negotiating governance may therefore be complex and difficult.

**Governance Arrangements**

It has been proposed that risks associated with alliance formation fall into two major categories (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, p. 93; Das and Teng, 1998, pp. 494-499). The first is relational risk and is the concern that the partner is untrustworthy and may act opportunistically to the detriment of the partnership. The second is performance risk and refers to the concern that even a trustworthy partner may not be able to deliver on
commitments. Several authors argue that trust is closely related to risk (Mayer et al., 1995, pp. 710-713; Mayer and Argyres, 2004, p. 401, 404, PP. 407-408; Todeva et al., 2004, p. 20). One of the ways that organisations reduce relational risk and performance risk is to draw on the repositories of knowledge and trust found in their inter-organisational networks (Zaheer and Venkatraman, 1995, pp. 378-79).

Trust can be defined as the "willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the action of another party based on the expectations that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control the other party" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 712). Trust and risk are related in that higher levels of perceived risk require greater levels of trust (Bradach and Eccles, 1989, pp. 104-108; Scott and Gable, 1997, p. 108, 113; Das and Teng, 1998, 494-99; Jefferies and Reid, 2000, pp. 874-879; Herzog, 2001, pp. 31-36; Izquierdo and Cillan, 2002, p. 979). When the level of trust does not provide adequate expectations to achieve the threshold for the levels of perceived risk, governance mechanisms can bridge the gap (Bradach and Eccles, 1989, pp. 104-108; Davis et al., 1997, pp. 42-43; Ring and Van der Ven, 1992, pp. 484-490; Jefferies and Reid, 2000, pp. 874-879; Herzog, 2001, pp. 31-36). Much has been written about the importance of governance in alliances and how this can be used to minimise the risks present in establishing alliances. Among these considerations have been studies on planning (Das and Teng, 1998, pp. 494-99), governance structures (Casciaro, 2003), information asymmetry (Feller et al., 2009), social ties (Kim, 2011), network effects (Robinson and Stuart, 2006) and strategic fit, contractual and procedural governance (Nielsen, 2010).

Barney and Hansen (1994, pp. 176-182) developed a typology of trustworthiness that incorporates both trust and governance. This typology identifies three forms of trust. The
first is 'weak form trust', which is achieved when the partnership involves no significant trust issues for the individual organisations (Barney and Hansen, 1994, pp. 176-182). The second is 'strong form trust', which can be the result of either an organisational culture that holds the values of stronger form trust, or characteristics of the particular individuals involved in the partnership that make them trustworthy (Barney and Hansen, 1994; pp. 176-182). The third type is 'semi-strong form trust', which results from complex governance structures, such as contracts, that define appropriate behaviours as well as penalties for failure to meet expectations (Barney and Hansen, 1994, pp. 176-182).

Semi-strong form trust allows organisations to engage in relationships because they can protect potential vulnerabilities with governance structures that enforce disincentives for engaging in opportunistic behaviour. Greater disincentives for opportunistic behaviour often results in elaborated governance structures, while increases both negotiation and coordination costs (Barney and Hansen, 1994, pp. 176-182; McAllister, 1995, pp. 51-54; Gulati, 1998, pp. 302-04; Zaheer et al., 1998, pp. 153-56).

In cupid alliances weak-form trust, in which neither party is highly vulnerable to the other, is unlikely to exist. This is due to asymmetries that exist due one or more partners possessing more power and control than the other. As the potential benefits are external to the alliances themselves, incentives in the relationship shift from what each target can gain from each other to what each target might gain independently from the cupids. The presence of third party rewards may make target firms highly vulnerable both to one another and to the demands of cupids.
Strong form trust also is not likely to exist between any partners that do not have the benefits of information that results from relational embeddedness. The most likely situation for cupid alliances is the need to develop semi-strong for trust through the development of effective governance mechanisms, and these are likely to be very costly. This situation is further complicated when lack of prior trust means that some form of trust must be established during the negotiation process. This trust will be difficult to establish since benefits are individual (targets benefit from cupids and not one another) and external to the partnership.

Managing performance risk through governance mechanisms also may be challenging. Cupids will measure the success of the alliances on the basis of the benefits that they reap from the relationships. The cupids' motivations are likely to differ from those of the target organisations (Stephens et al., 2009, pp. 511-512). For example, cupids may be rewarded simply by signing an agreement among the target organisations, leaving them to figure out how to implement it. Cupids also may press for certain alliance forms, reducing the ability of the target organisation to select less process-intensive forms and flexible provisions such as incremental short-term contracts.

In some multi-party cupid alliances, it is possible that some targets chosen by cupids have existing direct network ties while other targets do not (Insch and Steensma, 2006, p. 327, pp. 334-335). In such cases, there will be imbalances across alliance partners in their abilities to assert trust and reduce risk. This imbalance can add another element of uncertainty as coalitions may develop and some parties may be more vulnerable than others.

A particularly interesting cupid alliance occurs when the target organisations have no prior alliance experience with each other (Tedeva, et al., 2004, p.19). This lack of history, or
relational unembeddedness, means that the target organisations have no direct experience upon which to base expectations. In voluntary alliances relational embeddedness is important and organisations tend to choose as future alliance partners other with whom they have had prior direct alliance relationships in an attempt to reduce the risks of entering new alliances (Osborn and Hagedoorn, 1997, pp. 266-271). The dynamics by which cupid organisations put target organisations in relationally unembedded alliance situations have yet to be explored in the research literature.

Research has confirmed the importance of the initial conditions of collaboration, such as power dependency, during establishment in influencing the dynamics of the alliance relationship (Van de Ven and Walker, 1984, pp. 617-619). Mandated relationships such as cupid alliances have the potential to adversely affect these interactions and produce tension and perceptions of lower cooperation (Hall et al., 1977, 469-470). For voluntary alliances, the uncertainly regarding trustworthiness of new partners can be mitigated through information flows from structural embeddness (relationship with other organisations in a formal network), however this mechanism is absent where the decision on entering an alliance in constrained.

In this case, relational embeddness (relationship with other individuals) is important. If partners in a constrained choice alliance have not worked together before, then trust may actually reduce during the establishment leading to a dysfunctional alliance. In voluntary alliances, the partners are relatively free to decide with whom to partner and can make this decision based on factors such as strategic fit, comparable status and power and complementary of skills.
For constrained choice alliances these dynamics are not at work and the capacity of the partners to choose appropriate and potentially ideal partners is severely constrained. The weak trust associated with constrained choice alliances could potentially be mitigated to some extent through the alliance governance arrangements. However, often the donor is prescriptive or dominant in this regard and the partners have little or no choice in the alliance governance structure. There may be, therefore, asymmetry in regard to factors such as trust, risk and power between the partners with the potential for alliance dysfunction and suboptimal outcomes.

5.4 THE IMPORTANCE OF 'ALLIANCE TYPE' IN ALLIANCE ESTABLISHMENT

I initially considered 'Alliance Type' as a sub-category under 'Conception'. However, as the study progressed it became increasingly apparent that the study participants were of the view that issues associated with the sub-groups under 'Alliance Type' (Fig. 5.2) were of critical importance to alliance establishment. This combined with the typology (in which the sub-categories are closely associated with alliance type) and the importance of alliance type in the established body of literature on alliance types caused me to re-examine the status of this factor.

I decided that additional research was required to identify whether 'Alliance Type' was of sufficient importance to be elevated to the level of a core category and to develop a more in-depth understanding of 'Alliance Initiation' and its role in alliance establishment. This was achieved by answering the research question: What is the relationship between 'Alliance Type' and the core categories 'Process/Process Issues', 'Alliance Leadership', 'Modifiers
(overlaying factors)’ and ‘Alliance Relationships’ and does alliance type affect the concerns of the participants and the decision making processes associated with the establishment of strategic public-private alliances? To this end a comparative analysis of seven PPAs (four constrained choice-type PPAs and three voluntary-type PPAs (refer Appendix G)), using the conceptual model developed in Chapter Nine as a research framework, was carried out (Chapter Three).

5.4.1 Comparative Analysis

The framework for this comparative analysis is the ‘Theoretical Model of the Establishment of Public-Private Alliances in Overseas Development Assistance Programs’ developed and further explained in Chapter Nine. This model is comprised of the five core categories detailed in Chapters Four to Eight: ‘Processes and Process Issues’; ‘Alliance Type’; ‘Alliance Relationships’; ‘Alliance Leadership’ and ‘Modifiers’ (overlaying factors) (Fig. 5.4).

Four ‘Constrained Choice-type’ and three ‘Voluntary-type’ alliances were identified for the comparative analysis as described in section 3.6.2.1. Using this framework, the aggregated codes from the study participant interviews were grouped under these core categories for comparison of ‘Constrained Choice-type’ and ‘Voluntary-type’ alliances. The results of the comparative analysis are presented in tabular form in Appendix I (Tables 1 to 21) and summarised in Table 5.1.
Figure 5.4  A Theoretical Model of the Establishment of Public-Private Alliances in Overseas Development Assistance Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Type</th>
<th>Core Categories</th>
<th>Modifiers</th>
<th>Alliance Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type</td>
<td>- Mechanism for investment by donor - Donor strategy - Donor initiation - Core partner initiation - Donor decision to invest - Convince donor to invest - Processes imposed by donor - Donor sets objectives and strategy - Donor involvement in the details of implementation</td>
<td>- Donor as leader - Donor representative provides leadership - Leadership provided by core partners - Implementer involved in the details of establishment - Strong leadership - Directing - Leadership appointed by donor - Formal recognition of leader</td>
<td>- Focussed individuals - Driven individuals - Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type</td>
<td>- Common purpose - Common view</td>
<td>- Commercial opportunities - Commercial opportunities - Core group - Key individuals - Personal relationships - Commitment</td>
<td>- Seeking closer relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1  Summary of Comparative Analysis of Core Categories With Respect to Alliance Initiation
- Initiation by key individuals
- Joint initiation
- Multiple initiators
- Like-minded individuals
- Agreement to establish alliance
- Partners form steering committee
- Steering committee develops objectives and strategy
- Management by steering committee
- Partners free to come and go

- Government agenda
- Introduction to alliance through individuals
- Open invitation to join
- Request to join
- Core partners
- Secondary partners
- Informal partners
- Complementary
- Accepting of others
- Natural fit
- Differences in contributions
- Balance
- Assigned responsibilities
- Varying levels of commitment
- Agreement to work together
- Gaining agreement
- Shared goals
- Flexible goals
- Problems solving
- Reaching consensus
- Building networks
- Joint problem solving
- Informal/flexible

- Informal leadership
- No clear leadership
- Tension between emerging leadership
- Steering
- Mentor
- Holds alliance together
- Appointed by partners
- Unofficial
- Changing leadership
- Identified leader

- Alliance politics
- Building relationships
- Cementing relationships
- Cohesive, open relationships
- Relationship with individuals
- All partners equally involved
- Partnerships
- Friendships
- Sense of belonging
- Respecting individuals
- Working together
- Openness
- Structure not linked to function
- Power and control
- Lack of trust
- Conflicts of interest
- Divergence of views
- Potential competition
- Alliance pulled in many directions
- Reliance on government
- Meets partners needs
- Build community
- Sharing a vision
- Long-term benefits
- Benefits from relationships
5.4.2 Alliance Conception (Chapter Four)

In the case of both constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances the Conception process commences with a driver for initiation such as a focus issue, problem, identified need or the failure of an existing modality. However, for constrained choice-type alliances this driver was often an opportunity for the initiator (often a donor), a mechanism for investment by the donor or part of a donor strategy. With voluntary-type alliances, the driver could also be a collective view of purpose on the part of the potential partners.

The initiator, in the case of constrained choice-type alliances was a donor, a dominant potential partner or a project implementing agency or contractor. Initiation in these alliances occurred in one of two ways. In the first, the donor (or other initiator) decided to initiate the alliance (often using a pre-determined or pre-existing model) and a 'request for proposal' or 'contestable process' was sometimes used to identify the potential alliance partners and/or the alliance implementer.

With a second style, a dominant potential partner, core partners or implementer approached the donor with an opportunity or potential new modality (Appendix I, Table 2). In this case the onus was on the initiator to convince the donor to invest and for the donor to make an investment decision. Where the donor did decide to invest, then they essentially took over the driving of the initiation process. With voluntary-type alliances, the initiator was generally key individuals, stakeholders or stakeholder representatives and there was often joint or multiple initiators (often from a range of potential partner organisations). These key individuals were 'like-minded' and they agreed to form a steering committee and/or alliance. In some cases a donor representative was one of the key individuals but, in other cases, the
embryonic alliance or steering committee requested assistance from the donor, with the donor responding by entering the partnership.

The data for alliance initiation not only supported the findings of the grounded theory research and the typology developed in Fig. 5.3, but it also provided additional data which allowed this typology to be enhanced (Fig. 5.5). In constrained choice-type alliances, the initiation of the alliance was directed or imposed by the donor (or dominant initiator). The donor set, or significantly influenced, the development of objectives and PPA strategy and the establishment, management and operation of the PPA were 'controlled' by the donor through direct intervention, imposition of rules and regulations or through close management of an appointed implementation agency or contractor.

For voluntary-type alliances, initiation was more participatory with the process directed by an elected leadership, steering committee formed by the partners; a core group of partners or in some cases, the model evolves from a prior organisation or relationship. Objectives and strategy in this case were developed and implemented by a steering committee made up of the partners and the establishment, management and operation of the alliance is a collegiate process facilitated by a steering committee of the partners, key individuals or management appointed by the partners by generally with participation by the major partners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Initial Influence</th>
<th>Initiator Role in the Development of Objectives and Strategies</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Establishment, Management and Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constrained Choice-type</td>
<td>Donor directs initiation</td>
<td>Donor sets objectives and provides direction</td>
<td>Donor guidelines, requirements and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td><em>Processes imposed by donor</em></td>
<td><em>Donor 'drives the bus'</em></td>
<td><em>Donor involved in details of implementation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Donor power and control</em></td>
<td><em>Donor framework</em></td>
<td><em>Donor reporting framework</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>Partner/core group initiation</td>
<td>Steering committee develops objectives</td>
<td>Steering committee and coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of steering committee</td>
<td>Shared objectives</td>
<td>Management team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Core partners influence decisions</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Key individuals</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Open forum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Importance of steering committee</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, during the 'Conception' process, the focus for constrained choice-type alliances was on the donor (or other dominant initiators) particularly with respect to the initiator and the decision to initiate an alliance Appendix I, Tables 2 and 3). In the case of voluntary-type alliances, the 'Conception' process was often driven by collective views and purpose and initiated by groups of individuals representing several potential partner or stakeholder groups in a collegiate initiation process with like-minded individuals agreeing to establish an alliance or the pre-cursor of an alliance. These results support those of Stephens *et al.* (2009) and
Oliver (1990) who found that a major difference between constrained and voluntary alliances is that, in the former, the choice on whether or not to enter the partnership is constrained and dominated by the actions of the initiator.

5.4.3 Other Process/process Issues (Chapter Four)

'Bringing the Partners on Board'

At the initial interest stage of alliance establishment, in both constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances, the motivations to join the alliance as stated by the study participants appeared to be consistent with the individual partner priorities (Appendix I, Table 4). While constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances shared many of the same partner motivations for joining the alliance, in the case of voluntary alliances, additional motivations related to the commercial priorities of the partners (e.g. consistency of supply, relationship with input providers). This is consistent with the tendency for voluntary-type alliances to be initiated and managed by a consortium of core partners or partner representatives. In some cases of constrained choice-type alliances the motivations to join the alliance was driven by the donor and included specific development objectives (for example, poverty reduction, reaching and poor farmers), public good and country government strategic objectives.

In regard to the selection and initial approach of alliance partners, for constrained choice-type alliances, alliance partners were generally approached by the donor or alliance implementer and invited to join. For voluntary-type alliances, partners could be either introduced to the alliance through existing partners or networks, approach the alliance to become members or join as a result of an open forum. In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, the
partners were mostly 'formal' organisations such as public and private sector organisations, implementing agencies and contractors and international organisations (e.g. CGIAR centres) (Appendix I, Table 5).

Partners were identified or targeted by the alliance initiator (generally the donor) or implementer and this was based on technical merit, experience, track record or potential to contribute to the alliance. With voluntary-type alliances, in addition to 'formal' partners there was often also a range of industry partners, informal partners and grower representative bodies. In this case the partners either approached the alliance for membership or were invited to join and specific skills set, natural fit, balance, representation, and representation of the range of stakeholders was all considerations. Partners generally appeared to be more complementary and accepting of other additional partners.

During the stage of bringing the partners on board, there was no apparent difference between constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances in the way in which support was gained for joining the alliance at either the organisation (that is, organisation or sector support) or within the organisation (in particular, gaining support and commitment from parent organisation senior management) (Appendix I, Table 6).

With constrained choice-type alliances the negotiation process was mainly about clarity and developing of shared understanding around the roles and responsibilities of each of the partners and what each would contribute to the alliance (Appendix I, Table 7). In general, this process was not so much participatory as directed by the donor or implementer and agreed to (sometimes with reservation) by the partners. Negotiation ended in a firm commitment by each partner to the alliance and the assigned roles and responsibilities and
contributions. For voluntary-type alliance partners focussed on the differences in contributions (as a result of differences in partner size, power and commitment to the alliance). Negotiations centred on bargaining, facilitated negotiations and reaching agreement regarding roles and responsibilities and the partner contributions to the alliance. The resulting commitment to the alliance appeared to be less firm or formal than for constrained choice alliances and partners used terms like varying levels of commitment, no formal commitment and additional commitment.

'Sorting Out the Detail'

With constrained choice-type alliances, alliance goal and objective development was often driven by the donor (or initiator) and the focus was on getting alignment between the partner goals and objectives and the donor goals and objectives (Appendix I, Table 8). The alliance goals and objectives reflected the donor goals and objectives and the partners had little or no say in the development of the alliance goals and objectives. For voluntary-type alliances, the alliance goals and objectives were developed collaboratively and agreed between the partners. There was some conflict between individual partner organisation goals and objectives and alliance goals and objectives, but the alliance goals and objectives were made broad and flexible to accommodate this where possible.

During the development of the alliance principles of operation, with constrained choice-type alliances there appeared to be a greater tendency to use previous PPA models and either transplant or replicate these in the new situation (Appendix I, Table 9). The alliance implementation was driven by the implementer with a focus on systematic processes, checks and balances, validation, accountability and risk management. The resulting alliances tended to be focussed on process, mechanistic and quite rigid. For voluntary-type alliances,
the alliance models tended to emerge or evolve and this was often still continuing late in the establishment process.

The alliance implementation was driven by small groups, core partners or elected/appointed management staff and the focus was on joint problem solving, building networks, two-way communication flows and on the needs of the stakeholders. Alliance management operations were carried out collegiately and on a consensus basis. Active participation from the partners in all aspects of the establishment and implementation, working together, transparency, consensus and a culture of respect were features of the resulting voluntary alliances.

With regard to formality within the alliance and alliance establishment processes, for constrained choice-type alliances, formal agreements, formal structures and rules and formal reporting and operating arrangements were features of the alliance (Appendix I, Table 10). In voluntary alliances, there were often no formal agreements or informal and non-binding agreements. The structure of the alliance was simple and loose, but there was a desire amongst the partners for more formality. Operating arrangements within the voluntary-type alliances was organised but informal with a tendency to an evolution towards formality.

5.4.4 'Alliance Relationships', 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Modifiers'

'Alliance Type' also had a significant influence on the core categories: 'Alliance Relationships', 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Modifiers'. The details of these relationships and interactions are discussed in detail in Chapter Six ('Alliance Relationships'), Chapter Seven ('Alliance Leadership') and Chapter Eight ('Modifiers'), although comparative data associated with these core categories has been included in Table 5.1 for completeness.
5.5 'ALLIANCE TYPE' AS A CORE CATEGORY

The comparative analysis and the close fit between the findings of other researchers and those reported here, supports my decision to replace 'initiator imposed' and 'partner driven' alliance types developed in the grounded theory analysis with 'constrained choice-type' and 'voluntary-type' alliances respectively as per the established literature on PPAs. In addition, the typology of alliance types developed in Fig. 5.3 could be enhanced as detailed in Fig. 5.5.

As discussed in the extant literature regarding alliance types, a range of authors support the view that organisations considering joining an alliance make three main decisions: whether to enter into the alliance; with whom to partner and how the alliance should be governed. These choices are the source of the main difference between voluntary-type and constrained choice-type alliances (Geringer, 1991, pp. 43-45, 53-55; Barney and Hansen, 1994, pp. 177-179, 188-189; Podony, 1994, pp 479-82; Gulati, 1995a, pp. 105-106; Khanna et al., 1998, pp. 205-208 ; Kogut, 1988, pp. 320-322; Zaheer et al., 1998, pp. 142-146, 153-156).

The current research supports the findings of these authors and the range of studies comparing constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances. In general, constrained choice-type alliances in this study were initiated by donors who maintained control and influence throughout the establishment process. With these alliances, the ability of the partners to make informed decisions on whether to enter the alliance, their ability to choose appropriate partners, their influence over the design of alliance governance and their involvement in the management and decision making processes of the alliance were severely constrained. The resulting alliances were process driven, mechanistic, with partners focussing on individual benefits.
Voluntary-type alliances were initiated by groups of like-minded individuals, or key individuals with alliance establishment progressed through steering committees, elected representative and open consultation. New partners were often targeted to meet the needs of the alliance by way of specific skills sets or additional resources but existing partners were involved in the 'recruitment' process. In these alliances, partners were able to make informed decisions about entering the alliance, were involved in partner selections and had the opportunity to participate in alliance decision-making and management. Features of these alliances included networking, partners working together, transparency, less formality and a culture of respect for individual partners. The alliance relationships were associated with shared goals, openness and shared visions.

However while the extensive literature focuses the differences between constrained choice and voluntary alliances in terms of whether to enter into an alliance, who to ally with and the nature of the governance structures, the comparative analysis of constrained choice and voluntary alliances found that in addition to these (predominantly located within the core categories 'Processes/Process Issues' and 'Alliance Type') there were also important difference with respect to the core categories 'Alliance Leadership', 'Modifiers' and 'Alliance Relationships'. For example, in the case of constrained choice-type alliances donors often appointed formal alliance leadership and the partners had little or no involvement in the decision making and management associated with the alliance.

In these cases, the alliances were often process and donor-outcomes dominated with partners focussing on individual benefits and dysfunction ranging from game playing and rivalry to hidden agendas and information asymmetry. Voluntary-type alliances however were generally managed and governed through groups of core partners or management committees
comprised of the core partners. These alliance relationships were associated with shared goals, openness and shared visions, but there were dysfunctions ranging from the formation of clubs and cliques, personality clashes, divergent views, competition between partners and lack of common understanding.

What appear to be of particular importance are the initiation processes (constrained or open) and the type of alliance that is initiated (that is, a tendency towards a constrained choice model or a tendency towards a voluntary model). This, in turn, has a significant impact on the other processes ('bringing the partners on board' and 'sorting out the detail'), the nature of 'Alliance Leadership', the dynamics and characteristics of the 'Alliance Relationship' and to a lesser extent, the influence on 'Modifiers'. Thus this comparative analysis has demonstrated the importance of 'Alliance Type' in the establishment of PPAs and this supports the elevation of the key attribute to the status of a core category. In the Theoretical Model, 'Initiator Influence'; 'initiator role in the development of objectives and strategy'; and 'initiator role in establishment, management and operations' are retained as categories under 'Alliance Type'.

Thus 'Alliance Type' is of fundamental importance in the establishment of PPAs and the comparative analysis combined with a consideration of the established literature support the elevation of 'Alliance Type' to a core category.

The results of the current study differ from those reported in the established literature in two other respects:

(a) The literature to date discusses alliances in terms of either voluntary or constrained choice. However, many of the alliances included in the study exhibited characteristics of both constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances (for example,
they varied with regard to the dominance and influence of the initiator in the initiation and subsequent processes, the ability of the partners to make informed decisions about alliance membership and the involvement of the partners in partner selection, alliance governance decisions and alliance management). Pure forms of constrained choice or voluntary alliances were less common. That said, all of the alliances in the study had a leaning towards one type or the other. Thus this work appears to show that alliance types of constrained choice alliances and voluntary alliances as described in the literature can be regarded as Weberian Ideal Types (Marshall, 1998, pp. 292-293; Colombo, 2006, pp. 141-142).

(b) According to Stephens et al. (2009, p. 503) and Stephens (2011, pp. 10-12), in constrained choice alliances ('Cupids') the initiator of the alliance does not directly participate in the brokered alliance. While the alliances classified as constrained choice alliances in this study shared many of the characteristics associated with 'cupid' alliances (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Kanter, 1994; Stephens et al., 2009; Stephens, 2001) they differ from the description by Stephens in that in many cases the initiator did participate directly in the management and operation of the alliance. The differences were particularly noticeable when the initiator was a donor. This may be a characteristic of PPAs in ODA and is a potential area for further investigation.

5.6 IMPLICATIONS OF THESE FINDING

The results of this study show that 'Alliance Type' is of fundamental importance to alliance establishment. While 'Alliance Type' has been studied in detail as an individual factor in alliance performance and success it has been ignored by previous researchers as a component of an integrated model of alliance establishment. The results of the current study show that the process of 'Conception' influences 'Alliance Type' and that 'Alliance Type' is central to the
further establishment of the alliance through its influence on all of the other core categories associated with alliance establishment.

The importance of the initial conditions of collaboration during Conception has been confirmed by the work of researchers such as Van der Ven and Walker, 1984, pp. 617-619). In this stage there is the potential for tension between the partners, low trust and perceptions of low co-operation. This is particularly the case if the partners have not previously worked together. In voluntary-type alliances, these issues may be mitigated through the flow of information about potential partners from networks and by the freedom to choose partners and governance mechanisms. The sub-optimal conditions of constrained choice alliance formation (i.e. conditions imposed by the initiator) may also result in asymmetries in regard to trust, risk and power. Due consideration must be given, therefore, to 'Alliance Type' during alliance establishment.

While the literature appears to portray alliances as either constrained choice or voluntary, I did not find this to be the case in the current study. Many of the alliances exhibited characteristics of both alliance types, although they generally have a leaning towards one type or the other. For example, with some of the alliances studied, the alliance formation was initially driven by the initiator, but the initial partners were involved in subsequent partner selection or in alliance strategy development and management. In the case of some initially voluntary alliances, strong partners within the consortium gained prominence, controlling subsequent partner selection and alliance operation. I propose that 'Constrained Choice and 'Voluntary' alliances as described in the literature be regarded as Weberian Ideal Types with most alliances, in reality, tending towards either one form or the other. An implication of this is that not all alliances 'behaved' in accordance with the predictions of previous studies.
Some of the voluntary-type alliances exhibited low trust, poor commitment and dysfunctional partner behaviours on account of the emergence of strong leadership or the formation of factions. Several of the constrained choice-type alliances evolved into mature alliances where the partners were actively involved in alliance establishment in one case resulting in the formation of an alliance steering committee. In all cases, the initiator retained at least some form of direct involvement and influence in alliance establishment and subsequent implementation. This alludes to the complex nature of alliance establishment and the influence and integration of other factors which are discussed in subsequent chapters.

5.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter has defined and described the core category 'Alliance Type'; a core category within the process of 'Conception'. While 'Alliance Type' has been considered by many researchers in regard to alliance success and performance, it has been examined in isolation and not as part of the integrated processes associated with alliance establishment.

Through 'Alliance Type' the earliest factors involved in alliance establishment significantly affect all other core categories. This confirms the importance of 'Alliance Type' but also 'Conception' more generally.

Thus 'Alliance Type' is central to alliance establishment because of its influence over the other parts of 'Processes and Process Issues' and the other core categories of 'Alliance Relationships' (Chapter Six); 'Alliance Leadership (Chapter Seven) and 'Modifiers' (Chapter Eight).
The core category 'Alliance Relationships' is particularly interesting for two reasons. Firstly, 'Alliance Relationships' essentially marks the end of the alliance establishment processes. Secondly 'Alliance Relationships' are the very essence of the alliances as described by the study participants and thus influence the nature of the emerging alliance. These are further discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6: ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIPS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter I defined and described the second of the five core categories developed in the Grounded Theory analysis; 'Alliance Type'.

'Alliance Relationships' is the third core category identified by the Grounded Theory analysis. As previously discussed in this study, stable alliance relationships are the result of the establishment processes, that is, alliance establishment can be seen as leading to the development of stable alliance relationships. Therefore, this core category marks the end of the processes of alliance establishment but is, in reality, a transition between alliance establishment and alliance implementation. Because of this and the importance of these relationships in alliance establishment, 'Alliance Relationships' was acknowledged as a core category.

This chapter defines 'Alliance Relationships' and describes its dimensions, properties and characteristics. These are related to the extant literature on alliance relationships to develop a greater understanding of this core category based on previous research and to identify areas where the current study adds to this established body of knowledge.

I continue this chapter with a discussion on the interactions between 'Alliance Relationships', 'Processes and Process Issues' and 'Alliance Types' and conclude with the implications of these for the current study and alliance establishment more generally.
6.2 THE CORE CATEGORY 'ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIPS'

'Alliance Relationships' are the stable and sustainable relationships that develop during and a result of the alliance establishment processes. These relationships influence the nature of the resulting alliance and their importance was widely recognised by the study participants.

*I think that the alliance relationship is really important in our terms of reference of working together. The question is always asked - like why is it that after these years this alliance is still together and the other industry associations are on and off.....[P6]*

*I think that alliance relationships are critical. ........because the group has been together pretty well, I guess, for four years we've had a consistent membership and so a good relationship can build up and that allows communication.....[P11]*

*If you look at the alliance now everything is based on trust. If we don't have this trust then it's useless doing all these things. Now we have inculcated the minds of all members, that we are doing everything for the benefit of everybody......... [P10]*

The study participants described 'Alliance Relationships' in terms of four dimensions. These are captured by the four sub-categories of this core category: 'Relationship Interactions'; 'Relationship Characteristics'; 'Relationship Performance'; and 'Relationship Dysfunction' (Fig. 6.1).
'Relationship Interactions' pertains to the nature of the relationship or former relationships between the partners, for example:

It worked out of two independent projects that were started in the early 1990s.

So the donor said "well since these are addressing things that are inter-related in farmer's fields they should be addressed through a larger consortium that could bring in more partners". [P1]

'Relationship Interactions' is itself comprised of four groups of factors (sub-groups): 'prior relationships'; 'partnership evolution/development'; 'types of relationship'; and 'general dynamics' (Fig. 6.2). These are described below.
'Prior relationships' includes prior association between some or all of the alliance partner organisations and individuals (for example existing alliances and personal relationships). These prior relationships can be important in that they may increase the trust between partners engendering commitment and a willingness to accept risk (Hall *et al.*, 1977, 469-470; Van de Ven and Walker, 1984, pp.617-619).

*So Bill is a friend of mine. So when he told me that he is now with this company promoting these kinds of projects I said, why don’t you do this with me...and that is how we began.........[P2]*

'Prior relationships' is related to 'partnership evolution/development' insofar as alliances with prior relationships focussed on "strengthening relationships" and "cementing relationships". Those without prior associations concentrated on "new partnerships" and "developing relationships".
Yeah, well I guess getting to know each other is really important.

What are their real objectives? Can we work with these people?........[P9]

'General dynamics' describes the range of interactions between the partners in the alliance. Examples of these as identified by the study participants include "linking with the private sector", "seeking a more formal alliance" and "all partners equally involved". 'Prior relationships', 'partnership evolution/development' and 'general dynamics' interacted with other factors to influence the 'type of relationship'.

I'm very comfortable with the implementer because although we don't really agree as much, we understand each other, OK. And we respect each other and if there is a problem, just tell them and they get to even assist to solve the problem........[P9]

Most everything here gets done based on relationships. It's very difficult for a foreign organisation to move in and operate independently without working through relationships and contacts which we have cultivated over the years......[P6]

'Types of relationships' describes the resulting relationships, and this varied widely between alliances. In the case of alliances which were dominated by the initiator, the resulting alliances were often formalised and strategic. In voluntary alliances, where the partners had greater involvement in alliance establishment," informal" and "open" relationships were common. With constrained choice alliances "formal" and "strategic" relationships often developed.
Relationship Behaviours

The second sub-category, 'Relationship Behaviours' (Fig. 6.1), includes those behaviours which affect the operation of the relationship. This includes a range of relationship behaviours and characteristics such as trust, respect, goodwill and excitement with respect to the PPA relationship (Appendix J). As an example:

*It's a consensus. We try to make decisions in a consensual manner. That's been the practice and it has been working well.* [P3]

'Relationship behaviours' is comprised of three sub-groups: 'relationship linkages'; 'partner behaviours'; and 'alliance behaviour' (Fig. 6.3).

Figure 6.3 The Components of the Sub-Category 'Relationship Behaviours'

'Relationship linkages' describes the types of associations between the partners. There was some overlap between 'relationship linkages' and 'type of relationship'.

*Well I'm an implementer and on a day-to-day basis I'm in charge.*

*In terms of the conceptual aspects it's a dialogue between us and*
the donor who was heavily involved...and we had a management committee and sometimes representatives from the private sector and government line agencies.....[P6]

The behaviour of the individual partners during alliance establishment is captured by the by the sub-group 'partner behaviours' (for example "connected", "dedicated").

The characteristics of the individual partners are very, very important. You have to have trust and credibility. You need to be able to talk to the other partners on their level. So personal traits of competence are important, of the kind of people in the network...........[P11]

The final sub-group under this sub-category, 'alliance behaviour' describes the behaviour of the alliance as a discrete entity or organisational structure (for example the alliance working together with other stakeholders and organisations).

..........one of the attractive things with the alliance is that there's a culture in the organisation of respecting all the members.......[P5]

'Alliance behaviour' is related to 'relationship linkages' and 'partner behaviours' but is also affected by a wide range of other factors.

I think the most important thing is openness with each other.

That's the most important thing, to keep the organisation going.

and also it will not die a natural death........[P10]
Relationship Dysfunctions

'Relationship Dysfunctions' (Fig. 6.1) describes a range of adverse partnership issues and characteristics which impact negatively on the relationship. This subcategory includes exercise of uneven power, conflict between the partners, internal competition for funding and resources, divergence of perspectives and strategies and 'game playing' (Appendix J). For example:

What's changed is that membership of the steering committee has changed and one of the partners dropped out. As they were an important member it was a very serious challenge to the way the project was going to be implemented and we had a long period where we tried to look for another public sector leader on an international scale who could fill this role....[P2]

Some of the partners have not been easy to work with. Their institutions have been incredibly bureaucratic and things have not gone as smoothly as they should. They are running many different agendas on what to do with the funding.....[P3]

Because of the nature and size of its contributions one of the partners wanted more participation and although it's not in writing they have demanded more say in the running of the alliance.....[P2]

'Relationship Dysfunctions' has five sub-groups: 'model dysfunction'; 'partner interaction'; 'partner behaviours'; 'cohesion'; and 'implementation issues' (Fig. 6.4).
'Model dysfunctions' include a range of adverse issues associated directly or indirectly with the alliance model, resulting in inefficiencies or causing problem during establishment (for example, "lack of flexibility", "bureaucracy"). 'Partner interaction' describes dysfunctions inherent in the establishment of relationships and interaction between alliance partners during establishment, for example "hidden agendas" and "inappropriate use of power and control".

I said "You better make the difference between are we partners or are we working for you?" I mean there is a big difference......[P9]

A range of dysfunctional partner organisation and partner individual behaviours (for example, "game playing") were manifest during alliance establishment and these are described in 'partner behaviour'.

---

I said "You better make the difference between are we partners or are we working for you?" I mean there is a big difference......[P9]
I guess some groups can be very single minded and they cannot always tell you the full story behind something or just selectively give you information......[P9]

'Cohesion' in the context of relationship dysfunction describes the manifestations of disunity within the alliance partners, for example "factions".

'Implementation issues' captures a range of dysfunctions (for example, "competition between partners") which became apparent during alliance establishment. These issues are wide ranging and vary widely between alliances.

A problem with the alliance has been frequent misunderstanding:

misunderstanding in terms of responsibilities different parts of implementation, you know.........[P9]

Relationship Performance

'Relationship Performance' (Fig. 6.1) refers to participants' perceptions and indicators of the success or otherwise of the alliance, including satisfaction with the model, perceived achievement of alliance objectives and meeting stakeholder expectations. For example:

Well, overall I just want to say that it's really a successful implementation program. We had fun implementing it but we learned a lot and because of that we are looking at continuing the relationship......[P3]
The study participants perceived alliance relationship performance along three dimensions. These are captured by the three sub-groups: 'benefits for partners'; 'satisfaction with the model'; and 'alliance performance' (Fig. 6.5).

Figure 6.5  The Components of the Sub-Category 'Relationship Performance'

And you develop friendships and you develop that relationship.

And this is one thing value added here, it is not just activities that come out of the alliance. By bringing them together as a network they communicate directly with each other outside the alliance..........[P11]

The perceived performance of the alliance structure as a relationship model for delivering ODA programs is captured in the sub-group 'satisfaction with model'.
And they were looking for successful partnership models like this because the donor had no concrete cases of their own to talk about. 

It was possible for the alliance to meet its objectives and deliver significant benefits and impact but still be viewed by some participants as an unsatisfactory or unsuccessful modality. The reverse was also true. Therefore, study participants were able to perceive the success of the PPA along at least two dimensions; the performance of the PPA model and the performance of the PPA against its stated goals and objectives.

'Alliance performance' describes the general (perceived) performance of the alliance in terms of impacts, outputs, outcomes and the alliance objectives. Alliance performance was often viewed differently by different partners within the same alliance.

The farmers really started making money out of it and many farmers started adopting this so at the outset it was quite good for me.  

I mean basically we've easily reached our objectives...more than reached our objectives. And I think we can say we're still sort of best of friends so to speak. 

'Relationship Interactions', 'Relationship Behaviours', 'Relationship Dysfunctions' and 'Relationship Performance' together comprise 'Alliance Relationships'. The way in which these sub-components come together to influence the exact nature of the individual alliance
relationship is influenced by the other core categories and, in this regard, 'Alliance Type' is of particular importance.

6.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN 'ALLIANCE TYPE' AND 'ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIPS'

In the comparative analysis for 'Alliance Type' (Chapters Three and Five) differences between constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances were apparent for most of the categories and sub-categories associated with 'Alliance Relationships'. These are listed in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Summary of Comparative Analysis of the Core Category 'Alliance Relationships' With Respect to Alliance Initiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Type</th>
<th>Alliance Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type</td>
<td>- Strengthening relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stronger engagement with donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stable, continuing, long-term relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leveraging off partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Linking with the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Positively engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategic relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Value relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unequal partner influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hidden agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Favouring certain partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Missed opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Verified success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieving objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type</td>
<td>- Seeking closer relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cementing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cohesive, open relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relationship with individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All partners equally involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the category 'Relationship Interactions,' prior relationships, partnership evolution/development, types of relationships and general relationship were important considerations (Appendix I, Table 18). For constrained choice-type alliances, partnership development focussed on the strength of the relationship, whereas in voluntary alliances the focus was on cementing and building enduring relationships. In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, relationships focussed on individual, stable and long-term relationships but with voluntary-type alliances the focus was on personal relationships, cohesiveness and openness. The Relationship Interactions for constrained choice-type alliances focussed more on what the individual partner could get out of the relationship (linking with the private sector, leveraging off partnership) whereas with voluntary-type alliances there was more concern for the "value" and "depth" of the relationship (closer relationships, relationships with individuals).

Relationship Behaviours of constrained choice alliances tended to be strategic, positively engaged and intentional; whereas for voluntary-type alliances the relationships tended to be
about networks, friendships and sense of belonging (Appendix I, Table 19). In constrained choice-type alliances the partnerships focussed on commitment, viability and partner focus whereas with voluntary-type alliances, it was about mutual interest, respecting individuals, trust and full participation. Constrained choice-type alliances tended to exhibit mutual support, strong commitment and enthusiasm, whereas voluntary-type alliances exhibited collaboration, working together, openness and sense of belonging.

A range of Partnership Dysfunctions were identified as important by the study participants and there were differences with most of these in regard to Alliance Type (Appendix I, Table 20). Partnership Dysfunctions associated with the model included the lack of flexibility, administrative burden and bureaucracy for constrained choice-type alliances and competition within and between the alliances and structure not linked to function in the case of voluntary-type alliances. For partner interactions, little interaction between the partners, lack of true partnership and unequal partner influence were seen as major factors. With voluntary-type alliances conflict of interest within the alliance, the "club effect" (power groups within the alliance) and a lack of formal control over individuals were issues. Dysfunction partner behaviours for constrained choice-type alliances manifested as game playing, rivalry, hidden agendas and different values. In the case of voluntary-type alliances, these behaviours included a lack of common understanding, hoarding of information, personality clashes, inactive partners and potential competition. A lack of cohesion, a lack of trust and a lack of harmonisation were identified as alliance dysfunctions in constrained choice-type alliances. For voluntary-type alliances this was identified as the formation of splinter groups, partners doing their own thing and divergent views. Dysfunctional implementation issues were technical limitations, management dysfunction and barriers to entry for constrained choice-
type alliances, but were competition between partners, multiple levels of management and alliance pulled in many directions for voluntary-type alliances.

With regard to Alliance Performance, benefits to the partners were seen to be improved relationships and increased market share for constrained choice-type alliances and benefits for members and building community for voluntary-type alliances (Appendix I, Table 21). Both constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances expressed general satisfaction with the alliance model but there was no difference between the two. In regard to Alliance Performance, individual benefits for the partners were the major focus (identified benefits, value add, verified success) whereas for voluntary-type alliances mutual benefits, advantages of working together and sharing a vision appeared to be the focus.

6.4 THE EXISTING BODY OF PPA LITERATURE ON ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIPS

A wide body of literature on alliance relationships has developed across a range of disciplines and from a large number of perspectives. However, while the importance of relationships and relationship interactions in alliance establishment is alluded to by a number of researchers (Kogut, 1988; Shamdasani and Sheth, 1994; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Gulati, 1998; Todeva and Knoke, 2004 Stephens et al., 2009; Stephens, 2011), there are relatively few structured studies which focus on these areas. A large number of studies have considered a wide range of alliance relationship factors and interactions (for example trust and power) but these have not been considered in an integrated framework or in direct relationship to alliance establishment. The body of PPA literate on alliance relationships captures many of the individual elements of this core category which were identified by the current study participants. This previous research studies many of these factors in detail and
thus adds depth to this Grounded Theory study (for example, a better understanding of the operation and nature of these factors). In an attempt to give some structure to the huge literature on alliance relationships, these factors are consider under the four categories which comprise 'Alliance Relationships' (Fig. 6.1).

6.4.1 Relationship Interactions (Fig. 6.2)

Prior Relationships

Prior relationships were identified in the Grounded Theory study as important components, not only of 'Alliance Relationships' but also of 'Alliance Type' and 'Processes and Process Issues'.

It has been found that prior working relationships between organisations' top management teams were closely related to alliance activity between organisations (Arino and De la Torre, 1998, pp. 306-308; Olk and Elvira Rojo, 2001, pp. 124-130). The relationship amongst the founders can influence partner selection and commitment.

These findings are supported by those of Stephens (2011, p. 24) who found that more time was spent communicating and sense-making between partners who had prior relationships and whose behaviour was predictable. Without prior organisational relationships, organisational trust is difficult to achieve because no prior experience provides any basis for reliability, predictability and fairness.

According to Todeva and Knoke (2004, p.19) a lack prior alliance relationships are particularly important in constrained choice alliances. This lack of history means that the target organisations have no direct experience upon which to base expectations. In voluntary
alliances, previous alliance relationships are also important and organisations tend to choose as future alliance partners other with whom they have had direct prior in an attempt to reduce the risks of entering new alliances (Osborn and Hagedoorn, 1997, pp. 266-271).

**Relationship Interactions**

Case studies of the alliance formation process portray it as a mix of interpersonal and inter-organisational activities (Olk and Elvira Rojo, 2001, p. 125). Such descriptions have emphasized the need to understand the underlying relational dynamics and social processes (Arino and De la Torre, 1998, pp. 306-308) and this is emphasised by the diverse literature in this area.

In a study of relationship dynamics for buyers and suppliers firms in strategic alliances in high technology markets, Khalid (2002, p. 1) considered relationships as a governance mechanism for activities and resources of companies involved in new product development.

The interaction process between buyer and sellers starts with short-term periods of interaction that could be a product or service, information, financial, social, or technical exchange. In high technology-based firms, these may include the sharing and enhancement of research and development activities, technological knowledge between the parties, cross fertilisation of scientific technological fields and technology transfer (Hagedoorn, 1993, pp. 372-374). With gradual development of these episodes of interaction, firms build up relationships, either short-term or long-term, depending on the objectives of the firm. Entrepreneurs appear to be the mechanisms of coordination by mutual sharing of learning of process and product innovations vis-a-vis relationship development process in a network (Halinen et al., 1999, pp. 782-784). They found that the more complex the product, the more interdependent the buyer-
supplier relationship. The characteristics of the relationship between buyer and seller and the nature of interaction shapes the whole process in an overall atmosphere of relationships that could be characterised in terms of power-dependence relationship, close or distant relationship, conflict or cooperation or mutual expectations which develop over time within a certain relationship.

According to Kanter (1994, p. 98) companies can participate simultaneously in many kinds of relationships, and partners in any relationship may play a variety of roles. Successful company relationships nearly always depend on the creation and maintenance of a comfortable personal relationship between the senior executives. In another sense, the formation of alliance relationships rests largely on hopes and dreams - what might be possible if certain opportunities are pursued. Inter-organisational relationships seem to work best when they are more family-like and less rational. Obligations are more diffuse, the scope for collaboration is more open, understanding grows between specific individuals, communication is frequent and intensive, and the interpersonal context is rich. The best IORs are frequently messy and emotional, involving feelings like chemistry and trust, and they should not be entered into lightly. Only relationships with full communication on all sides endure long enough to create value for the partner. The best inter-organisational relationships are true partnerships that tend to meet certain criteria (Kanter, 1994, p. 100):

(a) **Individual Excellence** - Both partners are strong and have something of value to contribute to the relationship. Their motives for entering into the relationship are positive (for example, to pursue future opportunities) not negative (for example, to mask weaknesses).
(b) **Importance** - The relationship fits major strategic objectives of the partners, so they want to make it work. Partners have long-term goals in which the relationship plays a key role.

(c) **Interdependence** - The partners need each other. They have complementary assets and skills. Neither can accomplish alone what both can together.

(d) **Investment** - The partners invest in each other to demonstrate their respective stakes in the relationship and each other. They show tangible signs of long-term commitment by devoting financial and other resources to the relationship.

(e) **Information** - Communication is reasonably open. Partners share information required to make the relationship work, including their objectives and goals, technical data, and knowledge of conflicts, trouble spots, or changing situations.

(f) **Integration** - The partners develop linkages and shared ways of operating so they can work together smoothly. They build broad connections between many people at many organisational levels. Partners become both teachers and learners.

(g) **Institutionalization** - The relationship is given a formal status, with clear responsibilities and decision processes. It extends beyond the particular people who formed it, and it cannot be broken on a whim.

(h) **Integrity** - The partners behave toward each other in honourable ways that justify and enhance mutual trust. They do not abuse the information they gain, nor do they undermine each other.
The most productive relationships achieve five levels of integration (Kanter, 1994, pp. 105-107):

(a) **Strategic Integration** - which involves continuing contact among top leaders to discuss broad goals or changes in each company.

(b) **Tactical Integration** - which brings middle managers or professionals together to develop plans for specific projects or joint activities, to identify organizational or system changes that will link the companies better, or to transfer knowledge. Establishing formal integrator roles is another way to ensure tactical integration.

(c) **Operational Integration** - which provides ways for people carrying out day-to-day work to have timely access to the information, resources, or people they need to accomplish their task.

(d) **Interpersonal Integration** - which builds a necessary foundation for creating future value. As relationships mature beyond the early days of scrambling to create initial projects and erect structural scaffolding to manage them, the network of interpersonal ties between members of the separate companies grows in extent and density. Broad synergies born on paper do not develop in practice until many people in both organisations know one another personally and become willing to make the effort to exchange technology, refer clients, or participate in joint teams. Many strong interpersonal relationships help resolve small conflicts before they escalate.
(e) **Cultural Integration** - which requires people involved in the relationship to have the communication skills and cultural awareness to bridge their differences. Managers from both partners and affiliated companies must become teachers as well as learners. When managers accept teaching and learning roles, they demonstrate interest and respect, which helps build the goodwill that is so useful in smoothing over cultural and organisational differences.

Olk and Elvira Rojo (2001, p. 125) distinguish between attributes of the person and attributes of the role. This is supported by the work of Ring and Van de Ven (1994) who noted that relationships based on the person (personal ties and friendships) is not identical to those based on role. To examine personal ties, they focussed on the degree of friendship between the individuals negotiating the alliance. To examine the influence of role-based relationships they explored how organisational roles vary by level of discretion granted the actor. Some roles provide relatively high levels of autonomy to individuals whereas other requires individuals to seek organizational approval before acting. Social networks (friendship ties) represent a central component of an organisation's structure. Social relationships within an organisation are important because they reflect and influence the intra-organisational power structure and introduce innovations into organisations. Externally, social ties are particularly beneficial in creating inter-organisational relationships.

Various authors have described three organisational benefits from external social relationships: joint problem-solving arrangements; trust; and information transfer. Joint problem-solving benefits emerge when individuals use their relationships to initiate or solve problems both organisations face. Inter-organisational trust aids organisational efficiency and flexibility. Finally, information sharing through social ties reduces the cost of an
information search outside the organisation. Friendship ties are not considered merely sets of linked friends but are ties that affect intra-organisational communication, decision making, and resource availability. Besides affecting intra-organisational activities, friendship ties outside the organisation facilitate inter-organisational relationships (Olk and Elvira Rojo, 2001, pp. 128-129).

For structural characteristics of the alliance, they found that friendship was not associated with differences in equity, the scope of the arrangement, or the type of contract. Although friendship may play a role in forming an inter-organisational relationship, it appears unrelated to the relative share of control or the goals of the arrangement. The importance that researchers have attributed to individuals in forming alliances may stem from other elements of an individual's social relationships or organisational role either separately or in combination with friendship. When isolated from other considerations, friendship does not strongly influence alliance characteristics (Olk and Elvira Rojo, 2001, pp. 147-148).

At the individual level, the findings for trust revealed that friends had higher levels of trust than did non acquaintances, suggesting the importance of friendship in creating trust between alliance managers. Because trust affect cooperation, friendship may be important in facilitating agreement negotiation to a greater extent than usually acknowledged. Their findings suggest that companies giving their employees chances to associate with those they consider friends may increase the level of trust needed for collaboration.
Types of Relationships

Types of relationships refers to the myriad of ways in which partners (and stakeholders) can interact during the establishment processes and in the stable alliance relationship that emerges from establishment.

The importance of relationship types in alliances is illustrated by a study of personal and organisational relationships in Chinese-other foreign university strategic alliances carried out by Willis (2008). The author based his study around a consideration of a form of Chinese personal relationship called 'Guanxi'. Guanxi is the development and maintenance of deep personal links between individuals, based on trust and empathy, as the basis on which business is often undertaken. These Guanxi relationships are apparently widely studied in the literature as the basis for 'doing business' with Chinese companies and organisations. On the basis of his study, Willis (2008, pp. 227-230) identified four types and forms of personal relationships and the details of these are summarised in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2  Types and Forms of Personal Relations (Willis, 2008, p.228)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Relationship</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guanxi</td>
<td>Deep, complex personal relationships based on honesty, reciprocity, empathy, and trust form the 'cement' between the two sides. Once relationships develop at this level they can be open, honest, trusting and committed to each other and the alliance. Crucial to form these relationships amongst core staff in an alliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic friends</td>
<td>Relationships based on basic, simple and uncomplicated form of friendship between staff. These relationships do not have the depth and commitment of Guanxi relationships. They featured simplicity, directness, openness, frankness and superficiality. Individuals are friendly and kind towards each other but the relationships remain at a superficial, albeit friendly level. These are important relationships in an alliance context but far less crucial that Guanxi relationships because they lack the depth and level of commitment amongst the various staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working colleagues</td>
<td>These relationships are basic and simple. Individuals turn up to work without forming any particular friendship with other staff or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuals. These relationships were quite common in an alliance and did no damage to it.

| Neutral relationships | In these relationships individuals minimised any form of relationship with other people. This could be because they did not like the other people or because they were deliberately withdrawing from a relationship to make a point or emphasise a point of view. These relationships may cause some conflict amongst staff. They tended to upset foreigners but were accepted by the Chinese as part of the way they tended to treat people who had upset, insulted or demeaned them. |

Guanxi relationships were the most complex and had several dimensions (Willis, 2008, pp.230-234). Successful alliances in the study tended to feature a core group of people who had developed long-term and well established Guanxi relationships. At this level, the two sides could discuss issues in a direct, trustful and specific manner. Less well-developed Guanxi relationships tended to lack commitment, openness and directness, making it difficult for the two sides to negotiate and discuss issues in an open, clear, precise and direct manner. These networks were important for alliances in that they tended to form a part of the alliance network.

Basic friendships were quite valuable in an alliance because of their simple, uncomplicated manner. However, they were not very useful if the aim was to develop, maintain, and manage an alliance where it was usually necessary to have higher levels and far deeper personal relationships.

Working colleague relationships were also useful in an alliance and were quite common. Like basic friends, they were not negative to an alliance, but even more so were of little use in alliance situations which required a higher level of interpersonal commitment.
Neutral behaviour could be a sign of a failing relationship, or of a relationship which could never develop at all. It could be used quite ruthlessly by either side, but was used quite deliberately and artfully by some Chinese respondents. These types of relationships could be exercised over time or could be quite short-term, depending on the situation and context. They could be damaging to an alliance, particularly in a situation where they were evident amongst key individuals.

All of the alliances studied contained these four types of linkages or relationships and they tended to intersect to form three types of organisational relationships (Table 6.3):

(a) Formal - these were often exercised at a Guanxi, basic friendship or working colleague level; but were most effective when the people involved had Guanxi relationships.

(b) Informal - were also often exercised at a variety of relationship levels, most commonly at the basic friendship stage.

(c) Hidden - were almost always Guanxi relationships.

Table 6.3 Types of Organisational Relationships (Willis, 2008, p.238)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Relationship</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>These relationships were the links which were formed between key people in an alliance setting because of the structure of the alliance and the nature of its work. Some formal links or relationships were between staff at the same level, or amongst staff at various levels of the alliance. They were the kind of linkages and relationships that might be included in an organisation chart. They were overt, formalised, and were crucial to the success of an alliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>These linkages or relationships were informal and were developed between staff as part of how they undertook their activities and projects within an alliance. They were not printed in an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organisation chart but were the informal links, relationships or processes which enabled an alliance to "work" in a real situation.

| Hidden                      | Hidden or discrete links or relationships were formed amongst people on the basis of power. They formed what could be termed the hidden operational framework of an alliance. |

6.4.2 Relationship Behaviours (Fig. 6.3)

The relationship behaviours literature concentrates on four inter-related elements which work across partners and alliances. These are: trust; empathy; power and magnitude and they are also considered (often briefly) in the other PPA literatures such as 'Alliance Type' (Stephens et.al, 2009).

Trust

Trust is associated with concepts such as respect, face, empathy, and friendship; but it is much broader than this. It is the sense that two sides have a deep understanding of each other which transcends business and physical issues and merges into their social and family life.

Trust could be developed over the short-term, but might also take a longer period of time and may never develop between people if the "chemistry", the intuitive and cognitive interaction between them, is not appropriate and suitable for each party (Willis, 2008, pp. 224-225).

In the absence of power, trust offers organisations an alternative for managing inter-organisational relationships. (Morrissey and Pittaway, 2006, p. 277; Izquierdo and Cillán, 2004, p. 978). Trust, like power is a complex concept having a diverse range of definitions from a variety of disciplines.

According to Provan and Sydow (2008. pp.13-14), trust is a key element of "bonding" social capital, and is generally seen as being both critical for holding a network together and as an outcome of network involvement (Adler and Kwon, 2002, pp. 32-36). It is a necessary
condition for enabling organisations and their managers to work together in ways that can ultimately produce desired outcomes (Zaheer *et al.*, 1998, pp.153-156; Augustine and Cooper, 2009, p. 46; Zaman, 2009, p.2).

Trust is defined as confidence between the parties that the other party is reliable and that the parties will act with a level of integrity when dealing with each other (Heffernan, 2004, p. 115). From the literature trust has three components (Mayer *et al*. 1995, pp. 717-721; Sirdeshmukh *et al*., 2002, pp. 17-21):

(a) a credibility component - whether the partner has the capability and expertise to undertake the purpose of the partnering (Ganesan 1994; pp. 12-14);

(b) an integrity component - whether the partner will adhere to written or verbal promises (Nicholson *et al*., 2001 pp. 10-12);

(c) a benevolence component - whether the partner will be accommodating and act with equity when new conditions relating to the relationship arise (Ganesan, 1994, pp. 12-14).

The components of trust have also been identified as competency trust; contractual trust and goodwill trust. Competency trust refers to the expectation that a partner can perform at a set level. It is defined as "that group of skills, competencies, and characteristics that enable a party to have influence within some specific domain". Contractual trust refers to each partner adhering to specific written or oral agreements. Further, contractual trust is shown when partners uphold an ethical standard, namely the keeping of promises. Goodwill trust
refers to willingness to do more than is formally expected. Consequently, goodwill trust grows when a partner commits to be responsive to certain requests outside the norm. Moreover, goodwill trust can be defined as behaviour from one partner to place the other partner's interest ahead of their own (Williamson, 1981, pp. 553-554).

Empathy

Empathy is also described as a similarly, complex, and subtle aspect of behaviour between two or more people (Willis, 2008, pp. 224-225). If two people have a well developed sense of empathy, they display a deep sense of understanding each other's views and ideas, and do not make judgements about each other. They have a deep sense that they would look after each other and would never undermine the other person. They have an innate sense of what the other person might believe about this or that situation or context. Their friendship has moved beyond simple and vague gestures of friendship to a deeper level where there is genuine respect and trust developed between them.

Power

The mainstream literature offers a wide and varied discussion of power in inter-organisational relationships. For example, some authors have confirmed that size asymmetry was a determining factor affecting the levels of cooperation in alliance formation. While it is broadly acknowledged that size-based power cannot be ignored, this alone should not be considered the key factor influencing dependency. This can be significant irrespective of firm size. For example, a small organisation operating a niche market or offering specific expertise may hold a more important position in the view of a much larger organisation than may be expected given its size (Bucklin and Sengupta, 2001, pp. 3, 11-13; Morrissey and Pittaway, 2006, pp. 273-276). It should not be the power dependency relationship that is of
major concern but focus should be give to how dominant partners use this advantage and how far trust and mutual interest are pursued. The implication is that instead of focusing on the relative power position between the two firms, partners may be better advised to seek out organisations and/or individuals with whom they feel they can best develop relationships. Similarly it may be prudent, where possible, to distance themselves from organisations that repeatedly demonstrate a high propensity toward profit maximisation.

Power can be defined as the capacity of one social actor to influence the actions and behaviours of others in intended ways. It is based on relative dependencies, especially concerning the control of resources (Provan and Sydow, 2008, p. 16). Izquierdo and Cillián (2004) call this asymmetry. If there is a balanced dependence, both parties have incentives to invest in the relationship (the pursuit of mutual benefits) and opportunistic behaviour is unlikely (Izquierdo and Cillián, 2004, pp. 977-978). On the other hand, if the levels of dependence are unbalanced, the less dependent party will not have any incentive to shares its resources with the other in a close long-term relationship as the benefit is both insignificant and replaceable. Even when the more dependent party was interested in sustaining a relationship oriented towards the long-term, the less dependent party's lack of interest in investing in joint access and the fear of opportunistic behaviour (potentially with the aim of securing greater control) discourages the more dependent party away from seeking a relational orientation.

Magnitude

Relationships between people, although different, are analogous to those between firms - they have different levels of intimacy or magnitude (Golicic et al., 2003, p. 63). While the formation and maintenance of interpersonal relationships are different than that of inter-organisational relationships, the notion of differing levels of intimacy within one type of
relationship provides support to the concept of inter-organisational relationship magnitude. Relational embeddedness is the degree of reciprocity and closeness among new product alliance participants. This concept is based on the strength-of-ties literature, which is primarily concerned with the nature of the relational bond between two or more social actors. Tie-strength researchers typically classify the relation as linked by a strong or weak tie. Strong ties are viewed as having higher levels of closeness, reciprocity, and indebtedness than weak ties. Similar to the notion of strength-of-ties, coupling research looks at the relationships among elements or variables and their variation from loose to tight. Both strength-of-ties and coupling may be applied to relations between organisations as well as individuals. The literature and focus groups use terms such as coordination, cooperation and collaboration to describe the strength or magnitude of the relationship. Collaboration implies a higher magnitude between or among firms, while coordination and cooperation are lower levels of relationship magnitude (Golicic, 2003, p. 71). The focus groups referred to trust, commitment, and mutual dependence when discussing the closeness of a relationship, which reflected some of the characteristics of relationships presented in the literature.

These above behaviours and characteristics are associated with what Ramamani and Sambamurthy (2007) refer to as social capital. Relationships with high social capital have frequent interaction, which in turn cultivates norms of reciprocity through which individuals become more willing to help each other, and which improve coordination and dissemination of information and knowledge sharing. Social capital highlights the central importance of networks of strong personal relationships that develop over a period of time. It includes intangible elements such as goodwill, fellowship, sympathy and social interaction. By definition, concepts such as, trust, networks civil society all arise as a part of social capital, but do not constitute social capital itself. From a strategic alliance point of view, social
capital is important in the formation of inter-organisational alliances within a rich social context. In this regard the resulting social structures have a two-fold purpose; to act as a medium to be aware of possible alliancing opportunities ad also serve as a basis of trust between the partners.

6.4.3 Relationship Dysfunctions (Fig. 6.4)

A significant range of relationship dysfunction types, behaviours and elements were identified by the participants in the current study. Alliance dysfunction does not appear to be as well examined by other researchers and significant studies could only be found in regard to power imbalances; managerial imbalances; opportunistic behaviour; and dysfunctional conflict. This is consistent with the observations of Park and Ungson (2001, p 38) and Saz-Carranza and Longo (2012, p. 332) who are of the view that there is a lack of robust technical studies on the causes of alliance failure and on which integrated management strategies to increase the success and performance of PPAs can be based.

Power Imbalances

The presence of power imbalance in an exchange relationship creates the potential for conflict. Organisations with superior power will act to exploit that power. If dependencies are out of balance in a relationship, the weaker party will take precautions to limit is vulnerability. In the present context, this effort could take the form of competing alliances, subtle efforts to diminish the role partner with customers, or failure to employ all of the resources required. Recognising the potential for this behaviour, the more powerful party may similarly be loath to put for the maximum effort required by the project. The best outcome that can emerge from this type of interactions is a failure to take full advantage of the joint marketing opportunity. The worst is that the fears lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy and irresolvable conflict from counterproductive efforts, reduced participation, or even
outright sabotage. Power imbalance therefore is detrimental to alliance effectiveness (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p. 35). A major principle of inter-organisational exchange theory is that organisations seek external relationships that are balanced (Cook, 1977) in terms of power. The data suggest that imbalances in power and in the managerial resources that each partner provides are significant drawbacks to alliance operations and, as organisational theorists predicted, have an important role in limiting alliance success. Consequently, a key aspect of project management is understanding the strength of the resource base of potential partners, the managerial contributions that each makes, and how disparity in these conditions might lead to conflict (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p 40).

Managerial Imbalances

In exploratory interviews the authors found that executives showed sensitivity to the adequacy of the managerial resources assigned to projects by the partners (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p.35). Managerial imbalance, or the failure to allocate the expected managerial talent, in numbers or stature, created a concern for equity in "pulling ones load". The differences in perceived positions or status among the managerial levels at which interactions occur among alliance partners could lead to cultural and political conflict. Doz, (1988, pp. 51-53) found that differences in the locus of management among partners in technology alliances could lead to communication difficulties.

Opportunistic Behaviour

Cooperation in alliance relationships is subject to the threat of opportunistic behaviour by one of more partners. If trust and commitment develop between partners, they counterbalance the potential for adverse forms of behaviour (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, pp. 36-37). Dwyer et al. (1987, p.23) point out the importance of commitment in their process model of buyer-
seller relationships. In their view, commitment is an implicit or explicit pledge of relational continuity between exchange partners. Heide and John (1990, p. 26) found a positive association between the historical length of an alliance relationship and expected continuity of future interaction. Therefore, a long and stable history of prior business relations can build trust and commitment between partners.


**Dysfunctional Conflict**

The data also show that alliance success is sensitive to dysfunctional conflict. The need to manage and contain conflict is further emphasised (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p. 40). Significant and reassuring, is the finding that well-planned projects with high payouts in relation to cost are most likely to be successful. Mediocre co-marketing alliances are probably not worth the effort. It clearly pays to develop prior relationships with prospective partners before engaging in formal alliances to ensure effective working relations. Similarly, the need for compatibility in terms of partner culture, operations, goals and objectives is reinforced.

In a study of international strategic alliance in the university sector, Willis (2008, pp. 239-243) identified a number of characteristics of problematic and dysfunctional alliances:

- A lack of high level and well-developed relationships amongst key stakeholders from different partner organisations;
• Competing personal networks or a personal network which had no real power, status or connections;

• A limited range of basic, low-level relationships or a high number of neutral relationships (those with a minimum or interaction between the parties) which was a danger sign for the future of an alliance because of its perceived lack of personal commitment;

• A limited number of organisational relationships; a sign of a poorly conceived and executed alliance.

6.4.4 Relationship Performance (Fig. 6.5)

Evaluation of relationship performance is important to the partners in alliance relationships as it influence partner commitment to the alliance, partner satisfaction with the alliance and partner interest in continuing the alliance and other ongoing relationships. In the current study, partners perceived performance along three dimensions; 'benefits for partners', 'satisfaction with model' and 'alliance performance' and these tother make up the category, 'relationship performance'. However, alliance performance has been considered in a number of ways by other researchers.

Outcomes are critical in evaluating the value of a particular relationship and in study by Rumsey and White (2009, p. 302) three aspects of outcomes for partners emerged from the data: types of benefits for the nonprofits, types for the corporation, and the benefit ratio between partners. The obvious benefit for nonprofits was financial support from corporate gifts. The data also revealed benefits for the corporate partners, including potential increase in sales, publicity and exposure and business opportunities. Three major properties of corporate non-profit relationship emerged: communication with partners; symmetry of the
relationship; and evolution and depth of the relationship. Multiple testimonials reflected the
notion that strategic philanthropy invites closer relationships than does traditional
philanthropy. Several non-profit managers commented that symmetrical, strategic intent
usually prompts larger gifts, while purely philanthropic motives are likely to yield smaller
gifts.

Shamdasani and Sheth (1995, pp. 7-11), based on a review of the strategy, marketing
channels of distribution and interpersonal and inter-organisational exchange relationships
literature, identified three relational predictors (competence, commitment, and compatibility)
which influence a partner form's evaluation of its alliance relationship on two dimensions
(satisfaction and continuity).

There are two important dimensions to evaluating alliance relationships:

(1) how well satisfied are the parties in their relationship (that is, satisfaction); and
(2) are they likely to continue the relationship (that is, continuity).

Satisfaction with an alliance relationship is defined as "the degree of a partner's overall
affective evaluation of the alliance relationship". Satisfaction reflects existing feelings about
the alliance based on evaluation of outcomes and experience received in the past whereas
continuity decisions reflect expectations of future cooperation. Alliance continuity is defined
as "the degree of a partner firm's expectation of continued cooperation in the future".
Continuity decisions are related closely to the overall level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction
with the alliance.
Commitment is a pledge by alliance members to undertake certain actions that will facilitate the attainment of the alliance's strategic goals. Competence is viewed conceptually as one dimension of trust in the alliance relationship. Trust has been defined as one party's confidence in an exchange partner's reliability and integrity, and an important quality which influences this confidence is the competence of the exchange partner. Compatibility is a crucial element which affects the extent to which orientations, abilities and activities of organisations can be integrated successfully.

Their results confirm the importance of commitment, competence and compatibility in ongoing strategic alliances since they strongly influence alliance satisfaction and continuity. Satisfaction is positively related to continuity since a satisfied firm is more likely to maintain its ongoing relationship than seek out a new partner alliance. Continuity indicates that partner firms expect to continue to work together closely to achieve their mutual strategic goals thorough the alliance.

After an extensive review of IOR performance, Provan and Sydow (2008) formed the view that this can be measured at a range of levels: structural indicators; process indicators; and outcome indicators (Fig. 6.6).

(a) Structural Indicators

Structural indicators are those that focus on the connections between organisations (Provan and Sydow, 2008, pp. 10-12). These examine the extent to which organisations are structurally connected to the larger social system (society of organisations) in which they operate. Structure may also refer to the type of IOR (for example, alliances versus joint ventures; two organisation structures versus multi-organisation structures). Structural
measures are often used for evaluating inter-organisational networks, especially as they evolve, include changes in both density and multiplexity, as they develop from early formation to maturity (Human and Provan, 2000, pp. 359-363; Owen-Smith and Powell, 2004, p. 17). Density is usually defined as the number of actual relationships in a network divided by the maximum number of ties that are possible (Granoveter, 1973, pp. 1360-1365; Provan and Milward, 1995, pp. 27-30). Multiplexity refers to the number of different kind of exchanges or different types of relationships between two or more actors. Multiplex relationships are often considered as more interactive, trustful and stable. Thus increasing multiplexity of an IOR would likely mean that the relationship would likely mean that the relationship would be stronger and more enduring than an IOR based in a single tie, which if broken, would terminate the relationship.

(b) Process Indicators (Provan and Sydow, 2008, pp. 12-16)
Because performance-based outcomes are often difficult to obtain and assess, and because structural indicators often have limited utility as a dependent variable, process indicators are frequently utilised by researcher attempting to evaluate IORs. Process indicators typically focus on those actions and activities (rather than structures) that are likely to result in effective outcomes. The literature suggests that these include learning, trust, fairness, legitimacy and power (Human and Provan, 2000, pp. 359-363).

(b) Outcome Indicators (Provan and Sydow, 2008, pp. 16-21).
IORs can also be evaluated based on what they set out to achieve and eventually do (Perrow, 1961, pp. 861-865; Parkhe, 1993, pp. 818-822). The authors take a narrow view of outcomes, focussing only on innovation, financial performance, non-financial performance, and survival. In contrast to most structural and process indicators, these outcome indicators
are often specified and influenced by societal institutions and regulatory bodies and national and international accounting standards. It may therefore seem that managers have little flexibility when responding to these demands.

Figure 6.6 Focus and Theoretical Roots of IOR Performance Criteria (Provan and Sydow, 2008, p. 36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Theoretical Roots</th>
<th>Theories (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Survival</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>• Macro Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transactional Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Financial and Non-Financial Performance</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Organisation Theory</td>
<td>• Financial Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resource-based View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Theories of Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Legitimacy and Learning</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Network Theory</td>
<td>• Neoinstitutionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Trust and Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Structuration Theory, Theories of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Structure of Relations Between Organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developmental Theories, Evolutionary Theories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A link between organisational learning and alliance performance has been proposed by Inkpen and Crossman (1995, p. 603), with organisations that more effectively outperforming competitors in the long run. This view is supported by other authors who caution that learning does not always lead to intelligent or improved behaviour (Levitt and March, 1988, pp. 322-323). Organisations can incorrectly learn and they can correctly learn "that which is not correct" (Huber, 1991, pp. 94-95). In a reliable learning process, an organisation develops common understandings of its experience and makes its interpretations public, stable and shared. For a valid learning process, an organisation understands, predicts and controls its environment. As organisations engage in learning efforts, neither reliability nor
validity is assured because different people and groups in an organisation approach historical experience with different expectations and beliefs. Shared understanding about the value of alliance learning experiences was often obstructed by the variety and differences in managerial beliefs (March et al., 1991, pp. 2-4). Although learning is a major component in any effort to improve organisational performance and strengthen competitive advantage, the increased knowledge associated with a learning process may reduce the variability of performance rather than increase it (March, 1991, pp. 83-84). Thus, performance provides important feedback about the efficiency and effectiveness of a learning process and, ultimately, an organisation's strategy will come to reflect the accumulated learning.

The research of these previous authors on factors and associated with the formation of alliance relationships generally supports the results of the current study. However, while this work provides a good depth of understanding of the nature of these factors it fails to provide insights into the mechanics of the formation of alliance relationships or the interaction between these factors.

6.5 AN INTEGRATED MODEL OF ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIP DEVELOPMENT

An integrated model of alliance relationship development has been proposed by Pesämaa (2007) in a study of the development of relationships in inter-organisational networks (Fig. 6.7). This model builds on the previous research of Parkhe (1993) and Wetzels et al. (1998). According to this model relationships do not just emerge but they evolve through a series of processes.
In the initial stages of relationship development are "awareness" and "exploration". With 'awareness' the potential partners become aware of the existence of the embryonic alliance and other likely partners. 'Exploration' involves initial interaction with the other partners but no formal commitment. Both 'awareness' and 'exploration' involve cooperative motives to enter inter-organisational networks and preferences upon which partners are selected. These initial stages are followed by an "expansion stage" in which initial relationships (developed
on the basis of motives to join the network and partner selection) are expanded to include the
development of relationships based on friendships, interpersonal commitments, reciprocity
and trust. The outcome of this process is stability and maturity, which means relationships
are sustained by dependencies, their initial objectives and the desire to protect the relationship
(Pesämaa, 2007, p. 17; Pesämaa and Hairy, 2007; Pesämaa et al., 2007). Stability and
maturity are reflected by increased cooperation and loyalty. These expanding processes
ultimately lead to inter-organisational commitment. At the inter-organisational commitment
level, relationships are based on concrete and often long-term pledges (resources,
management input and operations), which give potential sustainability to the relationships.

6.6 THE CORE CATEGORY 'ALLIANCE LEADERSHIP' IN RELATION TO
THE BODY OF ESTABLISHED KNOWLEDGE ON PPAS

Relationships are the very essence of an alliance and the types, behaviours, interactions and
dysfunctions are central to the success and robustness of these relationships which in turn
influences the resilience and longevity of the alliance.

The established literature on alliance relationships shows the complexity associated with the
establishment, development and ongoing functioning of relationships and complexity
associated with the measurement of alliance performance. However, while there is a large
volume of literature providing a good understanding of alliance relationships and factors
affecting these, there are few integrated studies which attempt to explain the processes of
alliance relationship development.
The relationship 'diamond' proposed by Pesämaa (2007, p.16) attempts to provide an integrated explanation of alliance relationship development. It includes most of the factors and issues considered by other authors in this area and it picks up many of the categories, sub-categories and factors identified in the current study. Pesämaa's model of alliance relationship development provides a good conceptual explanation of relationships in the PPAs used in this study based on the participant data and my personal observation and features the following:

- relationship formation starts from the earliest processes of alliance establishment (following 'conception') (Chapters Four, Five and Six) with "awareness" and "exploration" and does not just suddenly occur towards the end of alliance formation;
- the initial stages of relationship development are based around partner selection, motivation to join the alliance and initiation cooperation;
- the alliance relationship grows ("expansion") based on the continuing development of a range of factors ('Relationship Interactions' and 'Relationship behaviours') including friendship, interpersonal commitment, reciprocity and trust;
- increasing cooperation and loyalty leads to relationship stability and maturity; and
- ultimately this inter-organisational commitment which is the stage at which the partners have a high level of commitment to the alliance and the structure is potentially sustainable.

The results of the current study add to Pesämaa's model and to the established body of knowledge on PPAs in three significant ways:

(a) The results of the current study provide support for a focus on alliance relationships in alliance establishment and, in general, for the findings of previous
researchers. They also add additional depth of understanding on the factors involved in the development of alliance relationships during alliance establishment and an understanding of some of the integrations between these factors. Thus the current study adds depth to the established knowledge of alliance relationships in the development of PPAs. The model of Pesämaa (2007, p.16) and others (Parkhe, 1993 and Wetzels et al., 1998) of alliance relationship development provides a good conceptualisation of alliance development. However, the results of the current study appear to indicate that this model may be too simplistic and other factors such as types of relationships, general dynamics and other relationship behaviours may also be important in relationship development. Additional research may be necessary to enhance this model.

(b) In Pesämaa's model, the discussion of initial processes concentrates on cooperative motives to join the alliance and the initial selection of partners. The results of this study indicate that this is a gross over-simplification of these initial processes and that more consideration need to be given to the complexity and importance of these initial processes and factors in alliance relationship development. I propose that Pesämaa's model should be modified to include much more of the detail developed in Chapters Four and Five of this thesis and I provide a suggested model based on this proposal in Chapter Nine.

(c) The categories 'Alliance Interactions' and 'Alliance Behaviours' identified in this study and in the general literature on PPAs are a good fit with the conceptual model developed by Pesämaa (2007, p.16) and others. However, in the current study, the participants also identified 'Alliance Dysfunctions' and 'Alliance Performance' as important considerations and this model may need to be modified to accommodate these. Alliance Dysfunctions affect the alliance development process and intimately the success or effectiveness of the alliance (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p. 40). However, during
relationship development they may be counterbalanced by factors such as the development of trust and commitment (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, pp. 36-37). Thus a consideration of alliance dysfunctions is important but may be complicated. Alliance Performance is about how the partners perceive the success of the alliance and the benefits that accrue to individual partners. Alliance Performance transgresses both alliance establishment and alliance implementation. However, early perceptions of performance affect partner satisfaction with the developing alliance (and thus commitment) and decisions on whether or not to continue with the alliance (and thus sustainability) (Shamdasani and Sheth, 1995, p. 7-11).

6.7 IMPICATIONS OF THESE FINDINGS

Stable alliance relationships are central to the establishment of PPAs and while many studies have examined various elements of PPA alliance relationships, very few integrated studies looking at alliance establishment have been undertaken. Much of the research to date considers alliance development in terms of the meeting of alliance objectives, the implementation of activities and programs and organisational learning and structure rather than the development of stable and mature relationships. This inattention to the importance of relationships may help explain many of the failures of PPAs reported in the literature.

Stable, mature relationships do not just emerge. They evolve through a series of processes and stages which must be considered in the overall context of alliance establishment. The model proposed by Pesämaa (2007) appears to provide an excellent way of looking at alliance relationship development. It may also provide a suitable framework for additional research in this area. However, on the basis of the current study, additional work may be needed to increase the utility of this model by modifying the initial stages and by incorporating considerations of alliance dysfunctions, alliance performance and additional major alliance interactions and alliance behaviours.
In this chapter I have defined and described the core category 'Alliance Relationships'. A large number of studies have been conducted on aspects of alliance relationships; however few of these have included integrated considerations of alliance relationships in alliance establishment. One exception is the alliance relationship development model proposed by Pesämaa (2007) and I suggest that this model should be further refined considering the results of the current study. This is further discussed in Chapter Nine.

Alliance Relationships mark the end of alliance establishment but also the beginning of the implementation stages of alliance development. Thus 'Alliance Relationships' can be regarded as a transition between establishment and other phases of alliance development. The consideration of the alliance establishment processes leading to the establishment of stable and mature alliance relationships is an important one and has the potential to change the way in which practitioners and others view PPAs and their establishment. This is further discussed in Chapters Nine, Ten and Eleven.

The PPA literature and the results of this study highlight the complex nature of alliance relationship development. Alliance Relationships do suddenly emerge, they start at the very beginnings of alliance establishment, expand and grow as the alliance develops and eventually become mature, stable relationships which influence the nature and success of the alliance. Alliance relationship development is complicated by a range of dynamics and interactions. A major factor interacting with all of the processes of alliance establishment and the development of alliance relationships was fourth core category identified in this study, 'Alliance Leadership'. 'Alliance Leadership' refers to the individuals or groups of
individuals who provide the vision, energy and drive during the establishment of the PPAs and it is discussed in detail in the next chapter of this thesis.
7.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, I defined the third of the core categories developed from the Grounded Theory analysis; 'Alliance Relationships' and described its dimensions, properties and characteristics. These were then related to the current body of exiting literature on PPAs.

This Chapter describes 'Alliance Leadership', the fourth of the five core categories developed in the Grounded Theory analysis. In essence, 'Alliance Leadership' refers to the individuals or groups of individuals (often the initiators) who provide the vision, energy and drive during the establishment of the PPAs and often continuing into alliance implementation. A defining feature of this core category is that it operates across the entire alliance establishment processes ('Processes and Process Issues') and 'Alliance Relationships' (Fig. 7.1).

I commence the chapter with a description of the dimensions, properties and characteristics of this core category. This chapter continues with a consideration of the relationship between 'Alliance Type' and 'Alliance Leadership' using the results of the comparative analysis (Chapter Five).

These findings are related to the relevant established literature on PPAs to 'locate' the current research and to identify major areas of agreement or disagreement. The chapter closes with a discussion of the implications of this research for the current study and for PPAs more generally.
7.2 THE CORE CATEGORY 'ALLIANCE LEADERSHIP

This core category emerged strongly from the data across all processes and 'Alliance Relationships'. A range of participants indicated that the nature and characteristics of the leadership of the emerging alliance were important to successfully establishing a PPA. The 'Alliance Leadership' often 'steers' the direction of the establishment processes and provide leadership, coaching and mentoring to the partners and alliance as a whole. For example:

_Leadership, I think, is what holds it together. If there is no deep understanding of that partnership, if there is no appreciation of the nature of that partnership, then its going to be very difficult to manage that partnership. In situations like this, leadership matter..... [P2]_

_What you had - and what you need in any of these are champions. You need people who are willing to see through all the difficulties.....[P3]_
The factors for 'Alliance Leadership' could be grouped under three emerging categories: 'Type'; 'Leadership Attributes'; and 'Acceptance/Formality' (Fig. 7.2).
Type

Leadership 'Type' describes the origins of the leadership (for example, the initiator of the alliance, leadership emerged from the alliance partners or leadership appointed by the donor or partners) and the dynamics of the leadership (for example, whether the leadership has evolved or been formally appointed and the relationship of the alliance leadership with the other partners). For example:

*The donor partner, they're competent people but we had problems with the third party that they appointed to implement the project. We were in conflict so many times but we decided to resolve the issue by sitting down and doing food planning and we had to make hard decisions together.......[P2]*

'Type' itself is comprised of two sub-categories: 'source' and 'dynamics' (Fig. 7.3).
Figure 7.3  The Components of the Category 'Leadership Type'

'Source' refers to where the alliance leadership comes from. This is generally the initiator; an individual or group appointed by the donor; an individual elected by the core partners; or the alliance leadership emerges from within the group of partners either formally or informally.

The leadership of this alliance was provided by a group of three, three people, three individuals. One from [a growers’ organisation], one from [the private partner] and one from the implementer. Their role in the ultimate success of the alliance was absolutely critical......[P9]

Who is the driver? Well until now, I think that the partners are reliant on the fact that we will do that in the donor team. So it basically comes down to me and my colleagues....[P 7]

'Dynamics' describes the emergence or 'sorting out' of the alliance leadership and the ways in which this may change over time.
It just happened at the time that you had a group of three concerned leaders (from various partner groups). People who got on well together...who had been through and understood the issues....and you just had a team that naturally worked well together....[P 5]

The driver now is the Project Manager....but before it was the Executive Director of the implementer. They held national partners meetings in 2009 and then they chose the Project Manager who now provides the leadership......[P9]

Because this is not a formal organisation we have to rotate the leadership every six months.....[P5]

Leadership Attributes

The category 'Leadership Attributes' refers to behaviours through which the alliance leadership exercises their influence and control (for example, collaborative versus authoritative) and the individual characteristics of the individual(s) which can have a significant effect of their effectiveness. For example:

He had come from an academic background before going into the commercial sector, so he could very much appreciate our thought patterns. That kind of person one might not always find in this kind of partnership and I think that he played a very key role in
facilitating and lubricating the partnership to avoid too much friction.....[P3]

You need people who are willing to see through all the difficulties. He had this very strong vision that the private sector, while doing its own job could produce public benefits to the – to developing countries. [P3]

The glue was having a couple of people who were committed to the goals, who early on had agreed a core goal and basically didn't let other issues get in the way of the core goal.......[P3]

But, we had a leader on the private sector who was really committed to this project and wanted to make it through.......[P1]

'Leadership Attributes' has two sub-categories: 'characteristics' and 'behaviours' (Fig. 7.4).
Figure 7.4 The Components of the Category 'Leadership Attributes'

The characteristics of the alliance leadership are contained in the category 'characteristics'. Study participants readily described the characteristics of the alliance leaderships in terms such as "dynamic", "passionate", "visionary" and "dominant" (Fig. 7.4) and these descriptors were quite consistent across alliances.

Associated with these characteristics are a range of behaviours exhibited by the alliance leadership as they discharge their role. The characteristics and associated behaviours varied widely between alliances depending on such factors as whether the leadership emerged or was appointed, the realtionship of the leadership to the alliance initiator and whether the alliance was constrained choice or a voluntary alliance.

The implementers are the drivers of everything........we as the private sector are contributing.....but they are definitely the drivers, and absolutely very, very active....[P9]
He's from the donor....but the way he works, he's very consultative, he does not make a move without asking us first out opinion and all decision take into account the opinion of the private partner....[P7]

On a day-to-day basis I'm (the implementer) in charge........but overall, the donor is driving the bus......[P6]

He is very consultative. Normally he has information that we don't....and he shares with us what information he has.
Collectively we come up with recommendations on how to implement the alliance....[P8]

Acceptance/Formality

'Acceptance/Formality' refers to the degree to which the leader/driver has formal authority and the degree of acceptance by the other partners. In some cases the alliance leadership is the initiator of the PPA. On other occasions, the alliance leadership is either appointed by the alliance management/steering group or they may emerge from the partners (or alliance staff) during the establishment phase. In these two latter situations, the degree of acceptance by the partners is important. Examples of this sub-category are as follows:

We don't really see ourselves as the ones setting the direction. We were really trying to work out a partnership with the major stakeholders and we decided that we needed to appoint somebody to implement it, a third party........ [P2]
In our particular case, we have a leader from the private sector.

These are the people who try and keep it together...... [P3]

'Acceptance/Formality' is comprised of two sub-categories: 'acknowledgement' and 'satisfaction with performance' (Fig. 7.5).

![Figure 7.5 The Components of the Category 'Acceptance/Formality']

'Acknowledgement' refers to the way in which the partners perceive the alliance leadership (for example, "perceived leader") and the acknowledgement (or lack of acknowledgement) of the alliance leadership by the alliance partners.

We didn't actually formally define the alliance leadership...but we recognise that we really need to have one. Then there's and informal leadership team which is the glue that holds the alliance together......[P5]
Well, actually the group wants me to be the leader. I told them to make me just the deputy leader......let a younger one be the leader......[P10]

'Satisfaction with performance' describes the ways in which the partners measure and perceive the performance of the alliance leadership.

.....because they are bullies at everything....[P7]

The leadership, the one we are working with very closely...we were fortunate to work with this person. And in many ways she has been very helpful in how we have grown as an association........[P6]

...so basically every time they will call it's good news...so you're excited every time........[P6]

Alliance leadership can be formally acknowledged by the partners but perceived not to be performing and vice versa.

'Type', 'Attributes' and 'Acceptance/Formality' interact to influence the nature of the 'Alliance Leadership'. However, while the responses of the study participants could be clustered around these three categories, the reality is that there were many complexities associated with 'Alliance Leadership' which were not readily 'captured' by the Grounded Theory analysis and which are worthy of additional future study. For example:
• in several cases there was formally appointed leadership apparently co-existing with informal leadership, sometimes under conditions of extreme tension and conflict;
• multiple and sometime competing leaders existed in some alliance;
• in some alliances the leadership could not readily be identified by the partners and in one case appears to be absent;
• alliance leadership can change over time (either formally or informally);
• there are often clear differences between the 'Alliance Leadership' and alliance management, the later often appointed by the donor or carried out by a management group.

7.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN 'ALLIANCE TYPE' AND 'ALLIANCE LEADERSHIP'

During the Grounded Theory analysis it also appeared that the type of alliance may have a significant influence of 'Alliance Leadership'. The comparative analysis of 'Alliance Type' allowed me to assess that assertion (Table 7.1).

Table 7.1 Summary of Comparative Analysis of the Core Category 'Alliance Leadership' With Respect to Alliance Initiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Type</th>
<th>Constrained Choice-type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor as leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor representative provides leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership provided by core partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementer involved in the details of establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership appointed by donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal recognition of leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voluntary-type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Key individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No clear leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alliance Leadership
In general, with constrained choice-type alliances the source of formal leadership was from the donors, or more commonly, implementing agencies appointed by, and acting on behalf of the donors (Appendix I, Table 11). Where this was the case, the implementer managed the alliance, designed programs, allocated resources, was involved in most details of the alliance establishment and implementation and often pursued their own agenda. In some cases, core partners or individuals also emerged as leaders and multiple (or secondary) leadership emerged.

The secondary leadership was generally informal and not recognised by the donor or Implementer. This resulted in conflict and alliance dysfunction. With voluntary-type alliances, the source of alliance leadership was individuals, key partners, core groups of partners or elected/appointed individuals and groups. In some cases, this leadership was appointed or agreed by the partners, but in other cases it emerged from the alliance partner organisations as an individual or a group of like-minded individuals. Where the leadership emerged, the dynamics depended on the degree of acceptance by the other partners. With emerged leadership, there could be tension between emerging and more formal leadership, or there could be a perception of no clear leadership, dual leadership or rotating leadership.

With respect to alliance leadership attributes, there did not appear to be any differences between the characteristics of leaders in either constrained choice-type or voluntary-type alliances (Appendix I, Table 12). However, there were differences in the behaviour of the
leadership within the different alliance types. Leadership in constrained choice-type alliances was generally directing, aggressive, and strong, with a tendency to want to do things their way. In voluntary-type alliances, the leadership was more likely to act as a binding force to hold the alliance together, supporting, coordinating, mentoring, steering and connecting individuals.

For constrained choice-type alliances, formal recognition of the alliance leadership, acceptance by stakeholders and wide support were important considerations (Appendix I, Table 13). In the case of voluntary-type alliances, there was acknowledgement of informal, unofficial and changing leadership, but the leadership was perceived as the glue that holds the alliance together. Thus for constrained choice-type alliances, leadership was perceived as being formal, but in voluntary-type alliances there was more acknowledgement of the informal nature of leadership.

The data from the Grounded Theory analysis and the comparative analysis could be combined to develop a theoretical typology of 'Alliance Leadership' in relation to 'Alliance Type' (Fig. 7.6).

**Figure 7.6 A Typology of 'Alliance Leadership' in Relation to 'Alliance Type'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Acceptance/Formality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained</td>
<td><strong>Primary Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Behaviours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Acknowledgement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice-type</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Formal recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>appointed implementer</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Acknowledged by stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Group</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dynamics</strong></td>
<td>'Drives the Bus'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wide support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus 'Alliance Type' appears to exert a strong influence over 'Alliance Leadership' and in turn this has a significant effect on the other processes of alliance establishment. This is further considered in Chapters Nine and Ten.

### 7.4 THE ESTABLISHED BODY OF KNOWLEDGE OF PPA LITERATURE ON ALLIANCE LEADERSHIP

A range of research has highlighted the importance of leadership in the establishment and operation of strategic alliance and this aspect has been studied from varying perspectives.

For example, the importance of alliance leadership; those persons or groups who can foster collaboration, and create and maintain trust and confidence between participants in networks and alliances; has been underlined by Sökjer-Petersen (2010, pp. 4-5). These individuals are driven by passion and not by money and the leadership often develops informally on the basis of personal respect, high status and productive and successful relationships with other in various networks (social capital). In the literature, the leadership of alliances has been considered from two main perspectives; the role of leadership (the unique challenges, characteristics and roles of leadership in alliances) and the dynamics of leadership (the
interaction of leadership characteristics to others and with the other contextual elements of alliances such as alliance type (Kendrick, 2006, p. 22).

7.4.1 The Role of Leadership

In terms of management and leadership roles and requirements, alliances are unique and they have unique challenges (Isabella, 2002, pp. 47-48). Firms must cooperate while simultaneously holding in check the natural inclination to look out for their own self-interests and leadership is needed as a catalyst to help orientate people to needed purposes and directions (Kendrick, 2006, p. 22). Managers must share decision-making but cannot control the actions of their partners. They are compelled to share information, but must guard against the expropriation of sensitive knowledge. A range of studies have added to the established knowledge of leadership roles in strategic alliances.

Although IOR literature emphasises interpersonal relationships, the findings of Austin (2000, pp. 82-83) suggest that it is really the double connect with people and purpose that is important. In this perspective, the mission connect is the motivational driver while the personal relationships are the ‘glue’ that binds the organisation together. The active involvement of senior management from the partner organisations is vital to alliance success because of the authorising and legitimising functions, but the connections need to permeate all levels of the organisation.

In his work on cooperating in small firm networks, Lesage (2006, pp. 1, 4, 9, 11, 18-19) describes the role of the alliance leadership in the alliance establishment and implementation process. Lesage (2006, pp. 1, 4, 9, 11, 18-19) and Nueno (1999, p. 322) refer to this leadership as intrepreneuriship. In the visionary process, at the very beginning of alliance
establishment, the leadership (either individual or collective) must help the group define a collective vision and to develop this into intermediary objectives which can satisfy most members. The leadership must arouse interest and then, by charisma, get potential members to adhere (simple subscription) to the project. This leadership may rely on their own experience or deep knowledge of their profession to secure this adherence (Lesage, 2006, p. 9). As the alliance development moves from adherence through to the idealistic state of cohesion (co-definition and elaboration of the project) the leadership must show more functional capacities moving on to relational capacities and finally to organisational capacities. Initially helping the partners to organise and develop as a team to which all can contribute. Then behaving as a mentor to help each member of the alliance to 'transcend itself' and the group as a whole to operate as a 'learning community' (Lesage, 2006, p. 18-19).

One of the key roles of leadership in the alliance is to set the right tone for relationship development (Kanter, 1994, p. 107; Kelly et al., 2002, p. 32; Todeva and Knoke, 2004, pp. 18-19). The alliance leadership also has a key role to play in creating the foundation for trust building. Thus the following skills are required:

- strong interpersonal skills to compensate for cultural and organisational differences between partners;
- integrative skills and the ability to manage diverse perspectives and a wide array of staff capabilities;
- demonstrated ability to work in a cooperative environment; and
- the ability to manage the technical aspects of the alliance as well as the relationship.

A framework to describe the role of leadership in strategic alliances has been developed by Reinfeld (2009, pp. 164-165) and is based on three components:
• **Leadership Perspective** - This author makes the distinction between (a) the individuals engaged in the alliance and (b) the parent organisations. Organisations are often referred to as leaders if they dominate the markets in their industry, are first movers or have unique core competencies. However, organisations do not need to be dominant within their industry to establish successful alliances. Within an individual organisation, individuals may be regarded as leaders if they have vision, inspire others, make things happen and are able to mobilise and direct resource. Within an alliance the individual as leader also depends upon his ability to solicit cooperation from the partners and make decisions in the best interest of the partnership.

• **Stages in the Strategic Alliance Life Cycle** - During the different phases of alliance establishment and development leaders may need to assume different roles in helping the network to develop. This is supported by the work of Sökjer-Petersen (2010, pp. 7-8) who suggests that initially there is a need for a leader highly competent in motivating change and building relationships. Later on the focus is on personal relationships.

• **Configuration** - The author distinguishes between two configurations dyads (partnerships between two organisations) and multiple partnerships. As strategic alliances grow in size and complexity the organisations generally recognise the importance of formalising the management of the alliance and the activities being implemented. In this case the leadership must have a strong strategic alliance-focused philosophy, strategy and culture and continuous alliance monitoring and evaluation becomes important (Reinfeld, 2009, pp. 186-187).
The capabilities, knowledge, information, and resources associated with effective strategic alliance leadership as articulated by Reinfeld, 2009, pp. 168-169) are presented in Table 6.2.
Table 7.2  The Capabilities, Knowledge, Information, and Resources Associated with Effective Strategic Alliance (SA) Leadership (Reinfeld, 2009, pp 168-169)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectives</th>
<th>Parent Organisation</th>
<th>Suppliers</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Knowledge/information /resources</th>
<th>Knowledge/information /resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall /throughout</td>
<td><strong>Capabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge/information /resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capabilities (in addition to usual leadership qualities)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge/information /resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High-level commitment/ Sponsorship for SA</td>
<td>• Philosophy and guidelines for types of alliances and partners</td>
<td>• Build consensus</td>
<td>• Management of collaborative efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Corporate culture supporting SA</td>
<td>• Experience with SA</td>
<td>• Effective in loosely defined structure</td>
<td>• Evaluation of difficult-to-quantify metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognized/value core competencies</td>
<td>• SA-related infrastructure: tools/data/training/studies etc</td>
<td>• Tolerance for ambiguity</td>
<td>• Best practices and benchmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive/proactive strategies</td>
<td>• Qualified leaders/staff for SA</td>
<td>• Value-driven</td>
<td>• Players/dynamics of organisations value net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• See &quot;real value added&quot;: Broad definition of benefits/costs ; Create trust</td>
<td>• Assets/capabilities/competencies to trade in a SA</td>
<td>• Able to manage co-leadership</td>
<td>• Cultural sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>• Well articulated priorities and criteria</td>
<td>• Resolve conflicts</td>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td>• Strategic Master Plan</td>
<td>• Gain trust of partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By stages:</td>
<td><strong>Capabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge/information /resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capabilities (in addition to usual leadership qualities)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge/information /resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic formulation</td>
<td>• Set visionary goals/directions</td>
<td>• Well articulated priorities and criteria</td>
<td>• Address the right questions</td>
<td>• Strategies of key players in their Value Net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deal proactively with change</td>
<td>• Strategic Master Plan</td>
<td>• Lateral thinking</td>
<td>• Planning/forecasting tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seek value creation</td>
<td>• Requirements for strategic fit</td>
<td>•Resourceful</td>
<td>• Value-chain analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SWOT of players in their value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner exploration</td>
<td>Negotiating/design Negotiation</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create shared vision</td>
<td>Relationship with players in their Value Net</td>
<td>Available resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to approach negotiation as a give and take</td>
<td>Statement of own objectives/capabilities/needs/priorities</td>
<td>Partner decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to commit resources/attention required</td>
<td>Insight into candidates' objectives/capabilities/needs</td>
<td>Partner's goals/objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to leave some arrangements open-ended</td>
<td>Objective assessment of your bargaining power</td>
<td>Partner's capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support design team</td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Partner's needs/priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner SWOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(More on points in partner Exploration, above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metrics for measuring qualitative elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deep knowledge of/skills in management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative in adapting measuring mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net (customers, suppliers, complementors, substitutors)

- Quickly obtain candidates' trust/confidence
- Good judge of people/organisations
- Good salesman
- Good sense of timing
- Inspiring

- Structure acceptable arrangements
- Navigate to successful conclusion
- balance determination/strength and flexibility/understanding
- Establish Organisation's value to partner

- Stay results/goal oriented
- Create climate of openness
- Reach consensus
- Enlist and mobilise "best" team

Deep knowledge of/skills in management

Creative in adapting measuring mechanisms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA execution phase Governance</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Progress in meeting milestones</th>
<th>Reports from the alliance &amp; Balanced scorecard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Empower governing team</td>
<td>• Empower and support decisions of SA management team</td>
<td>• Progress in meeting milestones</td>
<td>• Reports from the alliance &amp; Balanced scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respond with conviction</td>
<td>• Recognise value contribution of participating individuals</td>
<td>• Develop/empower/incentivate team members</td>
<td>• Project management &amp; Appropriate learning environment &amp; Balanced scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet commitments</td>
<td>• Stay on track/avoid distractions</td>
<td>• Read signals</td>
<td>• Balanced scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Address conflicts if interest</td>
<td>• Look for new collaborative opportunities</td>
<td>• Close gaps between performance/expectations</td>
<td>• Balanced scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allow partner to learn</td>
<td>• Inspire team to take advantage of learning opportunities</td>
<td>• Ensure ongoing buy in</td>
<td>• Balanced scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• make adjustments</td>
<td>• Reports from the alliance &amp; Balanced scorecard</td>
<td>• Stay on track/avoid distractions</td>
<td>• Balanced scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase commitment, if necessary</td>
<td>• Look for new collaborative opportunities</td>
<td>• Inspire team to take advantage of learning opportunities</td>
<td>• Balanced scorecard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Influence organisation's decision makers need for adjustments
- Influence alliance management
- Balanced scorecard
- Project management
- Appropriate learning environment
- Balanced scorecard
7.4.2 The Dynamics of Leadership

The dynamics of leadership literature considers the interaction of leadership characteristics with those of other partners and with the other factors that impact on alliance establishment, development and implementation.

Standifer and Bluedorn (2006) are of the view that creating and managing strategic alliances poses a significant challenge for inter-organisational management teams. These authors consider successful management of alliances in terms of 'entrainment' of the 'mental models' (systems by which partners organise knowledge, relationships, inferences and perceptions) of the partners. Entrainment is defined as the adjustment of the pace (speed at which the phenomena occurs) or cycle (one complete iteration of a recurring activity) of an activity to match or synchronise with that of another activity (Ancona and Chong, 1996, p. 253). They propose that the success of the alliance is significantly affected by the success of entrainment efforts of the management team (Standifer and Bluedorn, 2006, p. 905). The development of shared mental models is dependent on perspective, communication, training and cultural differences (Standifer and Bluedorn, 2006, pp. 917-919).

Osborn and Marion (2009) consider two perspectives of leadership in relation to the performance of alliance; contextual leadership and transformational leadership. Transformational leadership enhances the motivation, morale and performance of other through a variety of mechanisms such as the use of ideology and values (Antonakis et al., 2003, pp. 264-265, 283-284). It may have substantial positive effects of performance in volatile conditions similar to those faced by innovation-seeking alliances in research intensive sectors (Waldman and Yammarino, 1999, pp. 267-269, 281-282; Waldman et al., 2001, pp.134-136, 140-141).
This works fine in single organisations where there is little question of who is expected to provide the vision and the linkage to individual corporate interests. Osborn and Marion (2009 p. 202) found that greater transformational leadership by either sponsoring executive was dysfunctional for innovation but contributed positively to the strategic contribution the alliance provided to the sponsor. This may have been due, at least in part, to different ideologies and separate goals.

In the case of contextual leadership, context is defined as the set of overall demands, constraints and choices of the leader and can range from a state of stability to one of chaos (Ellis, 1996, pp. 8-9; Osborn, et al., 1998, p. 621). In regard to alliances, leaders work in two contexts; their own organisations and the alliance. Contextual leadership in the case of alliances is based near the edge of chaos and concentrates on developing an ordered system from that chaos (Osborn et al., 1998, p. 621). In the study by Osborn and Marion (2009, p. 203) the emphasis on knowledge and information-based dimension of contextual leadership showed the potential to influence attempts to create conditions where motivation was channelled into the goals of the alliance. Thus Contextual leadership by the alliance leaders was associated with higher innovation and strategic contributions to the sponsors (Huxham and Vangar, 2000, p. 1171). They argue that this study provides considerable support for the contextual view of alliance leadership (Osborn and Marion, 2009, p. 203).

The dynamics of leadership in networks and alliances may depend upon the 'type' of organisation. Two types of networks were identified by Kilduff and Tsai (2003); serendipitous networks and goal-directed networks. Serendipitous networks evolve through random variation, selection and retention processes (Kilduff and Tsai, 2003, p. 91, 96). In this type there is no single leader and the ties between members is based on personal
relationships. A leader may emerge; draw in loosely-coupled members, and in the process trigger collaboration in achieving goals. In contrast, in goal-directed networks the partners share specific goals and activities are designed to achieve these. The structure is centralised through the presence of a leader and the boundaries involved are clear.

The view of many of these authors that the management philosophy of the alliance leadership has a fundamental effect of the subsequent 'behaviour of the alliance' is supported by Davis et al., (1997, pp. 32-34). Alliance leadership may adopt a control-oriented or and involvement oriented management philosophy. With control orientation, the thinking and controlling aspects are separated from the doing part of the work. When control-oriented leadership encounters an uncertain or risky situation, it manages the risk through the implementation of greater controls. In addition, in a control-oriented approach, relationships are generally transactional in nature or are based on institutional power. In contrast, involvement-oriented leadership is characterised by being highly participative, with open communication, empowerment of staff and the establishment of trust. In involvement-oriented approaches, the means of dealing with increased uncertainly and risk is through more training, empowerment and trust in staff.

Another way of considering leadership in strategic alliance may be the alignment of disparate leadership skills and interests into a successful partnership (Judge and Ryman, 2001, p. 73; Kendrick, 2006, p. 22). They suggest that successful strategic alliances involve two or more leaders who have relatively extensive power and authority over their own organisations but relatively constrained power and authority over the strategic alliance. On the basis of information and literature from the healthcare industry, they offer three lessons for senior management of alliance partners (Judge and Ryman, 2001, p. 73).
(a) Shared Commitment and Collaboration - Win-win collaborations are essential to the success of strategic alliances because they form the social glue that enables a loosely coupled partnership to continue to achieve its strategic goals. When managers take a collaborative approach they are often viewed as trustworthy over time (Judge and Ryman, 20012, p. 74).

(b) Shared Commitment to Enhanced Customer Value - When senior managers focus predominantly on financial performance adequate time is not allowed to create customer value. Research shows that focusing more on customer value increases the chances of alliance success (Judge and Ryman, 2001, p. 75).

(c) Shared Commitment to Innovation - Research apparently shows that being constrained to old paradigms is associated with alliance failure (Judge and Ryman, 20012, p. 76). Senior managers who jointly come up with creative new approaches to the management of their alliance are more likely to succeed.

A major cause of cooperative failure in alliances is poor leadership by management (Niederkofler, 1991, p.237). Managers are generally well trained in relation to their own organisations but often lack the skills required in inter-organisational cooperation situations. Thus alliances often appear to be managed reactively rather than based on deliberate and proactive strategies. On the basis of a theoretical model describing the major factors impacting on the evolution of strategic alliances based on six case studies, Niederkofler (2001, p. 237, pp. 250-253) identified three opportunities for managerial influence: the negotiation process; the boundary-spanning process; and cooperative flexibility.
(a) The Negotiation Process - Cooperative success is dependent on the contributions of both partners and only relationships that benefit both parties will work. To create strategic fit, the negotiation process must produce a clear understanding of the partner's resources and interests. Only then can the relationship be built on a solid foundation. This understanding is developed in detailed and open discussion, and through the avoidance of hidden agendas. Negotiations must lay a sound foundation for a cooperative relationship, by establishing for both a viable venture strategy on the basis of shared interests, by providing a clear concept for implementation, and by avoiding dependence on the partner (Niederkofler, 1991, pp. 250-251; Olk and Elvira, 2001, 124-130).

(b) The Boundary-spanning Process - Boundary spanning refers to all inter-organisational activities between firms. Careful interaction and cooperation in a climate of mutual trust are fundamental requirements for a successful relationship. To achieve this cooperation, the relationship must be carefully structured, specifically through the selection of communication channels, and the alliance leadership must receive unwavering support from senior management (Niederkofler, 1991, p. 251).

(c) Cooperative Flexibility - All partnerships are subject to change and uncertainly. As a result success in cooperative management requires flexibility. Alliance success ultimately depends on the partners' abilities to make adjustments in their relationship as necessary, overcoming operating misfit with structural and procedural changes in the boundary-spanning process, and renegotiating and repositioning the partnership to re-establish strategic fit (Niederkofler, 1991, p. 252).
According to Sökjer-Petersen (2010, pp. 11-13) differences in leadership dynamics are also associated with the way that new or additional partners are 'recruited' into existing networks. The author identifies three different ways in which this can occur. Firstly, the alliance initiators and/or leader can use existing or professional networks. In this case the leader can either use their own networks or the introductions and referrals from the initiators. Secondly, the alliance can 'advertise' or raise general awareness or specific groups may be targeted. In this type, the leader spends a great deal of time on creating and maintaining personal networks and on the development of trust. Thirdly, recruitment can occur as a result of an ad hoc meeting. In this case, two alliance leaders may come into contact with each other and discover a common interest leading to one joining with the other or the development of another alliance.

Austin (2000, p. 83) confirmed other’s findings that the active involvement of top leaders is vital to alliance strength because of their authorising and legitimising functions, but the connections need to permeate all levels of the organisations.

The leadership of partnerships requires an engagement in demanding boundary working and present ethical dilemmas (Broussine and Miller, 2005, p. 379). These authors argue that the moral purpose of a partnership is an important facet of the leadership 'holding' process in a turbulent and shifting environment, and that the maintenance of ethical leadership behaviour requires continuous working with uncertainty. 'Good' leadership comprises the holding of dual and simultaneous dimensions of being both ethical and effective. A primary function of organisational leadership is to increase awareness about ethical issues, and they described transformational leadership as a process in which leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation. They make a distinction between transformational
and transactional leadership. It is this distinction that provides an understanding of what is 'good' leadership.

These views of leadership represent ends and means, respectively: transactional leadership requires 'moral values' (responsibility, fairness, honesty, keeping promises), while transformational leadership requires 'end-values' (liberty, justice and equality). In the study, leadership was seen to be a pivotal process in effective partnership working. Managers felt that a combination of personal qualities and skills (passion, credibility, respect and power) and the symbolic importance of leaders in this environment were critical. Authoritative leaders were seen as giving credibility to partnerships. There was also recognition among our participants that leadership could be a shared or dispensed process. Formally designated leaders in partnership arrangements are not necessarily 'in control' in an orthodox hierarchical sense. In some cases it may be in the actors' interest to act with the integrity and transparency that 'real' partnership working requires. There can be considerable systemic pressures for leaders and representatives in partnerships to work 'unethically' as they operate politically at the boundary between the partnership and the 'home' organisation. A significant concern is whether or not this leadership position is regarded as legitimate by other players, and whether or not this questioning is voiced.

In such circumstances, organisational leaders face the dilemma that on the one hand, they have to deliver and promote a new form of governance and professional practice, and on the other, the rules and financing associated with this new way of working change in unpredictable ways. This generates high levels of uncertainty among participants. However, managers could not always contain the anxieties of people on the ground as they themselves sometimes did not know what would happen next. What was notable about the leaders in
their study was how they seemed, generally, to have the capacities for holding on to the fundamental purpose of the partnership (both for themselves, and enabling other to do so), for having a tolerance of working in a situation of uncertainty and turbulence, and for working with irreconcilable demands and dilemma.

7.5 THE CORE CATEGORY 'ALLIANCE LEADERSHIP' IN RELATION TO THE BODY OF ESTABLISHED KNOWLEDGE ON PPAS

Of the three categories identified in the current study as associated with 'Alliance Leadership': 'Type'; 'Leadership Attributes'; and 'Acceptance /Formality', only 'Leadership Attributes' (comprised of individual leadership characteristic and leadership behaviours) is really addressed in the current body of established knowledge. This is picked up in both the 'role of leadership' and 'dynamics of leadership' literature.

These studies highlight the importance of alliance leadership both in respect to role and leadership dynamics. Alliance leadership faces unique challenges, for example the need to balance individual partner organisation and alliance interests and objectives. Alliance leadership connects relationships with purpose (Austin, 2000) and is the 'glue' that holds the alliance together. The dynamics of alliance relationship relates to the way in which the alliance characteristics and behaviours impact on other factors associate with alliance establishment. These dynamics in turn depend on factors such as type of organisation, number of partners in the alliance and leadership style.

The importance of alliance leadership in the establishment of alliances is supported by the results of the current research. Participants in this study were able to identify a range of
characteristics and behaviours which defined the effective leadership within the alliances studied and these were consistent with the findings of researchers such as Kanter (2000), Isabella (2002), Lesage (2006) and others. Likewise in respect to the dynamics of leadership, the results of the current research were generally supportive of the work of Standifer and Bluedorn (2011) (entrainment), Osborn and Marion (2009) (leadership perspective), Davis et al. (1997) (alignment of disparate leadership skills and interests). However, while the current research identified these issues as being important considerations for the participants in the establishment of PPAs, the research was not designed to study the detail of these dynamics.

The extant literature is deficient in four areas and the current study has added significantly to these:

(a) The extant literature deals mainly with alliance attributes. The current study shows 'Alliance Leadership' as a function of three categories; 'Type'; 'Attributes'; and 'Acceptance/Formality' and it is the interaction of these three elements that is important (Fig. 7.2). Further, these interactions appear to be complex and this is an area where further study is required.

(b) Previous researchers have ignored the importance of 'Alliance Type' as a major factor in the determination of 'Alliance Leadership'. Through the effect of 'source', 'dynamics' 'behaviours' and 'acknowledgement', 'Alliance Type' largely influences the nature of the 'Alliance Leadership' and this has flow-on effects to affect all of the other establishment processes, thereby ultimately expressing a major impact on alliance establishment.
(c) The existing literature provides little discussion on the role of alliance leadership 'Type' in alliance establishment. Alliance leadership 'Type' has two components; 'leadership source' and leadership interactions'. The results of this study appear to show a strong relationship between 'Alliance Type' and alliance leadership 'Type' (Table 7.1, Figure 7.6). In constrained choice-type alliances, the leadership of the alliance is generally appointed (in many cases through the appointment of a managing contractor to 'manage' that alliance) or by the donor organisation sponsoring the alliance. Should this appointed leadership prove to be ineffective or dysfunctional, then this can have adverse effects on other parts of the establishment process. In some cases, parallel informal leadership emerged from within the other partners and this was the cause of considerable conflict within the alliance. With voluntary-type alliances, the leadership was generally elected by the partners, appointed by the leader, or emerged from the core partners.

(d) The current study adds to the body of exiting knowledge is in regard to the acknowledgement or acceptance of the leadership by the partners in the alliance. 'Acceptance/Formality' is a category within the core category 'Alliance Leadership' and it also interacts with 'Alliance Type' (refer Table 7.1, Figure 7.6). In the case of voluntary-type alliances, the alliance leadership was more likely to be accepted by the partners, particularly if the leadership was elected or appointed collectively by the partner or the core partners. Where leadership was not formally appointed or elected, leadership emerged from within the partners and the situation was less clear cut. With constrained choice-type alliances, the partners generally had little or no choice with regard to the appointment of the alliance leadership. In these cases, partners may unwillingly 'accept' this leadership but be less supportive with the potential for conflict and dysfunction. Informal 'parallel' leadership may also emerge from within the other alliance partners in this situation, further exacerbating this conflict and dysfunction.
7.6 IMPLICATIONS OF THESE FINDINGS

During the Grounded Theory (and subsequently comparative analysis) analysis it quickly became clear that the study participants viewed 'Alliance Leadership' as an important consideration in alliance establishment due to its influence across all of the establishment processes. The role of 'Alliance Leadership' in alliance establishment has been largely ignored by other researchers and further studies in this area are likely to be complicated by the nature of 'Alliance Leadership'. For example, the initiator of the alliance does not necessarily 'drive' the establishment processes following conception and 'Alliance Leadership' may change during the establishment phase or formal and informal leadership emerge from within the alliance partners. Thus 'Alliance Leadership' during establishment may be unstable and quite unpredictable but must be given adequate consideration due to its importance.

'Alliance Type' and 'Alliance Leadership' appear to be inextricably linked. Whilst 'Alliance Leadership' influences all of the establishment processes it cannot be viewed in isolation without considering the major effects that 'Alliance Type' exerts on it. Researchers such as Stephens et al. (2009) have considered the effect of 'Alliance Type' in terms of three aspects (a) whether or not to enter into an alliance; (b) with whom to partner; and (c) the governance arrangements.

The current study shows that to this group should be added a fourth factor (d) alliance leadership. Just as in constrained choice alliance the decision to ally, the choice or partners and the choice of governance arrangements are constrained, the results of the current work appear to show that the nature of the 'Alliance Leadership' may also be constrained. The tendency towards directive, non-collegiate leadership appointed by donors on constrained
choice alliances in ODA may further exacerbate the potential dysfunctions associated with these types of alliances. However, just as the majority of alliance included in the current study were neither purely constrained choice or voluntary (but had a tendency towards one or the other), so to the 'Alliance Leadership' was rarely at the extremes detailed in Fig 7.6 and they often exhibited a blend of characteristics adding complexity to this study and the results.

7.7 CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have defined and described the core category 'Alliance Leadership'. While 'Alliance Leadership' has been examined by other researchers it has only been investigated in terms of alliance leadership attributes. It has not been considered in the context of the three categories identified in this study or in terms of its influence across all the processes of alliance establishment.

The study of 'Alliance leadership' in relation to alliance establishment is complicated by the close linkage between 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Alliance Type'. Thus 'Alliance Type' not only exerts an important influence over 'Alliance Leadership' but the two are inextricably linked and cannot be considered alone. Together 'Alliance Type' and 'Alliance Leadership' are prime determinants of the nature of the resulting 'Alliance Relationships'.

These interactions are further complicated by a range of overarching factors identified by the study participants. These overarching factors sit outside the 'Process and Process Issues' associated with alliance establishment but they can affect any part or all parts of alliance establishment. They can occur at the very beginning of establishment or emerge throughout
the establishment processes and may thus be difficult to identify or predict. I have termed these factors 'Modifiers' and they are discussed in detail in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 8: MODIFIERS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, I defined and described the fourth of the five core categories developed in the Grounded Theory analysis; 'Alliance Leadership'.

The study participants readily identified a groups of factors which lie outside of the alliance establishment processes ('Processes and Process Issues') but which can exert an influence across all of the other core categories. I have termed these overlaying factors, 'Modifiers'. They form the fifth and final core category developed from the grounded theory analysis. In this chapter, I begin with a description of the dimensions, properties and characteristics of this core category.

During the Grounded Theory analysis, a group of factors 'alliance partner class' emerged as being potentially important in alliance establishment. 'Alliance partner class' is comprised of the different classes of alliance partners (for example, donors, private sector, and government). A comparative analysis was carried out and, as a result, I conclude that 'alliance partner class' is, in fact, a modifier. 'Alliance partner class' is discussed in this chapter as it gives a good insight into the nature and dynamics of modifiers. The comparative analysis of 'alliance partner class' also allowed an analysis of 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class interactions'. This is also discussed in this chapter as it provides additional understanding of the interaction between core categories and the complexity of alliance establishment.
This chapter concludes with a consideration of 'Modifiers' in relation to the established literature on PPAs and the implications of this research for the establishment of PPAs in ODA.

### 8.2 THE CORE CATEGORY 'MODIFIERS'

'Modifiers' are a group of factors which may have either a positive or negative effect across all of the establishment processes and process issues and may interact with the other core categories ('Alliance Type', 'Alliance Relationships' and 'Alliance Leadership'). The feature that unites these overlaying factors is that they lie outside of the alliance establishment processes and other core categories and that they may exert their influence across all of the other process and core categories associated with alliance establishment. Each of these factors may work individually, in multiples or through interaction. In addition, these modifiers may be important through their presence or absence at the beginning of the establishment process (precursors) or they may be important throughout, or later in the establishment process (contingency/emergent factors) (Fig. 8.1). Thus modifiers are problematic in that they are not always apparent at the beginning of alliance establishment and may emerge during these processes.
These modifiers may be individual (e.g. personal relationships), organisational (e.g. partner motivation), structural (e.g. management structures) or external factors (e.g. government regulations) factors (Figs. 8.1 and 8.2).
Figure 8.2 The Core Category 'Modifiers'

Individual

'Individual' modifiers relate to the attributes of key individuals in the establishment of the PPA. Examples of important individual factors which emerged from the analysis are:

- experience
- relationships
- interpersonal skills
- control/influence
- stability individual interests

An example of an 'Individual' precursor is given by the following interview extract:

*So he is a friend of mine. So I know him personally and he knows me.... [P4]*

Control/influence provides an example of an 'Individual' contingency/emergent Modifier as follows:
So I suggested that since I have a background in PPA, I said that why don’t we go into this kind of approach and we can attract more people so more organisations into our fold and then we can then expand our rates. I said it will be in our interest to do this kind of approach. And the management of the private sector partner company understood what I was proposing so they said okay let’s go for it........[P4]

'Individual' Modifiers has only one sub-category; 'attributes' (Fig. 8.3).

Figure 8.3 The Components of the Category 'Individual'

Organisational

'Organisational' Modifiers are characteristics and issues that are a function of the individual partner organisation and that can have a significant influence of the PPA establishment processes.

Examples of partner 'Organisational' precursors are previous experience and existing relationships:
Perhaps I was not fully aware of all the potential collaborations or ways of collaborating. So, I think probably we went into it more innocently without complete analysis of other ways of doing it. I think going into it probably a bit naïve, so didn’t consider the disadvantages. But going into it without a tremendous amount of experience in public/private partnerships I don’t think we realised these hurdles and bumps........[P3]

Unless you know the partners for an extended period of time before you enter into this I think you end up – it’s like going to a dance and you’re picking a partner and it’s a bit of a blind date. I know of another PPA that seems to work well because there is a tremendous amount of history and people know each other well..........[P3]

The following example describes one of the partnership 'Organisational' contingency factors; control/influence:

We’re providing capital investment. We’re also providing the policy direction....but we don’t have any control over how the project will be implemented........[P2]

An example of a partnership 'Organisational' contingency/emergent factor (trust/respect) is given in the following interview excerpt:
One of the attractive things with this PPA is that there is a culture in the organisations of respecting all partners........[P5]

'Organisational' Modifiers has one sub-category; 'organisational factors (Fig. 8.4).

Figure 8.4 The Components of the Category 'Organisational'

[Diagram showing categories and subcategories]

Structural

'Structural' Modifiers are the characteristics of the emerging alliance and associated structure that can exert an influence over PPA establishment processes and ultimately the ‘success’ of the PPA.

An example of a 'Structural' contingency/emergent factor is given in the following extract from a participant interview:

Well, you see it was true partnership. Like the partners were involved from the very beginning, even before there was a product to commercialise........[P3]
'Structural' contingency/emergent Modifiers include divergence of views and strategies, for example:

*I think that the weakness has been the one that I’ve already mentioned that the public and private sectors have turned out to have slightly different goals....* [P2]

As with 'Individual' and 'Organisational' Modifiers, 'Structural' Modifiers has a single sub-category; 'structural issues' (Fig. 8.5).

**Figure 8.5   The Components of the Category 'Structural'**

External

'External' Modifiers are those that are outside the control of the individual partners of the PPA but which, nevertheless, can significantly influence the PPA establishment processes or impact upon the strategy, management of operating environment of the PPA. The following two interview extracts demonstrate the importance of 'External precursors':
It’s a policy of the government that we need to provide these services in all villages be a certain date. So based on that we developed programs, projects and we looked for possible partners for implementation, to fast track the implementation.............[P2]

An example of an 'External' contingency/emergent factor (cultural differences) comes from one of the interview transcripts:

So there is no one representing the recipient country on the management committee at the moment. They don’t understand the country that well and then they have to have the country ways.......[P3]

'External' Modifiers has four sub-categories: 'government'; 'politics'; 'challenges'; and 'culture' (Fig. 8.6).

**Figure 8.6  The Components of the Category 'External'**

'Government' refers to the external government (generally local, provincial or national government) factors such as government policy, regulations and restrictions that can
exert a general and overarching effect on alliance establishment. 'Politics' describes the political factors (outside of the alliance and partner organisations) such as political interference, corruption and tension caused by differences in political agendas which impact on alliance establishment. In the PPAs studied, political factors were particularly important at the local and provincial levels but often were difficult to anticipate in the early stages of establishment. 'Challenges' includes a wide range of external factors with the potential for major impacts across the whole of the alliance establishment processes. These challenges include imponderables such as adverse climatic events and domestic conflict and other factors such as geographical isolation and the influence of the Church. The final 'External' Modifier is 'culture' and includes a number of cultural issues such as cultural differences and socially sensitive issues.

8.3 'ALLIANCE PARTNER CLASS' AS A MODIFIER?

Public-private alliances in ODA programs typically involve partners from the public sector (in particular donors, government organisations and CGIAR Centres (members of the 15 specialist international agricultural research centres coordinated under the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research)); private sector, and other sectors such as civil society (for example, non-government organisations (NGOs) and philanthropic trusts). The body of established research suggests that the different partners vary in terms of a range of factors such as motivation to join an alliance; organisation strategy, philosophy and values, power, and size. Therefore, for these partners, the dynamics with regard to the establishment process and the interaction with other core categories could potentially vary significantly. Whilst the participants in Grounded Theory component of the research for this study did not directly identify 'alliance partner class' as a key consideration in alliance establishment,
differences with regard to this attribute were apparent in responses regarding core categories, categories and sub-categories. Thus 'alliance partner class' was considered worthy of further study in order to add depth to the conceptual model and examine these apparent interactions. Using a comparative analysis methodology (Chapter Three), the alliance partnership classes associated with the PPAs used in this study were compared and contrasted using the Integrated Theoretical Model (Chapter Nine) as an analytical framework.

8.3.1 'Alliance Partner Class'

The partners in the PPAs used in this study could generally be grouped into six broad classes: donors; private sector organisations; government organisations; other public sector organisations (e.g. CGIAR Centres); implementing organisations; and secondary partners (including NGOs, industry associations, local governments and smaller commercial organisations) (refer fig. 8.7). Implementing organisations, while generally alliance partners, were responsible for the implementation, establishment, and management of the alliance but were generally not core partners. The secondary partners were involved in the execution of the alliance strategy and activities but generally had a lesser role in alliance establishment and the ongoing management of the alliance generally (refer fig. 8.7).
In the first phase of the research, the study participants did not directly identify 'alliance partner class' as a major concern in the alliance establishment process. This may be due in part to the individual participants viewing the alliance establishment processes from the point of view of their own partner organisation. Therefore, they may not have recognised the alternative points of view of other partner classes or the potential influence of partner class on alliance establishment. The importance of alliance partner class, however, appeared to be apparent through partner comments and perspectives regarding specific aspects of the alliance establishment process.

For example, with regard to the process of conception in P[2]:

*It was the right moment for a PPA because a private firm just came knocking at our doors saying we want to partner with you. We had*
this formal memorandum of intent between the Federal Government and us for an infrastructure project. So everything fell into place at the right time (Donor perspective).

We applied to the donor for funding to implement the project that required a private sector partner (Implementer Perspective).

It all started with a Presidential Directive............it's a policy of the Federal Government. So, based on that we looked for potential partners to implement, to fast track the implementation. One of those partners is this alliance...because we have a memorandum of intent with the donor (Government perspective).

We were already operating in this area for five years before this PPA. At the time, the donor wanted to put some money into infrastructure, since this was a major program of the Government. The Government Organisations came to us and since we were already investing significantly in this area we decided to join the partnership and spend part of our investment to be put into that partnership (Private Sector perspective).

Another example is highlighted by the subgroup of 'motivation to join the alliance' ('Processes/Process Issues', category 'Bringing the Partners on Board') in P[3]:

The private sector had decided that it was just too expensive and too risky to go ahead with the product. So they were only prepared to go ahead if the public sector would share the costs and responsibility. So it was really driven, I guess by a desire to
capture the private sector IP values for the public domain; that was the rationale. Get access for poor growers around the world to this proprietary IP free of charge. So we agreed to see if we could make a public-private partnership which would give the company the confidence to be able to go ahead with developing the product. And what happened then was that we persuaded the Donor to give us a bit of money just to look into the feasibility, sustainability and so on of such an idea. So they raised a small project. There were more discussions and it became apparent that if this was going to work we were going to need more skills in the PPP than the two partners had. So that was one reason to bring in more partners (Government Organisation).

I think they were looking for a public partner, I think partially to ease public acceptance of a GMO food crop. I think that they thought that the CGIAR centre could provide some continuation of that objective to introduce a GMO food crop and I think that was a large part of their motivations. For our motivation, it was a chance for us to learn all about the commercial development of GMO vegetables since it was an obvious area for evolution of the Centre and this would be an opportunity where there would be funding, or at least a mechanism for obtaining funding (CGIAR Centre).

So we decided to start a public-private partnership in which the private partner would take care of the development. So all of the transformation work, testing etc. And the public partners would
take care of getting the material to market. Like they would do negotiation, communication, biosafety studies and all the other things like interacting with government etc. And we were very excited about this model. And the private partners would take care of their budget and also the private partners would take care of their own budget. We also started looking for donors to fund the activities of the public partners (Private Sector).

Well, we had done work essentially on the product for about 15 years. Then when we were approached about a formal collaboration, I mean I think that we were really we were the only one or one of a few research groups working in this area. So we were asked to join this particular public-private partnership. So we were asked to join and it seemed that with the other partners, that is the private sector, and with funding (from the donor) it seemed that it was a way of moving this minor crop into commercial production. Well, the public sector may be very good at research and stewardship of a particular product, but they're not so good at commercialisation of it. And working with a company that has experience in commercialisation gives a heads up that will, or gives an advantage that the product will actually come to market. I think from a private sector perspective they thought that having a public partner gave them a better face for public relations especially on something as controversial as a GM product (Secondary Partner 1).
So a number of different strands came together that made me think that if businesses have something or the private sector have access to patents, access to skills to make those patents into products, that could be of great use to developing country farmers but that the marketplace on its own would never result in delivering them. So I think that this in essence was the reason why I felt worth engaging with the alliance because here, the idea of a public-private sector partnership which would enable farmers who wouldn't get access to a particularly promising technology would get it with the help of the public sector providing additional expertise and financing, I thought was important because it's not merely the finance (Secondary Partner 2).

During the Grounded Theory analysis, the data was not adequate to influence the characteristics or dimensions of 'alliance partner class' or to ascertain the role of this attribute in alliance reestablishment. Further study of this characteristic was deemed necessary.

8.3.2 The 'Alliance Partner Class' Literature

A large body of established literature discusses the critical process of selection of individual partners in voluntary alliances and the interactions with alliance establishment. This literature considers a diverse range of factors for individual partners, such as specific task-related skills and resources (Geringer, 1991, p. 54); unique experience and capabilities (Stephens et al., 2009, p. 506); status (Podony, 1994, p. 458; Li and Berta, 2002, p. 339); past relationships (Podony, 1994, p. 458; Gulati, 1995a, pp.621-727; Gulati et al., 2000, pp. 203-204); resources (Das and Teng, 2000, pp.493-496; Zhang, 2005, p. 631 ), stability (Solesvik
and Westhead, 2010, p. 841), embeddedness (Stephens et al., 2009, p.504), organisation capabilities (Zaman and Mavondo, 2009, pp.1-5) and diversity in partner's characteristics (Parkhe, 1991, p. 579). As previously discussed, in the case of constrained choice alliances, the partners have generally been selected by the initiating organisation. The decision thereby becomes one of whether or not to partner with the recommended organisations.

While a wide range of studies have considered individual partner selection in the establishment of PPAs, relatively few studies have been carried out from a partner class perspective.

One such study is the work of Rumsey and White (2009) who examined how managers of non-profit organisations perceived benefits, corporate motives, and communication patterns in their strategic philanthropic relationships with corporate partners. This study found that the traditional models of the corporation (the shareholder model and the stakeholder model) are being replaced by a new model of corporate social responsibility that promotes convergence between the norms of a company and those of its stakeholders (Rumsey and White, 2009, p. 301). In partnerships with these corporations, NGOs perceive multiple corporate motives which blend altruism and self-interest. Non-profits who understand the business needs and objectives of their corporate partners saw business and benevolent motives as compatible and need not preclude a genuine desire to serve community needs. In these partnerships, control was shared between the partners and there was high level of partner satisfaction (Rumsey and White, 2009, p. 303). However, this work fails to consider the effect of the partnership class on individual establishment processes and the complex dynamic of PPA establishment.
A second study examined differences among alliances formed by environmental (non-profit organisations), government agencies, for-profit businesses and other environmental (non-profit) organisations with respect to understanding non-profit alliance relationships and their role in influencing environmental policy and market behaviour (Milne et al., 1996, p. 203). This study was conducted in response to questions raised in the literature regarding (a) the different types of activities that non-profits pursue; (b) the distinctive cultures and operating styles that non-profits bring to their chosen activities; and (c) their important role in mediating between the public and private sectors.

From a sociological perspective, non-profit organisations can be described as culturally and organisationally distinct from for-profit and government organisations. For example, modern organisations in the business and government sectors are usually characterised by tightly coupled patterns of inter-organisational coordination, formal structures of intra-organisational coordination, and non-ideological patterns of intra-individual coordination. So-called third sector organisations (non-profits) use coordination mechanisms that are less tightly controlled than coordination mechanisms used by either the for-profit or government sectors (Milne et al., 1996, p. 204). The study found that alliances vary significantly (Milne et al., 1996, pp. 213-14). Alliances of non-profits with business and government seem to provide little improvement in the political position for the non-profits, whereas alliances with other non-profits often are more successful at improving the political influence of the non-profit, often through joint lobbying efforts.

In addition, non-profits perceived themselves as having more influence over the goals and policies of their government partners that they do over other types of partners. The research suggests that non-profits use alliances with each other to influence the legislative
policymaking process, but develop alliances with government partners to influence the way that particular legislative initiatives are implemented. Whilst this study has contributed to the understanding of non-profit alliance relationships, the authors admit that many other aspects of non-profit/non-profit and non-profit/business relationship dynamics remain to be fully understood.

8.3.3 Comparative Analysis of 'Alliance Partner Classes'

As discussed in Chapter Two, for the purposes of this analysis, the partners and senior managers for inclusion in this study were drawn from five alliance partner classes in each of the PPAs under study: donors; private sector organisations; implementers and secondary organisations. The results of this comparative analysis are presented in the tables in Appendix J (Tables 1 to 20) and summarised in Table 8.1.
Table 8.1  Summary of Comparative Analysis of 'Alliance Partner Class' With Respect to the Theoretical Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Partner Class</th>
<th>Core Categories</th>
<th>Modifiers</th>
<th>Alliance Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor</strong></td>
<td>Conception/Alliance Initiation</td>
<td>Other Process/Process Issues</td>
<td>Alliance Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor agenda</td>
<td>- Donor agenda</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor targets partners or partners approach donor</td>
<td>- Donor targets partners or partners approach donor</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieving buy-in</td>
<td>- Achieving buy-in</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understanding obligations</td>
<td>- Understanding obligations</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience/track record</td>
<td>- Experience/track record</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment with donor and national objectives</td>
<td>- Alignment with donor and national objectives</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning from earlier partnerships</td>
<td>- Learning from earlier partnerships</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accountability</td>
<td>- Accountability</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor guidelines and requirements</td>
<td>- Donor guidelines and requirements</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formality</td>
<td>- Formality</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>- Opportunity for Donor/mechanism of investment</td>
<td>- Commercial opportunity</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor decision to invest or convinced donor to invest</td>
<td>- Working with government</td>
<td>- Donors/ core partners/ Implementer/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dominance of Donor/power and control</td>
<td>- Testing the waters</td>
<td>- No clear leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor influence on objectives</td>
<td>- Reaching agreement</td>
<td>- Implementer sets direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor rules and regulations</td>
<td>- Natural fit</td>
<td>- Dynamic leadership, understanding supportive, professional, visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner steering committee role in</td>
<td>- Specific skills</td>
<td>- Sets direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shared vision</td>
<td>- Fixed on own agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment with partner and alliance goals</td>
<td>- Holds alliance together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bringing in the commercial sector</td>
<td>- Clear leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Networking with other organisations</td>
<td>- Formal leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dominant characters
- Strong ideas
- Differences in experience
- Organisational experience
- Organisation structure
- Alliance size
- Alliance politics
- Government policy
- Local politics
- Security issues
- Geographic issues
- Cultural issues

- Formalised relationships
- Advantages of working with the private sector
- Partnership
- Shared perspectives
- Committed
- Delivering to donor expectations
- Deliverables
- Rigid structure
- Dysfunction between private and public sectors
- Government concerns working with the private sector
- Tension between partners
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Initiation, objectives development, management and operations</th>
<th>Learning organisations</th>
<th>Government and donor relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor initiative</td>
<td>- Learning organisations - Formality</td>
<td>- Implementer/</td>
<td>- Partners not involved in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common purpose</td>
<td>- Share resources</td>
<td>Government/CIAR/core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New way of doing things</td>
<td>- Access to technology and resources</td>
<td>partners/secretariat/no official leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor decision to invest, convinced donor to invest or facilitated formation</td>
<td>- Bringing the private sector on board</td>
<td>- Consultative leadership, visionary, personable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor &quot;drives the bus&quot;</td>
<td>- Common understanding</td>
<td>- Oversight role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor provides strategic context</td>
<td>- Alignment</td>
<td>- Keeps the organisation going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor heavily involved</td>
<td>- Complete skills set</td>
<td>- Smooth implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering committee makes decisions</td>
<td>- Alignment with government priorities and government organisational objectives</td>
<td>- Draws on others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government oversight</td>
<td>- Leadership elected by stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Harmonisation of systems</td>
<td>- Appointed leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Desire for more formality</td>
<td>- Acknowledgement of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementer         | Donor interest - Established need - Response to problem - Multiple/joint initiation - Donor decision to invest, convinced donor to invest or core partners establish steering committee - Donor agenda - Donor drives overarching strategy - Compliance with donor rules and regulations - Steering committee develops strategy - Steering committee as | Networks - Business interests - Bringing the partner together - Selling the concept - Agreement on deliverables - Strong partners - Agreement on objectives - Convergence of objectives - Flexible structure - Honouring commitments - Complying with donor requirements - Clear expectations | Donor/implementer/Core partners - Implementer role in alliance management - Leadership able to get things done, good understanding of sector - Understands how to make things happen - Drives in the background - Coach - Mentor - Leadership credibility with partners - Appointment of leadership |
| Secondary | Decision maker | - Donor opportunity  
- New way of doing business  
- Opportunity for change  
- Donor preference for model  
- Selected partners form management committee  
- Management committee develops strategy  
- Active forum  
- Importance of donor experience | - Opportunity to partner with government  
- Overcome technical problems  
- Commercial motivation  
- Promoting alliance  
- Clarity about levels of support and commitment  
- Strategic fit  
- Common goals and objectives  
- Corporate goals and objectives  
- Partners in management  
- Consultation with partners  
- Culture of respect  
- Regular engagement  
- Formal/organised but informal | - Implementer/core partners/independent secretariat/government/donor  
- Alliance managed by Implementer  
- Professional leadership, straight, honest broker, strong individual  
- Enabler  
- Suggested what to do  
- Accommodates requests  
- Steering  
- Coordination  
- Independent broker  
- Guides activities  
- Acceptance of leadership  
- Unofficial leadership  
- Identified leadership  
- Informal leadership | - Personal agendas  
- Strong personalities  
- Persistent individuals  
- Individual commitment  
- Organisational experience  
- Organisation structure  
- Alliance size  
- Alliance politics  
- Government policy  
- Local politics  
- Security issues  
- Geographic issues  
- Cultural issues | - Direct relationship with core partners  
- All partners involved equally  
- Good relationships  
- Working together  
- Open door  
- Benefits for stakeholders  
- Meeting commitments  
- Model is context specific  
- No relationship with other partners  
- 'Clubs'  
- Limited input into decision making |
The results of the comparative analysis suggest that the 'alliance partner classes' do not differ from each other in regard to all core categories, categories and sub-categories. However, they do differ in regard to six characteristics and attributes: motivations for joining the alliance; perceptions of the alliance partner classes (particularly with respect to conception, alliance leadership, alliance processes, modifiers, alliance relationship dysfunction and alliance success); engagement in alliance management and decision making; alignment between organisation and alliance strategies; target relationships; and target outcomes. Summarised data from the comparative analysis has been re-grouped under these headings and is presented in Table 8.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Partner Class</th>
<th>Motivation to Join Alliance</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Engagement in Management and Decisions Making</th>
<th>Alignment Between Organisation and Alliance Strategies</th>
<th>Target Relationships</th>
<th>Target Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor</strong></td>
<td>- Donor agenda</td>
<td>- Donor drives strategy - Donor targets partners or partners convince donor</td>
<td>- Steering by donor - Donor guidelines and requirements</td>
<td>- Alignment with donor and national objectives</td>
<td>- Formalised relationships</td>
<td>- Delivering to donor expectations - Focus on deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>- Commercial opportunity - Working with government</td>
<td>- Donor power and control - Donor influences objectives</td>
<td>- Donor rules and regulations - Partner steering committee</td>
<td>- Alignment between partner and alliance goals</td>
<td>- Personal relationships - Strategic relationships - Good relationship with government</td>
<td>- Influence with government - Shared success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td>- Bringing in the private sector - Access to technical skills and resources</td>
<td>- Donor initiative - Donor heavily involved in processes - Donor drives bus</td>
<td>- Donor heavily involved - Steering committee makes decisions</td>
<td>- Government priorities and objectives</td>
<td>- Good relationship with donor</td>
<td>- Meeting government needs - Sense of affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementer</strong></td>
<td>- Business interests - Networks</td>
<td>- Donor agenda - Donor drives overarching strategy</td>
<td>- Donor rules and regulations - Steering committee as decision maker - Implementer role in alliance management</td>
<td>- Agreement on objectives - Convergence of objectives</td>
<td>- Stable/cohesive relationships - True partnership - Mutual respect</td>
<td>- Complying with donor requirements - Meeting government expectations - Verified success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td>- Partnership with Government - Overcoming technical problems - Commercial motivation</td>
<td>- Donor opportunity - Donor preference for model - Management committee develops strategy - 'Clubs'</td>
<td>- Alliance managed by implementer - Limited input in decision making - Partner not involved in management</td>
<td>- Common goals and objectives</td>
<td>- Direct relationships with core partners - Working together</td>
<td>- Opportunity to work with government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the donor perspective, donor strategy and mandate were prime drivers of the alliance conception with donors, but sometimes government agencies, CGIAR centres and Implementers were the actual initiators. There were essentially two initiation scenarios recognised by most of the partners: those where the donor initiated the process through a call for proposals or some other contestable process to influence partner composition; and those where the initiators approached the donor and convinced them to invest in the alliance. Even in the later scenario, the donors were still the major force in driving the establishment of the alliance. Alignment of the alliance and donor strategies was a key consideration.

Donors had a major influence on the alliance model, processes and establishment, and they provided oversight and close supervision at all stage of alliance establishment. However, they did recognise the role of the other partners and partner steering committee in the establishment, particularly in the case of voluntary alliances. Donors appointed, or had a significant influence on, the appointment of the alliance leadership. Their focus was on the development of formalised relationships, meeting donor expectations and alliance deliverables. The main alliance dysfunction as viewed by donors was tension between the alliance partners.

The private sector partners highlighted the dominance and influence of the donors in most aspects of alliance establishment and this was enforced through the use of rules, regulations and other accountability mechanisms. Their main motivations for joining the alliances were commercial opportunities and the opportunity to work with government. A key consideration was the alignment between partner and alliance goals. Private sector partners acknowledged the influence of the donors in establishing clear, dynamic leadership, but also identified the opportunity for multiple of no clear leadership. Private sector organisations were focussed on
developing personal relationships, strategic relationships and relationships with government. Target alliance outcomes were looking for influence with government, shared success and commercial agendas.

Government organisations acknowledged the role of the donors in alliance initiation and establishment but also identified the role of steering committees comprised of core partners. Motivations for government organisations to enter alliance included opportunities to work with the private sector and access to technologies and resources. The perception was that alliance leadership was either appointed (generally by the donor) or elected by the stakeholders. This leadership was viewed as consultative, personable, visionary, drawing on other partners and keeping the alliance on track. Government organisations were focussed on developing good government and donor relationships, public-private partnerships and a sense of affiliation. Targeted outcomes were value adding to investment and meeting of government needs. These organisations perceived conflicting goals and objectives and multiple levels of management as major alliance dysfunction.

As was the case with government organisations, Implementers acknowledged the role of the donors is alliance initiation and establishment but also identified the role of core partner steering committees as decision makers. Development of networks, business interests, strong partners and bringing partners together were prime motivators for joining these alliances. Agreement of objectives and deliverables amongst the partners was a high priority. Leadership was seen as being appointed, generally by the donor, and important leadership characteristics were seen as ability to get things done, understanding how to make things happen, ability to drive the alliance in the background, and credibility with partners. Implementers were generally seeking stable, cohesive relationships and true partnerships.
Targeted outcomes included meeting government expectations, verified success and official recognition of the alliance. Partner conflict, divergent strategies among the partners and not meeting commitments were identified as major alliance dysfunctions.

While the secondary partners viewed donor opportunity and donor preference of the PPA model as prime alliance drivers, the importance of core partners are seen as being of high importance. The motivation for secondary partners to join the alliances included opportunity to partner with government, potential to overcome technical problems and commercial motivation. There was a focus on strategic fit between the partners and development of common goals and objectives. Alliance leadership was perceived as either appointed by the donor or developing informally from among the partners. A focus for secondary partners was on the development of direct relationships with core partners and good relationships with other partners. Targeted outcomes were working together, meeting commitments and benefits for stakeholders. Limited input into decision-making and 'clubs' within the alliance were viewed as major dysfunction.

The results of the comparative analysis reflect the nature of the relationship between partner classes within typical PPAs in ODA (refer fig. 8.2). These PPAs are either initiated by the donor or another partner who approaches a donor with a view to establishment of an alliance. Donors generally have a formal relationship with the developing country partner who gives them a formal mandate or funding and other resources desired by the other partners. Thus the donor generally either drives the initiation, or has a dominant role in the initiation and establishment processes, and in the comparative analysis this was reflected in the donor importance of donor agenda and mandate.
The PPAs in this study have a group of core partners generally comprised of the private sector, government organisations and sometimes CGIAR centres which have a direct relationship with the donor and may form a management or steering committee. In the comparative analysis this is highlighted by the importance given by these partners to the role of the donor as highlighted by participant responses such as "driving the bus", "imposing rules, regulations and accountability mechanisms" or at the least "having a dominant role in the management committee".

The implementer may or may not be formally a partner in the alliance but is often not part of the core group. The implementer is the executing organisation and is effectively a bridge between the donor and the other partners, particularly the secondary partners. Their focus is on the strategic, repeating and accountability requirements of the donor, the objectives of the alliance and the requirements and dynamics of the other partners.

The secondary partners often become involved with the alliance later in the establishment phase and have less involvement in the inception, strategy and management of the alliance. Generally, they are not part of the core group and these partners often deal with the alliance through the implementers. They often have a distant relationship with the donor and sometimes the other core partners. This is reflected in the comparative analysis by their reduce focus on the donor and increased focus on their relationship with the other partners and the alliance steering committee.
8.3.4 Key Findings and Implications of the Comparative Analysis of 'Alliance Partner Class'

The results of the comparative analysis (refer Tables 8.1, 8.2 and Appendix M) confirm the observations made during the Grounded Theory research for this project; that there were apparent interactions between 'alliance partner class' and the other core categories and processes associated with PPA establishment. However, differences between alliance partner classes were not apparent for all of the core categories, sub-categories and categories. Differences were most evident in six attributes and these results are presented in Table 8.2.

Whilst important in the establishment of public-private alliances, the participants in the additional research for this study, like those in the Grounded Theory study, did not identify 'alliance partner class' as a consideration in the establishment process. The differences were only really apparent through the comparative analysis. For this reason, 'alliance partner class' does not have the prominence of a core category within the Grounded Theory analysis. However, it is clearly and an important consideration for practitioners and alliance stakeholders since it affects a range of alliance and attributes and characteristics across the core categories and to varying degrees and levels of importance. It is suggested, therefore, that 'alliance partner class' should be included as a sub-category within the 'Organisational' category of the core category of 'Modifiers'.

The results of this comparative analysis of alliance partner class, support the findings of Rumsey and White (2009) that, for some partner classes perceived differences in benefits, corporate motivation and communication patterns may be important and the views of Milne et al. (1996) that the degree of formality, types of co-ordination and resulting political influence may vary between partner classes thus influencing the alliance establishment,
development and effectiveness. However, in the current study the level of engagement in alliance management and decision making, alignment between organisation and alliance strategies and the types of relationships that partners were seeking to develop also differed between alliance partner classes.

8.4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF 'ALLIANCE TYPE' by 'ALLIANCE PARTNER CLASS' AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN CORE CATEGORIES

The results of this comparative analysis are presented in the tables in Appendix K (Tables 1 to 20 and summarised in Table 8.3).
### Table 8.3 Summary of Comparative Analysis of 'Alliance Type' by 'Alliance Partner Class' with Respect to the Theoretical Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Initiation X Alliance Partner Class</th>
<th>Core Categories</th>
<th>Conception/Alliance Type</th>
<th>Other Process/Process Issues</th>
<th>Alliance Leadership</th>
<th>Modifiers</th>
<th>Alliance Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained-type x Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor initiated</td>
<td>- Targeted partners</td>
<td>- Donor or donor</td>
<td>No major differences</td>
<td>- Establishing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor directs, drives</td>
<td>- Approach by partners</td>
<td>representative as</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Linking to other partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strategy and provides</td>
<td>- Obligations and</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management oversight</td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribution to donor objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Laying down your cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Picking the right partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dysfunction between public and private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Capability of partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning and oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impacts focussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensuring partners follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type x Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Government initiation</td>
<td>- Open invitation to join</td>
<td>Core partners as</td>
<td>No major differences</td>
<td>- Development of relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- CGIAR as initiator</td>
<td>- Roles of partners</td>
<td>leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cementing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Importance of steering</td>
<td>- Agreed priorities</td>
<td>- Donor as leader</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formalised relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>committee</td>
<td>- Reaching agreement</td>
<td>- Influencer</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Business relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Steering committee</td>
<td>- Partner balance</td>
<td>- Steering</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting stakeholder needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>develops strategy and</td>
<td>- Additional skill sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Added value for partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provides management</td>
<td>- Donor priorities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Government organisation dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Competing objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Competing agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Setting ground rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Uneven power and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Outcomes focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Exerting influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decreasing formality</td>
<td>No major differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constrained</strong></td>
<td>- Initiated by donor&lt;br&gt;- Donor power and control</td>
<td>- Decreasing formality&lt;br&gt;- Implemented as leader&lt;br&gt;- Multiple leaders&lt;br&gt;- Dynamic&lt;br&gt;- Directs</td>
<td>No major differences&lt;br&gt;- Strengthen relationships&lt;br&gt;- Long-term association&lt;br&gt;- Not previously worked together&lt;br&gt;- Commercial benefits&lt;br&gt;- Meeting stakeholders objectives&lt;br&gt;- Tangible benefits&lt;br&gt;- Impacts&lt;br&gt;- Partners not formally part of alliance&lt;br&gt;- Game playing&lt;br&gt;- Government interference&lt;br&gt;- Tension between partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td>- Grower association as initiator&lt;br&gt;- Alliance initiated by stakeholders&lt;br&gt;- Initiated by key individuals&lt;br&gt;- Establishment of management groups</td>
<td>- Decreasing formality&lt;br&gt;- No clear leadership&lt;br&gt;- Dual leadership&lt;br&gt;- Confusion regarding leadership&lt;br&gt;- Influential&lt;br&gt;- Facilitator&lt;br&gt;- Binding force&lt;br&gt;- Election of leadership</td>
<td>No major differences&lt;br&gt;- Develop new relationships&lt;br&gt;- Seek closer relationships&lt;br&gt;- Long-term&lt;br&gt;- Strategic&lt;br&gt;- Good experience for commercial partners&lt;br&gt;- Sustainable solutions for stakeholders&lt;br&gt;- Profitability&lt;br&gt;- Side benefits&lt;br&gt;- Little formal contact with other partners&lt;br&gt;- Partner dominance&lt;br&gt;- Selective information sharing&lt;br&gt;- Lack of coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constrained</strong></td>
<td>- Donor initiated&lt;br&gt;- Donor drives the bus</td>
<td>- Decreasing formality&lt;br&gt;- Implemented providers leadership&lt;br&gt;- Government provides leadership</td>
<td>No major differences&lt;br&gt;- Building relationships&lt;br&gt;- New relationships&lt;br&gt;- Relationships with other partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type x Government</td>
<td>Constrained-type x Implementer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Government as initiator</td>
<td>- Initiated by donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CGIAR as initiator</td>
<td>- Initiated by core partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initiated by core partners</td>
<td>- Donor agenda and framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decisions, strategy and management by steering committee</td>
<td>- Partner invited to join</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments responsibilities</td>
<td>- Approached donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitated negotiation</td>
<td>- Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Complete skills set</td>
<td>- Agreement on deliverables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Complementary</td>
<td>- Track record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shared objectives</td>
<td>- Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consistent with national priorities</td>
<td>- Overarching objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consultative forum</td>
<td>- Targeted objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss issues and concerns</td>
<td>- Complying with donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active membership</td>
<td>- Donor as leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partners involved in management</td>
<td>- Implementer as leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Desire for more formality</td>
<td>- Implementer as alliance management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common understanding</td>
<td>- Tension between emerging leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>- Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People you can work with</td>
<td>- Keeps organisation going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between partner objectives</td>
<td>- Draws on others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>- No official head of alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems and processes</td>
<td>- Core partners as leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder focused</td>
<td>- Tension between emerging leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with government needs</td>
<td>- Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>- Keeps organisation going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer as operations manager</td>
<td>- Draws on others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>- No official head of alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm leader</td>
<td>- Core partners as leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Meeting government needs and priorities
- Deliverables
- Recognition by government
- Power and control
- Lack of harmonisation
- Lack of consultation

No major differences
- Develop relationships
- Partnership evolution
- Friendships
- New Linkages
- Meeting stakeholders expectations
- Shared success
- Meeting objectives
- Competition between partners
- Resistance by government
- Political conflict
- Lack of contribution by some partners

No major differences
- Cultivate relationships
- Strengthen existing relationships
- Broader relationships
- Multinational alliance
- Donor country benefits
- Meeting donor objectives
- Verified success
- Recognition by government
- Withdrawal from
Voluntary-type x Implementer
- Multiple initiators
- Joint initiation
- Steering committee develops strategy and makes decisions

- Invited partners
- Open meeting
- Roles of partners
- Reaching agreement
- Experience
- Represent major stakeholders
- Flexible goals and objectives
- Conflicting partner goals and objectives
- Addressing problems
- Working together
- Client focussed
- Honouring commitment
- Informal/loose

- Donor as leader
- Core partners as leadership
- Implementer as alliance management
- Coach
- Glue
- Leaders works in the background

No major differences

Constrained-type x Secondary
- Approached by core partners
- Requested assistance
- Partner potential
- Strategic match
- Alignment of goals and objectives
- Sharing information
- Consultation with partners
- Focussed
- Clear boundaries
- Formal/informal

- Implementer as leadership
- Core partners as leadership
- Management by implementer
- facilitator
- Enabler

No major differences

Voluntary-type x Secondary
- Donor initiated
- Core group as initiators
- Management committee develops strategy

- Informal discussions
- Well-connected partners
- Represent breadth of stakeholders

- Implementer as leader
- Core partners as leadership
- Changing leadership

No major differences
| - Partner forum to discuss ideas | - Common goals and objectives  
- Agreed principles  
- Active participation  
- Active involvement  
- Implementation of activities by partners  
- Organised but informal | - Passionate  
- Steering  
- Coordinator  
- Guides activities | - Benefits for partners  
- Tangible benefits  
- Deliverables  
- Dominance by one partner  
- 'Clubs'  
- Lack of leadership  
- Uncoordinated |
Differences between 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class' were evident in the core categories of 'Alliance Type', 'Processes and Process Issues', 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Alliance Relationships', however there were no major differences in the core category, 'Modifiers'.

In constrained choice-type alliances donor generally initiated the alliance, drove the strategy and provided management and oversight of the establishment process. Donors targeted the other partners on the basis of their capabilities and approached them to join the alliance. The alliance was focused on impacts, donor priorities, policies and accountability and formality. Donors often commissioned or appointed the alliance leadership but reattained involvement in the alliance implementation. The focus of the alliance relationship was on contribution to the donor objectives and donor satisfaction. Relationship dysfunction included tension between the public and private sectors. With voluntary-type alliances, donors were often not involved in the initiation of the alliance, but were members of a group or core partner who formed a steering or management committee to oversee the establishment and operation of the alliance. In this case there was often an open invitation for new partners and an attempt to balance skills sets or take on partners with additional skills sets.

The details of the alliance operations was generally worked out through a negotiation process, with setting of ground rules, expectation management, a focus on outcomes and decrease formality. Donors had a reduced role in alliance leadership but could influence this through the steering/management committee. The focus of the donors in voluntary relationships was on developing, formalising and cementing relationships, meeting stakeholder needs, impact and adding value for partners. Relationship dysfunctions included competing partner agendas and uneven power and control.
With constrained choice-type alliances, private sector partners viewed the donor as initiating the alliance and as exerting power and control over the establishment process. They perceived partners as either approaching partners or in some cases partner approaching the donor. Partners were selected on partner balance, experience, credibility and reputation. The focus of the alliance operations was on donor strategy, clear objectives, impact and the ability of stakeholders to work with each other. There were clear objectives, clear roles and expectations and formality. The donor was viewed as appointing the alliance leadership, but the private sector was also of the view that secondary and multiple leadership was common.

The focus of the alliance relationships was developing new relationships, strengthening relationships, developing long-term relationships, meeting stakeholders' objectives, commercial benefits, tangible benefits and impacts. Dysfunctions included game playing, government interference and tension between partners. In voluntary-type alliances, private sector partners viewed a range of stakeholders initiating alliances including growers' groups, key individuals and groups of partners. There was an open invitation for partners to join the alliance and partner selection was on the basis of natural fit and complementarities. The basis of the alliance was agreement to work together, shared objectives, harmonisation, participation by partners and flexibility. The perception of the private sector was that there was no clear leadership or informal leadership with the alliance leadership emerging from the partners. This leadership was viewed as influential, facilitating and a 'binding force'. The focus of the alliance relationship was developing new relationships, seeking closer relationships, sustainable solutions for stakeholders, profitability, and side benefits. There were many perceived dysfunctions including partner dominance, selective information sharing, lack of coordination and little formal contact with other partners.
For government partners in constrained choice alliances the donor was viewed as initiating the alliance and ‘driving’ the agenda. They saw partners as being targeted or approaching the donor. The focus of alliance establishment was systems and processes, consistency with government needs, formality, alignment between partner objectives and defined roles and responsibilities. The donor or government was perceived as appointing the alliance leadership but maintaining influence. The focus of the alliance relationships were building new relationships, building relationships with other partners, meeting government needs and priorities, deliverables and recognition by government. Dysfunctions included power and control, lack of harmonisation and lack of consultation.

In voluntary-type alliances, government partners recognised a range of stakeholders as potential initiators of the alliance including government, CGIAR centres or core partners. Partners were recruited on the basis of complete skills sets and complementarities. The processes of establishment focused on facilitated negotiation, shared objectives, consistency with national objectives, active membership, partners involved in the alliance management and a desire for more formality. Alliance leadership often emerged from amongst the alliance partners and there was sometimes tension between the emerging leaders. The focus of the alliance relationship was on friendships and new linkages, meeting stakeholder expectations, shared success and meeting objectives. The government partners viewed alliance dysfunctions as including competition between partners, resistance by government, political conflict and a lack of contribution by some partners.

Implementers in constrained choice alliances viewed donors and core partners as the major potential initiators, but in either case the donor was viewed as pursuing their own agenda and trying to instil their framework. Partners could be invited to join the alliance or sometimes
approached the donor but were selected on the basis of competence and track record. The focus of establishment was on agreement on deliverables, roles and responsibilities, targeted objectives, complying with donor requirements, process management and formality. The implementer perceived the donor as providing the alliance leadership or appointing this leadership and the focus of the leadership was on getting things done. The focus of the alliance relationships was on broader relationships and multinational relationships, donor country benefits, meeting donor objectives, verified success and recognition by government. Alliance dysfunctions were viewed as lack of government support, game playing and processes that were not totally open. In voluntary-type alliances, implementers identified a range of potential initiators of the alliances and multiple or joint initiation was possible. Partners were invited to join and the focus of establishment was on open meetings, reaching agreement, flexible goals and objectives, working together, honouring commitments and informal arrangements. Leadership could emerge from the partnership or be provided by the donor or implementer. The leadership was seen as working in the background, as a coach or as the 'glue', holding the alliance together. The focus of the alliance relationships was building new relationships, personal relationships, meeting stakeholder needs, joint success and recognition by government. Alliance dysfunctions included conflict between public and private partners, conflicts of interest, hidden agendas and duplication.

Secondary partners in constrained choice-type alliances did not have firm views on alliance initiation. They viewed partners as being approached by the core partners on the basis of partner potential and strategic match. For them the focus of alliance establishment was on alignment of goals and objectives, sharing information, consultation with partners, focus and clear boundaries. Alliance leadership could be provided by the donor, implementer or core partners and the alliance leader was viewed as a facilitator or enabler. The focus of the
alliance relationships was relationships with other partners, meeting partner objectives, mutual benefits and side benefits. Dysfunctions included a lack of relationships with the other partners, technical limitations and limited input of partners into decision making. In the case of voluntary-type alliances secondary partner viewed as initiation potentially being carried out by a range of stakeholders including donors, core group of partners or key individuals. The focus of establishment was informal discussions, common goals and objectives, agreed principles, active participation, implementation by the partners and organised but informal. Alliance leadership could come from the initiator, implementer or core partners and it could change during the life of the alliance. The focus of the alliance relationship was on broad partnerships, personal relationships, new relationships, benefits for partners, tangible benefits and deliverables. There were a range of dysfunctions including dominance by one partner, formation of 'clubs', lack of leadership and a lack of coordination.

8.4.1 Key Findings and Implications of the Comparative Analysis of 'Alliance Type' by 'Alliance Partner Class'

The comparative analysis of 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class' interactions gives and insight into the complexities of alliance establishment and the way in which the elements may interact in the establishment process (in this case the interaction of an 'Organisational' Modifier, 'alliance partner class' with the core category 'Alliance Type' to impact on other attributes of the establishment process).

For example, the donor in constrained choice-type alliances exerted (and was viewed as exerting by the other alliance partners) a major influence over alliance conception, but also on the development of the alliance objectives, strategies and management processes. In voluntary-type alliances, the role of the donor was generally less dominant with the donor as
a member (along with the other core partners) of a management committee which developed the alliance objectives and strategy and was responsible for the strategic and operational oversight of the alliance.

This adds further weight to the argument that alliance establishment should not be viewed as a simple or linear process, but should be seen as a complex and messy process which requires careful consideration of the key elements and the way in which they may impact on alliance establishment.

8.5 THE ESTABLISHED BODY OF PPA LITERATURE ON 'MODIFIERS'

The influence of 'external' cross-cutting issues in alliance establishment, development and implementation has been considered by a number of authors, but most as individual or groups of factors, and not in an integrated model approach to alliance establishment. Authors such as Doz (1996); Ford et al. (1998); Austin (2000); Huxham and Vangar (2000) and Shachaf (2003) have studied the influence of drivers and enablers on the nature, functioning and effective management of the alliance relationships in evolutionary models of alliance establishment and development.

8.5.1 Drivers and Enablers

In his evolutionary model of alliance development, Austin (2000, p.69) proposed a conceptual framework for categorising different types of partnerships and their possible evolution through three principal stages: philanthropic, transactional and integrative. In addition to this conceptual framework, Austin also identified a set of alliance "drivers" that influence the nature and functioning of the alliance relationship and a set of alliance "enablers" that contribute to the effective management of the relationship. Table 8.4 presents
these driver and enablers and their relationship to the principal evolutionary stages; philanthropic, transactional and integrative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Philanthropic</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Integrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of strategy, mission, values</td>
<td>Minimal fit required, beyond a shared interest in a particular issue area</td>
<td>Overlap in mission and values</td>
<td>High mission mesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gratefulness and charity orientation</td>
<td>Partnering mindset</td>
<td>Shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship as tactical tool</td>
<td>Relationship as a strategic tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connections and relationships</td>
<td>Minimal personal connection to cause or people</td>
<td>Strong personal connection at leadership level</td>
<td>Expanded opportunities for direct employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded personal relationships throughout the organisation</td>
<td>involvement in relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased understanding and trust</td>
<td>Deep personal relationships and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>across organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value generation and shared visioning</td>
<td>Generic resource transfer</td>
<td>Core competency transfer</td>
<td>Joint value creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical unequal exchange of resources</td>
<td>More equal exchange of resources</td>
<td>Value renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal collaboration in defining activities</td>
<td>Shared visioning at top of organisation</td>
<td>Culture of each organisation influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporations respond to specific requests from non-profits</td>
<td>Projects of limited scope and risk</td>
<td>by the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects identified and developed at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>levels within the organisation, with leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broaders scope of activities of strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual learning</td>
<td>Minimal or informal learning</td>
<td>More active learning about process and substance</td>
<td>Systematic learning and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focussed attention</td>
<td>Little top leadership attention</td>
<td>Top management engaged at start-up and periodically</td>
<td>Significant and ongoing attention from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>top management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Organisational Systems</td>
<td>Mutual expectations and accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally annual around grant process</td>
<td>Corporate contact usually in community affairs or foundation; non-profit contact usually in development</td>
<td>Use for stated purpose but minimal other performance expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent communication between partners and externally</td>
<td>More people involved with responsibilities for specific collaboration activities</td>
<td>Explicit performance expectations for targeted collaborative activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit internal and external communication strategies and processes</td>
<td>Partner relationship managers</td>
<td>High performance expectations and accountability for results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational integration in execution, including shared resources</td>
<td>Incentives for collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Austin (2000) identified four alliance drivers that contribute significantly to the strength of the collaboration (that is, power the alliance): alignment of strategy, mission and values; personal connections and relationships; value generation and shared visioning; and continual learning.

**Strategy, Mission and Values Alignment**

The more centrally aligned the partnership purpose is to each organisation's strategy and mission, the more important and vigorous the relationship appears to be. The greater the mission mesh, the richer the collaboration. Similarly, the more congruent the partners' values, the stronger the alliance's cohesion (Austin, 2000, p. 81).

**Personal Connections and Relationships**

Social purpose partnerships appear to be motivationally fuelled by the emotional connection that individuals make both with the social mission and with their counterparts in the other organisation. Although the IOR literature emphasises interpersonal relationships, Austins' findings suggest that, for these cross sector alliances, the double connect with people and purpose is important. The mission connect is the motivational driver, and the personal relationships are the glue that binds the organisations together (Austin, 2000, pp. 82-83).

**Value generation and Shared Visioning**

The fundamental viability of an alliance depends on its ability to generate value for each of its partners. High-performance collaborations are about much more than giving and receiving money; they are about mobilising and combining multiple resources and distinctive capabilities to generate benefits for each partner and social value for society. Imbalance in the value exchange may hinder the development of the relationship. Because the resources
exchanges may depreciate in value over time, alliance vigour requires innovation in creating new value sources (Austin, 2000, p. 84).

**Continual Learning**

In the stronger collaborations, the partners are engaged in continual learning about the partnering process and how it can generate more value. There is openness and hunger to find new ways to engage more effectively. This discovered that ethics is fostered by win-win outcomes from learning in the collaborative relationship (Austin, 2000 p. 85).

The alliance drivers are the primary forces propelling the collaboration but supporting these appears to be a collection of factors that enable the effective management of the partnering relationship and process, factors such as focussed attention, communication, organisational system, and mutual expectations and accountability (Austin, 2000, p. 85) (Table 8.3).

**Focused Attention**

An intense and deep relationship requires considerable attention. A strategic alliance is seen as a priority relationship, has high internal visibility, and receives concentrated engagement by key decision makers. The partnership occupies a significant ongoing share of mind of the organisations' leadership beyond the initial personal connection, which they saw as one of the primary alliance drivers (Austin, 2000 p. 85).

**Communication**

To realise the full benefits of an alliance, the partners need to have means of communicating effectively, efficiently and frequently. Multiple communications channels, formal and informal, are used. partners stressed the importance of forthrightness and constructive
criticism. Openness seems particularly powerful in social purpose collaborations, especially in the integrative-stage relationships. Good communication appears to foster trust and vice versa (Austin, 2000, p. 86).

Organisational System

Clearly delineating responsibility for the management of the relationship in both partners' organisations contributes to alliance vitality. Incentives for collaboration that are built into the managers' performance evaluation process ensure attention to the alliance (Austin, 2000, p. 87).

Mutual Expectations and Accountability

Clarity of expectations about the deliverables from each partner appears to be importance. In addition to providing programmatic guidance, this fosters mutual accountability and motivates execution responsibility. Mutually high expectations promote both rising performance standards and greater value creation (Austin, 2000, p. 87).

The work of Austin (2000) is, at least in part, supported by that of Doz (1996) who identified a set of "initial conditions" that impact the ability of managers to learn about various aspects that are critical to the success of an alliance. The set of initial conditions are: task definition; partner's organisational routines; interface structure; and partners' expectations. These initial conditions facilitate or hamper partner learning along five dimensions: environment; task; process; skills; and goals (Doz, 1996, pp. 69-72, 74-75):
The Environment

The environment of the partnership encompasses both the external environment such as markets, competitors, governments, and an internal environment (the strategic context of the partnership within each partner organisation). The mere fact of joint learning about the environment, leading to joint sense-making and shared premises, is likely to foster convergence and cooperation.

The Tasks

The task of the partnership and how to perform it successfully, in particular when the task is initially ill-defined, when partners bring very different skills, when the alliance suffers from high information asymmetry between the partners, and when the task interdependence between the partners needs to be high.

The Process of Cooperation

As partners discover each other in the collaboration, they recognise how their differences in structure, processes, action routines, and the like may need to be overcome, or even constructively combined, to make cooperation more efficient. This may lead the partners to improve their process of cooperation over time.

The Skills of the Partners

Skill learning allows the partners to cooperate more closely in performing the alliance tasks as their respective skill bases converge and overlap. Very low skill learning raises doubts about the effectiveness of the alliance, and suspicions about the partner's motives. Very high skill learning raises concerns that a party may be about to 'outskill' and 'outlearn' the
other. Sustainably differentiated, but partly overlapping skill bases may contribute the most to alliance success.

The Goals and Motives

The behaviour of each partner in the collaboration process usually offers clues to the other about its motives and hidden agendas beyond, or beside, the explicitly shared goals of the collaboration. The collaboration process itself may lead partners to clarify, revise, or refocus their own goals.

The initial phase of collaboration in a strategic alliance can be conceptualised as the interaction between the four initial conditions (task definition, partners' organisational routines, interpartner interface design, and partners' expectations) and five learning processes or learning dimensions (environment, task, process, skills and goals) (Fig. 8.8).

Learning in turn allows the partners to re-evaluate their partnership on the basis of perceived efficiency, equity, and adaptability. Re-evaluation then leads to readjustment to initial conditions and hopefully to a new cycle of learning and reevaluation.
Initial conditions play a key role in fostering or blocking learning, and in at least some alliances in allowing cognitive learning (what the managers understand of how the relationship should be handled) but in stifling behavioural learning (what managers can do to better manage the relationship).

In addition to the studies of 'enablers' and 'drivers' as part of the conceptualisation of alliance establishment and development, a range of factors with an overarching impact have been reported in the academic and technical literature. These factors include culture, communications, organisational factors, environment and industrial factors and these are grouped under the core category of 'Modifiers' in the current study.
8.5.2 Culture

Kelly et al. (2002, pp. 15-16, 19) found that in a study of 59 technology alliance companies, problems related to cultural differences between partners was the second largest group of relationship issues cited by respondents. These problems include cultural mismatch, cultural misunderstandings, gaps in interests, ethical orientations, core values and beliefs (Cousens et al., 2006, pp. 37-38; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp.616-617; Grachev, 2009, p. 229; Simon and Vidot-Delerue, 2011). The greater the cultural differences, the greater the likelihood that barriers to communication will arise and that misunderstanding will occur (Simon and Vidot-Delerue, 2011). Culture and associated language differences impede communications and easy understanding and may therefore stand in the way of the development of affect-based trust (Bhaskaran and Gligorovska, 2009, p. 44). The differences between cultures in language, symbolism, and meaning, make it very difficult to find a common cognitive basis from which trust can develop (Doz, 1988, pp. 35-36). Minor irritations and repeated miscommunications caused by cultural differences can lead to the total breakdown of an alliance. Cultural conflict of some kind is inevitable when companies with different values, beliefs, and attitudes interact in the context of co-operative relationships (Bhaskaran and Gligorovska, 2009, pp.47-50). Each organisation will intentionally or unintentionally attempt to insert its own culture and values into the mix. Cultural differences are likely to be particularly pronounced in the early stages of cooperation, especially when those involved have little prior experience with each other.

The potential for culture conflict is particularly high where there is a high level of interpendence and interaction between the partners. It also tends to be high in international alliances where serious differences can arise over issues like goal setting, objectives,
decision-making, time orientation, competitive behaviour (Simon and Vidot-Delerue, 2011). Clashes between bureaucratic and entrepreneurial cultures are common problems in alliances between small and large technology companies. Research indicates that substantial size differences can be a significant barrier to success in collaborative activity (Zhu, 2011, pp.101-103, 104-105).

Cultural differences can lead to a myriad of operational problems (Albors and Hidalgo, 2007, p. 12). In particular, dissimilarities in culture can increase coordination or transaction costs (Grachev, 2009, p. 230). Overall, cultural distance will likely protract the process of achieving co-operation. Securing a cultural fit between co-operating partners in order that they can work together effectively and have a sound basis upon which mutual confidence can develop is a key challenge in alliance management (Kelly et al., 2002. pp. 15-16; Eckel and Hartley, 2008, pp.627-628).

At the same time, cultural differences do not just create problems, they can also bring positive benefits to alliances by creating an opportunity to use the competence and knowledge contained in each parties culture for the benefit of the alliance. When creatively and effectively managed, cultural differences can lead to a greater variance in ideas and enhanced innovation and dynamism leading to better group performance. In addition, the ability to overcome cultural distance may translate into valuable advantages such as quick access to a partner's competencies, joint manufacturing, global marketing, shared client base, accelerating innovations, and fostering industry standards (Grachev, 2009, p. 230)
Creating public-private alliances involves all the challenges inherent in cross-cultural work. Differences between public and private organisations may concern identity, values, ethics and operating principles (McDonnell et al., 2009, p.5).

The organisation must have an appropriate and strong culture that encourages its members to support collaborative efforts. This includes not only policies, goals, and mechanisms but also attributes and actions that give recognition and rewards for being good team players while recognising that individuals have their own self-interest to pursue and protect (Reinfeld, 2009, p. 170). The organisations policies, decisions, reputation, and behaviour concerning matters related to trust, credibility and cultural sensitivity must make a favourable impact on the partners. High moral and ethical standards are important. The organisation must show that it is flexible.

8.5.3 Communications

Kelly et al. (2002, p.15) found that communications problems accounted for over 50% of relationship problems and 25% of total problems cited by Executives form 59 technology alliance companies involved in their study. They found that:

- problems with respect to both establishing and maintaining communications and that the initial year of alliance formation was plagued by misunderstanding between the partners
- in some cases there was physical distance between the partners, which made it difficult to schedule face-to-face meetings and to follow up caused communication problems
- problems were caused by personality conflicts among the individuals involved in the start-up and operational phases of the alliance
- language differences in international alliance were cited as a problem
- in several cases, communication between partners was hampered by large structural or organisational differences between partners
- many of the communication problems were both internal and external to the partner organisations.

Poor communications within an alliance, and between partners, can create an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion that can undermine both the legitimacy and effectiveness of the venture. Good communication ensures transparency, minimises misunderstanding, reduces uncertainty, and encourages sustained cooperation. Good communication is also essential to the resolution of the operational problems that arise in the early phase of operations (Kelly et al., 2002, p. 15, 19).

Open communications and information sharing between the partners is critical to build a shared understanding of the joint venture's goals and objectives and to create the trust needed in day-to-day operations. It also helps to resolve early stage behavioural discrepancies quickly and amicably.

When two people communicate during a conversation, or in an exchange of dialogue, one person attaches a meaning (an interpretation) to the message that is transmitted. Similarly, when a message is received a meaning (an interpretation) is also attached. Therefore, for two people to effectively communicate, the process needs for similar meanings (interpretations) to both the message sent and the message received. This process is referred
to as communication fidelity, or the degree of congruence between the cognitions or thoughts of two or more individuals following a communication event (Mander, and Bobongie, 2010, p. 43).

8.5.4 Organisational Factors

The diversity of organisations within an organisational field stems from such company-specific properties as their size, visible and tacit assets, collaborative histories, ownership forms, corporate social capital networks, product ranges and diversification, market shares, and market penetration through distribution channels (Todeva and Knoke, 2004, pp.13-16). Given such diversity, propensities to participate in strategic alliances should vary across firms operating within the same organisational field. Studies of equity joint ventures make clear that huge discrepancies occur between the objectives of foreign and domestic firms. Domestic companies typically seek opportunities to improve their export capabilities, while foreign firms desire greater access to the host country's markets. The tension over incompatible objectives, capabilities, and constraints among international joint venture partners is a crucial reason why partnering firms often seek equity controls to safeguard their alliance risks. A substantial difference between an multinational corporations and a strategic alliance lies in the concept of shared control. Metaphorically, they describe the alliance management problems by referring to the old logic of the octopus and the new logic of the network, where a different kind of interdependence emerges. The octopus symbolises classical management control from the centre, while the network metaphor requires decentralised organisational structures and management processes to facilitate shared control. Strategic interdependencies is one salient feature of successful alliances in dynamic markets.
8.5.5 Environment

Shachaf (2003) developed a life cycle model of alliance development (refer Chapter Four). In this model, each alliance is affected by several levels of the 'operating' environment at different stages of its development from inception to disbanding (that is, alliance development occurs in the context of specific environments, each bearing constraints and opportunities for consortia construction). Shachaf (2003, p. 95) lists these environmental factors as:

- The General Environment (legal, political, social, cultural)
- The Task Environment (these are contextual to the individual alliance and in the case of the consortia studied in this work include potential partners and stakeholders such as libraries, consortia, publishers, vendors and patrons).

On one hand, an alliance must differentiate itself from its environment as a unique organisation with a unique definition of goals, funds and members. Unsuccessful differentiation threatens the consortium's viability. On the other hand, the consortium must aim for integration within its environment in order to coalesce with the partners and stakeholders. Too little integration will result in isolation, reducing consortia effectiveness and perhaps leading to eventual dissolution.

Waldman and Yammarino (1999, p. 279) considered environmental volatility as an important factor affecting group process in alliance establishment and organisational performance. They consider that environmental volatility is a potential moderator of relationship development and group process such as intragroup of intergroup cohesion.
According to Todeva and Knoke (2004, p. 10-12) alliance formation is broadly shaped by general economic conditions and the institutional frameworks in countries of operation, including legal requirements, macro-economic policies, price controls, financial capital markets, distributions channles, and methods of contract enforcement. They group these factors under the generic heading of "business environment factors". State regulatory activity affects firms' freedom to form business coalitions and joint ventures. Thus, government intervention provides the major constraints and opportunities for strategic alliance formation. Alliances are often require formal approval by national governments, particularly in adhering to antimonopoly and antitrust regulations. Likewise, some research and development alliances originate as government-funded projects that may include heavy state supervision. Tax incentives and international trade regimes established by foreign governments can also directly affect domestic firms' decisions regarding whether to enter into long-term overseas business relationships. Empirical researchers have apparently conducted little comparative research explaining the impact of state interventions on alliance formation (Todeva and Knoke, 2004, p.11). Another neglected research area is private-sector partnerships with government agencies.

Theorists generally recognise that firm responses to state regulatory interventions vary widely across national cultures. Another concensus is that both multinational corporations and international strategic alliance networks usually seek to overcome, circumvent, or subvert the regulatory mechanisms established by national governments.

8.5.6 Industrial Factors

According to Todeva and Knoke (2004, p. 12-13) the industrial context of alliances also exerts strong direct impacts on strategic alliances. The intensity of industry competition and
the social organisation of specific product markets powerfully influences whether firms
decide to internalise certain activities, to compete for greater market share, to cooperate with
other firms for particular strategic advantage, or to internationalise by entering foreign
markets.

Industries may be classified along numerous dimensions, such as resource consumption
levels, capital investment, labour scarcity, knowledge intensity, and technical innovation.
This multidimensionality means that potentially many industry factors drive organisational
strategies in seeking alliances for competitive advantage.

Due to technical or economic rationales, firms are more vulnerable when closely tied to a
dominant partner. Technology plays a significant role in setting organisational field
boundaries and shaping internal structures. Among the competing technologies in a specific
industry, some are core and leading while others are supporting. Rapid technological change,
or the abrupt emergence of a competence-destroying technology, can radically restructure and
entire organisational field's competitive and collaborative alignments. The relative private
and governmental sources of technology research funding, and R&D expenditure levels in
general, differ markedly across industries. Cross-border technology alliances benefit directly
from these differences.

8.5.7 Other Factors
Albors and Hidalgo (2007, p. 12) list the type of organisation (for example, company or
university); organisation characteristics; and market factors as factors which influence the
alliance process. Ford et al. (1998, p. 29) propose a range of external factors including
experience, level of resourcing and commitment of the partners that affects relationship
development in alliance formation and implementation.
8.6 THE CORE CATEGORY 'MODIFIERS' IN RELATION TO THE ESTABLISHED BODY OF KNOWLEDGE ON PPAS

The present literature on modifiers highlights the importance of these factors in alliance establishment. Enablers such as communication and organisational systems help set the initial conditions for alliance establishment and contribute to the effective management of alliance relationships. Drivers such as alignment of strategic mission and personal connections operate during the establishment processes and influence the nature, functioning and strength of the alliance relationship (Austin, 2000). Individual modifiers such as culture, communications, organisational factors (e.g. diversity), environment (e.g. general legal and political environment and task-specific environment) and industrial factors (e.g. resources, capital and capability) affect alliance establishment through their influence on dynamics such as trust, understanding, conflict and alignment of objectives, strategies and resources.

The comparative study which I conducted, and is reported in this chapter, has identified a range of 'Modifiers' which are consistent across the seven PPAs involved in this phase of the study. These are presented in Table 8.5.

Table 8.5 Major 'Modifiers' Identified in the Theoretical Analyses of 'Alliance Type', 'Alliance Partner Class' and 'Alliance Type' by 'Alliance Partner Class' Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Attributes e.g.- agendas - drive - commitment - passion - focus</th>
<th>Organisational Factors e.g. - size - experience - structure - power</th>
<th>Structural Issues e.g. - bureaucracy - critical mass - management structures - alliance politics</th>
<th>External Government e.g. - policy - agendas - regulations - support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the modifiers identified in this study have been the subject of research and analysis by previous researchers. Although many of these previous studies have only considered individual or groups of modifiers in isolation, these studies add depth to the understanding of the nature and potential influence of these factors in the wider context of alliance establishment. In the case of researcher such as Austin (2000) and Doz (1996) where modifiers have been considered in the context of evolutionary models of alliance establishment, these studies too are deficient in that only a narrow range of factors has been included in the study and the nature of the interactions between the modifiers and the establishment/development processes has not been considered.

The current study adds to the body of knowledge on PPAs in two areas:

(a) The interaction of 'Modifiers' with other establishment processes and process issues - the comparative analysis of 'alliance partner class' (as a Modifier) demonstrates the dynamics of the relationship between modifiers and the other elements of the alliance establishment processes. In the case of 'alliance partner class' this modifier influenced
motivation to join the alliance; perceptions of power and control; strategic alignment between
organisation and alliance strategies and goals; target relationships and target outcomes.
Donors were generally the alliance 'driver'; often exerting control and influence over alliance
management and with a focus on donor objectives and alliance outcomes that met the needs
of the donor. Private partners were motivated by commercial opportunities, less formal
management structures and a focus on personal and business relationships, shared success
and influence with government.

(b) The interaction of 'Alliance Type' and 'alliance partner class' highlights the
dynamics of the relationship between core categories (in this case 'Alliance Type' and
'Modifiers') - For example in constrained choice-type alliances the donor exerted a major
influence over alliance conception, but also on the development of the alliance objectives,
strategies and management processes. Through these interactions, the donor has a dominant
influence over the whole establishment process. In voluntary-type alliances, the role of the
donor was generally less dominant with the donor as a member (along with the other core
partners) of a management committee which developed the alliance objectives and strategy
and was responsible for the strategic and operational oversight of the alliance. In this later
case the donor was unable to exert a dominant influence over alliance establishment overall
and the resulting alliances were more open, collegiate and "true" partnerships.

8.7 IMPLICATIONS OF THESE FINDINGS

In this study, participants identified 'Modifiers' as important factors in alliance establishment
and this view is supported by a range of studies in this area of PPA research. While the
current research supports the views of other workers, it also highlights the problematic nature
of modifiers in at least two respects:
(a) It is not always possible to predict in advance which modifiers will be present (e.g. contingent and emergent modifiers) and exactly where they will impact on alliance establishment and with what effect. This makes the study of modifiers difficult and the potential to manipulate them through appropriate management strategies problematic.

(b) There are a large variety of modifiers and the number of modifiers which are active within an individual PPA and their interactions also vary widely.

These problematic aspects of modifiers add weight to my assertion that PPA formation is context specific and the development of a recipe for PPA establishment is not possible. From a theoretical perspective, modifiers are clearly an area in which additional research is required in order to better understand and define this core category. However, in practical terms, knowledge of the nature and potential influence of modifiers can sensitise the practitioner to the potential existence of these factors and indicate when and where they may emerge.

8.8 CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have defined and described the last of the five core categories arising from this study, 'Modifiers'. While 'Modifiers' are important in alliance establishment the way in which some of these factors emerge during establishment (that is, they are not always apparent at alliance initiation) and the large variety of these factors which vary with individual PPAs makes them difficult to study and even potentially harder to manipulate.
A consistent theme of this thesis has been that alliance establishment is complex and multi-dimensional, and that all of the processes and core categories interact during the alliance establishment processes ending with the formation of mature, stable alliance relationships. To date, an integrated theoretical model which attempts to explain this complexity has not been developed. This lack of an integrated model has resulted in a simplistic approach to alliance establishment which has contributed to the high rate of failure and poor performance of these IORs to date.

In the next chapter, I draw together the findings of the Grounded Theory and comparative research from this study together with additional understanding and research from previous studies to develop an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA.
CHAPTER 9: BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER - THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED THEORETICAL MODEL OF PPA ESTABLISHMENT IN ODA

9.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapters Four to Eight, Grounded Theory analysis was used to develop the five core categories which account for the major concerns of the partners in the establishment of PPAs in ODA and the social processes which the key managers use to resolve them. For some cases, additional comparative studies have been conducted to develop a greater understanding of these core categories. The core categories developed in this study have also been considered in relation to the relevant extant literature on PPAs.

However, these core categories alone do not describe alliance establishment as a whole. By themselves, they ignore the complexity of the relationships between the individual elements and the complex interactions that occur between core categories and factors. In this respect, they fail to meet the objective of this thesis; the development of an integrated understanding of PPA establishment in ODA.

In this chapter I attempt to address this by developing an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment. This model is based on the results of the Grounded Theory and comparative studies and the relevant results of other workers in PPA research. I explain the individual components of the overall model and how these relate to each other to form the complete model.

The chapter ends with a consideration of the attributes and features of this model but with a particular focus on its limitations as a conceptualisation of alliance establishment.
9.2 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CORE CATEGORIES - AN INTEGRATED THEORETICAL MODEL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PPAS IN ODA

In this section, I explain the components which gradually build towards the development of an integrated conceptual model of PPA establishment. The complete model is presented in Fig. 9.7.

At the centre of the Integrated Theoretical Model is a process model of alliance establishment comprised of three processes: 'Conception'; 'Bringing the Partners on Board' and 'Sorting Out the Detail' (Fig. 9.3). Together, these are the processes which make up the core category 'Processes and Process Issues'.

9.2.1 Conception

The initiation of a PPA in ODA commences with a 'driver for initiation', and 'initiator' and a 'decision to initiate' an alliance (Fig. 9.1).
An alliance 'initiator', often a developed country aid donor agency (donor), sometimes a group of core partners or a key individual, but less often a developing country government agency or implementation agency, reacts to a driver for initiation. These 'drivers for initiation' are the "reasons" for the initiation of the alliance and are essentially of four types: 'donor or partner strategy' (that is, the formation of the alliance will contribute to the strategic intent of the donor or partner); 'core problem, issue or need' (the alliance may be a potential solution to core problem or issue); 'opportunity' (formation of the alliance may allow an opportunity to be captured for the benefit of the initiator); or 'new modality' (establishment of a PPA is a potential new modality which may have advantages over previous ones).

The initiator then makes a decision to initiate an alliance. This generally occurs in one of three ways:

(a) A donor decides to initiate an alliance;

(b) A group of partners convinces a donor to initiate an alliance; or
A group of like-minded individuals or organisations comes together, decides to initiate an alliance and invites a donor to be a partner in the alliance.

The decision to initiate an alliance is an important one. In Chapter Two, it was proposed that organisations can come together in a number of structural arrangements including joint ventures, partnerships, networks and consortia (Sorensen, 1999, p. 2; Bannerman et al., 2005, pp. 22-24). Thus, a number of options with regard to inter-organisational relationships are potentially open to the initiator. PPAs are a form of strategic alliance and are differentiated from other forms of IOR by their 'strategic nature' (Eckel and Hartley, 2008, p.614). The features of this 'strategic nature' have been previously discussed by many authors (Chapter Two) but are picked up together is the definition of PPA used in this study:

Public-private alliances are relatively enduring inter-organisational arrangements, involving flows and linkages that utilise resources and/or governance structures from a collaborative relationship between at least one public (government) organization and at least one for-profit commercial (private) organization, for the joint accomplishment of individual goals linked to the corporate mission of each of the sponsoring organisations.

In many cases, the initiator consciously decides to initiate an alliance using a PPA model but in other cases the initiation starts as a relatively informal relationship between core partners that develops into a PPA. The process of 'conception' ends with the establishment of an 'Alliance Type'.
9.2.2 Alliance Type

There are essentially two types of alliance; constrained choice-type alliances and voluntary-type alliances. These are dealt with extensively in the current academic and technical literature (Chapter Five). The type of alliance is of fundamental importance to the other establishment processes and the future development, implementation and functioning of the alliance.

In the case of voluntary-type alliances, partners have a high degree of freedom with regard to decisions about alliance membership, with whom to partner and alliance governance structures. With partner selection, partners who have not previously worked together have access to reputational and risk information from their network of other organisations outside the alliance, thus partially mitigating risk and making it easier for the development of trust. Partners are also free to choose other partners with whom to form these relationships and can consider status, strategic alliance and complimentarity in this selection process. Partners are often involved in the establishment of governance structures in voluntary alliances and this can help to ensure consistency with the needs of all members. Alliance type exerts effects through the other processes of 'Bringing the Partners on Board' and 'Sorting Out the Detail', through 'Alliance Relationships'. It also influences 'Alliance Leadership' and, to a lesser degree, 'Modifiers'. In the case of the other two establishment processes, the nature of voluntary alliances generally results in less exercise of power and control, more collegiate decision making, consensual and problem-solving based processes, partner participation in partner selection and alliance management and participatory alliances in which the partners work harmoniously together. The 'Alliance Leadership' associated with voluntary alliances often emerged from within the partners or was appointed by the core partners or alliance management committee. This leadership was supportive and mentoring, and was the binding
force that held the alliance together. Voluntary-type alliances were characterised by the establishment of 'Alliance Relationships' that were collaborative, cooperative, nurturing, open and cohesive with mutual respect. They centred on building and cementing relationships and development of close personal relationships. The dysfunctions associated with voluntary alliances included divergence of views amongst partners and individuals, the formation of 'clubs' and problems associated with multiple levels of management.

Constrained choice-type alliances are often formed under the dominance or coercion of the initiator and in these situations, the choices of the partners regarding the terms of joining the alliance, the decision with whom to partner, and the input into the alliance governance mechanisms are severely constrained. Under these conditions, the partners are free to decision whether or not to join the alliance, but the decision-making processes that they use to do this are inhibited. The only decision that they can make is to join or not to join and this decision is often made under conditions of asymmetric power, coercion or inducement with funds and other resources. In the case of partner selection, individual partners cannot rely on their networks for information about potential partner reputation and trustworthiness (since the partners are already decided by the initiator). Unless the partners have previously worked together, trust may be difficult to establish or may actually decrease in time.

In addition, individual partners are not free to explore relationships with other partners and the potential partners may be a poor match in terms of strategic alignment, culture and goals. Governance arrangements in constrained choice-type alliances may also be prescribed due to asymmetries of power and control and may be established to suit the agendas of the initiator but not the other partners. With constrained choice-type alliances, partners tend to be targeted by the initiator on the basis of technical fit and capacity to contribute to the initiator's
agenda using formal screening processes. The establishment processes of 'Bringing the Partners on Board' and 'Sorting Out the Detail' are dominated by the imitator and characterised by formal accountability and validation mechanisms, commitment to roles and responsibilities, and clarity about contributions and levels of support. The resulting partnerships are focussed, reactive and engaged. In these types of alliances, the leadership is often appointed by the initiator and in cases where the donor is the initiator, this leadership may be provided by implementation agencies or contractors selected or employed by the donor. This 'Alliance Leadership' is directing, "wants things done their way" and uses their superior power and influence to achieve their agenda. The resulting 'Alliance Relationships' are focussed on meeting the implementer needs and objectives and relationships with the initiator. Apparent dysfunctions in these relationships include rigid, bureaucratic relationships with a lack of cohesion and little involvement by partners in decision making and alliance management.

In practice, few PPAs in ODA programs are either purely voluntary or constrained choice as often suggested in the academic and technical literature. Voluntary and constrained choice may be regarded as Weberian Ideal Types, but in reality each PPA usually has a tendency towards one type or the other. This explains two features of the Integrated Theoretical Model and the results obtained in this study. Firstly, participants in the alliance establishment process do not generally recognise 'Alliance Type' as a major influence on the establishment process. What they recognise is the degree of initiator dominance and influence in relation to three factors: the initial stages of conception; the development of objectives and strategy; and the establishment; management and operation of the alliance. These three factors can be used to develop a typology of alliance type (Chapter Five); the more dominant the role or influence the greater the tendency towards a constrained choice model. Secondly, since
many of the PPAs are neither purely voluntary or constrained choice, it is possible for individual alliances to exhibit some feature of each model or to 'score' less prominently against some characteristics (for example, partners may be involved in some aspects of alliance management and decision-making).

Thus, while previously not studied in detail or highlighted by most researcher, the process of 'Conception' is fundamental to the establishment of successful PPAs in ODA. The decisions made by the alliance initiators in this early stage of establishment set the tenor for the future alliance and through flow-on effects into 'Alliance Type' and other key components such as 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Alliance Relationships' exert a strong influence on other aspects of the establishment process.

9.2.3 Bringing the Partners on Board

Following 'Conception', establishment moves into the second process, 'Bringing the Partners on Board'. However, there is considerable overlap between the two processes (Fig. 9.2).
In 'Bringing the Partners on Board', the alliance initiator's quest to identify suitable partners, and the potential partners' awareness of the alliance and motivation to join, come together. These potential partners must gain their interest and the support of their 'parent' organisations and following negotiation of the potential contributions and roles and responsibilities, these partners commit to the alliance goals and objectives.

Partners may come from a number of classes (including public, private, government and NGO sectors) and the comparative analysis conducted as part of this study indicates that partner class may have important influences on a range of alliance processes and characteristics (this is further discussed below in the section on modifiers). They may be primary (core) secondary partners with the later having little involvement in alliance management and decision making and often with few linkages to other partners or relationships with the alliance leadership and a few select partners. It is also possible for
some partnership relationships to be informal; having only weak ties to the alliance and mostly involved in the implementation of selected alliance activities and projects. These partner are identified on the basis of a wide range of characteristics including technical merit, strategic fit, alliance balance, existing networks and unique resources or skills sets.

The potential partners may become aware of the alliance through word of mouth, general awareness of the alliance, information from other partners or associates or approaches from the imitator or other alliance members. There are a wide range of general motivations for interest in alliance member including access to additional resources, new networks and skills and experience; new opportunities, potential influence with governments and other stakeholder groups and spreading of risk. In addition to general motivations, there are also more specific motivations and priorities related to partner class. For example, in the case of donors, organisation and donor-country goals and objectives are major motivations. With private sector organisations, commercial opportunities, commercial agendas and opportunities to work with developing country government organisations are important. Partner country government organisations are highly motivated by access to specialist technical expertise and skills, experience and networks provided by relationships with the private sector. For secondary partners, access to additional skills, capacity building and opportunities to leverage resources are important.

In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, the partners are often targeted, invited to join the alliance and subjected to due diligence assessments and formal evaluation processes. For voluntary-type alliances, partners may respond to open invitations for membership or they may be introduced by existing members of other stakeholders. In both constrained choice-
type and voluntary-type alliances, partner may also approach the alliance with an expression of interest in joining the alliance.

Approaches from the alliance initiators and initial interest in joining the alliance often occurs at the level of an individual or representative within a potential partner organisation. There follows a stage in which these individuals and/or the alliance initiators need to work to gain the general support of the organisation commitment for alliance membership and commitment of resources. If the individual is a senior manager within the target organisation then the task is one of gaining support from the rest of the organisation. However, if the individual is at a lower level within the organisation, then support must be gained from senior management. In addition to gaining support from the potential partner's own organisation, there is a need for both the potential partner and the initiators of the alliance to seek support for the alliance partners from other stakeholder organisations. The establishment of the alliance is a complex dynamic which is open to influence from organisations external to the alliance as well as to those with direct membership. These other stakeholders include governments (both partner country and donor country), community groups, industry groups and potential beneficiaries of the outputs of the alliance. Thus, gaining support is an important, but potentially problematic, stage of alliance establishment on account of the range of stakeholders and the need to gain support from these early in the establishment process. Another sub-process within 'Bringing the Partners on Board' is 'negotiation'. In this pre-commitment stage the potential partners negotiate on the roles and responsibilities associated with alliance membership and the contributions that each partner will make to the alliance. This stage ends with commitment to the alliance goals and objectives and to formal alliance membership.
Negotiations regarding the partner contributions, potential roles and responsibilities, and the nature of these negotiations, depend very much on whether the alliance is a constrained choice-type or voluntary-type alliance. In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, negotiations are more about reaching agreement and assignment but less about discussion and true negotiation and bargaining. For roles and responsibilities, the negotiations are centred on assigned responsibilities, obligations and expectations. With contributions, the negotiations are about the scope of work and being clear about the individual contributions of each partner and the level of support provided by the alliance to each partner. For voluntary-type alliances, negotiations are more focussed on discussing details, bargaining and developing common understandings. With roles and responsibilities this includes agreement on roles and responsibilities and development of shared roles and responsibilities. For contributions, negotiations consider differences in contributions from each partner, additional contributions (above those expected by the alliance) and flexibility in contributions of resources and other inputs.

The sub-process of 'negotiation' ends with commitment from the potential partners. This may be a full and unconditional commitment to join the alliance and provide the resources as negotiated. However, varying levels of commitment were evident in the study and at this stage several of the organisations in the study only gave initial or partial commitment.

### 9.2.4 Sorting Out the Detail

Following the process of 'Bringing the Partners on Board', the partners move into a process of sorting out the details of the basis on which the alliance will finalise establishment. This includes deciding on and developing the structure, management arrangements and governance principles under which the alliance will operate (Fig. 9.3).
The first stage of 'Sorting Out the Detail' involves the agreement of alliance goals and objectives and the development of strategic plans. In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, the goals and objectives of the alliance are often dictated by the alliance initiator and are focussed on the initiator agenda. The process, in this situation, is reduced to one of ensuring that the rest of the partners will buy-in to, or comply with, these goals and objectives. For constrained choice-type alliances, strategic planning may also be dominated by the initiator with little or no input from the other partners. With voluntary-type alliances, the process of setting goals and objectives is much more collegiate. In this situation, goals and objectives are more likely to be shared, broad and flexible. The process then becomes
one of alignment of organisation goals and objectives with those of the alliance and a "meeting of the minds". Planning in voluntary-type alliances generally involves at least the core partners. However, in voluntary-type alliances, the initiator is generally a member of the core partner group and even in this situation the process may be dominated by the agenda of the initiator or the competing organisational agendas of the individual core partners (for example, commercial agenda).

There then begins a sub-process of sorting out the 'principles of operation'. This includes, at the alliance model, alliance management and operations and alliance implementation levels. The decisions made during these stages influence the characteristics of the resulting alliance. At the alliance model (or structure) level the partners may agree to replicate and existing model, to modify an existing model, to scale up and existing structure or precursor or to develop a new model. In some cases, no conscious decision is made as to the model to be adopted and the model may evolve over time (often from a relatively informal structure). For constrained choice-type alliances, replication and modification of existing models previously used by the initiator (particularly donors) are common. With voluntary-type alliances, evolution of alliances from informal structures or precursor organisations (for example, grower industry bodies) is common.

The establishment of the alliance requires the development of a wide range of management systems, processes and governance structures in order that the alliance can function and reach implementation. These include administrative processes, monitoring and evaluation, communication, governance and coordination. In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, these systems and processes are likely to be strongly influenced by the alliance initiator and in many cases will be formal, heavily structured, focussed on accountability and
validation and designed to minimise risk. In extreme cases, the initiator may impose these processes and systems with little or no input from the other partners. This may also be the case for alliance implementations decisions which may be driven by the initiator or the appointed implementer. The resulting alliances under these regimes tend to be focussed, engaged and reactive.

With voluntary-type alliances, the focus of alliance management and operations is more on regular meetings, management committees, input from all partners and corporate decision-making. Alliance implementation centres on implementation by partners, two-way information flows and building networks. The resulting alliances have a tendency towards open communication, culture of respect for other partners, learning organisation, active participation, management by consensus, transparency and a culture of working together.

Related to the 'principles of operation', is 'formality'. When 'Sorting Out the Detail', the partners must make decision about the level of formality with regard to agreements (between partners in the alliance), structure of relationships and arrangements such as reporting and commitment of inputs. The PPAs used in this study varied widely in regard to formality with models often being quite formal in one or two of the attributes but informal in the remainder. Formality appeared to be related to alliance partner class. Donors and implementer generally required formality across all three attributes whereas private sector partners favoured formality with regard to arrangements but this was more variable for agreements and structure. Government organisations preferred formal agreements and structures and desired more formality in the arrangements into which they had entered. With secondary partners the degree of formality was quite variable across all three attributes and was sometimes described as "informal but organised".
'Conception', 'Bringing the Partners on Board' and 'Sorting Out the Detail' along with their processes and sub-processes make up the Integrated Theoretical Model core category of 'Processes and Process Issues'. While all of the PPAs in this study went through all three processes, it is important to note that this was not a simple, linear progression and there was no neat distinction between individual processes and sub-processes. In reality, there was considerable overlap between the three processes, for example between 'Conception' and 'Bringing the Partner on Board' with respect to partner identification and selection. Within each of the three processes, many of the sub processes were occurring simultaneously or were interacting with each other, for example 'the partners' and initial interest within 'Bringing the Partners on Board'. In this respect the current iteration of the Integrated Theoretical Model does not capture all of the complexities inherent within the core category, 'Processes and Process Issues'.

9.2.5 Alliance Relationships

Alliance establishment ends with the formation of stable, sustainable and functional partnership relationships which can take the alliance forward to further development and implementation (Fig. 9.4). This is captured in the model by the core category, 'Alliance Relationships'. 'Alliance Relationships' is not definitive but marks a transition between establishment and subsequent stages of alliance development. Further, the formation of 'Alliance Relationships' commences in the earliest stages of alliance establishment. These relationships continue to develop and grow influencing the processes and sub-processes previously described under the core category 'Processes and Process Issues'.

There appears to be four categories of factors which are important in the establishment of 'Alliance Relationships': 'Relationship Interactions'; 'Relationship Behaviours'; 'Relationship
Dysfunctions'; and 'Relationship Performance' (Fig. 9.4). 'Relationship Interactions', 'Relationship Behaviours' and 'Relationship Dysfunctions' interact to influence 'Relationship Performance'.

Figure 9.4  Alliance Relationships as a Component of the Integrated Theoretical Model

'Relationship Interactions' is about the inter-relationships between the partners during the formation of the Alliance Relationship. Four factors (sub-categories) appear to be important to 'Relationship Interactions': 'prior relationships'; 'partnership evolution/development';
'relationship dynamics' and 'types of relationships'. Prior relationships affect attributes such as trust and commitment (Ariño and De la Torre, 1998, pp. 306-308). Where partners have previously worked together, or have a previous relationship, there exists a basis on which to gauge performance, reliability, predictability and fairness (Stephens (2011, p. 24). Therefore, trust between these partners may more quickly develop. In addition, organisations tend to choose alliance partners with whom they have has former relationships as a way of reducing the risks of new alliance (Osborn and Hagedorn, 1997, pp. 26-271). Prior relationships are particularly important in the case of constrained choice alliances where the partners have neither the choice of whom to partner with nor the benefit of information about potential partners from their existing inter-organisational networks. In these constrained choice-type alliances, trust between partners who have not previously worked together may actually decrease during alliance establishment (Todeva et al., 2004, p. 19). The alliance goes through a stage of evolution or development ('partnership evolution/development') in which the partners develop new relationships; seek new partnerships; or in the case of prior relationships; strengthen or cement existing relationships. A range of 'relationship dynamics' (such as "getting to know each other", "linking with the private sector" and "seeking more formal alliance relationship") come into play during this stage to influence the 'type of relationship' that develops. Relationship interactions may be quite diverse and include sharing of knowledge and activities, transfer of technologies and cross fertilization of ideas and cultures Hagedoorn, 1993, pp. 372-374).

These interactions, in turn, affect such attributes as power-dependence, "distance" between partner and the levels of relationship conflict, cooperation or mutual expectations (Halinen et al., 1999, pp. 782-784). To add further complication, organisations can participate simultaneously in many kinds of relationships and partners may play a variety of roles
Thus the best alliances are frequently messy and emotional. For maximum productivity, Kanter (1994, pp. 105-107) suggests that relationship dynamics should ideally achieve integration at five levels: strategic integration (continuing contact among senior management); tactical integrations (development of plans for joint activities); operational integration (integration of day-to-day activities); interpersonal integration; and cultural integration (bridging of the culture between partner organisations). 'Prior relationships, partnership evolution/development' and 'relationship dynamics' influence the 'type of relationships'. For constrained choice-type alliances, individual, stable and long-term relationships were common. With voluntary-type alliances, these relationships tended to be more open, cohesive, personal and informal.

'Relationship Behaviours' are those behaviours exhibited by the alliance partners, partnerships and the emerging alliance which affect the operation and further development of the alliance. There appears to be three dimensions of 'Relationship Behaviours': 'relationship linkages' (the types of associations between the partners as the alliance forms, e.g. friendships); 'partner behaviours' (the associations between groups of partners and their behaviours e.g. collegial) and 'alliance behaviour' (the behaviours of the alliance as an entity e.g. working together). The established literature discusses relationship behaviour in terms of four characteristics: trust; empathy; power; and magnitude. Trust is the confidence between parties that they are reliable and that they will act with a level of integrity when dealing with each other (Heffernan, 2004, p. 115). According to Provan and Sydow (2008, pp. 13-14), trust is a key element of "bonding" social capital and is critical for holding an alliance together. In the absence of power, trust may also act as an alternative for organisations to manage inter-organisational relationships (Morrissey and Pittaway, 2006, p. 277; Izquierdo and Cillán, 2004, p. 978). Empathy is the development of a deep sense of understanding
each other's views and ideas and reluctance to make judgements about each other (Willis, 2008, pp. 224-225). High levels of empathy are characterised by a deep sense that the partners would look after each other and the ability to develop an innate sense of what the other person might believe about this or that situation or context. Power is the capacity of one organisation or individual to influence the actions and behaviours of others in intended ways (Provan and Sydow, 2008, p. 16). It is often based on dependencies, particularly resources. According to Morrissey and Pittaway (2006, pp. 273-276), it is not the power dependency relationship that is of major concern, but the way that the dominant partner uses this advantage and how far trust and mutual interest are pursued. Instead of focussing on the relative power position between organisations, partners should seek out organisations with who they feel that they can best develop relationships. Magnitude is the level of intimacy between organisations (Golicic et al., 2003, p. 63). Alliances and relationships with high levels of magnitude are characterised by well developed coordination, cooperation and collaboration. These and other characteristics interact at the organisational, multi-organisational, and alliance levels to influence the overall behaviours of the alliance relationship.

The way in which 'Relationship Interactions' and 'Relationship Behaviours' interact to form mature and stable 'Alliance Relationships' is shown by the "relationship diamond" which commences following 'conception' and finishes at the end of alliance establishment (Fig. 9.4). In the initial stages of relationship development are "awareness" and "exploration". During 'awareness' the potential partners become aware of the existence of the embryonic alliance and other likely partners. 'Exploration' involves initial interaction with the other partners but no formal commitment. These initial stages are followed by an "expansion stage" in which initial relationships (developed on the basis of motives to join the network and partner
selection) are expanded to include the development of relationships based on a range of relationship dynamics and relationship behaviours, for example, friendships, interpersonal commitments, reciprocity and trust. The outcome of this process is stability and maturity, which means relationships are sustained by dependencies, their initial objectives and the desire to protect the relationship (Parkhe, 1993; Wetzels, et al., 1998; Pesämaa, 2007, p. 17, Pesämaa et al., 2007, Pesämaa and Hairy, 2007). Stability and maturity are reflected by increased cooperation and loyalty. These expanding processes ultimately lead to inter-organisational commitment. At the inter-organisational commitment level, relationships are based on concrete, and often long-term pledges (resources, management input and operations), which give potential sustainability to the relationships.

During establishment, alliances exhibit a range of 'Relationship Dysfunctions' which impact on the establishment process and the characteristics of the resulting alliance. According to the literature relationship dysfunctions include power imbalances, managerial imbalance, opportunistic behaviour and dysfunctional conflict. Power imbalances in an alliance may create the potential for conflict. In these situations the weaker party may take precautions to limit is vulnerability through competing alliances, subtle efforts to diminish the role of the other partners or failure to employ all of the resources required. The more powerful party may be loath to put in all of the effort required by the partnership. This behaviour may result in a failure to take full advantage of emerging opportunities (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p. 35). Managerial imbalance is a failure to allocate the expected managerial "quantum" committed to the alliance. This may lead to partner conflict as the different partners perceive others as "not pulling their weight". Opportunistic behaviour is the threat of one partner attempting to gain advantage over another (Bucklin and Sengupta, 2003, pp. 36-37). While this is tied up with power and control it is also strongly associated with trust and commitment.
and prior relationships. Where trust and commitment develop between partners, they
counterbalance the potential for opportunistic behaviour (Dwyer et al., 1987, p. 23).

Therefore, prior relationships with their potential for high levels of trust and commitment
between partners may also moderate opportunistic behaviour. Dysfunctional conflicts within
the alliance can also impinge upon alliance success (Bucklin and Sengupta, 1993, p. 40).
These include competing personal networks, limited range or organisational relationships and
a lack of well-developed relationships among key stakeholders from different partner
organisations. Again, Bucklin and Sengupta (1993, p. 40) suggest that prior relationships can
help to alleviate these dysfunctional conflicts.

There are five dimensions to these 'Relationship Dysfunctions': 'model dysfunction'; 'partner
interaction'; 'partner behaviours'; 'cohesion'; and 'implementation issues'. The dysfunctions
evident in each of these dimensions are strongly associated with 'Alliance Type' (that is, there
are major differences between the dysfunctions for each dimension based on 'Alliance Type')
(refer Appendix L, Tables 18-21). 'Model dysfunction' includes a range of adverse features
and issues associated with the alliance model chosen by the alliance. For constrained choice-
type alliances, model dysfunctions include the rigid and cumbersome nature of the model,
bureaucracy, lack of flexibility and administration burdens. In the case of voluntary-type
alliances, these were competing alliances, limited spread and structure not linked to function.
'Partner interaction' describes dysfunctions inherent in the establishment of relationships and
interaction between alliance partners during establishment.

In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, these include uneven partner influence,
hidden agendas and internal conflicts. For voluntary-type alliances these include power and
control, lack of trust, no formal control over individuals and formation of "clubs" (refer Chapter Five). 'Partner behaviours' are a range of dysfunctional partner organisation and individual partner behaviours. For constrained choice-type alliances, these included game playing, imposed Western views, divergent strategies and different values. In the case of voluntary-type alliances, these include hoarding of information, lack of a common understanding, personality clashes and divergent views. 'Cohesion' in the context of relationship dysfunctions is manifest in the disunity among partners in the alliance. With constrained choice-type alliances, lack of trust and lack of harmonisation are common dysfunctions. In the case of voluntary-type alliances, these dysfunctions include disunity, factions, splinter groups and partners "doing their own thing". 'Implementation issues' are a range of dysfunctions associated with the establishment processes. For constrained choice-type alliances, these include technical limitations, favouring certain partners, management dysfunctions and barriers to entry. With voluntary-type alliances, they are competition between organisations, exploitation, multiple levels of management the alliance being pulled in many directions.

'Relationship Interactions', 'Relationship Behaviours' and 'Relationship Dysfunctions' interact to affect 'Relationship Performance' (Chapter Six). 'Relationship Performance' is important because it influences how well satisfied the parties are with their relationships and how likely they are to continue with those relationships (Shamdasani and Sheth, 1995, pp. 7-11). Satisfaction reflects the existing feelings about the alliance based on evaluation of outcomes. This is positively related to continuity since in a satisfied organisation, is more likely to maintain its ongoing relationship than seek a new partner alliance. Continuity indicates that partner firms expect to continue to work together closely to achieve their mutual strategic goals through the alliance. Performance also provides important indications about the
efficiency and effectiveness of leaning processes which in turn affect the organisation and alliance strategies (Inkpen and Crossman, 1995, p. 603). This is also important since it has been shown that learning organisations will effectively outperform their competitors in the long run.

The partners perceive the performance of the 'Alliance Relationship' across three dimensions: benefits to individual partners; satisfaction with the alliance model and the performance of the alliance in general. 'Satisfaction with the model' describes the perceived satisfaction with the alliance model as a modality for delivering ODA programs was not affected by 'Alliance Type'. It is possible for partners to view the alliance model as a successful modality for ODA delivery but for the alliance not to meet its objectives or provide significant to partners and vice versa (dissatisfaction with model but still meeting objectives and/or delivering partner benefits). In the case of 'benefits for partners' and 'alliance performance', the perceived differences in performance were different depending on whether the alliance was a constrained choice or voluntary model. 'Benefits to partners' includes those individual benefits from alliance membership that accrued to the individual partners. For constrained choice-type alliances these included improved relationships and increased market share. In the case of voluntary-type alliances, these included good experience from alliance membership and building community.

Common to both constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances was meeting partner's needs and partner satisfaction. 'Alliance performance' is the general performance of the alliance in terms of impacts, outputs, outcomes and alliance objectives. This 'alliance performance' was often perceived differently by the different classes of partners (private, public, government) and perceptions differed between 'Alliance Type'. For constrained
choice-type alliances, general success was viewed in terms of good working relationships, additional benefits' impacts, achieved objectives' value add and verified success. In the case of voluntary-type alliances, success was perceived in terms of side benefits, mutual benefits, benefits from relationships, long-term benefits, advantages of working together, sharing a visioning and meeting expectations.

As previously stated 'Relationship Interactions', 'Relationship Behaviours,' and 'Relationship Dysfunctions' interact to influence 'Relationship Performance'. These relationships are complex and influenced by other factors such as 'Alliance Type'. This is demonstrated by the comparative analysis reported in Chapters Five and Six. For constrained choice-type alliances, relationships focus on strength of relationships; individual, stable and long term relationships and what the individual partners can get out of the relationship (linking with the private sector, leveraging off the partnership). 'Relationship Behaviour' tends to be strategic, positively engaged and intentional with a focus on commitment, viability, the partners, mutual support and enthusiasm. Common dysfunctions include lack of flexibility of the model, administrative burden, bureaucracy, game playing, rivalry, hidden agendas and different values. A lack of cohesion may be manifest through lack of trust and lack of harmonisation. Dysfunctional implementation issues include technical limitations, management dysfunction and barriers to entry. This results in relationships where success is perceived in terms of benefits to individual partners (identified benefits, value addition and verified success), improved relationships and increased market share.

In the case of voluntary-type alliances, 'Relationship Interactions' focus on cementing and building enduring relationships, personal relationships, cohesiveness, openness and "value" and "depth" of relationships (closer relationships, relationships with individuals).
Relationship behaviours tend to be about networks, friendships, sense of belonging, mutual interest, respecting individuals, trust, full participation, collaboration, and working together. Partnership functions include competition within and between the alliance and structure not linked to function, "club effect" (power groups within the alliance), lack of formal controls over individuals, lack of common understanding, hoarding of information, personality clashes, inactive partners and potential competition. Lack of cohesion is typified by the formation of splinter groups, partners doing their own thing and divergent views. Dysfunction implementation issues include competition between partners, multiple levels of management and the alliance pulling in many directions. The performance of the resulting relationships are perceived in terms of benefits for members, building community, mutual benefits, advantages of working together and sharing a vision.

9.2.6 Alliance Leadership

Sitting outside of the alliance processes and process issues, but with a very important influence on these processes and process factors is the core category of 'Alliance Leadership' (Fig. 9.5).
'Alliance Leadership' refers to the individuals or groups who provide the energy, vision and drive during the establishment of the alliance and are often responsible for guiding and holding the alliance together during implementation (Chapter Seven). These persons or groups foster collaboration and create and maintain trust and confidence between participants and networks (Sökjer-Petersen (2010, pp. 4-5). They are driven by passion, and not by money, and the leadership often develops informally on the basis of personal respect, high
status and productive and successful relationships with others in various networks. 'Alliance Leadership' has unique challenges: they must encourage cooperation while simultaneously holding in check the natural tendencies of partner organisations to pursue their own self interests (Isabella, 2002, pp. 47-48). At the beginning of the establishment processes, they must help the group define a collective vision and develop this into intermediate objectives which can satisfy most of the alliance partners (Lesage, 2006, p. 9; pp. 18-19). Initially, this involves helping the partners to organise and develop as a team to which all can contribute. In the later stages, this involves behaving as a mentor to help each member to "transcend itself" and to contribute the alliance as a whole. Within an individual organisation, individuals may be regarded as leaders if they have vision, inspire others, make things happen and are able to mobilise and direct resources.

However, within an alliance, the leaders also depend upon their ability to solicit cooperation from the partners and make decisions in the best interests of the partnership (Reinfeld, 2009, pp.164-165). Initially, there is a need for leadership highly competent in motivating change and building relationships; later on in the processes the focus is on personal relationships. As strategic alliances grow in size and complexity, the organisations generally recognise the importance of formalising the management of the alliance and the activities being implemented. In this case, the leadership must have strong strategic alliance-focussed philosophy, strategy and culture (Reinfeld, 2009, pp. 186-187).

There are three dimensions of 'Alliance Leadership: 'Type'; 'Leadership Attributes'; and 'Acceptance/Formality'. 'Type' refers to the source of the leadership and the way in which this leadership comes into being. It has two sub-components: 'source' and 'dynamics'. In theory, the 'Alliance Leadership' can emerge from the alliance initiator, key individuals, key
partners, core partners, appointed or engaged individuals or organisations of from any of the participating partner classes (including private sector, public sector, government or secondary partners). This leadership can emerge from within the alliance, be engaged from outside the alliance, or may be appointed or elected from within the alliance membership. In practice the manner in which the 'Alliance Leadership' arises is inextricably linked to alliance conception process, and in particular the core category 'Alliance Type'.

In the case of constrained choice-type alliances, the initiator (generally a donor) or core group of partners appoints or commissions the alliance leadership often in the form of a commercial implementer or an appointed alliance manager. The implementer then exercises a high degree of control over the alliance strategy and management often including "command and control"-like leadership including the allocation of resources. It is not uncommon, in these situations, for the alliance initiator or core group to maintain a high level of input into, and influence over, decisions affecting the strategy and management of the alliance establishment. In these cases, the resulting alliance leadership may be more of a manager-implementer than providing leadership and the implementer may be a foreign-based company resulting is issues associated with cultural differences and alignment of objectives and agendas. As a result, the "imposed" alliance leadership may not be fully recognised by the alliance partners and a secondary leadership may emerge from within the partnership. This can cause tension (formal versus informal leadership), conflicting objectives and alliance dysfunction.

With voluntary-type alliances, 'Alliance Leadership' can result from a single leader (sometimes the alliance initiator), a core group of partners or individual(s) appointed or elected by the alliance partners. Where the leadership has emerged from within the
partnership or been appointed by the partners and is widely accepted by the partners, then
strong and effective leadership may result. However, where there is a lack of "buy-in" from
the partners or a number of potential leaders evolving leadership, multiple leadership, or even
no clear leadership may result, with associated problems including competing agendas, lack
of direction, personality clashes and misalignment of corporate goals and objectives.

The effect of alliance type on alliance leadership was further described by Kilduff and Tsai
(2003, pp. 91, 96) who identified two types of alliance networks; serendipitous and goal
directed. Serendipitous alliances evolve through random variation, selection and retention
processes. In this type of relationship there is no single leader and ties between members is
based on personal relationships. A leader may emerge; draw in loosely coupled members,
and in the process trigger collaboration in achieving goals. In contrast, in goal-directed
networks the partner's share specific goals and activities are designed to achieve these. The
structure is centralised through the presence of a leader and the boundaries involved are clear.

The second important dimension of 'Alliance Leadership' is 'Leadership Attributes'. This
describes the leadership characteristics and behaviours exhibited by the 'Alliance Leadership'
in the execution of their role and in exercising their influence and control (Chapter Six).
'Leadership Attributes' has two dimensions: 'characteristics' and 'behaviours'. The
characteristics and behaviours associated with effective strategic alliance leadership and the
importance of 'leadership attributes' to alliance establishment and development has been
widely reported in the literature (Chapter Six). According to Kanter (2000, p.107), Kelly et
al. (2002, p.32) and Todeva et al. (2004, pp. 18-19) alliance leadership has a key role in
creating the foundation for trust building. With this in mind, they suggest that 'alliance
leadership' requires the following skills: strong interpersonal skills (to compensate for
cultural and organisational differences); integrative skills and the ability to manage diverse perspectives; ability to work in a cooperative environment; and the ability to manage the technical aspects of the alliance. The capabilities and knowledge associated with effective strategic alliance leadership varies between partner organisations and individuals and the requirements for this may vary with the stage of alliance development. These differences are articulated by Reinfeld (2009, pp. 168-169) in Table 6.2 (Chapter Six). For example, during strategic formulation, capabilities associated with setting visions, goals and direction are required but, during the execution stage, addressing conflict and influencing skills are more important. The characteristics and management philosophy of the alliance leadership has a fundamental effect on the subsequent behaviour of the alliance (Davis et al., 1997, pp. 32-34). If the alliance leadership adopts a control-oriented philosophy, the thinking and controlling aspects of alliance management are separated from the doing aspects. In this case, the reaction to increasing risk and uncertainty will be greater controls and relationships will be transactional in nature and based on institutional or formal power. If an involvement-oriented philosophy is adopted, the leadership will be highly participative with open communication, empowerment of staff and establishment of trust. Here, increasing risk and uncertainty will be dealt with through more training, empowerment and trust in staff.

Leadership 'Characteristics' appear to be independent of 'Alliance Type' and include such qualities as vision, passion, credibility, strength of leadership, influence, credibility and understanding. In contrast, 'behaviours' may be strongly influenced by 'Alliance Type'. In the case of constrained choice-type alliances (which corresponds with the control-oriented philosophy of Davis et al., 1997), alliance leadership exhibited behaviours such as 'directing', 'aggressive management', 'micro-management', strong leadership' and 'wanting things done our way'. For voluntary-type alliances (which correspond with the involvement-oriented
philosophy of Davis et al., 1997) the behaviours demonstrated by the alliance leadership included 'connects individuals', 'steering', 'mentor', supportive', 'focal person', 'holds alliance together', and 'encouragement'. These contrasting sets of behaviours may be due to the relationship between the alliance initiators/strategic management (appointed and directed in the case of constrained choice-type alliance but generally emergent, elected or appointed or elected in the case of the voluntary alliances) and the subsequent level of involvement by the initiators/strategic management in alliance management (close involvement in the case of constrained choice-type alliances but involvement-oriented in the case of voluntary-type alliances).

The third and final dimension of 'Alliance Leadership' is 'Acceptance/Formality' which refers to the degree to which the 'Alliance Leadership' has formal or informal power and authority and the extent to which this recognised by the alliance partners. 'Acceptance/Formality' has two components: 'acknowledgement' and 'satisfaction with performance'. Satisfaction with alliance leadership performance appears to be independent of 'Alliance Type' and is described in terms such as 'satisfaction', 'highly regarded', 'acceptance' and 'perceived as doing a good job'. 'Acknowledgement', however, appears to be strongly associated with 'Alliance Type'.

For constrained choice-type alliances, the partners describe 'acknowledgement' in terms such as 'appointed by stakeholders', 'appointed by donor', 'acknowledged leader' and 'formal recognition' (that is, as being appointed or imposed, with a high level of formality and being acknowledged or accepted by the partners). In the case of voluntary-type alliances, acknowledgement was described in terms such as 'informal', 'identified', 'elected', 'lacks formal power', 'leaders is glue' and 'perceived leader (that is, 'Alliance Leadership' influenced with more involvement from the partners and more informal). For voluntary-type alliances,
the informal nature of the alliance leadership, the lack of formal power, and the changing nature of the alliance leadership were sometimes viewed as negatives.

Hence 'Type' ('source' and 'dynamics'), 'Leadership Attributes (particularly 'behaviours') and 'Acceptance/Formality' (particularly 'acknowledgement') contribute to 'Alliance Leadership' which has a fundamental influence on alliance establishment because of the effects in all of the alliance establishment processes ('Conception', 'Bringing the Partners on Board', 'Sorting Out the Detail') and 'Alliance Relationships'. There are essentially two types of 'Alliance Leadership'; control-oriented and involvement-oriented. Control-oriented leadership features appointment of the leadership by the initiators or core partners; a high degree of control exercised by the alliance leadership and strategic management; directing, aggressive micro-management; formality and acknowledgement of the leadership by the partners. This type of leadership is generally associated with constrained choice alliances. With involvement-oriented leadership, the leadership emerges or is appointed or directed by the partners; the alliance leadership involves the partners in decision making and strategic decisions; leadership is informal, connects individuals; steers, mentor and supports the partners and the alliance; and holds the alliance together. Involvement-oriented leadership is associated more often with voluntary alliances. Therefore 'Alliance Leadership' is very closely associated with (and may significantly impact on) 'Alliance Type'. However, as previously discussed, alliances in ODA are usually neither simply constrained choice nor voluntary alliances, but generally have a tendency towards constrained choice or voluntary.

Similarly, control-oriented and involvement-oriented alliance leadership should be considered as two extremes of a continuum, with individual alliances lying along this continuum but with as tendency towards either control-orientation or involvement-
orientation. Thus individual alliances may exhibit features of both control and involvement orientation or they may be one or the other to a greater or lesser degree. This was the case in the PPAs included in the current study.

9.2.7 Modifiers

In addition to the 'Processes and Process Issues', 'Alliance Type' and 'Alliance Relationships' components which make up the central part of the Integrated Theoretical Model, and 'Alliance Leadership' which impacts significantly on these central components, there exists a final set of factors which potentially exert an influence other in part or in full across all of the other components of the model. These factors are termed 'Modifiers' (or overlaying factors because they overlay the rest of the Integrated Conceptual Model (Fig. 9.6). 'Modifiers' are not just a collection of miscellaneous factors; they are factors which are external to the domain of the central establishment processes but which may have a fundamental influence over, or interaction with, individual model elements, groups of elements or the whole establishment process. There are four important features of these 'Modifiers':

(a) Their exact nature may not be immediately apparent and they may be difficult to identify before establishment commences;

(b) Some may be present from the very beginning of conception (precursors) whilst other may emerge during the establishment processes (emergent or contingency factors);

(c) The combination of modifiers active within an alliance may be specific to that alliance as a result of the unique context and combinations of variables and
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factors impinging on the individual alliance (that is, they may be context specific); and

(d) The effects of the modifiers on the alliance establishment may be difficult to predict due to the context specific nature of the modifiers and the complexities that may result from multiple interactions.
Figure 9.6  Modifiers as a Component of the Integrated Theoretical Model
There are essentially four groups of 'Modifiers': 'Individual Factors'; 'Partner Organisation Factors'; 'Structural Factors'; and 'External Factors'. 'Individual Factors' are those pertaining to the individuals within the alliance (particularly key individuals) and are essentially individual attributes such as personal agendas, individual ideologies and beliefs, individual power and influence and changes in key individuals. 'Partner Organisation Factors' are associated with the individual partner organisations and include factors such as partner class (for example, private sector, government, private sector, non-government organisation), organisation agenda, organisation politics, power and influence and changes in organisation staff. 'Structural Factors' are those relevant to the alliance as a whole and include attributes and issues such as size/critical mass, management structure, changes in alliance staff, alliance politics and stability of membership. 'External Factors' are those outside the alliance that impact on the establishment processes. There are four sub-groups of 'External Modifiers': 'government'; 'politics'; 'challenges'; and 'culture.' 'External Factors' include government policies and agendas ('government'); political influence and corruption ('politics'); geographical issues, natural disasters and civil unrest ('challenges'); and cultural awareness and culturally sensitive issues ('culture').

'Modifiers' have been studies widely by a range of researchers. Organisational factors were studied by Todeva and Knoke (2004, pp.13-16) who observed that on account of company-specific properties such as size, assets, experience and diversification, there was considerable differences in the potential of individual organisations to participate in strategic alliances. Incompatible objectives, capabilities and constraints among partner organisations may lead to tension and increased organisation and alliance risk. Communication, a structural modifier, was studied by Kelly et al. (2002, pp.15-19). Poor communication within an alliance and between partners can create an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion that can undermine both
the legitimacy and effectiveness of an alliance. Good communications ensures transparency, minimises misunderstanding, reduces uncertainty and encourages sustained cooperation. It is also essential to the resolution of operation problems that arise early in the establishment processes. External modifiers studied by previous researchers include culture, environment and industrial factors. According the Kelly et al. (2002, pp. 15-16, 19), cultural differences are the second largest group of relationship issues in alliance establishment after communications. Cultural issues include cultural mismatch, cultural misunderstandings, ethical orientations, core values and beliefs. Differences between cultures make it very difficult to find a common basis from which trust can develop and this may lead to a myriad of operational problems. "Business environmental factors" such as general economic conditions, institutional frameworks, legal requirements, macro-economic policies and markets were found by Todeva and Knoke (2004, pp. 10-12) to have a broad effect in shaping the formation of strategic alliances. These authors also observed that industrial factors such as knowledge intensity, technical innovation and resource consumption levels exert strong direct impacts on the establishment and development of alliances.

An insight into the potential impact of modifiers on the processes of PPA establishment is provided by the supplementary study of a specific partner organisation modifier, 'partner class' (Chapter Eight, Table 8.1 and 8.2). In the comparative analysis reported in Chapter Eight, 'partner class' was found to influence and interact with a range of attributes, sub-processes and sub-categories associated with all of the establishment processes and the core category 'Alliance Relationships'. These were identified as: motivation to join the alliance ('Bringing the Partners on Board'); perceptions ('Conception' and 'Bringing the Partners on Board'); engagement in management and decision making ('Sorting Out the Details');
alignment between organisation and alliance strategies ('Sorting Out the Detail'); target relationships ('Alliance Relationships') and target outcomes ('Alliance Relationships').

In addition to the effect on establishment processes, modifiers may interact with other core categories in influencing alliance establishment. An example of this is given by the comparative analysis of 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class' which was reported in Chapter Eight (Table 8.3). This analysis demonstrates the complexities of alliance establishment and the way in which the elements of the Integrated Theoretical Model may interact both with respect to other core categories and with establishment processes and sub-processes. Differences between 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class' were evident in the core categories of 'Alliance Type', 'Processes and Process Issues', 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Alliance Relationships'. For example, the donor in constrained choice-type alliances exerted a major influence over alliance conception, but also on the alliance objectives, strategies and management processes. In voluntary-type alliances, the role of the donor was generally less dominant with the donor as a regular member of a management committee which developed the alliance objectives and strategy and was responsible for the strategic and operational oversight of the alliance.

Each of the four groups of 'Modifiers'; 'Individual', 'Partner Organisation', 'Structural' and 'External' could be further divided into 'precursors' or 'emergent (contingency)' factors. 'Precursors' are present at the very beginning of the alliance establishment. 'Emergent (contingency)' factors emerge (and become important) during the establishment process and are more problematic in that they are not apparent in the beginning stages of the alliance establishment and their identity and characteristics may not always be early to predict. While the current study identified many of these modifiers and allowed them to be grouped into
'precursors' and 'emergent' factors, it was not designed to study the comparative differences between these factors or their dynamics with respect to the functioning of the Integrated Theoretical Model. A set of "initial conditions" were identified by Doz (1996, pp. 69-72, 74-75) as being critical to the success of an alliance. These "initial conditions" are task definitions; partner's organisational routines; interface structure; and partner's expectations. These interact with five learning processes (or learning dimensions): the environment; the task; the process of cooperation; the skills of the partners; and the goals and motives. This author suggests that the initial phase of collaboration in a strategic alliance can be conceptualised as an interaction between the four initial conditions and the five learning processes impacting on the ability of the alliance managers to learn about various aspects of the alliance. This learning allows the partners to re-evaluate efficiency, equity and adaptability and for the alliance to re-adjust to new conditions. A second author, Austin (2000, p. 69, pp. 81-87), identified a set of alliance "drivers", that influence the nature and functioning of the alliance relationship, and a set of alliance "enablers" that contribute to the effective management of the relationship (refer Chapter Seven). The identified drivers are: alignment of strategy, mission and vision; personal connections and relationships, value generation and shared visioning and continual learning, while the enablers are focussed attention, communication, organisational systems and mutual expectations and accountability. Whilst these studies allude to the importance of "initial" and other modifiers, much more research is required in this area to allow a fuller understanding of this dynamic.

Together the above components make up the Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA which is presented in Fig. 9.7.
Figure 9.7  An Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA in ODA
9.3 IMPORTANT FEATURES OF THE INTEGRATED THEORETICAL MODEL

There are a range of important features and limitations associated with this Integrated Theoretical Model:

1. **The establishment process is complex and non-linear**

   Whilst Fig. 9.7 portrays the model as linear with a logical progression of the establishment processes from one stage to the next, this is far from the case. As discussed above and demonstrated by the Grounded Theory and comparative analyses, there is considerable overlap and interaction between processes and stages. Alliance establishment is complex, multi-dimensional and "messy". This is difficult to capture in a one-dimensional model. Whilst all of the PPAs used in this study progressed through all stages, the sub-processes and factors associated with each process or stage varied between individual alliances. In addition, the interaction of 'Alliance Type', 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Modifiers' with the establishment processes and other factors makes the establishment of PPAs untidy, complex and sometime unpredictable.

2. **There is no universal recipe for PPA establishment**

   The complex, non-linear nature of alliance establishment, the combination of contextual variables associated within individual alliances (for example location, partners, focus, business environment), and the unpredictable nature of the modifiers associated with individual PPAs means that no two alliance will be the same. It is therefore highly unlikely that a universal recipe for PPA establishment can be developed. This is an important point since a review of the available literature indicates that several of the major international donor agencies have developed 'guidelines' and operations manual for the establishment and operation of PPAs (DFID, 2003; USAID, 2004; Herzberg and Wright, 2006; USAID,
These guidelines are widely circulated by these donor organisations as "best practice" guidelines for the establishment of new public-private alliances.

3. The conception process is fundamental to the establishment of the PPA

Most of the studies on PPA and strategic alliance establishment and development to date have considered establishment as commencing with the introduction of potential alliance partners. This study has shown that there is a critical stage before this; the process of alliance conception. The nature and type of alliance initiator, the way in which the decision to initiate the alliance comes about and the degree of control and influence that the initiator exerts on the conception process is a major factor in determining the 'Alliance Type'. The current study further shows that 'Alliance Type' is critically important to the rest of the establishment because it has a major influence not only over the establishment processes but also on 'Alliance Relationships' and 'Alliance leadership'. Thus due consideration needs to be given to the 'Conception' as a fundamental part of the establishment processes.

4. Alliance establishment focuses on the development of stable and mature alliance relationships

The results of this study appear to show that the focus of alliance establishment is the development of stable and mature alliance relationships. Partners identified a range of partnership dynamic and behaviours and the model of alliance relationship development proposed by Pesämaa (2007) provides a good conceptualisation of how these factors interact. Thus this model has been built into the overall integrated model of alliance establishment. However Pesämaa's model does not capture the breadth or complexity of the factors and
dynamics involved in alliance relationship development and more research is required in this area of alliance establishment.

5. The alliance 'Modifiers' are important but problematic

This studied has identified the existence of a group of factors external to the establishment processes but with the potential to exert influence across the whole conceptual model. The presence of some of these 'Modifiers' can be observed or practitioners alerted to their potential influence at the start of establishment (precursors) and so can be taken into account by practitioners and alliance managers. However some of these 'Modifiers' emerge during the establishment processes and their presence and influence is difficult to predict. The Integrated Theoretical Model does alert users that these emergent modifiers may be an influence on alliance establishment and this should hopefully serve to sensitize practitioners to their potential presence and serve as a reminder to remain open to the emergence of these as the establishment process proceeds.

6. The core categories represent five key points for potential intervention in alliance establishment

Several parts of the model require additional clarification and development to increase the utility and explanatory power of this conceptual model. That said, the Integrated Theoretical Model as currently developed provides a useful framework for the study of these processes and as conceptualisation of PPA establishment for use by ODA practitioners. In this regard, the five core categories which comprise the model ('Process/Process Issues'; 'Alliance Type'; 'Alliance Relationships'; 'Alliance Leadership'; and 'Modifiers') represent five key areas that of critical importance to the alliance establishment and these are areas to which practitioners seeking to establish new alliances must pay particular attention. These five key areas also
represent points at which researchers or practitioners can intervene to potentially modify the establishment processes and thus the nature and dynamic of the resulting alliances. For example, potential interventions by practitioners that change the degree of control exerted by the alliance initiator may be able to move the alliance type more towards either a constrained choice or voluntary alliance. Interventions that change the behaviours of the alliance leadership may have a profound effect on the other establishment processes.

9.4 CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have developed an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA programs. The Integrated Theoretical Model goes some way into filling significant gap in the current body of established knowledge and the implications of this study and the development of the model are discussed in Chapters Ten and Eleven.

This model is based on the five core categories identified by the Grounded Theory analysis in combination with the results of the comparative studies and theoretical and technical underpinning provided by the current body of established literature. The model is not a recipe for PPA establishment, but is a useful framework which can be used to further study the establishment of PPAs in ODA, the components of the establishment processes and the relationships between these elements. In addition, the Integrated Theoretical Model also provides practitioners with an understanding of the establishment processes and identifies a number of potential intervention points where practitioners may influence these processes. While this model is potentially useful as a tool for practitioners and as a framework for researchers, the current study identified a range of areas where additional research could be carried out to enhance its utility and explanatory power. This is
particularly the case at least two of the core categories, 'Alliance Relationships' and 'Modifiers'. More development is required in these areas. These additional areas for additional research are further discussed in Chapter Eleven.

The practical significance of this Integrated Theoretical Model and its utility can only really be confirmed through its application to 'real-life' PPAs in ODA programs. In the next chapter, I analyse and compare three contrasting PPAs which were used in this study using this model as an analytical framework. The aim of this is to analyse the decisions and processes which were involved in establishment of these PPAs, the consequences of these, and the way in which they may have been potentially modified to alter the alliance outcome.
CHAPTER 10: THE INTEGRATED THEORETICAL MODEL IN PRACTICE - A COMPARISON OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THREE PUBLIC-PRIVATE ALLIANCES IN ODA

10.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapters Four to Eight described the dimensions, properties and characteristics of the five core categories identified in the Grounded Theory analysis. The previous chapter developed an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment based on these five core categories.

In this chapter, I demonstrate the practical significance of this research and the Integrated Theoretical Model by applying it to three contrasting PPAs that were included in this study. I do this by using the Integrated Theoretical Model as a framework to analyse the establishment of these PPAs to

(i) demonstrate the Integrated Theoretical Model in practice;

(ii) show how the core categories interact to influence the alliance relationship and subsequent outcome; and

(iii) explain the five points in the model where practitioners may intervene to potentially alter the alliance outcome.

The chapter commences with a description of each of the three PPAs and their formation. These PPAs are then compared and contrasted using the Integrated Theoretical Model as a comparative analysis framework. In each case, the framework is used to analyse the establishment processes, factors, decisions and alliance outcomes.
I continue with a consideration of the possible intervention points and modifications which could have been made at the beginning of, and during, alliance establishment and the potential impacts of these on the alliance outcomes.

The chapter ends with a discussion of the implications of this type of analysis and the use of the Integrated Theoretical Model for future alliance establishment.

10.2 THE THREE CONTRASTING PPAs

For the purposes of this analysis I have selected three contrasting PPAs: P2 (refer Appendix A) is a constrained choice-type alliance in the infrastructure sector; P5 (refer Appendix G) is a voluntary-type alliance in the extension, information exchange and development strategy sector; and P4 (refer Appendix A) is a constrained choice-type alliance in the community development sector. However, while P4 is a constrained choice-type alliance, it is much more weakly so than P2 and exhibits characteristics of both alliance types. Figure 10.1 locates these PPAs in terms of the Weberian Ideal Types for constrained choice and voluntary alliances.

Figure 10.1 Location of the Three contrasting PPAs in Relation to the Weberian Ideal Types for Constrained Choice and Voluntary Alliances
10.2.1 Alliance P2

P2 was first established in 2004/05 with four core partners: a donor; a private sector partner, a developing country government agency and an implementer.

Conception

The donor has a formal development agreement with the developing country government which includes a mandate for infrastructure development in the developing country. This donor was approached by a private sector company seeking development assistance and a vehicle for delivering its mandatory corporate social responsibility obligations. The proposal was in keeping with the agendas of both the developing country government (infrastructure development for the poor) and the donor (ODA agenda and goodwill), and so the donor agreed to support the proposal.

...it was the right moment for a PPA because a private firm came knocking at our doors saying that we want to partner with you, and we have this, a formal Memorandum of Intent between the developing country Government and the donor for an infrastructure project. So everything fell into place at the right time....[Donor]

Thus, the initiation decision was made by the donor, with the donor driving the conception process using the donors systems, processes and model. The resulting alliance type was a constrained choice-type alliance.
Bringing the Partners On Board

Initially, the primary partners were identified and approached by the donor. They consisted of the donor, the private sector organisation and a relevant developing country government department. Both the donor and the government agency were keen to utilise the capacity and expertise of the private sector partner.

......and also we can get expertise from each partner, so expertise

is what they (private partners) put into the project.......[Donor]

In keeping with the donor model for alliances, an implementing agency was appointed following an open tender process. This implementer is a quasi-partner in that, while it is in reality a contractor to the donor, it is functionally treated as a partner. The motivation for the implementer is purely commercial (profit and the opportunity for further work from the donor).

Actually the implementer sits in the strategy meeting group

because we think of them also as an equal because they've got the

expertise in implementing the project.......[Donor]

Subsequently, other partners were taken on board resulting from an approach by the donor, implementer and private sector partner to fill skills and capacity gaps or as a result of approaches from private sector organisations, local government agencies and non-government organisations to join.
Sorting out the Detail

The strategy and objectives of the alliance were set by the donor with some input from the country government agency. The principles of operation were imposed by the donor through the implementer (with the implementer formally charged with ensuring compliance and performance) and there were apparently delays in agreeing to all of these conditions.

....I think that they also had a hard time probably getting the details of how they can work together on this project. They met a couple of times just to see what this partner is going to do, what this partner is going to provide etc.........[Donor]

These were enshrined in formal agreements between the parties, as were the specific roles and responsibilities.

It's confirmed by a partnership agreement- and the agreement spells out the roles of the different stakeholders........

[Implementer]

We have the Memorandum of Agreement which specifically indicates the roles and functions of each party, where the funds will go, how this will be reported.............[Government]

As alliance establishment continued, regular meetings of the partners were instituted but final decision-making powers were retained by the donor.
Alliance Leadership

The alliance Conception process for this PPA resulted in two levels of alliance leadership: a formal top level leadership from the donor and a second operational level of leadership imposed by the implementer. A management committee comprised of representative of the primary partners was established but it had no formal leadership or management role. There is, however, a major difference in perceptions on behalf of the partners as to the leadership and management arrangements.

_The strategy part is provided by all the major partners. And while we are providing a bulk of the funds we see them as co-equals and partners in this endeavour. We don't see ourselves as the ones setting the directions..........[Donor]_

_It is really the donor that more or less has control over the program........[Implementer]_

_The donor was very strict with the partners and they just look at the work plan, we do it, that's it........[Private Partner]_

_We didn't really know who we were dealing with, the donor or the implementer. I think that is one thing they have to resolve...who we are talking to........[Private Partner]_
Modifiers
Regional conflict in the developing country has resulted in delays and security issues during the implementation of the alliance.

"......you just have to forgo some of those targets and switch on to another thing just to make things happen because these are also conflict areas. I guess that's the dilemma we are having....."

[Government]

Cultural issues due both to cultural differences between the local communities and the federal agency and the developing country and developed country alliance partner staff has caused conflict and misunderstanding.

"Actually the hardest part is the implementers because they have to face quite different culture, a culture from the south....."[Donor]

"So they need to marry, harmonise the developing country way of doing things with the donor way of doing things..."[Government]

Government regulations (particularly changes in government policy direction) have adversely affected implementation. Some strong personalities have resulted in alliance dysfunctions and partner dissatisfaction with the alliance.

Alliance Relationships
The alliance relationship is quite formal. The partners meet regularly to discuss operational issues. However, strategic decisions are made by the donor and implementation decisions are
made by the implementer. The other partners have freedom to operate only within the terms of their agreement with the donor. A major role of the implementer is monitoring and evaluation to ensure progress against targets using formal reporting systems. Alliance dysfunctions abounded. Manifestations of this included game-playing by partners such as withholding of resources.

........the major private sector partner decided to withhold its money to indicate its displeasure over the restructuring that the implementer has done.........[Implementer]

The partners have conflicting agendas. Private sector partners have continually attempted to have more control over the management of the alliance.

The major private sector, because of the nature and size of its contribution, wanted more participation....for example they wanted a clear hand in the selection of the implementation manager.........[Implementer]

The leadership of the alliance is problematic in that the implementation manager is a strong personality and clashes have been frequent. When this occurs, the other partners go directly to the donor to resolve disputes.

The private sector partner would play games with us and would go to the donor every time they're not happy with us..... [Implementer]
We had some disputes with the implementer during implementation - if we tell them we cannot do this they're "we will go back to the donor - that's against our contractual agreement"........... [Private Partner]

General Comments

This alliance is successful in that it has achieved its stated objectives. The donor and the government partner are both achieving their objectives and the other partners have achieved their agendas to varying extents. However, as a modality for implementing this program, the perceived success varies with the individual partner. Most of the partners feel that the management and implementation of the alliance has been problematic and, going forward, they would wish to implement major reforms.

...when it comes to the planning for the implementation and policy making, everybody should be involved, the private sector, the communities, those who are the stakeholders of the program should be part of the development process........[Private Partner]

The three major partners (donor, government agency and primary private partner) intend to continue in a relationship of some form. However, many of the secondary partners have dropped out of the alliance.

10.2.2 Alliance P4

P4 is a community development PPA established in 2005 originally with three main partners: a donor; a developing country national government agency and a private sector financial organisation.
Conception

The alliance started with an agreement between a donor and the developing country government for assistance with micro-finance for rural development in some poor provinces in the developing country. This proposal met the development agenda of the donor and the mandate of a government agency for alternative income generation for poor smallholders.

For the government agency it's really having a sustained livelihood for a land based livelihood project which would add on to income derived from traditional cropping...........[Government]

The donor initiated the alliance with the government agency; however they also needed a micro-finance company. Thus this alliance was initially conceived as a constrained choice alliance with three partners and using the systems and processes of the donor and a Memorandum of Understanding between the donor and each of the partners.

And then they had all these guidelines - audit proposal guidelines--that we were able to follow....things like that........

[Private Partner]

The legal agreement between us is just a Memorandum of Agreement........

[Government]
Bringing the Partners On Board

In this alliance, the implementation of the alliance strategy is the responsibility of the government agency. The donor does not have a representative office in the developing country and manages the program from its home country using a range of monitoring and evaluation process and field verification visits. The government agency appears to have wide latitude in the implementation of the project.

So on the basis of trust they said that the day-to-day operations, it's all yours. So they gave us the freedom to do it the way we see fits best in the situation in the field..........[Private Partner]

Initially, there was only one private sector company; a microfinance company. This company entered the partnership somewhat reluctantly because they had not been involved in the rural sector; traditionally seen as high risk. That said they could see the potential for business development and commercial gain. As a result, an additional major partner, a private company with skills in agricultural production, was invited to join the alliance to transfer skills to the farmers and mitigate some of the risk.

Because we were informed that the donor had this program and were asked to submit a proposal to them........[Private Partner]

The additional partner was motivated by the potential for business development but also a corporate social responsibility agenda. This additional private partner had also previously worked with the government agency and there were well developed personal relationships.
So he is a friend of mine even before this project. So I said to him "Why don't you do this for me? Would you please help me help these farmers?"........... [Government]

A range of additional partners subsequently joined the alliance to add additional skills and geographic focus.

...yes, because if we have private business that becomes interested and - it's really a decision of the group, of - because what happened in some areas it evolved...........[Government]

Sorting out the Detail

Primary roles and responsibilities were captured in a Memorandum of Understanding, as were the reporting procedures. There were individual MoUs between each partner and the donor. While the donor was involved in overall strategy development and monitoring and evaluation, the general operation of the alliance, including implementation planning was carried out by a management committee comprised of the major partners.

We have regular meetings with the partners and then the heads of the farmer's organisations. We have a sort of assessment of where we have gone and how we are doing. So, there is regular communication and regular meetings........[Government]

The government agency has a high degree of ownership of the program. It carries out associated activities outside the alliance mandate and it is looking to the next phase of the program.
**Alliance Leadership**

Alliance Leadership is provided by the government agency, and in particular, one of the senior managers charged with overall responsibility for the project. This leadership appears to have acceptance by the other partners. When interviewed, this individual was of the view that the alliance leadership was shared by himself and the senior manager from the agricultural skills company and that this was a key success factor in the alliance.

*Essentially it was me and (the manager of the private agricultural company)........*[Government]*

These senior managers have a long standing personal friendship. The alliance leadership appears to be consultative, but focussed on the alliance objectives.

**Modifiers**

Several modifiers appear to be at play in this alliance. The physical remoteness of the donor from the project has created some problems (due to lack of accessibility for consultation) but may have aided the development of the alliance. There appears to be good strategic alignment between the partner agendas and the overall alliance objectives. Culture seems to play a role, in this case due to the shared culture of the project partners (including the implementer). Previous relationships have certainly been a positive influence in this alliance establishment. One negative modifier is remoteness of the rural communities and this has resulted in some issues associated with the timing and delivery of activities.
He said "They are very far....it will be hard for us to reach the farmers just to teach them the new technologies". But I said "No it's just the beginning, we are constructing roads for these farmers so that they will have access"...........[Government]

Another is the political agendas and aspirations of some local politicians, which has lead to occasional conflict with the alliance.

Alliance Relationships

The partners appear to have an excellent working (and personal) relationship and the alliance can be described as harmonious, dedicated and effective. Private sector partners describe the mutual trust associated with the relationship and apparently this was in place at the very beginning of the alliance establishment.

I think it's the mutual trust between them and us because we did not start from a spirit of doubt...........[Private Partner]

The partners are happy working together and are looking to the next phase of the alliance. Alliance objectives have been achieved and the individual objectives and agendas of the alliance partners are also being met

General Comments

Overall, P4 is perceived as successful both in terms of the alliance objectives and as a modality for the implementation of this program. The private sector partner, who was invited to join the alliance after establishment had commenced, expressed a desire to be involved earlier in the processes in the next iteration of the alliance.
So right at the very start at the design stage of this agreement I believe that if I will be given the chance to do it again I will be involved as early as possible. 

All partners appear to be keen to continue with this alliance.

### 10.2.3 Alliance P5

Alliance P5 commenced in 2006 with four initial partners: a donor, a private sector company, two government agencies and a growers' association.

**Conception**

In the early 2000's the developing country government made several attempts to organise several of the larger agricultural commodity sectors. These ended in failure. In 2006, the representative of a donor body who had an interest in this area met with a friend from the private sector and they agreed to facilitate a meeting between several of the major organisations involved in one of these sectors.

So the donor facilitated the meeting among the five main stakeholders and also invited the farmer to join. So it is actually initiated by these five main stakeholders.

As a result of this meeting, a steering committee was formed to move the establishment forward. Due to government regulations the agreement between the five initial partners was informal and membership of the consortium was voluntary. Thus the embryonic PPA was
formed as a voluntary-type alliance. The donor, the developing country government and the growers' association all has an interest in the development of this industry for poverty alleviation and economic development. The motivation for the private sector partner to join the alliance was security of commodity supply for its processing operations. The donor is a member of the alliance steering committee (now the management committee) but has little additional influence over the alliance structure, strategy or operations. In fact, it is as much the individual as the donor who is the driver of this alliance.

Bringing the Partners On Board

The steering committee organised a forum which was open to all organisations with an interest in commodity research and production.

> When we set it up we set it up so that membership was only available to people who were actually working in the field. So we were able to keep the politics out by largely avoiding people who really had political agendas........[Private Partner]

Membership of the alliance is now open to all organisations associated with the industry and membership has now increased to 22 member organisations. There are no formal agreements and members are free to enter or leave the alliance.

> Initially we tried to draft up a set of regulation, and we discussed them, but we never really got them approved...it was more informal than that....[Private Partner]
Most of the organisations associated with this industry are now members of the alliance.

So from those five, the main partners in 2006, there are now 22 partners in the partnership. We don't make the organisation to be a rigid one because there is a problem. It is not possible for government agencies to be members......[Secretariat]

The government is an entity that cannot be part of certain organisations. But we need to be partnering with government so that's why the organisation has chosen to be an alliance......[Secretariat]

Sorting out the Detail
Strategy is set by a management committee and regular forums of the alliance members. The management committee is responsible for the implementation of the strategy and alliance activities.

We discuss what are the principles of what we are trying to achieve as a group of people. We identify common goals and agree on some principles that we will adhere to in the separate work we do. The alliance doesn't force anybody to work together, it doesn't stop people doing their own work within their agencies but it helps guide us along the same direction.....[Donor 1]
There are three working groups (policy, research and extension) which develop the activities to be undertaken by the alliance and these are resourced by the partners and through external funding.

**Alliance Leadership**

A paid secretariat has been appointed by the management committee to run the day-to-day activities of the alliance. This secretariat has been weak and ineffectual.

*I think that the importance of a really good secretariat is key. I don't think we've done a good job of that........*[Private Partner]*

In reality, the senior manager of the donor organisation and the senior manager of the private sector processor (the initiators of the alliance) have remained as the informal alliance leadership, driving the direction and strategy of the alliance from the background.

*The private sector processor would admit that they cast a big shadow both as an organisation and as individuals. So they themselves would say "We want to see other commodity buyers around the table". Until that happens, there are groups who look at it and say "this looks a bit like a processor partner game rather than a real alliance"........*[Donor 1]*

This has meet with some resistance and dissatisfaction from the other partners. However, attempts by these informal leaders to withdraw from the alliance leadership have been
frustrated by the poor quality of the secretariat, the voluntary nature of alliance membership and the failure of other, more widely accepted leadership to emerge from the alliance.

Modifiers
Strong personalities and individual organisation agendas within the alliance membership have impacted on the effectiveness of this alliance. There are a range of cultural issues associated with the different nationalities and backgrounds involved in the alliance. The developing country government has been able to exert a strong influence on the structure and direction of the alliance through the policies of its agencies involved in alliance membership.

So government policy has affected the way we can operate and our ability to respond to certain issues that may be divisive to our membership..............[Secretariat]

Alliance Relationships
In general, the alliance relationship is informal and relatively weak with members not needing to demonstrate a high level of commitment to the alliance in terms of resources or management.

Yes, there were problems regarding the individuals because this is not a formal organisation. Sometimes the people who attend the meetings change so there is no continuity. Sometimes this is a difficulty..............[Grower Association]
There has been some relationship dysfunction, for example individual organisations attempting to get individual benefit.

From time to time there are people trying to get this partnership to do something that will benefit them. Such as getting the alliance to comment on certain issues and hoping that the comment will go towards the way that will benefit their interests........ [Secretariat]

Many personal relationships have formed as a result of this alliance and many other activities between partners now happen 'outside' the alliance. The alliance has had some success in terms of research activity, exchange of information, capacity building and influence on government policy. The developing country government now recognises the alliance as a forum for working with this industry. That said, the lack of formal arrangements, the ability of the partners to join and leave the alliance at will and the lack of formal commitment of resources and management work against the development of a resilient sustainable alliance relationship.

I think one of the biggest challenges now to the alliance is to have a sustainable funding for operations. Right now we have two or three partners that are committed regularly to contribute financially............ [Secretariat].
However, the alliance has continued to endure and the alliance relationship is maturing, with most of the original partners opting to retain membership albeit at various levels of activity and commitment.

*I'm worried about the long-term sustainability of it. It needs funds and it needs leaders to sign on and back it. But at the moment it's essentially a voluntary organisation.....*[Private Partner]*

General Comments

The alliance is perceived as being successful in that it has united the industry and this is now acknowledged widely both within the developing country and internationally.

*I think that many things have been achieved by the alliance. The decision of the government to have a national project on commodity improvement is one big achievement for the alliance. The decision of the government to introduce product certification is another.........*[Secretariat]*

Other donors and organisations such as NGOs have committed resources to, or are now working with, this alliance.

10.3 COMPARISON BETWEEN THE THREE CONSTRASTING PPAS

Due to the context-specific nature of each alliance and the variable factors involved (e.g. different modifiers) direct comparisons of differences between the alliances need to be
interpreted with considerable caution. A summary comparison between the three contrasting PPAs is presented in Table 10.1.
Table 10.1  A Summary Comparison of the Three Contrasting PPAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Core Category</th>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conception             |     | Donor approached by private partner  
|                        |     | Donor initiated alliance  
|                        |     | Donor drives and controls conception  
| Alliance Type          |     | Constrained Choice-type  
|                        |     | Initially Constrained Choice-type but with features of Voluntary-type  
|                        |     | Voluntary-type Alliance  
| Bringing the Partners on Board |     | Primary partners approached by donor  
|                        |     | Implementer contracted  
|                        |     | Secondary partners free to join  
|                        |     | Formal agreements  
|                        |     | Implemented by government agency  
|                        |     | Additional partners approached by donor and implementer  
|                        |     | Other partners free to join  
|                        |     | Formal agreements  
|                        |     | Steering committee holds forum  
|                        |     | Other partners join (free to come and go)  
|                        |     | No formal agreements  
| Sorting out the Detail |     | Strategy and objectives set by Donor  
|                        |     | Implementation and alliance management by implementer  
|                        |     | Partner meet regularly but no real role in management  
|                        |     | Roles and responsibilities detailed in legal agreements  
|                        |     | Government agency and some partners given wide latitude to implement alliance  
|                        |     | Partner meet regularly to discuss progress and work plans  
|                        |     | Strategy set by management committee and member forums  
|                        |     | Management committee and Secretariat manages alliance  
|                        |     | Working groups established to implement activities  
| Alliance Leadership    |     | Donor provides leadership at the strategic level  
|                        |     | Implementer provides 'leadership' at the operational level  
|                        |     | Provided by government agency with some input from major partners  
|                        |     | Paid secretariat is ineffective. Real leadership provided by two individual initiators but not universally accepted by all partners  

| Implementer not full acknowledged by all partners | Distance from donor | Personalities  
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------  
| Distance from donor  
Good strategic alignment  
Good cultural fit  
Previous relationships  
Remoteness  
Political agenda | Distance from donor  
Good strategic alignment  
Good cultural fit  
Previous relationships  
Remoteness  
Political agenda | Personalities  
Organisation agendas  
Suboptimal strategic alignment  
Cultural issues  
Government policies and agendas |
| **Modifiers** | **Regionally conflicts**  
Cultural issues  
Government policy and regulations  
Personalities  
Suboptimal strategic alignment | **Alliance Relationships** | **Excellent working relationship**  
Friendships  
Mutual trust  
Harmonious  
Sustainable  
Perceived as success in terms of alliance objectives and management model  
Achieved organisation agendas | **Informal but not strong**  
Some friendships developed  
Lack of commitment (voluntary)  
Some dysfunction (individual agendas, strong personalities)  
Relationship still maturing  
Partially successful and still developing  
Recognised by government and external stakeholders |
| **Alliance Relationships** | **Formal and not close**  
Regular meeting and communication  
Game playing and withholding of resources  
Conflicting agendas  
Perceived as partially successful  
Meeting of alliance objectives  
Meeting of donor and implementer agenda  
Dissatisfaction with management model  
Desire for more active involvement by partners | **Excellent working relationship**  
Friendships  
Mutual trust  
Harmonious  
Sustainable  
Perceived as success in terms of alliance objectives and management model  
Achieved organisation agendas | **Informal but not strong**  
Some friendships developed  
Lack of commitment (voluntary)  
Some dysfunction (individual agendas, strong personalities)  
Relationship still maturing  
Partially successful and still developing  
Recognised by government and external stakeholders |
10.3.1 Alliance P2

Alliance P2 (Table 10.1) is a formal alliance and closely fits the constrained choice-type alliance described in the literature (Oliver, 1990, pp. 247-249, 259-260; Kanter, 1994; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, pp. 101-102; Gulati, 1995a; Khanna et al., 1998; Kogut, 1988; Stephens, et al., 2009, pp. 502-503; Stephens, 2011, p. 10) and discussed in Chapters four and five. It also conforms well to the results of the Grounded Theory and comparative analysis conducted for 'Alliance Type' (Chapter Five).

This alliance was initiated by the donor who also maintained power and control over the alliance during all establishment processes. It included selection of primary partners, establishment of strategies, governance arrangements, operating procedures and appointment of the alliance implementer. The other partners were only indirectly involved in the decision making and management of the alliance. Their role was essentially reduced to that of service providers and they lacked ownership of the alliance.

The result was a formal relationship of low trust, without the development of close relationships and bonds. Conflict and dysfunction were common and this was manifest in behaviours such as game playing and withholding resources. The focus of the partners was on their own agendas and meeting individual needs rather than the objectives of the alliance. There was general dissatisfaction with the management arrangements and a desire by the partners to be more closely involved in decision making and alliance management.

10.3.2 Alliance P5

P5 (Table 10.1) is highly consistent with the voluntary-type alliance discussed by a range of authors (Oliver, 1990, pp. 247-249, 259-260; Kanter, 1994; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994, pp. 101-102; Gulati, 1995a; Khanna et al., 1998; Kogut, 1988; Stephens, et al., 2009, pp. 502-
This alliance was initiated by two individuals who facilitated a meeting of primary stakeholders resulting in the formation of a steering committee. The steering committee became a management committee which developed the alliance strategy and operating procedures for the alliance and was primarily involved in the alliance management. This alliance was open to membership by organisations associated with the commodity. The alliance lacked formality, the appointed Secretariat was ineffectual and not all of the partners supported the leadership which was essentially based on the initiators of the alliance.

The resulting relationship was informal and collegiate, but not strong. Some deeper relationships developed but in general the partners lacked full commitment to the alliance, which had the feel of a volunteer organisation. This has resulted in some dysfunction (individual agendas and strong personalities). However, the relationship is still developing and maturing, the alliance is achieving against its objectives and the organisation is widely recognised within and outside of the developing country for its role in the development of this commodity in that country.

10.3.3 Alliance P4

Alliance P4 (Table 10.1) has characteristics of both constrained choice-type and voluntary-types of alliances. It started off as a constrained choice-type alliance but has evolved to incorporate many of the features of a voluntary-type alliance. P4 highlights the complications associated with trying to stereotype alliance and the difficulties in making assumptions and predictions based on this approach.
This alliance was initiated by a donor but apparently in collaboration with the Country Government. The alliance was initiated using the donor systems and processes but the donor has relaxed its control, instead concentrating on maintaining accountability, performance management and risk management. A country government agency is the implementing agency and is given wide latitude by the donor to deliver the program. The implementer has brought additional partners on board as necessary. Some of these are associated with previous relationships and personal friendships. While the implementer maintains management control over the program this role is also shared in collaboration with the major partners. Thus the partners have buy-in and commitment to the program.

There is a good and harmonious working relationship between the partners. The relationship is characterised by mutual trust and cooperation. This alliance is perceived by the partners as successful both in terms of alliance objectives and the management model. The prospects of sustainability appear to be good. Partners are looking forward to the next phase of this alliance; however they are keen to be involved in planning and strategy from the very beginning.

10.4 POTENTIAL INTERVENTION POINTS

In Chapter Nine, I proposed that the five core categories identified in this study; 'Processes and Process Issues', 'Alliance Type', 'Alliance Relationships', 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Modifiers' and also represented five major intervention points where practitioners and stakeholders could intervene in the establishment of the alliance to potentially change the outcomes of the establishment processes.
In the case of Alliance P2, there are four main areas where intervention may have resulted in a more effective alliance. From the very beginning, the donor exerted firm control over the alliance development and this continued throughout establishment. More buy-in from the other partners, commitment to the alliance objectives and less conflict may have resulted from a more participatory model such as the one that evolved in P4. Interestingly, from the donor's perspective, the other partners were involved in alliance strategy and management but this does not reflect the comments from the other partners. P2 was close to a pure constrained choice alliance and the partners' ability to consider their strategic fit, freedom to choose with whom to partner and ability to influence the alliance governance arrangement were all constrained. These are also areas in which the donor could have allowed more participation by the other partners. The alliance leadership was problematic in that the donor held overall control and an alliance manager was appointed as a contractor. This implementer was not generally supported by the other partners, there were personality issues, and the management style was authoritarian. In addition there were cultural issues (the implementer was a foreign company) and the management responsibilities were not well understood by the partners. Alliance Leadership is clearly an area where much greater consideration should have been given by the donor. A range of cultural issues, government policies, regional conflicts and personality issues caused complications at various stages of establishment. The ability to identify and manage these modifiers is problematic for any alliance initiator, however an insight into their potential importance may help managers to be sensitised to their potential integration with the other processes. Finally, in the case of P2, several dysfunctions were apparent in the alliance relationship and these were either not dealt with adequately or were ignored by the alliance management increasing the level of frustration of the partners.
Alliance P5 is a voluntary-type alliance, and while the literature discusses these alliance types as a more desirable model, this alliance was not without major problems. The alliance was very informal, resulting in a lack of commitment by the partners and under resourcing of the alliance management. In this case, it was almost an alliance of convenience where the partners maintained a level of commitment as long as they received some organisational benefit. While the country government regulations preclude formal legal arrangements a much greater level of commitment on the part of the partners could have been sought. The leadership was problematic on account of the weak secretariat and the informal leadership by the initiators that was not recognised widely by the partners. Alliance leadership is a major area which needs to be addressed by this alliance. Government policy agendas and cultural issues (different nationalities of the partners) were issues that impacted on many of the establishment processes and managing these may be challenging for the alliance. The alliance relationship for P5 is still developing and there are opportunities to engender closer working relationships and greater commitment to the alliance ideals and objectives.

P4 appears to be a good example of a successful PPA and little intervention seems necessary. The 'evolution' of this alliance from a constrained choice-type to a more participatory model has worked well. This alliance is managed locally with local partners and so the cultural issues that have impacted P2 and P5 are not factors in this alliance. The alliance leadership is working well and the previous relationship and friendship of some partners is important. One area identified by the partners for future consideration is the involvement of the partners at an early stage of alliance establishment in strategy and objective development.
10.5 IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE ALLIANCE ESTABLISHMENT

While the Integrated Theoretical Model has a number of limitations in its current form (Chapter Nine) it does provide practitioners and stakeholders with a framework for use in developing PPAs and in analysing their performance. This is a considerable improvement on the current reliance on recipes, previous experience with specific models or perceptions for alliance design and development. The temptation to stereotype alliances and their characteristics based solely on the existing literature is similarly fraught with peril as highlighted by the relative success of alliance P4, a hybrid alliance type with characteristics of both constrained choice and voluntary types.

Hybrid alliance types were common in the PPAs included in this study. While these alliances tended towards either constrained choice or voluntary, the combination of characteristics makes interpretation and prediction, based on the pure forms discussed in the literature difficult and problematic. This added to the context-specific nature of the individual alliances (for example differences in modifiers, alliance leadership and other factors) means that conclusions based on direct comparisons between individual alliances must be interpreted with caution. The Integrated Theoretical Model has attempted to overcome this to some extent by drawing useful generalisations based on the 15 PPAs included in this study.

The five potential intervention points identified by the Integrated Theoretical Model provide practitioners and stakeholders with the opportunity to influence the alliance outcome. While I have attempted to indicate how this may work in theory for P2, P4 and P5, I also emphasise that in practice this would need to be done with extreme caution. The complex, multi-dimensional nature of alliance establishment, the range of interactions and the limited
understanding behind some components of the model contribute to the potential for unintended consequences for poor considered intervention in these processes. As previously indicated, more work needs to be carried out to clarify and enhance many of the components of the model.

10.6 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have sought to indicate the practical significance of the Integrated Theoretical Model as an analytical and development tool by applying it to three contrasting PPAs which were included in the study. This work shows that at the individual PPA level the results of the Grounded Theory and comparative analyses developed across 15 PPAs is consistent. Thus the Integrated Theoretical Model is a useful tool for use by practitioners and stakeholders in the development of PPAs, potentially increasing the success rate of the resulting alliances.

This analysis also highlights the complex nature of PPAs and alliance establishment. While the Integrated Theoretical Model identifies opportunities for influencing alliance establishment, this needs to be done with extreme caution to avoid adverse consequences.

As previously highlighted, the model in its current form has some limitations and several areas requiring additional work to provide a greater understanding of the model elements and interactions and to increase its utility. The next and final chapter of this thesis discusses the implications of the Integrated Theoretical Model in its current form and its suggested future development. The limitations of the model and the research methodology used for its
development are considered, and additional areas requiring additional research and clarification are identified.
CHAPTER 11: IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND AREAS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

11.1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis concentrated on identifying the primary concerns of those seeking to establish PPAs and the social processes that they use to address these issues. On the basis of this understanding, the extant literature and additional comparative studies, an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment has been developed for use by researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders.

In Chapter Eleven, the final chapter of this thesis, I begin with a detailed discussion of the implications of the results of this study and how it adds to the established body of knowledge on PPAs.

The Integrated Theoretical Model provides a useful conceptualisation of the alliance establishment processes for researcher and practitioners and I have demonstrated the utility of this model both as a practical tool and as a research framework. That said, it is important to understand that the results of this study, including the Theoretical Model, have significant limitations arising from the research methodology, research design and research methods used in this work. The limitations of the model, including their implications, are considered in the second part of this chapter.

During this study, a range of important areas and questions which require additional research have been identified. In addition, the model, while useful, requires research in a number of
important areas in order to add increased sophistication to the model, increase its robustness and to allow a better understanding the nature and interaction of the model components. In the last part of this chapter, these areas for additional work are identified and discussed in detail.

11.2 IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESULTS OF THE CURRENT STUDY AND INTEGRATED THEORETICAL MODEL OF PPA ESTABLISHMENT

The results of the current study have important implications for the theoretical understanding of alliance establishment; the practical aspects of establishing an alliance; and future research in the area of strategic alliance establishment.

11.2.1 Theoretical Understanding of Alliance Establishment

From a theoretical viewpoint, the current study adds to the established body of knowledge on alliance establishment in seven main areas:

(a) Models of Alliance Establishment and Development

As previously discussed, a significant gap in the current body of established knowledge is the lack of an integrated theoretical model of alliance establishment which combines the conceptualisations of the current process and evolutionary models of alliance development, with the theoretical underpinning provided by studies of individual aspects, attributes and factors associated with alliance establishment. In this study, five key components (core categories) have been identified, along with their dimensions and characteristics, and these have been used to develop an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment. The Model and associated analysis have shown that alliance establishment is not a simple, linear progression comprised of a number of processes.
At the core of the Integrated Theoretical Model is a process model made up of three processes ('Conception'; 'bringing the partners on board'; and 'sorting out the detail') and leading to the establishment of a sustainable and resilient 'Alliance Relationship'. Thus, this model considers alliance establishment in terms of alliance development rather than ending with the implementation of the activities of the alliance.

However, interacting with this process model are three important categories of factors: 'Alliance Type' (which internally affect these establishment processes); 'Alliance Leadership' (which interacts with the establishment processes but from outside) and 'Modifiers' (which may interact with all other components of the model). The Integrated Theoretical Model identifies and describes the key components of alliance establishment and how they relate to each other. It also provides some understanding of how these key components, processes, sub-processes and sub-factors relate and interact. Nevertheless, as discussed later in this chapter, a major objective of this study was to identify these key components and processes and much research remains to be carried out in order to fully understand these interactions and the interplay of these factors and components during the establishment processes.

(b) The Establishment Process of Conception

To date, most of the models of alliance establishment and development commence at the stage of partnering and alliance planning. There are two exceptions: the work of Lesage (2006, p. 20) who considered an initial visioning process; and Doz (1996, p. 64) who discusses the "initial condition" of the processes. However, neither of these concepts is well developed nor do the authors discuss these stages in detail or examine the effects on other stages of alliance establishment.
In this study, the earliest stages of alliance establishment are picked up in the process 'Conception'. This study has shown that 'Conception' is critical to the establishment of the alliance and decisions and relationships that develop at this stage fundamentally affect all of the other alliance establishment processes. In the Conception stage, the role and nature of the initiator(s) combined with the way in which the decision to form an alliance is made, interact to influence all of the other establishment processes. They do this in two ways: firstly through determining the type of alliance (tendency towards a constrained choice model or tendency towards a voluntary alliance); and secondly by determining the level of control and influence that the initiator exerts over the other alliance establishment processes (for example, power and control or participative management). This then sets the whole "tone" for the alliance. For example, a resulting alliance may be one in which all partners participate in strategic decision-making and management or it may be one in which the alliance leadership essentially "directs" the activities and actions of the other partners.

This study has not only highlighted the fundamental nature of 'Conception', but it has also provided an understanding of how 'Conception' and its sub-processes exert their effects on other alliance establishment processes. Thus 'Conception' needs to be a major consideration, not only for alliance partners and practitioners, but also for researchers seeking to better understanding alliance establishment and development.

(c) Alliance Type

The importance of 'Alliance Type' (constrained choice-type or voluntary-type) was alluded to early in the study during the Grounded Theory analysis of the initial data (Chapter Five). However, the true nature and importance of this factor was not apparent until further comparative studies were conducted. What this appears to indicate is that alliance partners do not recognise 'Alliance Type', per se, as a factor. What they recognise is the degree of
initial influence of the initiator; the initiator role in the development of alliance objectives and strategies; and the initiator role in alliance establishment, management and operations. These three factors can be built into a typology which aligns with 'Alliance Type' (Chapter Five; Table 5.2).

'Alliance Type' has been studied widely by Stephens et al. (2009) and many others. To date, these studies have concentrated on the study of 'Alliance Type' in isolation, and have been principally concerned with the relationship between alliance type and:

- the decision on whether or not to enter an alliance;
- the decision on who to partner with; and
- the decisions regarding the governance framework of the alliance.

While these factors are important, this study has shown that the influence of 'Alliance Type' is much more fundamental. This core category influences not only the decisions regarding whether to ally, with whom and under what governance arrangements, it also has major effects on the other alliance establishment processes, 'Alliance Leadership', Modifiers' and it ultimately influences the nature of the alliance established through its direct and indirect effects on 'Alliance Relationships'.

An additional contribution to the understanding of alliance type resulting from this study is with regard to the nature of alliance type. Other studies to date portray alliances as being either purely constrained choice or purely voluntary. From the current study it appears that constrained choice and voluntary alliances as described in the literature are really Weberian Ideal Types. Thus in practice the alliances in this study had a tendency towards either constrained choice or voluntary, but were never pure forms. The consequence of this is that
alliances did not always conform exactly to the expected "behaviour" of constrained choice or voluntary alliances. In some cases they exhibited the characteristics of constrained choice of voluntary alliances to a greater or lesser extent and in some cases they demonstrated characteristics of both alliance types.

Thus 'Alliance Type' was shown to be a major influence in alliance establishment and it needs to receive greater attention than it has in the past by both researchers and practitioners.

(d) Alliance Leadership

'Alliance Leadership' has been studied extensively in terms of role, capabilities and dynamics, but only in isolation and not in the context of an integrated theoretical model of alliance establishment. The current study, while confirming the work of previous researchers, builds on the body of established knowledge by providing and understanding of where 'Alliance Leadership' fits in the alliance establishment processes and how this core category may potentially relate to other components in the Integrated Theoretical Model. 'Alliance Leadership' appears to be closely related to 'Conception' and 'Alliance Type'. Whilst the characteristics of the 'Alliance Leadership' do not differ significantly between constrained choice-type and voluntary-type alliances, alliance leadership behaviour does. For example, in the case of constrained choice-type alliances the initiator may appoint or "champion" the alliance leader and may also exert a high level of influence over how the 'Alliance Leadership' is enacted. This may have a follow-on effect on other alliance establishment processes and 'Alliance Relationships'.

Thus, while 'Alliance Leadership' may have a significant effect on alliance establishment processes and 'Alliance Relationships' in its own right, 'Conception' and 'Alliance Type'
interactions may enhance these influences or induce additional effects. The interaction of 'Conception' and 'Alliance Type' with 'Alliance Leadership' may be complicated and more research is need in this area.

(e) Alliance Partner Class

'Alliance partner class' (for example, private sector, public sector and government) was alluded to by the study participants as a potential concern in alliance establishment; however the importance and role of this factor in alliance establishment was not immediately clear from the initial Grounded Theory study. There are few studies in the body of established knowledge on alliance establish which focus on the 'alliance partner class'. The importance of this factor was confirmed in the additional comparative analyses where 'alliance partner class' was found to affect a subset of alliance components and sub-processes (motivation to join alliance; perceptions (of the alliance); engagement in management and decision making; alignment between organisation and alliance strategies; target relationship; and target outcomes) but not all processes and core categories. Because of these isolated, but wide ranging effects, 'alliance partner class' was relegated to the status of an 'Organisational Modifier' rather than to a core category.

(f) Modifiers

Several researchers have tried to deal with a range of external factors which lie outside the establishment/development processes but which may exert a significant influence across these processes in general (Chapter Eight). Austin (2000, p.69) refers to these as drivers and enablers; Doz (1996, pp. 69-72, 74-75) discusses these in terms of initial conditions. Other authors have considered a range of individual external factors including culture and communications (Kelly et al., 2002, pp. 15-16, 19); organisational factors (Todeva and
Knoke, 2004, pp.13-16); environment (Schachaf, 2003, p.95) and industrial factors (Todeva and Knoke, 2004, pp. 12-13). While these previous studies have identified some of these external factors and identified the stage of alliance establishment at which they may act, the research has done little to analyse the way in which these factors influence the other processes and components of alliance establishment or consider the potential relationship between these factors.

In the current study, these factors are called 'Modifiers'. The results of this study have added significantly to the body of existing knowledge on alliance establishment is several ways. Firstly, this study has identified a wide range of potential modifiers which have been grouped under four headings; 'individual factors'; 'partner organisational factors'; 'structural factors' and 'external factors'. Further, these 'Modifiers' may be divided into two types; those which are present at the commence ment of the alliance establishment processes (precursors) and those that emerge during the establishment processes (emergent or contingency).

Secondly, this study has shown the problematic nature of these modifiers. There are a wide range of potential 'Modifiers', and because of the environment and conditions specific to each alliance the relevant 'Modifiers' may vary widely between individual alliances. In addition, many of these potential 'Modifiers' are not apparent or present at the start of the establishment processes. Thus these 'Modifiers' may make each individual alliances context specific, meaning that it may be impossible to develop a universal recipe for alliance establishment. Further, the absence of emergent modifiers at the start of alliance establishment means that researchers (and practitioners) need to be vigilant and attuned to the potential emergence and influence of thee 'Modifiers'.


Thirdly, as a result of this study, it is apparent that 'Modifiers' can have wide ranging and significant effects on the alliance establishment processes and other core categories in general. This is an area of research which needs to be further explored but it was demonstrated by comparative analysis in Chapter Eight which analysed the effect of 'alliance partner class' on PPA alliance. It is also clear that 'Modifiers' interact with other core categories to influence PPA alliance and this was demonstrated by the comparative analysis in Chapter Eight which considered the effect of 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class' interactions on PPA establishment.

(g) Alliance Relationships

This study shows that stable and mature alliance relationships are central to the establishment of PPAs. While many studies have examined various elements of PPA alliance relationships very few integrated studies looking at alliance establishment have been undertaken. Much of the research to date considers alliance development in terms of the meeting of alliance objectives, the implementation of activities and programs, and organisational learning and structure rather than the development of stable and mature relationships. This inattention to the importance of relationships may help explain many of the failures of PPAs reported in the literature.

In this study, the Grounded Theory analysis identified four categories within the core category of 'Alliance Relationships'. These categories are 'relationship dynamics'; 'relationship behaviours'; relationship dynamics; and 'relationship performance'. While the results of this study are consistent with the finding of other researcher, they give little understanding of how these factors interact in the emergence and development of new alliance relationships.
A model of alliance relationship development proposed by Pesämaa (2007) provides an excellent way of looking at alliance relationship development, particularly in regard to 'relationship behaviours' and 'relationship dynamics'. However, the initial stages of the original model developed by Pesämaa (2007) are quite simplistic. Combining this relationship development model with the five core categories developed in the current study provides a more robust framework for the conceptual understanding of alliance establishment. However, on the basis of the current study, additional detail is needed to increase the utility of this model by modifying the initial stages and by incorporating considerations of alliance dysfunctions, alliance performance and additional major alliance dynamics and alliance behaviours.

11.2.2 Practical Implications of this Study and the Integrated Conceptual Model

In practical terms there are four important implications of this study:

(a) Theoretical Model

The Integrated Theoretical Model provides researchers and practitioners with a model which identifies the key components of alliance establishment and a conceptualisation of the way in which these components relate and may potentially interact. Rather than a recipe for establishing an alliance, this model provides a framework to guide practitioners as they think through the steps associated with alliance establishment. In that respect, it identifies many of the important issues that need to be considered and resolved; it highlights the factors that may relate or interact, so that these may not be considered in isolation; and it sensitises those seeking to establish an alliance to potential interactions and important factors that may emerge during the establishment process. The Integrated Theoretical Model also brings together much of the current body of established knowledge on alliance establishment into a
form that can be readily used by researchers and practitioners to gain a deeper understanding
of the theoretical underpinning behind alliance establishment.

(b) The Importance of Conception and Alliance Type
One of the important practical implications of this work is the identification of the importance
of the 'Conception' process and a technical understanding of the dynamics of this process and
the influence on other parts of the establishment processes. This has been an area previously
receiving little attention. The results of this study underscores the importance of the
'Conception' process which involved the alliance initiators, the way in which they decide to
initiate the alliance, their motivation and the decisions that they make regarding the alliance
establishment in the earliest stages. This work will hopefully highlight the need for greater
attention at this stage on the part of practitioners, initiators and potential partners.

(c) Potential Points of Intervention on the Alliance Establishment Processes
The Integrated Theoretical Model identifies five major points of potential intervention in
alliance establishment ('Processes and Process Issues'; 'Alliance Type'; 'Alliance Leadership';
'Alliance Relationships' and 'Modifiers') and goes some way to developing and understanding
of the potential consequences of these interventions. These are points at which the
practitioners, initiators, donors, and other actors may act to potentially affect the alliance
establishment processes and dynamics and modify the resulting alliance.

For example, changes affecting the control and influence of the initiator may be made during
the process of 'Conception' potentially influencing 'Alliance Type', 'Alliance Leadership' and
'Alliance Relationships' with regard to a "command and control" alliance model or a
"participative, collegiate, partnership" arrangement. 'Alliance Leadership' interventions may
be aimed at modifying alliance leadership behaviour with a view to establishing a more "involved" alliance model in which all of the partners may participate in strategic decisions and alliance management. While I have attempted to indicate how this may work in theory, I also emphasise that in practice this would need to be done with extreme caution. The complexities mean that there is the potential for unintended consequences for poorly considered intervention in these processes.

(d) The Importance of Alliance Relationships

This study highlights the importance of viewing alliance establishment, not as a series of processes leading to the implementation of alliance objectives and strategies (the prevailing view in the extant literature), but as the development of stable and mature alliance relationships. The change in focus may alter the way that practitioners and stakeholders view alliance design and alliance establishment with greater concentration on interpersonal relationships, greater participation by all partners, good communication and consideration of long-term relationships. Alliance Relationships do not appear suddenly. The current study, in conjunction with the work of Pesämaa (2007) and others (Parkhe, 1993, Wetzels et al., 1998, Pesämaa and Hairy, 2007; Pesämaa et al., 2007) shows that relationship development commences at the earliest stages of alliance establishment and builds as factors such as trust and interpersonal relationships increase. The development of alliance relationships, like the other factors of alliance establishment, are influence by a range of internal and external interactions

11.2.3 Implications of this Study from a Research Perspective

From a research perspective the Integrated Theoretical Model developed in this study provides a conceptualisation of the processes of alliance establishment which can be used to
gain a greater understanding of the complexities of alliance establishment. It may also encourage the design of additional research that seeks to develop a deeper understanding of alliance establishment in a dynamic integrated approach.

In addition, the Integrated Model provides a framework which can be used as a tool for further study of PPA establishment. The utility of the Integrated Model as a research tool was demonstrated in the comparative studies of 'Alliance Type' (Chapter Five), 'alliance partner class' (Chapter Eight) and 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class'. In these comparative analyses, the Integrated Theoretical Model as a framework allowed the identification of differences in core categories, categories, sub-categories, and in some instances, sub-groups and then allowed these to be related to other processes and components to assess their effect on the overall establishment process.

11.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE INTEGRATED THEORETICAL MODEL OF PA ESTABLISHMENT AND THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study has achieved its research objectives in identifying the issues of concern of the partners and processes they use to address these concerns with respect to the establishment of PPAs; it has added significantly to the body of established knowledge on PPA establishment; and it has developed an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA establishment that can be used as a framework and conceptualisation of PPA establishment for use by practitioners and as a research tool that can be used in the further investigation of PPA establishment. That said, there are several important limitations associated with the Integrated Theoretical Model that affect the generalisability of the results from this study and the utility of the Integrated Model for general use.
(a) Model Complexity

At first glance the Integrated Theoretical Model, as presented in Fig. 9.7, appears neat and linear with a logical progression of the establishment processes from one stage to the next. This is far from the case. Firstly, as previously discussed and demonstrated by the Grounded Theory and comparative analyses, there is considerable overlap and interaction between processes and stages. Alliance establishment is complex, multi-dimensional and "messy". This is difficult to capture in a two-dimensional model. Whilst all of the PPAs used in this study progressed through all stages, the sub-processes and factors associated with each process or stage varied between individual alliances. In addition, the interaction of 'Alliance Type', 'Alliance Leadership' and 'Modifiers' with the establishment processes and other factors makes the establishment of PPAs untidy, complex and sometime unpredictable.

Secondly, while this study identified the major concerns of the participants in alliance establishment and the social processes by which these are addressed, it was not designed to study the way in which these element interact. While this study has identified the major components of the model, and the way in which they relate to each other, considerable research remains to be carried out on the dynamic inherent in each of the processes and components and the way in which they affect each other and the whole establishment process. Thus, while the current model is a useful conceptualisation of alliance establishment and has both value as a tool for practitioners and a research framework for future research in this area much additional research is required so that the model can be enhanced to its full potential.
(b) There is no universal recipe for PPA establishment

The complex, non-linear nature of alliance establishment, the combination of contextual variables associated within individual alliances (for example location, partners, focus, business environment), and the unpredictable nature of the modifiers associated with individual PPAs means that no two alliance will be the same. It is therefore highly unlikely that a universal recipe for PPA establishment can be developed. This is an important point and means that while this study has identified generalisable factors across a range of PPAs, comparison of individual PPAs and predictions on behaviour and outcomes based on the model should be carried out with care and with a consideration of the context in which the alliance is establishing.

(c) Substantive versus General Theory

This study relates to a specific context; the main concerns of the partners and the social and decision making processes of the key managers in the establishment of PPAs in official development assistance (ODA) programs. A limitation of Grounded Theory methodology when applied to specific contexts, is that the outcome of the research may have applicability only to the area of inquiry from which it has been induced and may thus be very specific, that is, a substantive theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, pp. 32-34, 114-115; Goulding, 1999, 00.18-19; Noble, 2002, pp. 4; 86-87; Birks and Mills, 2011, pp. 156-157). Even though the results of this study are, in general, consistent with the findings of other researcher across a wider range of strategic alliances and PPAs, this study is on capable of producing substantive theory. This means that the Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA needs to be interpreted and used with caution because it may only be strictly applicable to the context of the research.
There are four additional consequences of this limitation. Firstly, the study involved PPAs from the research and development, infrastructure, community development, extension, reproductive health and industry development sectors within ODA. This is only a subset of the sectors within ODA programs and does not take account of others such as microfinance, governance, education, medical, pharmaceutical and marketing. Secondly, and closely related, the inclusion of a range of sectors in the current study means that it is not possible to answer the question of whether there are individual difference between ODA sectors (for example research and development versus reproductive health) with the current data and more research would be required. Thirdly, the results from this study pertain to PPAs in ODA. Overseas development assistance programs have a number of characteristics which makes them different from other contexts such as industry, education of marketing, including:

- a donor government organization or proxy (e.g. CGIAR centre) (refer Chapter Two) is always present;
- the alliance comprises at least one donor organization, at least one private sector organisation and at least one recipient country government organisation;
- the donor organisation almost always brings significant financial resources to the alliance together with a donor country agenda and they often exert control and influence over the establishment, planning and management processes of the alliance;
- the donor and recipient governments often have in place high level agreements and agendas which may drive alliance establishment, implementation and performance;
- the donor often has a pre-existing model or guidelines that are imposed upon the alliance; and
• the alliance leadership is often appointed or contracted by the donor. These are usually multinational consulting companies who may have little or no cultural alignment with the recipient countries.

Thus the results of this study, whilst applicable to the ODA context, may not hold for other contexts outside of ODA.

Fourthly, this study focussed on alliance establishment. While it is evident that there is overlap between establishment and subsequent alliance development and implementation and the some of the results obtained are clearly applicable to the later stages of alliance development, cautioned needs to be exercised when extrapolating the results of this study to alliance development more generally.

In order for the results of this study to have applicability across wider number of contexts the work would have to be lifted to a higher level of abstraction and concepts made more generalisable through additional work with a wider range of substantive areas (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 140-145; Birks and Mills, 2011, pp. 156-157). For example, to have more general applicability within ODA, models would be chosen from a wider cross section of sectors. To have more general applicability outside of ODA, models from a range of sectors and other contexts such as education, business and industry would be used.

(d) Successful versus Unsuccessful Alliances

The current study successfully identified the major issues of concern to the partners seeking to form PPAs in ODA and the processes that they used to address these concerns. It also identified the key components of alliance establishment and provided valuable insights into
the dynamics of many of these elements. That said, the research did not differentiate between "successful" and "unsuccessful" and this was not a part of the intended design for this study. A consequence of this is that, for example, while it can be said that a high level of control and influence on the part of the initiator in alliance establishment and management may lead an alliance towards a constrained choice model, the current study does not allow any conclusions to be drawn about whether or not this form of alliance would be any more or less successful that say, a more participative model.

An indication of the complexities of measuring success in PPAs was gained during this study. Many of the study participants in the study perceived alliance success across at least three dimensions: success of the model as a modality to deliver the project (that is, project management); success of the alliance in meeting the alliance objectives; and success of the alliance in meeting the individual expectations and needs of the individual partner organisations. It was not unusual for participants to perceive success in one or two of these dimensions but not all three. For example, the alliance may have achieved the alliance objectives but not perceived as successful as a modality for delivery of the project or the alliance may have met the alliance objectives but not the individual partner needs and expectations. As an additional complication, different individual partners or classes of partner often had different perceptions of success. For example, the donor may have viewed the alliance as successful, but a secondary partner (such as local government agency in a recipient partner country) may have perceived the alliance as a total failure.

Ultimately, the linking of the elements, components and dynamics of the Integrated Theoretical Model to the success or failure of alliances would be most desirable. However, the complications associated with what success or failure actually means in this context, and
the perspectives of the individual partners, may mean that much more work is required in this area before this is possible.

11.4 AREAS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

In order to further develop the Integrated Theoretical Model and gain a fuller understanding of the complexities of PPA establishment and increase the explanatory power and usefulness of the Integrated Theoretical Model, additional research is required in four main areas:

(a) Individual Model Components and Processes

In this study, the main factors and processes associated with alliance establishment have been identified along with their sub-processes, subcategories and subgroups; and dimensions and characteristics. What the study has not achieved, nor was it designed to achieve, is to establish the dynamics at work within these factors and processes and the relationship between individual elements within these. Lying below each of the alliance establishment processes ('Conception'; 'Bringing the Partners on Board' and 'Sorting out the Detail') and core categories are categories, sub-categories and sub-groups of factors which interact to influence the expression of the process or core category with respect to the specific context of an individual alliance. For example, within the core category of 'Alliance Relationships', the categories of 'relationship dynamics'; 'relationship behaviours' and 'relationship behaviours' (along with their sub-categories and sub-groups), interact to influence the category 'relationship dysfunction' (Chapter Six). The process of alliance relationship development also needs to be better understood. Further research is required for each of the major elements which comprise the Integrated Theoretical Model so that the nature of these interactions can be fully understood.
(b) Modifiers

It is clear from the results of this study that 'Modifiers' are the most problematic part of the Integrated Theoretical Model and that further work in this area will continue to be challenging for three reasons:

- 'Modifiers' appear to be context specific and the modifiers at play for individual alliance may be different (the problem of non-commonality);
- not all of the 'Modifiers' that may influence the establishment of an individual alliance will be apparent at initiations (the problem of emergent modifiers); and
- 'Modifiers' may interact in complex and often unpredictable ways with other core categories and the establishment processes in general. An insight into this was gained during the comparative studies on 'alliance partner class' and 'Alliance Type' by 'alliance partner class'.

It should be noted that some 'Modifiers' were consistent across all of the alliance included in the study. These included the organisationl modifiers of experience, organisation agenda, and organisation structure; the structural modifiers of critical mass, alliance politics and stability of membership and staff; and the external modifiers of government agenda, government policies, political issues and cultural issues. Because of this "commonality", these 'Modifiers' may lend themselves to relatively easy additional study.

In this study, alliance across a range of sectors were used (Appendices A and G) and the data was essentially "pooled" for the purposes of analysis. This "pooling" of the data may have hidden any relationship between 'Modifiers' and alliance sector (that is, are there any relationships between 'Modifiers' and alliance sectors?) and this needs to be tested through
additional research. If 'Modifiers' were more consistent (or predictable) within sectors then this would certainly aid additional research efforts.

Finally, the comparative analyses carried out in Chapter Eight demonstrated the importance of 'Modifier' interactions with other core categories and alliance establishment processes and much remains to be done in this area.

(c) Systems and Sub-systems

A central argument of this thesis is that, prior to this study, there was no fully integrated theoretical model of PPA establishment. A large range of factors associated with alliance establishment and development have been studied in detail, but often in isolation with no regard to the potential relationships or interactions between these factors. The Integrated Theoretical Model, developed as part of this study, demonstrates the complexities involved in alliance establishment and that the establishment of alliances is actually the result of complex interactions between these alliance components. In order to capture the true dynamics of these factors they need to be studies as subsystems (for example the 'Conception' subsystem; the 'Alliance Leadership'/Processes and Process Issues' subsystem or the 'Conception'/Alliance Leadership' subsystem) or as a complete system of alliance establishment.

(d) Alliance Success (Performance)

As discussed above, one of the limitations of the current work is that the findings were not related to alliance success. That is, this study identified key concerns of partners in alliance establishment, the processes which they used to address these and the relationships between them but they were not related to alliance success or failure. There were two reasons for this.
Firstly this was not a part of the original study design. Secondly, alliance success is difficult to measure since it appears that the partners view success along at least three dimensions (as a management model; in terms of meeting alliance objectives; and in terms of meeting individual organisation objectives) and the perception of success associated with these dimensions may vary for an individual alliance depending on partner perspective.

For example, Provan and Sydow (2008, pp. 10-21) propose three types of indicators of alliance success: structural indicators (connections between organisations); process indicators (e.g. learning, trust, fairness or power); and outcome indicators (achievement of objectives). However, they do not address the issue about from which partner's perspective alliance performance should be measured. Thus, additional research needs to be carried out to develop robust methodologies and criteria for the measurement of alliance success or performance. In that way, the effect of interventions in alliance establishment by practitioners and the influence of key factors such as 'Alliance Type' and 'Alliance Leadership' could be better studied and lead to better outcomes for alliance performance and sustainability.

(e) Elevation to General Theory

The current study has developed substantive theory. That is theory strictly applicable to the context in which it was developed (in this case a limited sub-set of the sectors on ODA programs). In order to validate the Integrated Theoretical Model and to ensure its robustness for wider use this model would need to be elevated to a general theory through additional research using a much wider range of contexts. There are several features of ODA which may limit the contextual applicability of this model to alliance establishment more generally.
Therefore, in order to elevate this Integrated Theoretical Model to a general theory alliance from outside of ODA would also need to be included in further work.

11.5 CONCLUSION

This study commenced with the proposition that poor PPA performance and high alliance failure rates were due, significantly, to the lack of an integrated understanding of alliance establishment. I was also motivated to undertake this research because of the lack of a conceptual framework for use during PPA design and development by researchers, practitioners and stakeholders.

A major gap in the current understanding of PPAs is coherent studies that attempt to bring all of the elements of alliance establishment together into an integrated theoretical model, capturing the potential complexities and interaction inherent in alliance establishment (Mitchell-Weaver and Manning, 1991/92; Grant, 1996; Jacobs, 1996; Gulati, 1998; Park and Ungson, 2001, p. 38; Ridley, 2001; Widdus, 2003; Reid and Pearce, 2003; Hartwich et al., 2004; Spielman and von Grebmer, 2004; Dyer, et al., 2006, p. 3; San-Carranza and Longo, 2012, p. 331). This lack of a comprehensive integrated theoretical framework has led to fragmented research and encouraged simplistic and linear models of PPA establishment which have contributed to their failure at implementation (Park and Ungson, 2001, p. 38). This is particularly so for the phase of alliance establishment, which is of critical importance, but is an area that has received little attention from social researchers to date (Noble 2002).

This thesis has developed of an Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA Establishment in ODA programs. The model is based on five core categories ('Processes and Process Issues;
The results of this study, and the Integrated Theoretical Model, provide researchers, practitioners and stakeholders involved in PPA development with a better understanding of the dynamics of alliance establishment as well as an integrated framework which can be used during alliance design. These will allow those involved in alliance establishment to make better decisions and potentially reduce the relatively high rate of failure and the poor performance of these popular ODA modalities.

In doing so, this study has added significantly to the established body of knowledge on PPA provides important insights into alliance establishment in ODA program. In particular this study has:

- identified the importance of alliance establishment in terms of alliance relationship development;
- provided an understanding of the fundamental nature of the very early stages of alliance establishment (a stage neglected by most researchers) and the importance of alliance type;
- demonstrated the importance of alliance leadership;
- identified a range of overarching factors, which while problematic in that they are not always readily apparent and they are difficult to manage; and
- identified five major areas of concern to those involved in alliance establishment ('Processes and Process Issues'; 'Alliance Type'; 'Alliance Relationships'; 'Alliance Leadership'; and
'Modifiers'); the social process that are use to address these and the relationship between these elements.

Whilst the current research has met its intended research objectives and developed a useful model of PPA establishment, which has both academic and practical applicability, it has also identified and highlighted three major associated areas which require additional research. These are:

- research aimed at capturing the complexity, multi-dimensional nature of alliance establishment and the interactions of the model components (that is, research to add additional sophistication to the model to capture the complex interactions inherent in alliance establishment);
- studies to support the general applicability of the results and model (that is, to raise the status of the current theory from substantive to general theory); and
- research which links the elements and dynamics of the model to measures of alliance performance.

This additional research is required in order to increase the theoretical understanding of alliance establishment and to further enhance the utility and usefulness of this tool. Even without this additional research, the Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA establishment in ODA is still a very useful framework in its current form and its potential use and a theoretical and practical conceptualisation of alliance establishment: its use as a research framework for additional studies has been demonstrated in the current study.
A further benefit of this study has been my personal development both as a researcher and a practitioner in ODA program development. Grounded Theory was, for me, an excellent way of interacting with individuals and organisations who had first-hand experience in PPA establishment and through their experiences, interpretations and perceptions. This provided rich data and the tools from which to build the Integrated Theoretical Model. It also gave me a greater insight into the complexities of alliance establishment. This includes the importance of relationships during alliance formation and the potential difficulties encountered by individuals and organisations as they seek to develop these inter-organisational relationships to improve the efficiency of ODA programs.
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## APPENDIX A: Description of Public-Private Alliances used in the Grounded Theory Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPA Identifier</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P1            | Research & Development  | **Primary Partners:** Donor, Private Sector, CGIAR Centre.  
**Secondary Partners:** Country Government, Private Sector, NGOs, other Donors.  
**Objectives:** Development of staple crop cultivars and production technology and dissemination of these to developing countries.  
**Geographic Focus:** International.  
**Comments:** Well established alliance, started from pre-cursor projects, implementation by CGIAR centre, strategy and management through management committee of primary partners. |
| P2            | Infrastructure          | **Primary Partners:** Donor, National Country Government, Private Sector Utility.  
**Secondary Partners:** Private Sector, NGOs, other Donors, Local Government Units.  
**Objectives:** Provision of infrastructure to remote communities in the southern Philippines.  
**Geographic Focus:** southern Philippines.  
**Comments:** PPA is in its second phase. Initiated by Donor through agreement with Country National Government. Donor provides strategic oversight. Implementer is a private sector company commissioned by the Donor. Primary partners have limited say in implementation of the alliance. |
| P3            | Research and Development| **Primary Partners:** Donor, Private Sector, Developed Country Government Agencies, CGIAR centre.  
**Secondary Partners:** Country Governments, Private Sector, NGOs, other Donors, Private Sector other Government Agencies.  
**Objectives:** Development of genetically modified crops for developing countries.  
**Geographic Focus:** International.  
**Comments:** Initiation by individual and driven by individuals and Private Sector Partner. Donor has minor role. Managed by management committee, implemented by initiator. Formal agreements still be developed. |
| P4            | Community Development   | **Primary Partners:** Donor, Private Sector, Philippines Government Agencies.  
**Secondary Partners:** Country Government, Private Sector, NGOs, Local Government Units.  
**Objectives:** Development of local communities, provision of microfinance, enhancement of household incomes and capacity building.                                                                                                                                         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P5</th>
<th>Extension, Information Exchange and Development Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Geographic Focus:** Philippines.  
**Comments:** Initiated by Donor and Philippines Government. Private Sector brought in to provide specialist services. Alliance is well established and a second phase plus scaling out is being considered. Donor has formal arrangement in place. Implementation by Philippines Government agencies. Private sector has little role in management of implementation.

**Primary Partners:** Donor, Private Sector, Indonesian Government Agencies.  
**Secondary Partners:** Country Government, Private Sector, NGOs, other local and provincial government agencies' other Donor programs.  
**Objectives:** Industry development, extension, information exchange, economic development.  
**Geographic Focus:** central and Western Indonesia.  
**Comments:** Initiated by Donor and Private Sector. Wide membership but relatively informal with few formal agreements. Alliance has a role as a coordinating body. Implementer appointed by management committee. Management committee provides strategic oversight and manages implementation.
APPENDIX B: Semi-Structured Interview Questions used in the Grounded Theory Study

The following questions are proposed for the initial semi-unstructured interviews (note not all questions will be used in all cases):

- What motivated your organization to seek a formal collaboration with other public or private organizations?
- Did you consider other models of collaboration other than PPA, and if so what were they?
- What did you see as the advantages of the PPA model for your organization/goals and objectives?
- What did you see as the disadvantages/risks of the PPA model for your organization/goals and objectives?
- What other factors/issues did you consider when considering entering into a PPA?
- Why and how did you settle for a PPA model?
- What decision-making/analysis processes did you and others in your organization use when considering entering into a PPA?
- What did you consider when deciding which organization to include in the PPA?
- Did you consciously decide to include/exclude any particular organizations or types of organizations?
- What factors did you consider and what processes did you use when considering the structure, form and model of the PPA?
APPENDIX C: Examples of Preliminary Code Association Diagrams
APPENDIX D: Evolution of Category Relationship Models
An Integrated Theoretical Model of PPA in ODA (Final Version)
### APPENDIX E: Description of Public-Private Alliances used in the Comparative Analysis Phase of this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPA Identifier</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P6             | Community Development           | **Primary Partners:** Donor, National Government.  
**Secondary Partners:** Local Government, Private Sector, NGOs, other Donors.  
**Type of Alliance:** Constrained Choice Alliance.  
**Objectives:** Community development and economic livelihoods.  
**Geographic Focus:** Southern Philippines (Mindanao).  
**Comments:** Donor driven alliance, private sector implementer commissioned by donor, Donor retains tight control over strategy, operations and M&E. |
| P7             | Community Development           | **Primary Partners:** Donor, Local Government, Private Sector.  
**Secondary Partners:** Private Sector, NGOs, other Donors, Local Government Units, National Government.  
**Type of Alliance:** Constrained Choice Alliance.  
**Objectives:** Rural development, capacity building, food security and economic livelihoods.  
**Geographic Focus:** Cambodia (Siem Reap).  
**Comments:** Relatively new alliance, Donor driven and managed, prominent role for the private sector, all partners have a role in alliance management. |
| P8             | Reproductive Health             | **Primary Partners:** Donor, Private Sector, National Government.  
**Secondary Partners:** Local Governments, Private Sector, NGOs, other Donors, other Government Agencies.  
**Type of Alliance:** Constrained Choice Alliance.  
**Objectives:** Improvement of women's reproductive health in poor and remote communities.  
**Geographic Focus:** Southern Philippines.  
**Comments:** Donor initiated in partnership with national Government. Implementer appointed by Donor (private sector managing contractor), significant involvement of private sector, currently in second phase of implementation. |
| P9             | Community Development           | **Primary Partners:** Donor, Private Sector, Philippines Government Agencies.  
**Secondary Partners:** Country Government, Private Sector, NGOs, Local Government Units. |
| P5 | Extension, Information Exchange and Development Strategy | **Primary Partners**: Donor, Private Sector, Indonesian Government Agencies.  
**Secondary Partners**: Country Government, Private Sector, NGOs, other local and provincial government agencies' other Donor programs.  
**Type of Alliance**: Voluntary Alliance.  
**Objectives**: Industry development, extension, information exchange, economic development.  
**Geographic Focus**: Central and Western Indonesia.  
**Comments**: Initiated by Donor and Private Sector. Wide membership but relatively informal with few formal agreements. Alliance has a role as a coordinating body. Implementer appointed by management committee. Management committee provides strategic oversight and manages implementation. |
|---|---|---|
| P10 | Industry Development | **Primary Partners**: Private Sector, Local Government, Farmers.  
**Secondary Partners**: Donor, Country Government, Private Sector, NGOs, other local and provincial government agencies' other Donor programs.  
**Type of Alliance**: Voluntary Alliance.  
**Objectives**: Industry development, extension, information exchange, economic development.  
**Geographic Focus**: Southern Philippines.  
**Comments**: Initiated by growers and local government, implemented by management committee, drivers from within growers and local government, management committee provides direction and strategy. |
**Secondary Partners**: Private Sector, NGOs, other Donor programs.  
**Type of Alliance**: Voluntary Alliance.  
**Objectives**: Sharing of information and technology specific to a single commodity.  
**Geographic Focus**: International.  
**Comments**: Initiated by Donor, direction and strategy provided by a management committee comprised of the donor and country government representatives, relatively informal, based on personal friendships and relationships, well established, private sector comes and goes as appropriate. |
APPENDIX F: Semi-Structured Interview Questions used in the
Comparative Analysis Phase of this Study

• What prompted the idea for this alliance and how did it start?
• Can you identify an individual or group responsible for the initiation of the alliance? If so, what were their major characteristics that contributed to the establishment of the alliance?
• How much choice did your organisation have with regard to the management model, who to partner with etc?
• What stages/processes did the alliance formation go through and how important was each stage?
• What issues/factors did you consider before and during the formation of the alliance?
• How much involvement did your organisation have in the initiation, formation, strategy development and management of the alliance?
• Did the alliance have a clearly identified leader/driver during the establishment of the alliance and if so, how important was the driver(s) and in what ways?
• What characteristics did the driver(s) have and how did these contribute to the effectiveness if alliance establishment?
• What other individual factors were important in the establishment of the alliance?
• What other organisation factors were important in the establishment of the alliance?
• What other structural factors were important in the establishment of the alliance?
• What other external factors were important in the establishment of the alliance?
• Which ones were the most important and did they affect the establishment process?
• Tell me about the importance of the alliance relationships and why this was important. What went well and what went not so well?
• Tell me about 3 or 4 things that went well in the establishment of the alliance.
• Tell me about 3 or 4 things that did not go so well in the establishment of the alliance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver for Initiation</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Initiation Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor strategy</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Donor model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus issue-problem</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Donor decision to invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core problem or issue</td>
<td>Core partners</td>
<td>Convince donor to invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Key individuals</td>
<td>Meeting of potential partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive for change</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Agreement to establish alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of previous model</td>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Like-minded individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mew modality</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Request for proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified need</td>
<td>Joint initiation</td>
<td>Contestable implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for donor</td>
<td>Multiple initiators</td>
<td>Concept presented to Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism for Investment by Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donor interest in proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified need</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for assistance from Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator Influence</td>
<td>Initiator Role in Development of Objectives and Strategy</td>
<td>Initiator Role in Establishment, Management and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor directs implementation</td>
<td>Donor sets objectives</td>
<td>Donor guidelines processes and requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor power and control</td>
<td>Donor priorities/agenda</td>
<td>Steering committee as coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core partners</td>
<td>Donor provides direction</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners form steering committee</td>
<td>Steering committee develops objectives</td>
<td>Major decisions made by Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering committee provides advice</td>
<td>Shared objectives</td>
<td>Donor appoints implementer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolved from grower association</td>
<td>Strategy set by Donor</td>
<td>Donor involved in details of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner/core group initiation</td>
<td>Donor frameworks</td>
<td>Donor rules and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of steering committee</td>
<td>Donor &quot;driving the bus&quot;</td>
<td>Rigid reporting framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process imposed by Donor</td>
<td>Planning by steering committee</td>
<td>Donor-driven activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance imposed from the top</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forum of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management by steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core partners influence decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Category - PROCESSES and PROCESS ISSUES

Category - BRINGING THE PARTNERS ON BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION TO JOIN ALLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources/skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities/diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty alleviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages to other organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New skills development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ways of doing things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to technical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to new relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost saving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaining Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAKEHOLDER/PARTNER ORGANISATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capturing the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest from smallholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining the support of other parties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT/BUY-IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing/selling the concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of the minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing the others of board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining internal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling concept to senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater buy-in by public sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPES OF PARTNERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grower representative body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-connected partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation/credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability/track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to contribute to alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear about level of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear about contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities of the partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGOTIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaching agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing the detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation in coming to agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating the detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Synergies**
Value adding on investment  
Political influence  
Public good  
Profile/credibility/promotion  
Broader funding base

**PARTNER PRIORITIES**
Commercial agenda  
Strategic business opportunity  
Commercial opportunity  
Commercial perspective  
Government agenda  
Private sector interests  
Commercial interest  
Commercial motive  
Advantages for members

**AWARENESS OF ALLIANCE**
Word of mouth  
Made aware  
Awareness from other partners  
Became interested  
Interested generated by alliance  
Appeal of PPA model  
Appeal of joining consortium

**INITIAL APPROACHES**
Targeted  
Invited to participate  
Partners approached by donor  
Partners approached donor  
Introduced to alliance through individual  
Request to join alliance  
Open invitation to join

**COMMITMENT**
Full commitment  
Initial commitment  
Financial commitment  
Varying levels of commitment  
Additional commitment  
Partial agreement of commitment

**Complementarity**
Technical expertise  
Independent broker  
Values and expectations  
Active participation  
Commitment to new funding arrangements  
Risk aversion  
Contribution to the partnership

**SELECTION OF PARTNERS**
Suitability  
Targeted  
Due diligence  
Strategic fit  
Acceptance by other partners  
Technical merit  
Partner representatives  
Balance  
Natural fit  
Open to new members  
Specific partner  
Additional skills set  
Avoidance of duplication  
Specific skills  
Bias for certain partners  
Project management capacity  
Selection of initial partners  
Complimentarity  
Complete skills mix  
Partner compatibility  
Well-connected partners  
Balance between public and private  
Broad partnership base  
Missing skills set
## Core Category - PROCESSES and PROCESS ISSUES

### Category - Sorting Out the Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Objectives</th>
<th>Principles of Operation</th>
<th>Formality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALIANCE MODEL</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGREEMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>Formal agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner role in planning</td>
<td>Scaling up</td>
<td>Written agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify plans</td>
<td>Previous model</td>
<td>Unwritten rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc basis</td>
<td>Modified structure</td>
<td>Legal agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial agenda</td>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>No formal contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic review</td>
<td>Transplant model</td>
<td>Informal agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint planning</td>
<td>Duplicate model</td>
<td>Non-binding agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOALS/OBJECTIVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALIANCE MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRUCTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of goals</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Formal processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor goals and objectives</td>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted objectives</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Formal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with donor objectives</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Formal Donor model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad objectives</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance goals</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Simple structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared goals</td>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>Loose operating structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible goals</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Desire for formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting goals</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Formality evolving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner objectives</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common goals</td>
<td>Changing focus and objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with strategic direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem solving
Management Committee
Joint management/decision making
Managing risk
Governance

**ALLIANCE CHARACTERISTICS**
Reactive
Timeliness
Focussed
Learning
Commitment
Engaged
Action focussed
Proactive
Active participation
Working together
Transparency
Consensus
Open communication
Culture of respect
Participation by partners
Creativity
Joint problem solving
Sharing

**ALLIANCE IMPLEMENTATION**
Implementation by partners
Umbrella program
Government involvement
Engagement with the private sector
Driven by implementer
Checks and balances
Building networks
Working with small groups
Two-way information flows
Core Category - ALLIANCE LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Leadership Attributes</th>
<th>Acceptance/Formality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Acknowledge leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Formal recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Credibility with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core partners</td>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>Acceptance by stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple drivers</td>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>Appointed by Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Power and influence</td>
<td>Wide support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Paternal</td>
<td>Identified leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key partners</td>
<td>Credible</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Appointed by partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent secretariat</td>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>Elected by partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNAMICS</th>
<th>BEHAVIOURS</th>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementer allocates resources</td>
<td>Gets things done</td>
<td>Good relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer designs programs</td>
<td>Wants things done our way</td>
<td>Perceived as doing a good job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer agenda</td>
<td>Micro-management</td>
<td>Highly regarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary leadership</td>
<td>Aggressive management</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clear leadership</td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual leadership</td>
<td>Connects individuals</td>
<td>Good Impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating leadership</td>
<td>Steering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension between emerging leaders</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership evolved</td>
<td>Supportive'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership from alliance initiator</td>
<td>Focal Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold alliance together</td>
<td>Binding force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Category - Modifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Organisational</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTRIBUTES</strong></td>
<td><strong>ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRUCTURAL ISSUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Organisation size</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused individuals</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Scaling up</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven individuals</td>
<td>Organisation structure</td>
<td>Alliance size</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative individuals</td>
<td>Country experience</td>
<td>Critical mass</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal agendas</td>
<td>Power and influence</td>
<td>Management structure</td>
<td>Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent individuals</td>
<td>Organisation agenda</td>
<td>Changes in alliance staff</td>
<td>Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>International experience</td>
<td>Geographic spread</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Staff issues</td>
<td>Alliance politics</td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual’s passion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stability of membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLITICS**
- Political differences
- Politics
- Corruption
- Political influence
- Local politics
- Country politics
- Keeping both sides of politics happy

**CHALLENGES**
- Security
- Conflict areas
- Geographic isolation
- Church influence
- Geographic dispersion
- Natural forces
- Isolation
Geographical issues
External influences

**CULTURE**
Language
Cultural issues
Regional differences
Country challenges
Socially sensitive issues
Cultural differences
Cultural sensitivity
Cultural awareness
### Core Category - ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Interactions</th>
<th>Relationship Behaviours</th>
<th>Relationship Dysfunctions</th>
<th>Relationship Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIOR RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MODEL DYSFUNCTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>BENEFITS FOR PARTNERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationships</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>Improved relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing alliances</td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Cumbersome</td>
<td>Donor satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>Strong linkages</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Partner satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior arrangements</td>
<td>Positively engaged</td>
<td>Lack of flexibility</td>
<td>Increased market share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enduring relationships</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Administration burdens</td>
<td>Good experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Competing alliances</td>
<td>Meets partners needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>Limited spread</td>
<td>Benefits for members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td>Build community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTNERSHIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>PARTNERSHIPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PARTNER INTERACTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>SATISFACTION WITH MODEL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution/Development</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Little interaction</td>
<td>Successful model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership evolution</td>
<td>Connected</td>
<td>Not true partnership</td>
<td>Approval of model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing relationships</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Internal conflicts</td>
<td>Recognition of alliance by Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New partnerships</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Unequal partner influence</td>
<td>Example of best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening relationships</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Hidden agendas</td>
<td>Perceived success of model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking closer relationships</td>
<td>Viability</td>
<td>Tension between public and private</td>
<td>Support for model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cementing relationships</td>
<td>Mutual interest</td>
<td>Power and control</td>
<td>Satisfaction with model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future-focus</td>
<td>Lack of trust</td>
<td><strong>ALLIANCE PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respecting</td>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td>Perceived success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>Club effect</td>
<td>Good working relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment of partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALLIANCE BEHAVIOUR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Mutual support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieving objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identified benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL DYNAMICS
Leveraging off partnership
Interacting with other partners
Linking with the private sector
Getting to know each other
Cultivating relationships
Seeking more formal alliance
All partners equally involved

Mutual respect
Cooperation
Collaboration
Working together
Openness

Different values
Processes not open
Hoarding of information
Lack of vision
Lack of common understanding
Inactive partners
Personality clashes

COHESION
Lack of cohesion
Lack of trust
Not harmonised
Disunity
Factions
Uncoordinated
Splinter groups
Partners do own thing

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES
Technical limitations
Missed opportunities
Favouring certain partners
Management dysfunction
Barriers to entry
Time constraints
Competition between organisations
Exploitation
Multiple levels of management
Alliance pulled in many directions
Reliance on government

Verified success
Side benefits
Mutual benefits
Long-term benefits
Advantages of working together
Sharing a vision
Meeting expectations
APPENDIX K: Examples of Memos Developed as Part of This Study

General Memo for Private Sector Partner, Alliance P4 (14/3/2010)

From this interview it seems that the Donor had a PPA program going and was keen to invest in Ag in the Philippines. They approached the Private Sector Partner who they knew were doing a good job elsewhere. The Private Sector Partner saw this as an opportunity to leverage funding and the Donor saw this as an opportunity to get technical expertise. The Private Sector Partner was already working with farmers in the Philippines and could bring in the expertise. The Donor took a while to get their act together in terms of due diligence and contracts. There was a great deal of trust involved and the Private Sector Partner commenced activities and committed its own funds well before the agreements were formalised. The Private Sector Partner apparently had to apply to Donor. The representative of the Private Sector Partner was keen to be involved in a PPA since he had done his PhD in this and understood the concept and its potential. The Private sector company management took a bit of convincing.

A second advantage for east-West was that Donor had been previously implementing PPA models and the Private Sector Partner was able to get the learning from this, particularly in the global sense (they had generally been working locally with small groups). Thus the Private Sector Partner could get the learning from other parts of the world. A third advantage for the Private Sector Partner was commercial i.e. the opportunity to build long-term trust and relationships with the growers and their potential customer base. A fourth advantage was that Private Sector Partner picked up addition project work from the Donor in other parts of the world.

The Donor was mandated by the Donor Government to do agricultural work in the Philippines and so this was the basis of the relationship with the Private Sector Partner. For the Donor another advantage was access to the Private Sector Partner seeds network which is in a range of SE Asian countries.

One of the disadvantages was the length of time that it took for the project to get up and running. Another was the regular reporting requirements and the reporting burden.

The model has apparently been successful, East-West is happy with the result and the Donor has offered the Private Sector Partner additional work (in other countries) as a result.

The Donor was a good partner. They came and discussed the PPA concept and what was involved up front. They were prepared to discuss and negotiate on the contract with the Private Sector Partners and this was not overly formal.

The Private Sector Partners were already in partnerships with the Development Country Government Agency before the approach by the Donor. One of the conditions of the arrangement was that the Private Sector Partner could bring in additional partners (and they brought in the Donor) and/or expand existing relationships.

Trust is a feature that is prominent in the interview. There was high degree of trust within the partnership, partly due to the Private Sector Partner Culture and probably also due to the Donor’s
approach. As a result of this trust, the Private Sector Partner went ahead and started the work even before the contracts had been signed so that they did not lose a year (production season). Also since the Private Sector Partner was local they were allowed to manage the project and make all of the implementation decisions. That said the Private Sector Partner was quite strict with the funds and with reporting. An example of this is the need to get permission to change expenditure of funds. They also had fairly rigorous M&E frameworks and made several visits to the Philippines to ensure that everything was in order. There was a lot of mutual trust and the Donor eased back on some of the reporting and audit requirements. Both partners must have been satisfied with the progress since the project was extended with minimal paperwork.

There were clear objectives established up front and this allowed success to be measured.

The representative of the Private Sector Partner suggests that trust is the glue which held the PPA together. This may be so, but having the representative of the Private Sector Partner as the implementer must also have been a major driving force in making this project work. For example the representative of the Private Sector Partner was the key to convincing the company management to become involved and to invest in the project before the contract had been signed with the Donor.

The representative of the Private Sector Partner was of the view that identifying partners and skills requirements etc should have been done at the start of the relationship and is something that he would do differently. He also expressed concern about the timing and negotiation of the agreement.

Overall the themes that come out of this interview are the mutual advantages of the partnership and the strategic fit. There is clearly unequal power but this seems to be managed quite well. Mutual trust and respect are key issues in the success of this relationship and I suspect that personal relationships may also pay a factor. The Private Sector Partner representative’s role as leader and facilitator is clearly also important. In one sense this model is a cupid, however, the Private Sector Partner negotiated to be able to bring in additional partners and they have worked with the Donor before.
General Memo re: Alliance P3 (2/5/2010)

Bill was the initiator of this idea and he went to see (The Private Partner). As luck would have it (The Private Partner) was about to pull out of Technology Development and after discussions they decided it could work on another crop. From (The Private Partner) perspective one of the main drivers was the Director of R&D. He was more than just interest in the commercial aspects; he had a real passion for the project. They got on board a range of technical partners and then they started work. For the (Government Research Partner) it was about a chance to learn about commercialization. For the others and the (Government Research Partner) it was about feeding poor countries. For (The Private Partner) it was about sharing of development costs, using the reputation of the public sector to gain support for the technology and about getting the technical support that they needed for registration. They needed someone to accept the IP from (The Private Partner) and look after the licensing arrangements back to (The Private Partner), other partners etc. They also needed a public organization to launder the money through. Enter The CGIAR Centre, the then DG became involved and was a key driver. Thus the three key drivers were the (Government Research Partner), (The Private Partner) and The CGIAR Centre.

There were a number of problems. Five of the partners formed the management group with a number of secondary partners. The PPA really emerged and there was no real opportunity to sit down together to sort out the detail. The concept was really rushed and designed over a two-hour meeting. None of the partners were really experience with PPA. Many of the partners gave little thought to what they were getting into. They saw themselves as technical service providers and really did not fully commit to the ideals of the PPA. The project was high risk technically, there was potentially reputation risk and there was legal and liability risk. These issues were never really addressed. The legal frame work and agreements were not sorted out up front and so this became a source of conflict. In the end (The Private Partner) retained the IP and they used this as a source of power, which they exercised from time to time. They would do things and not consult the other partners etc. To make matter worse, the Research Director of the Private Partner retired and he was really the driving force so the company went back to its commercial focus. The Director General of the CGIAR Centre left. The CGIAR Centre was carrying out most of the admin and was going to be the commercialiser. The new DG pulled the CGIAR Centre out and the program faltered.

Technically the PPA has been good and the technical side is great. From a management point of view it has been less successful. The management and operating committees are really steering committees only and give little real leadership and control. This is left up to the drivers of which only key individual remains. Because they struggle for money, the key individual has little real power.
There were a lot of other dysfunctions as seen through the eyes of the partners (particularly) the second tier partners but this is mostly due to the way that the PPA was established. There is also some misalignment of goals and objectives.
All of the participants interviewed have identified Leadership/Driver as an important consideration in the establishment of the PPA. The Leader/Driver is the individual or group of individuals who provide leadership to the group during alliance formation, "drive" the processes and act as the glue which hold the alliance together. This factor appears to impact on all of the establishment processes and so it is a candidate for the status of a core category.

There appears to be three clusters of codes that make up Leadership/Driver; a group around the origin of the leadership/driver; a group around the characteristics of the Leadership/Driver; and a group around the acceptance of the Leadership/Driver by the other partners.

It appears that there are a number of ways in which the Leadership/Driver can originate. In some cases the initiator takes on the role as the Leadership/Driver. In many cases the Donor appoints an implementing agency and this organisation takes on the role of Leadership/Driver. Sometimes a key individual of group of core partners takes on the role of Leadership/Driver. Finally the partners can appoint or elect the leadership/Driver. The Leadership Driver can be appointed/elected by the partners or can emerge from within the partners. Leadership/Driver is not necessarily stable and can change throughout the life of the alliance; there can also be multiple Drivers. Conflict can arise when:

(i) There is more than one Leadership/Driver
(ii) There is an existing Leadership/Driver and another is emerging
(iii) A Leadership/Driver is appointed by the initiator or partners but an informal leader emerges

This raises the issue of Leadership/Driver and formality and acceptance by the other partners. In some of the models studied to date, the Leadership/Driver was a key individual or group of individuals who initiated the alliance or the Leadership/Driver emerged. If this Leadership/Driver is not accepted by the other partners then conflict can result. Where the initiator is a Donor and they appoint an Implementing Agency to provide Leadership/Driver, the partners may accept the Implementer in this role, but depending on the characteristics of this leadership and the dynamics with the partner, there may be underlying frustrations and problems. Where the Leadership/Driver is appointed or elected by the partners, acceptance can be greater. Irrespective of the "source" of the Leadership/Driver, acceptance in very important and appears to occur at two levels; formal acceptance and informal acceptance. Informal acceptance is more important.

The characteristics and behaviours of the Leadership/Driver are predictably important. Leader/Drivers varied from dominate non-consultative to collegiate, participative leaders who acted as mentors and were the glue holding the alliance together. Dominant Leader/Drivers
appeared particularly to be associated with Donors and initiators who had a dominant influence on the initiation of the alliance.

Leadership/Driver is emerging from the analysis as a core category and additional information is needed on the characteristics, dimensions and dynamics of this factor.
**APPENDIX L: Comparative Analysis Tables for 'Alliance Initiation Type'**

**Table 1: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Processes/Process Issues' Category of 'Conception'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Driver for Initiation</th>
<th>Initiation Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Constrained Choice -type Alliances** | - Focus issue  
- Common problem  
- Failure of previous model  
- Identified need  
- New modalities  
- Opportunity  
- **Mechanism for investment by donor**  
- Need for new model  
- **Donor strategy**  
- **Opportunity for donor** | - Donor  
- **Dominant partner**  
- **Project Implementer**  
- Core partners | - Donor decided to invest  
- Donor model  
- Developed concept  
- Request for proposal  
- Contestable implementation  
- Convinced donor to invest  
- Developed concept  
- Concept presented to donor  
- Donor interested in proposal  
- Decision to invest |
| **Voluntary-type Alliances** | - Focus issue  
- Common problem  
- Failure of previous model  
- Identified need  
- New modalities  
- Opportunity  
- Need for new model  
- **Common purpose**  
- **Common view** | - Core partners  
- **Key individuals**  
- Stakeholders  
- Joint initiation  
- **Multiple initiators** | - Like-minded individuals  
- Meeting of potential partners  
- Partners for steering committee  
- Agreement to establish alliance  
- Joint discussions  
- Request for assistance from donor |

Note: Concepts which differ between alliance types are bolded for easier identification.
Table 2: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the Core Category of 'Alliance Initiation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Initiator Influence</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Development of Objectives and Strategy</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Establishment, Management and Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Donor directs implementation</td>
<td>- Donor priorities/agenda</td>
<td>- Major decisions made by donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Process imposed by Donor</td>
<td>- Strategy set by donor</td>
<td>- Donor appoints Managing Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dependence on donor</td>
<td>- Donor framework</td>
<td>- Donor involvement in details of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alliance designed by donor</td>
<td>- Donor 'drives the bus'</td>
<td>- Donor rules and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alliance imposed from the top</td>
<td>- Donor provides direction</td>
<td>- Managing contractor distributes resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor power and control</td>
<td>- Donor sets objectives</td>
<td>- Donor approval processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rigid reporting framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor driven activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Elected leadership</td>
<td>- Steering Committee develops strategy</td>
<td>- Steering Committee appoints chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal leadership</td>
<td>- Planning by Steering Committee</td>
<td>- Importance of Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partners form steering committee</td>
<td>- Strategy and Objectives by Steering Committee</td>
<td>- Establishment of management group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core partners influence decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Key individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Steering committee provides advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partners free to come and go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evolved from grower association</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Forum of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting of potential partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Management by Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Concepts which differ between alliance types are bolded for easier identification
Table 3: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partner's on Board' Sub-Category of 'Initial Interest'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Motivation to Join Alliance</th>
<th>Partner Priorities</th>
<th>Awareness of Alliance</th>
<th>Initial Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Information&lt;br&gt;- Resources/Skills&lt;br&gt;- Opportunities/Diversification&lt;br&gt;- Marketing&lt;br&gt;- Networks&lt;br&gt;- Leveraging&lt;br&gt;- Synergies&lt;br&gt;- Influence&lt;br&gt;- Public Good/CSR&lt;br&gt;- Capacity Building&lt;br&gt;- Funding&lt;br&gt;- Poverty Alleviation&lt;br&gt;- Reaching Poor Farmers</td>
<td>- Commercial Agendas&lt;br&gt;- Strategic Business Opportunity&lt;br&gt;- Commercial Perspective&lt;br&gt;- Attractiveness&lt;br&gt;- Private Sector Interests</td>
<td>- Word of mouth&lt;br&gt;- Made Aware&lt;br&gt;- Awareness from other Partners&lt;br&gt;- Became Interested&lt;br&gt;- Interest Generated by Alliance</td>
<td>- Targeted&lt;br&gt;- Invited to Participate&lt;br&gt;- Partners Approached by Donor&lt;br&gt;- Identified Commercial Partners&lt;br&gt;- Approached by Implementer&lt;br&gt;- Partners Approached Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Information&lt;br&gt;- Resources/Skills&lt;br&gt;- Opportunities/Diversification&lt;br&gt;- Marketing&lt;br&gt;- Networks&lt;br&gt;- Leveraging&lt;br&gt;- Synergies&lt;br&gt;- Influence&lt;br&gt;- Public Good/CSR&lt;br&gt;- Capacity Building&lt;br&gt;- Funding&lt;br&gt;- Food Safety</td>
<td>- Commercial Opportunity&lt;br&gt;- Commercial Agendas&lt;br&gt;- Government Agenda&lt;br&gt;- Initial Impressions</td>
<td>- Word of mouth&lt;br&gt;- Made Aware&lt;br&gt;- Awareness from other Partners&lt;br&gt;- Became Interested&lt;br&gt;- Interest Generated by Alliance</td>
<td>- Introduced to alliance through individual&lt;br&gt;- Request to Join Alliance&lt;br&gt;- Invited Key Industry People&lt;br&gt;- Open Invitation to Join&lt;br&gt;- Formal Invitation&lt;br&gt;- Attended Open Forum&lt;br&gt;- Initial Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partners on Board' Sub-Category of 'Gaining Support'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Stakeholders/Partner Organisations</th>
<th>Support/Buy-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Constrained Choice-Type Alliances** | - Stakeholder Interest  
- Stakeholder Support  
- Community Based  
- Interest from Smallholders  
- Support of Commercial Sector  
- Government Becomes Interested | - Commitment of Senior Management  
- Convincing/Selling the Concept  
- Voluntary Involvement  
- Meeting of the Minds  
- Bringing the Others on Board  
- Promoting Alliance |
| **Voluntary-Type Alliances**     | - Community Interest  
- Support from Stakeholders  
- Government Support  
- Capturing the Private Sector  
- Gaining the Interest of | - Common Language  
- Common Understanding  
- Support of Senior Management  
- Selling the Concept  
- Convincing  
- Bringing the Partners on |
## Table 5: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partners on Board' Sub-Category of 'The Partners'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Types of Partners</th>
<th>Partner Characteristics</th>
<th>Selection of Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-Type Alliances</td>
<td>- Public</td>
<td>- Quality</td>
<td>- Suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private</td>
<td>- Profile</td>
<td>- Targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation</td>
<td>- Reputation/Credibility</td>
<td>- Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agency</td>
<td>- Expertise</td>
<td>- Screening Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- End User</td>
<td>- Reliability/Track Record</td>
<td>- Due Diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- National</td>
<td>- Experience</td>
<td>- Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategic Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open to New Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Engaged in Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bringing in New Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Engaged in Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Acceptance by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential to Contribute to Alliance</td>
<td>- Technical Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-Type Alliances</td>
<td>- Grower Representative Body</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Brought in by Other Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Core Partner Role in New Partner Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Industry Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Complementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accepting of Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type</td>
<td>- Scope of Work</td>
<td>- Roles and Responsibilities of the Partners</td>
<td>- Full Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Clear About Level of Support</td>
<td>- Obligations</td>
<td>- Initial Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear About Contributions</td>
<td>- Expectations</td>
<td>- Decision to Invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resource Contributions</td>
<td>- Agreement on Deliverables</td>
<td>- Financial Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cost Sharing</td>
<td>- Understanding Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner Contributions</td>
<td>- Primary Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary -type Alliances</td>
<td>- Partner Contributions</td>
<td>- Agreed Priorities</td>
<td>- Varying Levels of Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Differences in Contributions</td>
<td>- Clear About Functions</td>
<td>- No Formal Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Voluntary Contributions</td>
<td>- Assigned Responsibilities</td>
<td>- Additional Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unequal Investment</td>
<td>- Defined Functions</td>
<td>- Relative Levels of Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Strategy/Objectives'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Goals/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constrained Choice-type</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Alliances</strong></td>
<td>- Strategic Planning&lt;br&gt;- Partner Role in Planning&lt;br&gt;- Modify Plans&lt;br&gt;- Ad Hoc Basis</td>
<td>- Alignment of Goals&lt;br&gt;- Donor Goals and Objectives&lt;br&gt;- Evolution of Goals&lt;br&gt;- Donor Country Goals&lt;br&gt;- Clear on Objectives&lt;br&gt;- Targeted Objectives&lt;br&gt;- Alignment with Donor Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary-type Alliances</strong></td>
<td>- Commercial Agenda&lt;br&gt;- Strategic Plan&lt;br&gt;- Strategic Review</td>
<td>- Broad Objectives&lt;br&gt;- Alliance Goals&lt;br&gt;- Shared Goals&lt;br&gt;- Flexible Goals&lt;br&gt;- Conflicting Goals&lt;br&gt;- Partner Objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Principles of Operation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Alliance Model</th>
<th>Alliance Management Operations</th>
<th>Alliance Characteristics</th>
<th>Alliance Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Evolution</td>
<td>- Planning</td>
<td>- Reactive</td>
<td>- Implementation by Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Previous Model</td>
<td>- Risk Management</td>
<td>- Timelessness</td>
<td>- Umbrella Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scaling Up</td>
<td>- Implementation</td>
<td>- Focussed</td>
<td>- Government Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Modify Structure</td>
<td>- M&amp;E</td>
<td>- Learning</td>
<td>- Engagement with the Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Replication</td>
<td>- Administration</td>
<td>- Commitment</td>
<td>- Driven by Implementer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transplant Model</td>
<td>- Coordination</td>
<td>- Engaged</td>
<td>- Systematic Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Duplicate Model</td>
<td>- Validation</td>
<td>- Action Focussed</td>
<td>- Checks and Balances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accountability</td>
<td>- Proactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Evolution</td>
<td>- Communication</td>
<td>- Active Participation</td>
<td>- Building Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scaling Up</td>
<td>- Networking</td>
<td>- Working Together</td>
<td>- Joint Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Model Emerged</td>
<td>- Regular Meetings</td>
<td>- Integrated Solution</td>
<td>- Working with Small Growers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Modified Structure</td>
<td>- Problem Solving</td>
<td>- Transparency</td>
<td>- Two-way Information Flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changes to Model</td>
<td>- Reaching Consensus</td>
<td>- Consensus</td>
<td>- Focus on Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Still in Establishment Stage</td>
<td>- Management Committee</td>
<td>- Open Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Culture of Respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Formality'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Agreements</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type</td>
<td>- Formal Agreements</td>
<td>- Formal Processes</td>
<td>- Formal Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>- Written Agreements</td>
<td>- Rules</td>
<td>- Legal Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unwritten Rules</td>
<td>- Formal Structure</td>
<td>- Formal Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Legal Agreements</td>
<td>- Formal Donor Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- No Formal Contracts</td>
<td>- Informal</td>
<td>- Informal Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal Agreements</td>
<td>- Simple Structure</td>
<td>- Evolution of Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-binding Agreements</td>
<td>- Loose Operating Structure</td>
<td>- Organised but Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Desire for Formality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formality Evolving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Type'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type</td>
<td>- Implementer</td>
<td>- Implementer Allocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>- Government</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor</td>
<td>- Implementer Designs Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor Representative</td>
<td>- Implementer Involved in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Manager</td>
<td>the Details of Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided by Core Partners</td>
<td>- Implementer Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple Drivers</td>
<td>- Implementer as Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type</td>
<td>- Public Sector</td>
<td>- No Clear Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Dynamic&lt;br&gt;- Understanding&lt;br&gt;- Visionary&lt;br&gt;- Passionate&lt;br&gt;- Strong&lt;br&gt;- Firm&lt;br&gt;- Power and Influence</td>
<td>- Gets Things Done&lt;br&gt;- Want Things Done Our Way&lt;br&gt;- Strong Leadership&lt;br&gt;- Micro-Management&lt;br&gt;- Aggressive Management&lt;br&gt;- Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Helpful&lt;br&gt;- Visionary&lt;br&gt;- Paternal&lt;br&gt;- Credible&lt;br&gt;- Dominant&lt;br&gt;- Passionate&lt;br&gt;- Influential</td>
<td>- Connects Individuals&lt;br&gt;- Steering&lt;br&gt;- Mentor&lt;br&gt;- Supportive&lt;br&gt;- Coordination&lt;br&gt;- Focal Person&lt;br&gt;- Holds Alliance Together&lt;br&gt;- Encouragement&lt;br&gt;- binding Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Leadership Attributes'
Table 13: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Acceptance/Formality'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Acceptance/Formality</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</strong></td>
<td>- Acknowledged Leader</td>
<td>- Good Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal Recognition</td>
<td>- Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Credibility with Partners</td>
<td>- Perceived as Doing a Good Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acceptance by Stakeholders</td>
<td>- Highly Regarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointed by Donor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wide support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary-type Alliances</strong></td>
<td>- Identified Leader</td>
<td>- Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal</td>
<td>- Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointed by Partners</td>
<td>- Acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changing Leadership</td>
<td>- Good Impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elected by Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unofficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lacks &quot;formal' Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Perceived Leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leader is Glue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 14: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Individual'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type</td>
<td>- Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>- Strong Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focussed Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Driven Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Negative Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal Agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Persistent Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Strong Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual's Passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Organisational'  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Organisational Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Organisation Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience with Alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Country Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Power and Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- International Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Size and Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Power and Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience with Alliances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Structural'  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Structural Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained</td>
<td>- Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Choice-type Alliances | - Scaling up  
|                      | - Size 
|                      | - Critical Mass  
|                      | - Economies of Scale  
|                      | - Management structure  
|                      | - Changes in Alliance Staff  
|                      | - Geographic Spread  
| Voluntary-type Alliances | - Critical Mass  
|                       | - Economies of Scale  
|                       | **Alliance Politics**  
|                       | - Changes in Alliance Staff  
|                       | - Stability of Membership  

Table 17: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'External'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Constrained Choice-type Alliances | - Government Policy  
|                              | - Government Agenda  
|                              | - Government Support  
|                              | - Government Regulations  
|                              | - Government Restrictions  
|                            | - Political Differences  
|                            | - Politics  
|                            | - Corruption  
|                            | - Security  
|                            | - Conflict Areas  
|                            | - Geographical Isolation  
|                            | - Church Influence  
|                            | - Laws and Regulations  
|                            | - Geographic Dispersion  
|                            | - Languages  
|                            | - Cultural Issues  
|                            | - Regional Differences  
|                            | - Country Challenges  
|                            | - Socially Sensitive Issues  
| Voluntary-type Alliances   | - Government Decisions  
|                            | - Government Agenda  
|                            | - Government Rules and Regulations  
|                            | - Government Influence  
|                            | - Government Policies  
|                            | - Political Influence  
|                            | - Local Politics  
|                            | - Keeping Both Sides of Politics Happy  
|                            | - Natural Forces  
|                            | - Isolation  
|                            | - Geographical Issues  
|                            | - External Influences  
|                            | - Cultural Differences  
|                            | - Cultural Sensitivity  
|                            | - Cultural Awareness  
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Table 18: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationship' Category of 'Relationship Dynamics'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Prior Relationships</th>
<th>Partnership Evolution/Development</th>
<th>Types of Relationships</th>
<th>General Dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Previous Relationships</td>
<td>- Partnership Evolution</td>
<td>- Individual</td>
<td>- Leveraging Off Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Existing Relationships</td>
<td>- Developing Relationships</td>
<td>- Continuing</td>
<td>- Interacting with Other Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal Relationships</td>
<td>- New Partnerships</td>
<td>- Stable</td>
<td>- Linking with the Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthening Relationships</td>
<td>- Long-Term</td>
<td>- Getting to Know Each Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stronger Engagement with Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultivating Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Previous Relationships</td>
<td>- Evolution of Model</td>
<td>- New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Existing Alliances</td>
<td>- Seeking Closer Relationships</td>
<td>- Healthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prior Arrangements</td>
<td>- Developing Relationships</td>
<td>- Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Previous Alliance Failed</td>
<td>- Alliance Emerged</td>
<td>- Strategic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Building Relationships</td>
<td>- Sustained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cementing Relationships</td>
<td>- Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cohesive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formalised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Behaviours'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Alliance Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Constrained Choice-type Alliances** | - Strategic Relationships  
- Resilient Relationships  
- Strong Linkages  
- Positively Engaged  
- Intentional Partnership | - Collaboration  
- Connected  
- Dedicated  
- Credibility  
- Commitment  
- Viability  
- Partner Focus | - Mutual Support  
- Excitement  
- Enthusiasm  
- Mutual Respect  
- Value Relationships  
- Strong Commitment |
| **Voluntary-type Alliances**   | - Networks  
- Partnership  
- Friendships  
- Sense of Belonging | - Connects Individuals  
- Mutual Interest  
- Future Focus  
- Respecting Individuals  
- Collegial  
- Full Participation  
- Trust | - Cooperation  
- Collaboration  
- Self-Interest  
- Sense of Belonging  
- Working Together  
- Openness  
- Treated as Equal |
Table 20: Comparison of Constrained Choice-Type and Voluntary-Type Alliances with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Dysfunction'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Model Dysfunction</th>
<th>Partner Interactions</th>
<th>Partner Behaviours</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Implementation Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Constrained Choice-type Alliances | - Rigid  
- Cumbersome  
- Bureaucracy  
- Lack of Flexibility  
- Admin Burdens  
- Restrictions | - Little Interactions  
- Not True Partnership  
- Internal Conflicts  
- Unequal Partner Influence  
- Hidden Agendas | - Corruption  
- Game Playing  
- Rivalry  
- Agendas  
- Imposed Western Views  
- Divergent Strategies  
- Different Values  
- Processes Not Open | - Lack of Cohesion  
- Lack of Trust  
- Not Harmonised | - Technical Limitations 
- Missed Opportunities  
- Favours Certain Partners  
- Management Dysfunction  
- Barriers to Entry |
| Voluntary-type Alliances     | - Competing Alliances  
- Limited Spread  
- Structure Not Linked to Function | - Tension Between Public and Private  
- Power and Control  
- Lack of Trust  
- Conflict of Interest  
- No formal Control over Individuals  
- Club Effects | - Hoarding of Information  
- Lack of Vision  
- Lack of Common Understanding  
- Sceptical  
- Inactive Partners  
- Personality Clashes  
- Divergence of Views  
- Potential Competition | - Disunity  
- Factions  
- Uncoordinated  
- Divergent Views  
- Splinter Groups  
- Partners do Own Thing | - Time Constraints 
- Competition Between Organisations  
- Challenges  
- Exploitation  
- Multiple Levels of Management  
- Alliance Pulled in Many Directions  
- Reliance on Government |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Benefits for Partners</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Model</th>
<th>Alliance Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Choice-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Improved Relationships</td>
<td>- Successful Model</td>
<td>- Perceived Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor Satisfaction</td>
<td>- Approval of Model</td>
<td>- Good Working Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner Satisfaction</td>
<td>- Recognition of Alliance by Donor</td>
<td>- Additional Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Market Share</td>
<td>- Example of Best practice</td>
<td>- Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieving Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary-type Alliances</td>
<td>- Good Experience</td>
<td>- Perceived Success of Model</td>
<td>- Identified Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meets Partners Needs</td>
<td>- Support for Model</td>
<td>- Value Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Benefits for Members</td>
<td>- Satisfaction with Model</td>
<td>- Side Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Build Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Benefits from Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Long-Term Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Advantages of Working Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sharing a Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M: Comparative Analysis of Partner Class with Respect to the Core Categories, Categories and Sub-categories of the Conceptual Model

Table 1. Comparison of Alliance Partner Types with Respect to the 'Processes/Process Issues' Category of 'Conception'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Driver for Initiation</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Initiation Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Donor       | - Donor strategy/mandate  
- Trigger event  
- New modality  
- Innovation/different approach  
- Focus/core issue  
- National issue  | - Donor  
- Implementer  
- Government  
- CGIAR Centre  | - Request for proposal  
- Submitted proposal  
- Contestable implementation contract  
- Solicited donor  
- Key partners approached donor  
- Convince donor  
- Submitted application for funding |
| Private Sector | - Focus/common issue  
- Opportunity for donor  
- Failure of previous model  
- New modality  
- Mechanism for investment by donor  
- Donor county interests  | - Donor  
- Implementer  
- Key individuals/partners  
- Stakeholders  
- Growers association  | - Convinced donor to invest  
- Donor decision to invest  
- Approach donor  
- Donor interest  
- Meeting of like-minded  
- Request for assistance |
| Government | - Focus/common issue  
- Donor initiative  
- New modality  
- New way of doing things  
- Common purpose  | - Donor  
- Implementer  
- Government  
- CGIAR Centre  
- Core partners  | - Funding proposal  
- Concept proposal  
- Facilitated formation |
| Implementer | - Real change  | - Donor  | - Request for proposal |
### Table 2. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the Core Category of 'Alliance Initiation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Initiator Influence</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Development of Objectives and Strategy</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Establishment, Management and Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor</strong></td>
<td>- <em>Donor agenda</em></td>
<td>- Donor drives strategy</td>
<td>- Donor provides oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Donor model</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor follows up closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Process imposed by donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor policies and rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor closely monitors</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor involved with steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor as funder</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Steering committee as manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Donor as partner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Importance of steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partners establish steering committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td>- Dominance of donor</td>
<td>- Donor dictates objectives</td>
<td>- Donor rules and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Donor power and control</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accountability requirements of donor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Concepts which differ between alliance types are bolded for easier identification*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Elected leadership | - Key individuals elect management group  
- Donor as partner |
| Donor systems    | - Steering committee makes decisions                                             |
| Government       | - Donor drives the bus  
- Donor driven  
- Donor provides direction  
- Partners form steering committee |
|                  | - Donor provides strategic context  
- Steering committee leads strategy and planning |
|                  | - Donor heavily involved  
- Strict processes  
- Donor approval  
- Steering committee makes decisions |
| Implementer      | - Donor framework  
- Donor agenda  
- Alliance designed by donor  
- Core partners influence decisions  
- Partners form steering committee |
|                  | - Donor drives overarching strategy and objectives  
- Steering committee develops strategy |
|                  | - Compliance with donor rules and regulations  
- Targets and timelines set by donor  
- Open forum of partners  
- Steering committee as decision maker |
| Secondary Partners | - Donor preference for model  
- Donor targeted sectors  
- Selected partners form management committee |
|                  | - Management committee develops strategy |
|                  | - Common agreement  
- Active forum  
- Importance of donor experience |
Table 3. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partner's on Board' Sub-Category of 'Initial Interest'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Motivation to Join Alliance</th>
<th>Partner Priorities</th>
<th>Awareness of Alliance</th>
<th>Initial Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Donor        | - Accessing the disadvantaged  
- Government can't solve problem by themselves  
- encourage participation of the private sector  
- Influence government policy  
- enhanced economic growth  
- improved agricultural production  
- poverty alleviation  
- strengthening national networks | - Alternative distribution system  
- Facilitate product registration  
- Consistency of supply  
- Distribution network  
- Enhanced exports  
- Access to markets  
- Volume of supply | - Attractiveness  
- Word has gotten out  
- Interest from the private sector  
- Gaining stakeholder interest | - Approached by specific partners  
- Targeted partners  
- Invited partners  
- Offered to national companies |
| Private Sector | - Working with government  
- Market development  
- Opportunity to influence government  
- Industry-focussed problem  
- Business risk  
- Specialist advice  
- Business development | - Assistance with product registration  
- Commercial opportunity  
- Increased sales  
- Exposure to new markets  
- Commercial expansion  
- Influence supply chains  
- Specialist production  
- Quality assurance  
- Meeting market demand | - Made aware of alliance  
- Interest in joining alliance  
- Interest in alliance model | - Approached partners  
- Approached by donors  
- Chance meeting  
- Approached by implementer  
- Recommendation from former partner  
- Like-minded individuals  
- Introduced through individual |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Commercial leveraging</strong></th>
<th><strong>Seed funding</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CSR</td>
<td>- Business decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access to donor funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can't do big things alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Close technology gap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access to technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engaging with the public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Government</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Share resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Skills/resources/capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stable markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Production issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access to plant material and varieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Market focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Became aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Made aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initial interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Implementer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Influence government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involving the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Obligation to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Importance of business interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Value chain approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initial interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| - Partners invited to join |
| - Identified core partners |
| - Approached donor |
| - Invited key industry people |
| - Invited partners |
| Secondary Partners | Development of new skills | Opportunity to enter new sectors | Problem better solved by an alliance | Partners couldn't solve problem alone | Raise profile with government | Influence government agenda | National approach | Central source of information | Wide geographic spread | Technical assistance/skills/capacity building | Marketing support | Quality control | Support Assistance | Subsidies | Networking | Opportunity to partner with government | Influence government policy | Overcoming technical problems | Broader funding base | Commercial opportunity | Distribution network | Access to additional product | Product promotion | Commercial motivation | Access to free products | Initial interest | Made aware by another partner | - Formal invitation | - Initial meeting | - Approached by core partner | - Approached to join alliance | - Invited to join alliance | - Introductions | - Presentations proposal |
Table 4. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partners on Board' Sub-Category of 'Gaining Support'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Stakeholders/Partner Organisations</th>
<th>Support/Buy-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Supporting other partners</td>
<td>- Enthusiastic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on the private sector</td>
<td>- Commitment of senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private sector engagement</td>
<td>- <strong>Attractiveness to new players</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Achieved buy-in</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Stakeholder buy-in</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Stakeholder interest</td>
<td>- <strong>Agreement with the concept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community support</td>
<td>- Bringing in the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Smallholder focus</td>
<td>- <strong>Buy-in from senior management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Testing the waters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Needs convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bringing institutions together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Capturing the private sector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Government support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Bringing the private sector on board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gaining support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Bringing stakeholders on board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Supported by partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>- Government involvement</td>
<td>- <strong>Partner buy-in</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support of the commercial sector</td>
<td>- Convincing others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bringing partners together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Keeping senior management on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Gaining interest of other potential partners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Selling the concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>- Stakeholder commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partners on Board' Sub-Category of 'Negotiation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Willing to contribute to donor objectives</td>
<td>- Clear about what can be done</td>
<td>- Financial commitment</td>
<td>- Concerns of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What they bring to the table</td>
<td>- Expectation management</td>
<td>- Up front about commitments</td>
<td>- Laying down your cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear about contributions</td>
<td>- Support from other partners</td>
<td>- Level of commitment</td>
<td>- Meeting of the minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Invest resources</td>
<td>- Obligations</td>
<td>- Initial commitment</td>
<td>- Agreed priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contributions to the partnership</td>
<td>- Understanding roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>- Initial commitment</td>
<td>- Gaining agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commitment of funds and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gauging commitment from other partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Differences in partner contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Willing to commit resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Genuine commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreement to join</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Resource contributions</td>
<td>- Expectation management</td>
<td>- Full commitment</td>
<td>Support provided by alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of partners own resources</td>
<td>- Clear on roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>- Long-term commitment</td>
<td>Reaching agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Commit resources</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unequal partner contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreement to form alliance</td>
<td>Common language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribution to the alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Financial commitment</td>
<td>Agreed to work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary partner contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Written commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Physical contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Commitment to alliance objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Resource commitment by partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Partner contributions</td>
<td>- Expectation management</td>
<td>- Local commitment</td>
<td>Reaching agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Implementer                                      | - Defined roles and responsibilities  
|                                                | - Clearly defined functions  
|                                                | - Assigned responsibilities  
|                                                | - Stakeholder commitment  
|                                                | - Commitment by partners  
|                                                | - Resource commitment  
|                                                | - Full commitment  
|                                                | - Funding commitment  
|                                                | - Common understanding  
|                                                | - Gaining agreement  
| Implementer                                    | - Up-front contribution to partners  
|                                                | - Partner contributions  
|                                                | - In-kind contributions  
|                                                | - Counterpart contributions  
|                                                | - Initial contributions  
|                                                | - Active contribution  
|                                                | - Primary responsibility  
|                                                | - Role of Government  
|                                                | - Stakeholder roles and responsibilities  
|                                                | - Role of the private sector  
|                                                | - Agreed commitment  
|                                                | - Partial commitment  
|                                                | - Tangible commitment  
|                                                | - Partner commitment  
|                                                | - Initial commitment  
|                                                | - Commitment of funds and resources  
|                                                | - Varying levels of commitment  
|                                                | - Full commitment  
|                                                | - Scope of work  
|                                                | - Sharing of costs  
|                                                | - Agreed share  
|                                                | - Agreement  
|                                                | - Agreement on deliverables  
|                                                | - Meeting of the minds  
|                                                | - Bargaining position  
|                                                | - Gaining agreement  
| Secondary Partners                             | - Partner contributions  
|                                                | - Individual contributions  
|                                                | - Requested assistance  
|                                                | - Clear about level of support  
|                                                | - Financial limitations  
|                                                | - Time demands  
|                                                | - Commit substantial resources  
|                                                | - Commit funds and resources  
|                                                | - Negotiation with government  
|
Table 6. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partners on Board' Sub-Category of 'The Partners'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Types of Partners</th>
<th>Partner Characteristics</th>
<th>Selection of Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Implementation partners</td>
<td>- Clarity of purpose</td>
<td>- Partner quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community involvement</td>
<td>- Initiative</td>
<td>- Wide range of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Principal partners</strong></td>
<td>- Willing partner</td>
<td>- Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal counterparts</td>
<td>- Experience</td>
<td>- <strong>Experience with Donor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Multiple partners</strong></td>
<td>- Partner strength</td>
<td>- <strong>Technical competence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core partners</td>
<td>- Profile</td>
<td>- Specific partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Wider range of partners</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Open to new partners</strong></td>
<td>- Skills and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- compulsory partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Proven track record</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bias for specific partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Linkages and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Independent agency</td>
<td>- Quality partners</td>
<td>- Partner skills and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Primary partners</td>
<td>- <strong>Values and beliefs</strong></td>
<td>- Partner viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contractors</td>
<td>- Open to new things</td>
<td>- Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Principal partners</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Respect for experience</strong></td>
<td>- Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Foreign partners</td>
<td>- Flexibility</td>
<td>- <strong>Previous experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core partners</td>
<td>- <strong>Ability to adapt</strong></td>
<td>- Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Specific partners</td>
<td>- <strong>Open to new partners</strong></td>
<td>- Company networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Specific skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relevant partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bias for certain partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Natural fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Core partners</td>
<td>- Complementary</td>
<td>- Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Key partners</td>
<td>- Open to new partners</td>
<td>- People you can work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Complementary partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Alignment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Secondary Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Specific partners  
- Stakeholder representation  
- International community | - Secondary partner  
- Implementation partner  
- Core partners  
- National partners  
- Dominant partners  
- Respected partners  
- Key partners |
| - Partner skills and expertise  
- Partner capacity  
- Experience  
- Complete skills set | - Benevolent partner  
- Open to new partners |
| - Strong partner  
- Open to new partners  
- Common language | - Experience  
- Reputation  
- Skills and experience  
- Strength  
- Project management skills  
- Strategic fit with other partners  
- Individual partner capacity  
- Well connected  
- Alignment  
- Broad skills base |
Table 7. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Strategy/Objectives'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Goals/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Strong vision</td>
<td>- Socially-oriented objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment of vision</td>
<td>- Clear on objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment with donor objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Balance partner and alliance goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- National objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Specific planning</td>
<td>- Mutual goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategic planning</td>
<td>- Agreed objectives and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Structure follows objectives</td>
<td>- Common goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shared vision</td>
<td>- Alignment of partner and alliance goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Long-term vision</td>
<td>- Evolution of alliance objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Commercial objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Importance of strategic planning</td>
<td>- Agreed objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives set up front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment with government priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment between alliance and partner objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Government organisational objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Local partner input into alliance objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Changing priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consistent with national priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overarching objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consistent objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Changing focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual identified priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreement on objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Convergence of objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Targeted objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secondary Partners | - **Role in developing strategic plans** | - Changing strategy  
- Partner goals and objectives  
- Government goals and objectives  
- **Strategic fit with alliance goals and objectives**  
- Alignment of goals and objectives  
- **Common goals and objectives**  
- Corporate goals and objectives |

- Government objectives  
- Donor objectives  
- **Fit between partner and alliance objectives**  
- Real objectives  
- Flexible goals and objectives
Table 8. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Principles of Operation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Alliance Model</th>
<th>Alliance Management Operations</th>
<th>Alliance Characteristics</th>
<th>Alliance Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Evolution</td>
<td>- M&amp;E</td>
<td>- Targeted</td>
<td>- Bringing about policy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Several prior iterations</td>
<td>- Systematic process</td>
<td>- Engaged</td>
<td>- Significant investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preursors</td>
<td>- Accountability</td>
<td>- Focus</td>
<td>- Government support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Modified model</td>
<td>- Planning and oversight</td>
<td>- Reach</td>
<td>- Clear messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evolution of model</td>
<td>- Monitor closely</td>
<td>- Risk averse</td>
<td>- Technical feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prior alliance</td>
<td>- Clear communication</td>
<td>- Active participation</td>
<td>- Wide range of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning from earlier partnership</td>
<td>- Reporting</td>
<td>- Problem solving</td>
<td>- Focus on visible things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scaling up</td>
<td>- Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear on activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential to scale up model</td>
<td>- Ground rules</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Leverage off previous success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Model for duplication</td>
<td>- Donor guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Engaging the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Aggressive promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Scaling up</td>
<td>- Networking with other organisations</td>
<td>- Meaningful participation</td>
<td>- Government as partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential for modification of the model</td>
<td>- Integrated planning</td>
<td>- Responsibility</td>
<td>- Stakeholders set direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Model is context</td>
<td>- Consultation</td>
<td>- Project focussed</td>
<td>- Opportunity to plan together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- dealing with conflict</td>
<td>- Uncertainty</td>
<td>- Partners responsible to set direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Evolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Joint decision making</td>
<td>Regional agenda</td>
<td>Communication between implementer and partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing model</td>
<td>- Risk management</td>
<td>- Focussed</td>
<td>- Leveraging off information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partnership evolution</td>
<td>- Compliance</td>
<td>- Targeted</td>
<td>- Consultation with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alliance already in place</td>
<td>- Accountability</td>
<td>- Local market focus</td>
<td>- Support from other partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evolution of alliance</td>
<td>- General principles</td>
<td>- Consideration of other partners</td>
<td>- Synergies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transplant model</td>
<td>- Working together</td>
<td>- New relationships</td>
<td>- Government support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Copy other alliance models</td>
<td>- Ground rules</td>
<td>- Active participation</td>
<td>- Networking with other alliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Problem solving</td>
<td>- Bringing people together</td>
<td>- Bringing in the commercial sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sharing knowledge</td>
<td>- Impacts focussed</td>
<td>- Geographic spread/reach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning organisation</td>
<td>- Learning organisation</td>
<td>- Government buy-in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential for more partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Industry leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Design based on needs</td>
<td>- Consultative</td>
<td>- Focus on the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evolution of model</td>
<td>- Complementary</td>
<td>- Implementation as projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Previous project</td>
<td>- Reach</td>
<td>- Work with implementer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alliance already established</td>
<td>- Stakeholder focussed</td>
<td>- Involvement of government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Redevelopment of model</td>
<td>- Evolving</td>
<td>- Managing partner expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alliance restructure</td>
<td>- Consensus</td>
<td>- Design based on needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Future focus</td>
<td>- Interaction with other partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hope</td>
<td>- Government participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Encourage cooperation</td>
<td>- Harmonisation of systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultation between partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Government oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pulling in the same direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sharing resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementer | - Alliance has previous iterations  
- Evolution of model  
- Replicate model  
- Alliance already up and running  
- Prior phase of alliance  
- Replication of prior model  
- Scaling up of precursors  
- Model evolved  
- Flexible structure | - Honouring commitments  
- Develop networks  
- Honouring agreements  
- Complying with requirements  
- Replicate successful activities  
- Government requirements  
- Annual work plans  
- Maintain records  
- Terminate unsuccessful activities  
- Roles and responsibilities  
- Accountability  
- Monitoring and evaluation | - Valued contributions  
- Partner-oriented program  
- Targeted geographic focus  
- Learning organisation  
- Flexibility  
- Action oriented  
- Adaptable  
- Reactive  
- Progressive  
- Flexible  
- Future focus  
- Visibility  
- Proactive  
- Accessibility  
- Driven | - Implementation at the local level  
- Leverage from existing projects  
- Consistent with local needs  
- Partner capacity building  
- Government agenda  
- Sharing of expertise  
- Alliance in line with mandate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Secondary Partners | - Model already established  
- Evolving structure and governance | - Administrative support  
- Sharing information  
- Coordination  
- Regular meetings | - Good/open communication  
- Focussed  
- Flexibility  
- Responsible | - Carefully designed proposals  
- Working through relationships  
- Partners involved in design  
- Partners involved in implementation  
- Co-management  
- Working directly with the private sector  
- Clear expectations  
- Formal participation  
- Project execution  
- Partner involvement in alliance design  
- Obligations  
- Agreed to work together  
- Making things happen  
- Role of government  
- Trouble shooting  
- Review of progress  
- Implementation through projects  
- Stakeholder representative body |
| - Existing structures | - Clear communication  
  - Sort out issues/concerns  
  - Consultation with partners  
  - Partner capacity building | - Future focus  
  - Evolution  
  - Complicated  
  - Local focus  
  - Regional focus  
  - Culture of respect | - Clear about roles and responsibilities  
  - Partner promotion  
  - Leverage off network  
  - Working with core partners  
  - Acknowledgement of government role  
  - Flexible arrangements  
  - Feedback to core partners  
  - Feedback to implementer  
  - Feedback to alliance  
  - Work together  
  - Contribution to operations  
  - Clear boundaries  
  - Partners involved in management  
  - Participation in administration  
  - Communication with partners  
  - Partners use own management  
  - Partners use own policies  
  - Learning from past mistakes  
  - Regular engagement  
  - Vigorous debate |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Agreement Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Arrangement Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Formal agreements</td>
<td>- Formal donor model</td>
<td>- Formal arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Comparative agreements</td>
<td>- Formal process</td>
<td>- Formal reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cooperation agreements</td>
<td>- Formalised structure</td>
<td>- Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PPP agreement</td>
<td>- Informal structure</td>
<td>- Formality decreased over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-enforceable agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Less formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No formal contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Loose agreements</td>
<td>- No formal structure</td>
<td>- Formal arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal agreement</td>
<td>- Loose organisational structure</td>
<td>- No formal arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical cooperation agreement</td>
<td>- Informal structure</td>
<td>- Unwritten rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Time-based agreement</td>
<td>- Legal structures</td>
<td>- Modify rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexible agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Written rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No official agreement</td>
<td>- No legal structure</td>
<td>- Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuing agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-binding agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Evolution of Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- MoU</td>
<td>- Informal structure at inception</td>
<td>- Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal agreement</td>
<td>- Initially informal structure</td>
<td>- Loose arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No formal agreement</td>
<td>- Concrete organisational structure</td>
<td>- Initially informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal structure</td>
<td>- Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Simple structure</td>
<td>- Formalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Desire for more formal</td>
<td>- Government problems with informality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Desire for formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>Formality evolving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Formal agreements</strong>&lt;br&gt;- MoU&lt;br&gt;- No legal identity&lt;br&gt;- Legal issues</td>
<td>- Informal management structure&lt;br&gt;- <strong>Formal structure</strong></td>
<td>- Formal legal arrangements&lt;br&gt;- Formality of alliance&lt;br&gt;- Informal arrangements&lt;br&gt;- Loose alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Partners</th>
<th>structure</th>
<th>Formality evolving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Formal agreement</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Written agreement&lt;br&gt;- No legal arrangements</td>
<td>- <strong>Formal structure</strong></td>
<td>- Legal arrangements&lt;br&gt;- Formality&lt;br&gt;- Informal arrangements&lt;br&gt;- Loose alliance&lt;br&gt;- Organised but informal&lt;br&gt;- Formal processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Type'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Donor</td>
<td>- Management by implementer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor representative</td>
<td>- Donor-driven approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementer</td>
<td>- Donor as manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Original partners</td>
<td>- Larger growers taking control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core group of partners</td>
<td>- Driver lacks formal power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Larger growers</td>
<td>- Informal power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Steering committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Initiator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Implementer</td>
<td>- Implementer allocates resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government</td>
<td>- Implementer designs programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary leadership</td>
<td>- Implementer involved in details of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor</td>
<td>- Implementer withdrew support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commercial partner</td>
<td>- Implementer sets direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple drivers</td>
<td>- Changes in leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO</td>
<td>- Confusion regarding leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No clear leadership</td>
<td>- Retirement of leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dual leadership</td>
<td>- Evolution of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership evolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Implementer</td>
<td>- Perception that secretariat provides leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government</td>
<td>- Tension between emerging leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CGIAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secretariat as leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointed leader is not real leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rotating chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No official leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>- Donor</td>
<td>- Strong support from implementer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementer</td>
<td>- Implementer makes recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core partner</td>
<td>- Implementer role in managing alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Steering committee</td>
<td>- Acknowledgement of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>- Implementer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>- Core partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Independent secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Program approved by implementer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alliance management by implementer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Leadership Attributes'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Enabler</td>
<td>- Want things done our way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong leadership</td>
<td>- Encourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vision</td>
<td>- Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Passionate</td>
<td>- Tells them what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Confidence</td>
<td>- Aggressive management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supportive</td>
<td>- Leader as back-stopper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Credibility</td>
<td>- Holding alliance together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dominant</td>
<td>- Driving force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Influencer</td>
<td>- Steering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Paternal</td>
<td>- Glue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective</td>
<td>- Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ownership</td>
<td>- Leader lacks formal power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Dynamic</td>
<td>- Sets direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understanding</td>
<td>- Not assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supportive</td>
<td>- Building confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Excite partners</td>
<td>- Motivate partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respect</td>
<td>- Leader fixed on own agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organised</td>
<td>- Micro-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professional</td>
<td>- Leader directs other parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Passionate</td>
<td>- Encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Patient</td>
<td>- Binding force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong Leader</td>
<td>- Leader connects individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Influential</td>
<td>- Leader holds alliance together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visionary</td>
<td>- Dominant individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Helpful</td>
<td>- Pushes things along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Receptive</td>
<td>- Provided direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultative</td>
<td>- Oversight role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supportive</td>
<td>- Firm leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dedicated</td>
<td>- Strong leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focal person</td>
<td>- Keeps the organisation going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vision</td>
<td>- Smooth implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Facilitator</td>
<td>- Encourages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personable</td>
<td>- Draws on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Donor
- Key partners
- Private sector
- Opportunity to change alliance leadership
Weak leadership
- Humble
- Flexible
- Enabler
- Strong motivation
- Ability to get things done
- Good understanding of sector
- Visionary

- Strong motivation
- Ability to get things done
- Good understanding of sector
- Visionary

- Facilitator
- Suggested what to do
- Enabler
- Accommodates requests
- Steering
- Coordination
- Independent broker
- Guides activities
- Encouraging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementer</th>
<th>- Weak leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Humble</td>
<td>- Understand how to make things happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flexible</td>
<td>- Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enabler</td>
<td>- Glue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong motivation</td>
<td>- Drives in the background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ability to get things done</td>
<td>- Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good understanding of sector</td>
<td>- Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visionary</td>
<td>- Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Partners</th>
<th>- Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Straight</td>
<td>- Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Honest broker</td>
<td>- Suggested what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong individual</td>
<td>- Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Passionate</td>
<td>- Accommodates requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Steering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Independent broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Guides activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encouraging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Acceptance/Formality'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Acceptance/Formality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>- Support for leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clearly identified leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trust in leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identified leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Looking for leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Political appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal recognition of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acceptance of formal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Importance of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Performance</td>
<td>- No major issues with leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vote of confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>- Good relationship with leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged driver</td>
<td>- Satisfaction with leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good leader to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Perceived as a good leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Doing a good job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of leadership</td>
<td>- Clear leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accepted leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal recognition of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identified leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Recognized leader&lt;br&gt;- Elected leadership&lt;br&gt;- No appointed leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership well regarded&lt;br&gt;- Identified leader&lt;br&gt;- Importance of leadership&lt;br&gt;- Accepted leader&lt;br&gt;- Leadership elected by stakeholders&lt;br&gt;- Informal leader&lt;br&gt;- Acknowledgement of leadership&lt;br&gt;- Leader is the glue&lt;br&gt;- Appointed leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Satisfaction with leadership&lt;br&gt;- High regard for leadership&lt;br&gt;- Discontent with leadership arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>- Leadership credibility with partners&lt;br&gt;- Appointment of leadership&lt;br&gt;- Acceptance of leadership&lt;br&gt;- Previous leadership&lt;br&gt;- Perceived leader&lt;br&gt;- Informal leadership&lt;br&gt;- Formal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstrated leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Partners</td>
<td>- Acceptance of leadership&lt;br&gt;- Unofficial leadership&lt;br&gt;- Identified leadership&lt;br&gt;- Informal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good relationships with leadership&lt;br&gt;- Happy with leadership&lt;br&gt;- Respect for leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Individual'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual capacity</th>
<th>Word as bond</th>
<th>Personal relationships</th>
<th>Dysfunctional individuals</th>
<th>Individual commitment</th>
<th>Personal issues</th>
<th>Personal agenda</th>
<th>Changes in key individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Range of personalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Good knowledge of target sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowledge of local context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dysfunctional individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individuals passion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dominant individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Negative individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many individuals involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focused individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Driven individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Key individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Partners</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personal agendas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong personalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Persistent individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Organisational'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Organisational Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ethics and principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Issues and Aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Private Sector | - Organisation interests  
- Experience  
- Organisation structure  
- Staff  
- Local representation  
- Organisation resources  
- Size  
- Organisation politics  
- Organisation values  
- Organisation power and influence  
- Organisation stability  
- Partner organisation agendas |
| Government     | - Organisation structure  
- Organisation size  
- Differences in financial capacity  
- Experience  
- Knowledge of government systems  
- Changes in organisation representation  
- Organisation agenda |
| Implementer    | - Difficulties for foreign organisations  
- Staff  
- Size  
- Experience  
- Organisation policy  
- Organisation characteristics  
- Organisation agenda  
- Organisation self-interest  
- Link to organisation core business |
| Secondary Partners | - Experience  
- Staff motivation  
- Organisation internal problems  
- Staff changes  
- Size  
- Unequal power |
Table 15. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Structural'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Structural Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Donor        | - Size  
- Scaling up  
- Changes in staff  
- Changes in management structure  
- Alliance politics  
- Stability of membership  
- Economies of scale |
| Private Sector | - Scale  
- Size and power  
- Critical mass |
| Government   | - Changes in alliance staff  
- Changes in partnership representation  
Stable membership |
| Implementer  | - Budget  
- Geographic spread  
- Corporate memory  
- Critical mass  
- Economies of scale  
- Industry politics |
| Secondary Partners | - Scale of operation  
- Alliance politics |
Table 16. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'External'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Government policy</td>
<td>- Local politics</td>
<td>- Security</td>
<td>- Cultural sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government constraints</td>
<td>- Balance political issues</td>
<td>- Dispersed population</td>
<td>- Cultural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government influence</td>
<td>- Political problems</td>
<td>- Geographic isolation</td>
<td>- Regional differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td>- Political interference</td>
<td>- Operating environment</td>
<td>- Cultural awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government rules and regulations</td>
<td>- Keeping both sides of politics happy</td>
<td>- Local laws and regulations</td>
<td>- Cultural aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government priorities</td>
<td>- Country politics</td>
<td>- Corruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government intervention</td>
<td>- Political influence</td>
<td>- Provincial border issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government corruption</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Country differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Government policy</td>
<td>- Internal politics</td>
<td>- Geographic isolation</td>
<td>Cultural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government regulations and procedures</td>
<td>- Political problems</td>
<td>- External influences</td>
<td>- Cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weak government structures</td>
<td>- Political agenda</td>
<td>- Language difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government requirements</td>
<td>- Political influence</td>
<td>- Remote access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government restrictions</td>
<td>- Political support</td>
<td>- Security issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td>- Local politics</td>
<td>- Corruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Country differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government decision</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Natural forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government power and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Secondary Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government policy</td>
<td>- Government rules and regulations</td>
<td>- policy agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strict Government systems</td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td>- Local government interference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government regulations</td>
<td>- Government mandate</td>
<td>- Government priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td>- Government policies</td>
<td>- Government priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government direction</td>
<td>- Government requirements</td>
<td>- Local government interference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government rules and regulations</td>
<td>- Government influence</td>
<td>- Government priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural factors</td>
<td>- Cultural differences</td>
<td>- Cultural issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accessibility</td>
<td>- Cultural differences</td>
<td>- Cultural issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural issues</td>
<td>- Cultural awareness</td>
<td>- Cultural awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>- Political influence</td>
<td>- Political unrest</td>
<td>- Local politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Political issues</td>
<td>- Political interference/influence</td>
<td>- Political influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>- Corruption</td>
<td>- Factors outside their control</td>
<td>- Geographic isolation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Church influence</td>
<td>- Security issues</td>
<td>- External factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>- Geographic dispersion</td>
<td>- External variables</td>
<td>- Global financial issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Climatic factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>Prior Relationships</td>
<td>Partnership Evolution/Development</td>
<td>Types of Relationships</td>
<td>General Dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Prior relationships - Existing relationships - Previous alliance failed - Precursor project - No previous partner relationship</td>
<td>- Strengthen relationships - Leverage relationships - Establish relationships - New linkages - Cementing relationships - Alliance emerged</td>
<td>- Working relationships - Linking to other partners - Linking to other stakeholders - New relationships - Continuing relationships - Still the best of friends - Linkages - Formalised relationship - Strong relationship - Personal relationships</td>
<td>- Interacting with other partners - Importance of good relationships - Advantages of working with the private sector - Engaged partners - Steep learning curve for new partners - Relationship dynamics - Evolution of strategy - Relationship problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Existing relationships - No prior relationships - Prior alliance - Dynamics of previous relationship - Existing partnership - Advantages of prior relationships - Previous relationship with donor - Previous relationship with implementer - Precursor</td>
<td>- Nurture relationships - Improvements in partnership - Strengthening relationship - Stronger engagement with other partners - Seeking closer relationships - Involvement in future alliances - Renew previous relationships - Formed relationships</td>
<td>- Friendships - Multiple relationships - Individual relationships - No relationships with other partners - Existing positive relationships - Not previously worked together - Long-term association - Personal relationship - Informal relationship - Close friends - Open relationships</td>
<td>- Importance of relationships - Good relationship with Government - Relationship with other partners - Advantages of working with the private sector - Leverage from existing alliances - Knowledge of other partners - Dysfunctional individuals - Parties worked well together - Alliance still establishing - Synergies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Importance of previous</td>
<td>- Building relationships</td>
<td>- Relationship with other</td>
<td>- Importance of relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Secondary Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Prior alliance  
- Importance of previous relationships  
- No prior relationships  
- Previously worked together  
- Long-term previous relationship | - Relationships already established  
- Previous working relationship  
- Prior networks  
- Precursor |
| - Develop relationships  
- Partnership evolution  
- Synergies with other networks | - Alliance evolution |
| - Develop relationships  
- Partnership evolution  
- Synergies with other networks | - Alliance evolution |
| - Other alliances  
- Good government and donor relationships  
- Preferential relationships  
- Relationships still forming  
- Relationships not yet fully developed  
- New relationships  
- Friendships  
- Good friends | - Individual relationships  
- Direct relationship with core partners  
- Broad partnership  
- Personal relationships  
- New relationships |
| - Importance of trust  
- Involved in other alliances  
- Ownership by partner  
- Changes in partner representation | - Established good relationship  
- Importance of relationships  
- All partners involved equally  
- Partnership dynamics  
- Leverage relationships |
Table 18. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Behaviours'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Relationship Behaviours</th>
<th>Relationship Behaviours</th>
<th>Alliance Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Donor             |                         | - Good relationship with stakeholders  
<p>|                   |                         | - Partnership         | - Value partnership | - Trusted        |
|                   |                         | - Close relationship    | - Shared perspectives | - Open           |
|                   |                         | - Working relationship  | - Sense of belonging | - Reputation     |
|                   |                         | - Open relationship     | - Sustainable network | - Goodwill       |
|                   |                         | - Long-term relationship| - United voice     | - Connected      |
|                   |                         | - True partnership      |                         | - Enthusiasm     |
|                   |                         | - Successful alliance  |                         | - Committed      |
| Private Sector    |                         | - Continuing partnership | - True partnership  | - Open           |
|                   |                         | - Ongoing relationships | - Support each other | - Flexible       |
|                   |                         | - Working relationships | - Want to succeed   | - Goodwill       |
|                   |                         | - New partnerships      | - Full participation | - Reputation     |
|                   |                         | - Healthy relationship  | - Working together  | - Trust          |
|                   |                         | - Long-term relationship| - Connects individuals | - Future focus  |
|                   |                         | - Open relationship     |                         | - Sustainability|
|                   |                         | - Partnership          |                         | - Reputation     |
|                   |                         | - Networks             |                         | - Positive engaged |
|                   |                         | - Strategic relationships|                         | - Trust         |
|                   |                         | - Resilient relationships|                         | - Sustainability|
|                   |                         | - Enduring relationships|                         | - Political independence |
| Government        |                         | - Public-private partnership | - Sense of affiliation | - Open minded |
|                   |                         | - Harmonious relationships | - Sense of belonging |                         |
|                   |                         |                          | - Active participation |                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Benefits for Partners</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Model</th>
<th>Alliance Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>- Deeper relationships - Public-private partnership - True partnership</td>
<td>- Partners know each other - Relationship based - Partnership focus - Mutual confidence - Mutual respect - Strong commitment - Sense of loyalty - Working together - True partnership - Sense of belonging - Treated as equals - Respect individuals</td>
<td>- Openness - Future focus - Coherent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Performance'
| Donor | - Advantages for developing country  
- Side benefits for stakeholders  
- Meeting stakeholder needs  
- Delivering to donor expectations  
- Meeting government needs and expectations  
- Benefits for the private sector  
- Government endorsement  
- Added premium to brand  
- Trading off alliance membership  
- Increased market share  
- Donor satisfaction  
- Added value for partners | - Best practice  
- Successful partnership  
- Success in terms of model  
- Model works  
- Satisfaction with model  
- Appropriateness of model  
- Advantages of alliance model | - Recognition by other organisations  
- Government recognition  
- Perceived success  
- Major successes  
- Deliverables  
- Return on investment  
- Example of best practice  
- Accomplishments  
- Meeting objectives  
- Side effects  
- Acknowledgement of alliance  
- Positive perception  
- Official recognition |
|---|---|---|
| Private Sector | - Stakeholder benefits  
- Farmer benefits  
- Relationship extends beyond alliance  
- Commercial benefits  
- New organisational linkages  
- Influence with government  
- Meeting government agenda | - Potential for duplication of model  
- Successful model  
- Satisfaction with model | - Acknowledgement by government  
- Better utilisation of resources  
- Tangible benefits  
- Alliance impacts  
- Continuing alliance  
- Success in terms of meeting objectives  
- Side effects  
- Positive experience  
- Benefits for the poor |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>- Raising the profile of the sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple benefits for stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Government</td>
<td>- Benefits for poor farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- benefits for the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting consumer needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholder benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting government needs and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Benefits to alliance members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting partner objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementer</td>
<td>- Stakeholder benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Business development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting government needs and expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop new networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor country benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary Partners</td>
<td>- Benefits for stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Benefits of alliance membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        | - Positive perceptions |
|                        | - Meeting commitments |
|                        | - Official recognition |
| - Perceived success of model |
| - Good organisational structure |
| - Support for model |
| - Shared success |
| - Side effects |
| - Value add |
| - Acceptance of alliance |
| - Meeting goals and objectives |
| - Perceived success |
| - Recognised as making a useful contribution |
| - Verified success |
| - Improved production |
| - Value add |
| - Side benefits |
| - Improved quality |
| - Success stories |
| - Deliverables |
| - Success in terms of objectives |
| - Official recognition |
| - Growth of alliance |
| - Partial satisfaction with model |
| - Satisfaction with model |
| - Appropriateness of model |
| - Advantages of model |
| - Meeting partner organisation goals and objectives |
| - Meeting government objectives and priorities |
| - Side benefits |
| - Robust model | - Acknowledgement by government  
|               | - Success in terms of outcomes  
|               | - Early benefits  
|               | - Tangible benefits  
|               | - Meeting commitments  
|               | - Impacts |
Table 20. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Dysfunction'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Model Dysfunction</th>
<th>Partner Interactions</th>
<th>Partner Behaviours</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Implementation Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Cumbersome</td>
<td>- Government reluctance to engage with the private sector</td>
<td>- Government concerns working with the private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of human capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Structure not linked to function</td>
<td>- Partners don't take advantage of the alliance</td>
<td>- Resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Withdrawal of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Structure not created to meet goals</td>
<td>- Dysfunction between the private and public sectors</td>
<td>- Conflicts of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dissatisfaction with model</td>
<td>- Competing organisations</td>
<td>- competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Time constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rigid structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Communication issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Market resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Lack of flexibility</td>
<td>- Partners not formally part of alliance</td>
<td>- Divergent views</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Model is regional specific</td>
<td>- Conflicting opinions</td>
<td>- Power and control</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Too geographically dispersed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No concrete model</td>
<td>- Tension between partners</td>
<td>- Government dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td>- In appropriate technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inappropriate model</td>
<td>- Little formal contact with other partners</td>
<td>- Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Too many partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Commercial versus alliance agenda</td>
<td>- Unequal partner influence</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tension between partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tension between partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reliance on government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Clash of personalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of support by organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Adverse publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Withdrawal of finances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Government | - Multiple levels of management  
- Multiple structures  
- Dysfunctional management arrangements | - Lack of stakeholder consultation  
- Lack of influence by government  
- Lack of harmonisation between partners  
- Tension between national and international objectives  
- Competition between partners | - Rumours  
- Assert role  
- Betraying trust  
- Government organisations feel threatened  
- Resistance by government organisations  
- Passive resistance  
- Game playing  
- Power and control  
- Lack of contribution by some partners  
- Information asymmetry  
- Lack of passion  
- Lack of commitment | - Member disunity  
- No formal contract  
- Lack of time to establish  
- Processes not harmonised  
- Private sector left behind  
- Financial constraints  
- Conflicting goals and objectives  
- Partners doing 'own thing'  
- Small membership base  
- No formal control over individuals  
- Tension between appointed leader and donor  
- Tension between alliance and organisation agendas |
| Implementer | - Little interaction between partners | - Tension between government and | - Lack of unity  
- Withdrawal of partners  
- No interest from government |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict between public and private partners</th>
<th>Conflicting role of government</th>
<th>Alliance agendas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Corruption</td>
<td>- Competition between partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conflicting strategies</td>
<td>- Selective information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hidden agendas</td>
<td>- Not fully committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mortal enemies</td>
<td>- Divergent views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vested interest</td>
<td>- Game playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rivalry</td>
<td>- Attempts to influence alliance agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opposing views of partners</td>
<td>- Misuse of alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trying to gain individual benefit</td>
<td>- Disrupt meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overlap</td>
<td>- Limited geographic spread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Partners</th>
<th>Model is context specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No relationship with other partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little contact with other partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Antagonism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frustration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 'Clubs'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dominance by one partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Power and control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partner self-interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lack of government support |
| Process not fully open      |
| Unable to honour contributions |
| Major delays                |
| Lack of supporting infrastructure |
| No organisation representative in country      |
| Lack of delivery             |
| Not meeting commitments     |
| Limited scope of existing program |
| Conflicting recommendations |
| Limited geographic spread   |
APPENDIX N: Comparative Analysis of 'Alliance Type x 'Partner Class' Interactions with Respect to the Core Categories, Categories and Sub-categories of the Conceptual Model

Table 1. Comparison of Alliance Partner Types with Respect to the 'Processes/Process Issues' Category of 'Conception'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Driver for Initiation</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Initiation Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Trigger event</td>
<td>- Donor initiated</td>
<td>- Request for proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus issue</td>
<td>- Initiated by implementer</td>
<td>- Contestable implementation contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Target problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Submitted proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Traditional solutions didn't work</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Solicited donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Looking for new modalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Submitted application for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Convince donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Focus issue</td>
<td>- Initiated by donor</td>
<td>- Concept development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- New modality</td>
<td>- Implementer as initiator</td>
<td>- Formative stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor country interest</td>
<td>- Initiated by partners</td>
<td>- Convinced donor to invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mechanism for investment by donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor decision to invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Approached donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need for new model</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Focus issue</td>
<td>- Donor initiation</td>
<td>- Funding proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor initiative</td>
<td>- Initiated by implementer</td>
<td>- Concept proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- New modality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Different model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Areas of focus</td>
<td>- Areas of focus</td>
<td>- Initiated by donor</td>
<td>- Request for proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementer | - Unique model  
- Common problem  
- Established need  
- Donor interest in PPA concept | - Initiated by core partners | - Specific proposal  
- Bidding process  
- Concept presented to donor  
- New concept |
|---|---|---|---|
| Constrained x Secondary | - Diversification  
- New opportunity  
- Common issue | | |
| Voluntary x Donor | - Common issue  
- National issue  
- New model  
- Different approach  
- Identified need  
- Initiator strategy  
- Initiator mandate | - Donor initiation  
- Government initiation  
- CGIAR as initiator | |
| Voluntary x Private | - Focus issue  
- Driver for partnership  
- Commercial problem  
- Identified problem  
- Failure of previous model | - Initiated by government  
- Grower association as initiator  
- Alliance initiated by stakeholders  
- Initiated by key individuals | - Meeting of potential partners  
- Like-minded individuals  
- Request for assistance |
| Voluntary x Government | - Common issues  
- Priority issues  
- New way of doing things  
- New modalities  
- Common purpose | - Government as initiator  
- CGIAR as initiator  
- Initiated by core partners | - Facilitated formation |
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Response to problem  
- Common issue  
- Focus issue  
- Target problem  
- Core issue | - Multiple initiators  
- Donor as initiator  
- Initiation by core partner  
- Joint initiation | - Core partners establish steering committee |
| Voluntary x Secondary | - Focus issue  
- New way of doing things | - Donor initiated  
- Core group as initiator | - Selected partners form management committee |
Table 2. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the Core Category of 'Alliance Initiation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Initiator Influence</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Development of Objectives and Strategy</th>
<th>Initiator Role in Establishment, Management and Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Donor directs</td>
<td>- Donor drives strategy</td>
<td>- Regular follow-up by donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Processes imposed by donor</td>
<td>- Donor assistance in development of alliance plans</td>
<td>- Donor involved in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor provided oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Follow donor policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Dominance of donor</td>
<td>- Donor dictates objectives</td>
<td>- Donor checks on partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor power and control</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor framework</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accounting requirements of donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Gov</td>
<td>- Donor influence</td>
<td>- Donor provides conceptual aspects</td>
<td>- Donor heavily involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor driving the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Directly responsible to donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor provides direction</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor project approval process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Concepts which differ between alliance types are bolded for easier identification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constrained x Implementer</th>
<th>Constrained x Secondary</th>
<th>Voluntary x Donor</th>
<th>Voluntary x Private</th>
<th>Voluntary x Government</th>
<th>Voluntary x Implementer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Donor provides framework  
  - Initiation as a donor project | - Donor framework  
  - Rigid framework  
  - Compliance with donor rules and regulations  
  - Alliance designed by donor  
  - Donor agenda | - Donor agenda  
  - Donor determines model and structure  
  - Importance of steering committee | - Elected leadership  
  - Establishment of management group  
  - Key individuals | - Planning by management committee  
  - Steering committee makes policy | - Forum of stakeholders  
  - Initial group  
  - Partners as steering committee  
  - Planning by steering |
| - Donor drives overarching objectives  
  - Donor drives strategy  
  - Objectives set by donor | - Compliance with donor rules and regulations  
  - Timelines and targets set by donor  
  - Approval of work plans by donor | - Strategy by steering committee |  | - Management committee sets strategy  
  - Steering committee makes decisions  
  - Management committee  
  - Partner involvement in steering committee | - Steering committee develops strategy  
  - Steering committee as decision maker  
  - Open forum |
| Committee | Voluntary x Secondary | Management Committee Develops Strategy | Recommendations by Management Committee  
Forum to Discuss Ideas  
Active Forum |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
### Table 3. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partner's on Board' Sub-Category of 'Initial Interest'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Motivation to Join Alliance</th>
<th>Partner Priorities</th>
<th>Awareness of Alliance</th>
<th>Initial Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Access for poor people - Developing country support - Private sector participation - New commercial partners - Leverage off donor reputation</td>
<td>- Commercial considerations - Commercial opportunities - Exposure to new markets - Supply chains - Established distribution channels</td>
<td>- Interest in alliance model - Interest in joining - Became aware of alliance</td>
<td>- Approached by specific partners - Targeted partners - Invited partners - Offered to national companies - Partner approached donor - Approached companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Access to technologies - Technical expertise - Working with Government - Influence - CSR/Public good - Can't do alone - Diversification - Close technology gap</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interest from new partners - Attractiveness - Word has gotten out - Interest from the private sector - Gaining stakeholder interest</td>
<td>- Approached by donor - Approached by management committee - Partner approached donor - Recommendation from former alliance partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Share resources - Service delivery - New markets - Access to skills - Broaden skills base</td>
<td>- Engaging the private sector</td>
<td>- Became aware - Made aware - Initial interest</td>
<td>- Approached alliance - Implementer approached partners - Targeted partners - Invited partners - Approached to join</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>Linkages/networks</td>
<td>Commercial focus</td>
<td>Initial interest</td>
<td>Partners invited to join</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional resources</td>
<td>- Strategic business opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Influence</td>
<td>- Importance of business interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involving private sector</td>
<td>- Business decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on poor farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resource base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constrained x Secondary</th>
<th>Source of funds/resources</th>
<th>Commercial opportunity</th>
<th>Initial interest</th>
<th>Approached by core partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Quality control</td>
<td>- Distribution network</td>
<td>- Made aware by another partner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brought on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Skills/expertise/capacity building</td>
<td>- Access to additional products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Subsidies</td>
<td>- Product promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Networking</td>
<td>- Access to free products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary x Donor</th>
<th>Public sector skills and resources</th>
<th>Working with input suppliers</th>
<th>Stakeholder consultation</th>
<th>Open invitation to join</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Leverage investment and resources</td>
<td>- Access to markets</td>
<td>- Consistency of supply</td>
<td>- Partner interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National reach</td>
<td>- Direct relationship with exporters</td>
<td>- Links to market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transfer of technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved productivity and livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary x Private</th>
<th>Logistic support</th>
<th>Commercial opportunity</th>
<th>Heard about alliance</th>
<th>Open invitation to join</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- R&amp;D</td>
<td>- Alternative source of supply</td>
<td>- Awareness through networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technology development</td>
<td>- Marketing/market access</td>
<td>- Became aware of alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access to technology</td>
<td>- Consistency of supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Influence</td>
<td>- Quality assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Critical mass</td>
<td>- Specialist production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engage with the public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharing data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

553
| Voluntary x Government | - New technologies/information  
- Contacts/networks/individuals  
- Technical expertise/capacity  
- Influence  
- Credibility | - Information dissemination  
- Better prices  
- Production issues  
- Access to new technologies | - Initial interest |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Raised profile with government  
- Leverage off private sector  
- Technical skills  
- National approach  
- Wide geographic spread  
- New perspectives | | - Initial interest  
| | | - Invited partners  
- Formal invitation  
- Open meeting  
- Initial meeting |
| Voluntary x Secondary | - Opportunity to partner with government  
- Overcome technical problems  
- Access to research results  
- Industry sustainability  
- Involve private sector  
- Broader funding base | - Commercial opportunity  
- Commercial focus | - Informal discussions |
Table 4. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partners on Board' Sub-Category of 'Gaining Support' 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Stakeholders/Partner Organisations</th>
<th>Support/Buy-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Focus on the private sector</td>
<td>- Attractiveness to new players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private sector engagement</td>
<td>- Achieving buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government on board</td>
<td>- Senior management buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Help identifying stakeholders</td>
<td>- partner buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Stakeholder interest</td>
<td>- Bringing the private sector on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Smallholder focus</td>
<td>- Buy-in from senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support from stakeholders</td>
<td>- Convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government on board</td>
<td>- Seeking support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Help identifying stakeholders</td>
<td>- Bringing institutions together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Invite corporations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Government involvement</td>
<td>- Bringing the partners on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support of the commercial sector</td>
<td>- Gaining support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private sector support</td>
<td>- Bringing the stakeholders on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- Stakeholder commitment</td>
<td>- Consultation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultation with other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Importance of stakeholders</td>
<td>- Partner buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seeking partners</td>
<td>- Support by partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>- Community support</td>
<td>- Selling alliance concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support for alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Private</td>
<td>- Community support</td>
<td>- Buy-in from stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Buy-in from partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gaining support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support of senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increasing stakeholder support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Involvement of key senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Voluntary x Government | managers  
- **Gaining agreement**  
- Bringing the others on board |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Supported by partners  
- **Common understanding**  
- **Initial support** |
|                        | - Convincing others  
- Bringing the partners together  
- Involving senior management  
- **Gaining interest of other potential partners**  
- **Selling the concept**  
- Convincing |
| Voluntary x Secondary  | - Capturing the private sector  
- Involving the private sector |
Table 5. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Bringing the Partners on Board' Sub-Category of 'Negotiation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Scope of work&lt;br&gt;- What they bring to the table&lt;br&gt;- Clear about contributions&lt;br&gt;- Partner inputs</td>
<td>- Obligations&lt;br&gt;- Understanding responsibilities&lt;br&gt;- Expectations&lt;br&gt;- Expectation management</td>
<td>- Partner commitment&lt;br&gt;- Clear about what can be done</td>
<td>- Concerns of stakeholders&lt;br&gt;- Laying down your cards&lt;br&gt;- Discussions&lt;br&gt;- Meeting of the minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Resource contributions&lt;br&gt;- Partner contributions&lt;br&gt;- Use of partners own resources&lt;br&gt;- Unequal partner contributions</td>
<td>- Private sector role&lt;br&gt;- Expectations&lt;br&gt;- Role of government</td>
<td>- Full commitment&lt;br&gt;- Commitment by the private sector</td>
<td>- Private sector perspective&lt;br&gt;- Reaching agreement&lt;br&gt;- Finalise involvement&lt;br&gt;- Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner expectations&lt;br&gt;- Role of government&lt;br&gt;- Defined roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>- Local commitment&lt;br&gt;- Stakeholder commitment</td>
<td>- Common understanding&lt;br&gt;- Reaching agreement&lt;br&gt;- Come to an understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Scope of work&lt;br&gt;- Sharing of costs&lt;br&gt;- Agreed share&lt;br&gt;- Counterpart contributions&lt;br&gt;- Partner investment</td>
<td>- Primary responsibility&lt;br&gt;- Role of government&lt;br&gt;- Stakeholder roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>- Agreed commitments&lt;br&gt;- Partial commitments&lt;br&gt;- Tangible commitments&lt;br&gt;- Partner commitment&lt;br&gt;- Initial commitment</td>
<td>- Agreement&lt;br&gt;- Speak their language&lt;br&gt;- Agreement on deliverables&lt;br&gt;- Meeting of the minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- Partner contributions&lt;br&gt;- Clear about level of support provided</td>
<td>- Financial limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Negotiations with government&lt;br&gt;- Requested assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Voluntary x Donor | - **Limited partner contributions**  
- Contribution to partnership  
- Partner contributions  
- Government support  
- Support of other partners | - Government role  
- Roles of private partners | - **Differences in partner commitment**  
- Gauging commitment of other partners  
- Willing to commit resources  
- No formal commitment  
- Genuine commitment  
- Partner commitment | - **Agreed priorities**  
- Reaching agreement |
| Voluntary x Private | - **Physical contributions**  
- Role of government | - **Fully committed**  
- Long-term commitment  
- Commit resources  
- Additional commitments  
- Commitment to alliance  
- Initial commitment | - Agreement  
- Common language  
- Agreed to work together  
- Government position |
| Voluntary x Government | - Partner contributions  
- **Defined functions**  
- Assigned responsibilities  
- Role of government organisations | - Commitment by partners  
- **Resource commitment**  
- Government commitments  
- Full commitment  
- **Funding commitment** | - **Facilitated negotiation**  
- Reaching agreement |
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Contribution of partners  
- **Active contributions**  
- Role of the private sector | - Commitment of funds and resources  
- Relative levels of commitment  
- Varying levels of commitment  
- Partner commitment  
- Full commitment | - **Working out the detail**  
- Reaching agreement  
- **Bargaining position** |
| Voluntary x Secondary | - **Individual contributions**  
- Partner contributions of the alliance  
- Acknowledgement of contributions | - **Commit substantial resources** |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Types of Partners</th>
<th>Partner Characteristics</th>
<th>Selection of Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Implementation partners</td>
<td>- Partner differences</td>
<td>- Picking the right partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Principal partners</td>
<td>- Willing</td>
<td>- Initial quality of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal counterparts</td>
<td>- Experienced</td>
<td>- Ease of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple partners</td>
<td>- Catalyst</td>
<td>- Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community involvement</td>
<td>- Profile</td>
<td>- Willingness to move into new areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wide range of partners</td>
<td>- Open to new partners</td>
<td>- Track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Key industry players</td>
<td>- Quality of partners</td>
<td>- Due diligence by donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Primary partners</td>
<td>- Values and beliefs</td>
<td>- Credibility/reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Principal partners</td>
<td>- Consistent with organisation values</td>
<td>- Previous relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Foreign partners</td>
<td>- Respect for experience</td>
<td>- Equal importance of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open to new things</td>
<td>- Technical merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to adapt</td>
<td>- International experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Core partners</td>
<td>- Complementary</td>
<td>- Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Key partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- People you can work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Complementary partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Specific partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bias for partner type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Wide range of partners</td>
<td>- Good partners</td>
<td>- Track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Co-operation partners</td>
<td>- Strong partners</td>
<td>- Screening partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementing partners</td>
<td>- Open to new partners</td>
<td>- Experience with individual partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Country counterparts</td>
<td>- Accepting of new partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Voluntary x Private | - Silent partners  
- Core partners  
- Growers as partners  
- Grower representative body  
- Informal alliance partners  
- International partners  
- Appropriate partners  
- Selected partners  
- Relevant partners | - Careful selection of partners  
- Technical capacity  
- Natural fit  
- Reputation  
- Bias for certain partners  
- Complementary partners  
- Additional skills set |  
|---|---|---|  
| Voluntary x Donor | - Compulsory partner  
- Government appointment  
- Grower representative organisations | - Appropriate  
- Represents industry  
- Represents key stakeholders  
- Quality  
- Acceptance of new partners | - Partner balance  
- Partner suitability  
- Partner bias  
- Additional skills sets |  
| Constrained x Secondary | - Secondary partners  
- Implementing partners  
- National partners  
- Benevolent partners | - Partner potential  
- Reputation  
- Non-profit orientation  
- Strategic match  
- Complementary  
- Conscious selection |  
| Voluntary x Government | - Stakeholder representative partner  
- Specific partners  
- International community | - Accepting of other partners | - Complete skills set  
- Bias for certain partners  
- Complementary  
- Private sector linkages |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>- Country partners</th>
<th></th>
<th>- Country partners</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Voluntary x Implementer  | - Technical partner  
- Cross-industry representative  
- Additional partners  
- Core industry players | - Openness to new partners | - Represent major stakeholders  
- Strategic role  
- Experience |                      |
| Voluntary x Secondary    | - New partners  
- Major players  
- Key partners | - Partner strength  
- Dominant partners  
- Open to other partners | - Represents breadth of stakeholders  
- Individual partner capacity  
- Number of partners  
- Well-connected partners  
- Broad skills base |                      |
Table 7. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Strategy/Objectives'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Strategy/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Donor priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment with donor objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shared objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joint objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- <strong>Specific planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Strategic planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Broadening of objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shared objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Objectives set upfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment between alliance and partner objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- <strong>Well structured implementation framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Overarching objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consistent objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutual objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Targeted objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreed objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- <strong>Role in developing strategic plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategic fit with alliance goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consistency between goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alignment of goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>- <strong>National objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor priorities and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Competing objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Common goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Voluntary x Private | - Commercial objectives  
|                      | - Shared objectives  
|                      | - Compatible business objectives  
|                      | - Alignment of goals and objectives  
|                      | - Shared vision  
|                      | - Common goals and objectives  
| Voluntary x Government | - Strategic planning  
|                      | - Strategic review  
|                      | - Changing priorities  
|                      | - Shared objectives  
|                      | - Alignment with partner objectives  
|                      | - Consistent with national priorities  
|                      | - Common goals and objectives  
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Donor goals and objectives  
|                      | - Flexible goals and objectives  
|                      | - Conflicting partner goals and objectives  
|                      | - Partner goals and objectives  
| Voluntary x Secondary | - Common goals and objectives  
|                      | - Partner organisation goals and objectives  
|                      | - Corporate goals and objectives  
|                      | - Donor goals and objectives  

### Table 8. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Principles of Operation'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Alliance Model</th>
<th>Alliance Management Operations</th>
<th>Alliance Characteristics</th>
<th>Alliance Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Evolution &lt;br&gt;- Precursors &lt;br&gt;- Learning from earlier partnerships &lt;br&gt;- Scaling up &lt;br&gt;- Extension of previous model &lt;br&gt;- Model for duplication</td>
<td>- Systematic process &lt;br&gt;- Feasibility studies &lt;br&gt;- Accountability &lt;br&gt;- Planning and oversight &lt;br&gt;- Monitor closely &lt;br&gt;- Donor guidelines &lt;br&gt;- Clear communication &lt;br&gt;- Ground rules &lt;br&gt;- Decision making</td>
<td>- Broad &lt;br&gt;- Flexible &lt;br&gt;- Targeted &lt;br&gt;- Engaged &lt;br&gt;- Learning alliance &lt;br&gt;- Impacts focussed &lt;br&gt;- Open to new ideas &lt;br&gt;- Risk averse</td>
<td>- Regular meeting of stakeholders &lt;br&gt;- Regular consultation &lt;br&gt;- Clear on activities &lt;br&gt;- Engaging the private sector &lt;br&gt;- Ensuring partners follow policies &lt;br&gt;- Proactive approach &lt;br&gt;- Separation of management and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Scaling up &lt;br&gt;- Model is context specific &lt;br&gt;- Existing model &lt;br&gt;- Partnership evolution &lt;br&gt;- Modified structure &lt;br&gt;- Alliance still forming &lt;br&gt;- Transplant model &lt;br&gt;- Potential for larger alliance</td>
<td>- Networking with other organisations &lt;br&gt;- Joint decision making &lt;br&gt;- Learning partners &lt;br&gt;- Working together &lt;br&gt;- Coordination &lt;br&gt;- Liaison &lt;br&gt;- Problem solving &lt;br&gt;- Integration</td>
<td>- Consideration of other partnerships &lt;br&gt;- New relationships &lt;br&gt;- Evolution &lt;br&gt;- Project focussed &lt;br&gt;- Active participation &lt;br&gt;- Flexibility &lt;br&gt;- Impact focussed &lt;br&gt;- Consensus &lt;br&gt;- Equity</td>
<td>- Opportunity to plan together &lt;br&gt;- Working with other stakeholders &lt;br&gt;- Leverage off partnerships &lt;br&gt;- Synergies &lt;br&gt;- Working with new organisations &lt;br&gt;- Learning together &lt;br&gt;- Addressing opportunities &lt;br&gt;- Potential to be more effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Alliance already running &lt;br&gt;- Design based on needs &lt;br&gt;- Evolution of model &lt;br&gt;- Previous project &lt;br&gt;- Alliance still developing</td>
<td>- Defined roles and responsibilities &lt;br&gt;- Consultation with partners &lt;br&gt;- Allocation/management of resources &lt;br&gt;- Systems and processes</td>
<td>- Joint activities &lt;br&gt;- Consultative &lt;br&gt;- Complementary &lt;br&gt;- Reach &lt;br&gt;- Stakeholder focussed &lt;br&gt;- Evolving</td>
<td>- Interaction with partners &lt;br&gt;- Focus on private sector &lt;br&gt;- Government participation &lt;br&gt;- Harmonisation of systems &lt;br&gt;- Consistent with government needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Constrained x Implementer** | - Structure evolved  
- Consultation  
- Problem solving  
- Consensus  
- Future focussed  
- Partners involved in management  
- Consultation  
- Pulling in the same direction | **Constrained x Secondary** | - Replicate model  
- Scale up of precursor  
- Working with other donors  
- Annual working plans  
- Compliance  
- M&E/audits  
- Program execution  
- Partner consultation  
- Accountability  
- Risk management  
- Process management  
- Clear understanding of objectives  
- Reactive  
- Action-oriented  
- Mutual understanding  
- Driven  
- Proactive  
- Value contributions  
- Active participation  
- Focussed  
- Adaptable  
- Carefully designed proposals  
- Working through relationships  
- Resolve political problems  
- Clear expectations  
- Formal participation  
- Implementation framework  
- Rules of engagement  
- Partners involved in design  
- Making things happen  
- Obligations | - Model already established  
- Evolving structure and governance  
- Sharing information  
- Learning  
- Regular meetings  
- Clear communication  
- Partner capacity building  
- Coordination  
- Conflict resolution  
- Consultation with partners  
- Open communication  
- Focussed  
- Flexibility  
- Responsible  
- Future focus  
- Evolution  
- Local focus  
- Regional focus  
- Implementation through projects  
- Clear about roles and responsibilities  
- Ongoing role in management decision making  
- Clear boundaries  
- Communication with partners  
- Input into partnership  
- Active participation | - Modify model  
- Evolution of structure  
- Setting ground rules  
- Expectation management  
- Coordination  
- Decision making  
- Links partners  
- Problems solving  
- Collaboration  
- Transparency  
- Consensus  
- Active participation  
- Outcomes focus  
- Priority focus  
- Project driven  
- Regional focus  
- Implementation through working groups  
- Exerting influence  
- Representative on steering committee | - Voluntary x Donor |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary x Private</th>
<th>Voluntary x Government</th>
<th>Voluntary x Implementer</th>
<th>Voluntary x Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Recognition of the limitations of the structure  
  - Alliances structure developed  
  - Modified structure | - Development of model  
  - Alliance restructure | - Flexible structure  
  - Alliance evolved | - Implementation by members  
  - Communication between partners |
| - Scaling up  
  - Impacts focussed  
  - Active participation  
  - Management by partners  
  - Harmonisation  
  - Align groups  
  - Manage stakeholders  
  - Conflict management | - Annual working plans  
  - Consultative forum  
  - Planning  
  - Coordination  
  - Regular meetings  
  - Discuss issues and concerns  
  - Rules and regulations | - Avoiding conflict  
  - Dealing with conflict  
  - Addressing problems  
  - Consultation  
  - Working together  
  - Trouble shooting  
  - Governance  
  - Ground rules | - Implementation of activities by partners  
  - Partners implement activities |
| - Discussing everything  
  - Problem solving | - Open communication  
  - Constant communication  
  - Participation  
  - Long-term view  
  - Learning from others  
  - Active membership | - Client focussed  
  - Empowered  
  - Focus response  
  - Action focus | - Leveraging off networks  
  - Partner role in planning  
  - Participation by partners  
  - Board of trustees  
  - Active participation  
  - Joint problem solving |
| - Management committee elected by stakeholders  
  - Getting to know each other  
  - Communication between partners  
  - Partners involved in management  
  - Governance arrangements evolving | - Management committee elected by stakeholders  
  - Getting to know each other  
  - Communication between partners  
  - Partners involved in management  
  - Governance arrangements evolving | - Partner role in alliance strategic direction  
  - Getting others involved  
  - Joint decision making  
  - Working together  
  - Building the alliance  
  - Honouring commitment  
  - Forum to discuss ideas  
  - Managing individual agendas  
  - Involving all parties | - Management committee elected by stakeholders  
  - Getting to know each other  
  - Communication between partners  
  - Partners involved in management  
  - Governance arrangements evolving |
| - Administrative structures  
  - Common activities  
  - Governance  
  - Learning | - Agreed position  
  - Very active | - Communication with stakeholders  
  - Active participation  
  - Agreed responses  
  - Vigorous debate |
Table 9. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Sorting Out the Detail' Sub-Category of 'Formality'  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Agreements</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Formal agreements</td>
<td>- Formal donor model</td>
<td>- Formal arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Cooperation agreements</strong></td>
<td>- Formal structure</td>
<td>- Formal reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Legal agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal procurement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Joint agreements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PPP agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Written agreements</td>
<td>- No formal structure</td>
<td>- Loose arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal agreements</td>
<td>- <strong>Loose organisation structure</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Unwritten rules</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Time-based agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuing agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- <strong>MoU</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Informal structure at inception</strong></td>
<td>- Loose arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Legal Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Formalisation evolved</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Formal agreement between donor and government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- <strong>Alliance rules and guidelines</strong></td>
<td>- Informal management structure</td>
<td>- Legal arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- Formal agreements</td>
<td>- Informal arrangements</td>
<td>- Lack of formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Written agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>- <strong>Non-enforceable agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formality decreased over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No formal contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x</td>
<td>- Legal agreements</td>
<td>- Loose operating structure</td>
<td>- Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Voluntary x Government</td>
<td>Voluntary x Implementer</td>
<td>Voluntary x Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | - Non-binding agreements  
                           - Informal agreements | - Initially formal structure  
                           - Simple structure  
                           - Formal structure | - Formal structure  
                           - Loose alliance  
                           - Organised but informal |
|                         | - Contracts still being developed | - Legal issues  
                           - Informal agreement  
                           - No legal agreement |                     |
|                         |                         |                         | - Government issues with informality  
                           - Desire for more formal structure  
                           - Formality evolving  
                           - Formality of alliance  
                           - Informal alliance  
                           - Loose alliance |
Table 10. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Type'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Constrained x Donor  | - Donor representative as leadership  
                      - Donor as leadership  
                      - Implementer as leadership | - Management by Implementer  
                      - Donor-driven approach  
                      - Donor as manager |
| Constrained x Private| - Implementer as leadership  
                      - Government as leader  
                      - Secondary leadership  
                      - Donor as leadership  
                      - Commercial partner as leader  
                      - Multiple drivers | - Implementer allocates resources  
                      - Implementer designs programs  
                      - Implementer assisted private partners  
                      - Changes in leadership |
| Constrained x Government| - Implementer provides leadership  
                          - Government provides leadership | - Implementer as operations manager |
| Constrained x Implementer | - Donor as leadership  
                           - Implementer as leadership | - Strong support from implementer  
                           - Implementer as alliance management  
                           - Implementer determines activities |
| Constrained x Secondary| - Implementer as leadership  
                          - Leadership provided by core partner | - Program approved by implementer  
                          - Directed by leadership  
                          - Implementer established structure  
                          - Management by implementer |
| Voluntary x Donor    | - Core partners as leadership  
                         - Donor as leader  
                         - Larger growers take a leadership role  
                         - Government leadership | - Changes in management  
                         - Leader lacks formal power |
| Voluntary x Private  | - Government as leader  
                         - No clear leadership  
                         - Dual leadership  
                         - Informal leadership  
                         - Individuals as leaders  
                         - Public sector as leader | - Leadership evolved  
                         - Confusion regarding leadership |
| Voluntary x Government| - Government as leader  
                         - CGIAR as leader | - Appointed leader is not real leader |
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Secretariat as leader  
- No official head of alliance  
- Core partners as leaders  
- Informal leadership | - Tension between emerging leaders |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Voluntary x Secondary  | - Donor as leader  
- Core partners as leaders | - Role of implementer |
|                        | - Government leader  
- Donor as leader  
- Key partners as leadership  
- Private sector as leadership  
- Implementer as leadership | - Opportunity to change leadership |

Table 11. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Leadership Attributes'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Leadership Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Passionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Excites partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Passionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Receptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x</td>
<td>- Humble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>- Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to do things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good understanding of sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x</td>
<td>- Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Private</td>
<td>Strong leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Government</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Implementer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Secondary</td>
<td>Strong individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Leadership' Category of 'Acceptance/Formality'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Personalities, - Philosophy and beliefs, - Moral perspective, - Confidence, - Negative individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x - Credibility</td>
<td>- Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>- Appointed manager, - Clearly identified leadership, - Identified individual leader, - Formal recognition of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Private</td>
<td>- Recognised leader, - Accepted leader, - Elected leadership, - Appointed leadership, - Made good impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Government</td>
<td>- Accepted leaders, - Elected leader, - Acknowledgement of leader, - Discontent with leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Implementer</td>
<td>- Appointment of leadership, - Acceptance of leadership, - Acknowledgement of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Secondary</td>
<td>- Identified leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Individual'**
| Government | - Knowledge of sector  
| - Knowledge of local context |

| Constrained x Implementer | - Influence of individual  
| - Negative influence  
| - Strong individuals  
| - Focus  
| - Driven individuals |

| Constrained x Secondary | - Personal agendas  
| - Strong personalities  
| - Persistent individuals |

| Voluntary x Donor | - Personalities  
| - Dysfunctional individuals  
| - Strong individuals  
| - Experience  
| - Dominant individuals  
| - Education |

| Voluntary x Private | - Dysfunctional individuals  
| - Commitment  
| - Personalities  
| - Personal issues  
| - Personal agendas |

| Voluntary x Government | - Dysfunctional individuals  
| - Dominant individuals  
| - Personalities |

| Voluntary x Implementer | - Commitment  
| - Individual agendas |

| Voluntary x Secondary | - Strong individuals  
| - Commitment |

**Table 14. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Organisational'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Organisational Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Constrained x Donor      | - Experience  
| - Own plans  
| - Ethics and principles  
| - Organisational structure  
| - Partner size |
| Constrained x Private    | - Own interests  
| - Experience  
| - Staff issues  
| - Size  
<p>| - Organisation politics |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Partner Type</th>
<th>Structural Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Power and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Organisation structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Financial capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowledge of government systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- Staff issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>- Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Private</td>
<td>- Lack of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Government</td>
<td>- Organisation agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Implementer</td>
<td>- Staff issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisation agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Self interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Secondary</td>
<td>- Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Power and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'Structural'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Donor               | - Substantial investment  
                        - Scaling up  
                        - Staff issues  
                        - Size  
                        - Management structure |
| Constrained x Private | - Bureaucracy  
                        - Scale  
                        - Size and power  
                        - Critical mass |
| Constrained x Government | - Power and control  
                        - Power dynamics |
| Constrained x Implementer | - Geographic spread  
                        - Budget/funding  
                        - Critical mass  
                        - Economies of scale |
| Constrained x Secondary | - Scale of operations |
| Voluntary x Donor | - Size  
                        - Stability of membership  
                        - Critical mass  
                        - Economies of scale |
| Voluntary x Private | - Critical mass  
                        - Scale |
| Voluntary x Government | - Changes in staff  
                        - Changes in partner representation  
                        - Stability |
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Internal politics |
| Voluntary x Secondary | - Internal politics |
Table 16. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Modifier' Category of 'External'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Government constraints</td>
<td>- Local politics</td>
<td>- Security concerns</td>
<td>- Cultural sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td>- Balance political issues</td>
<td>- Dispersed population</td>
<td>- Cultural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic isolation</td>
<td>- Socially sensitive issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government corruption</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Operating environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Government policy</td>
<td>- Internal politics</td>
<td>- External influences</td>
<td>- Cultural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government regulations and procedures</td>
<td>- Political problems</td>
<td>- Language difficulties</td>
<td>- Cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Country differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Country challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Government systems</td>
<td>- Political differences</td>
<td>- Corruption</td>
<td>- Cultural factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Church influence</td>
<td>- Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic dispersion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Government rules and regulations</td>
<td>- Political unrest</td>
<td>- Factors outside their control</td>
<td>- Cultural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td>- Political influence</td>
<td>- Security issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government mandate</td>
<td>- Political interference</td>
<td>- Conflict areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government policies</td>
<td>- Policy issues</td>
<td>- Climatic factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic isolation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- Government agenda</td>
<td>- Political influence</td>
<td>- External factors</td>
<td>- Socially sensitive issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local government</td>
<td>- Local politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interference</td>
<td>- Global financial issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Voluntary x Donor   | - Government regulations  
- Government agenda  
- Government policies  
- Government intervention  
- Government capacity | - Political infighting  
- Political problems  
- Political interference  
- Keeping both sides of politics happy | - Geographic issues  
- Country differences  
- External factors | - Cultural sensitivity  
- Cultural awareness  
- Cultural aspects |
| Voluntary x Private | - Government agenda  
- Government rules and regulations  
- Government power and influence | - Political influence  
- Political agenda  
- Political support  
- Local politics | - Geographic isolation  
- Natural forces |                     |
| Voluntary x Government | - Government regulations | - Political influence  
- Political issues | | - Cultural issues  
- Cultural differences  
- Country differences  
- Cultural awareness |
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Government regulations  
- Government agenda  
- Government influence  
- Government policy | - Political issues  
- Political influence | - External influence | - Cultural differences  
- Cultural issues |
| Voluntary x Secondary | - Government priorities | | | |
Table 17. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationship' Category of 'Relationship Dynamics'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Prior Relationships</th>
<th>Partnership Evolution/Development</th>
<th>Types of Relationships</th>
<th>General Dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Prior relationships - Existing relationships</td>
<td>- Strengthen relationships - Leverage relationships - Establishing partnerships - New linkages</td>
<td>- Linking to other partners - Relationship with government - Continuing relationship - Still good friends - New networks</td>
<td>- Interacting with other partners - Compatibility between partners - Engaging other partners - Relationship enhanced by alliance - Working with the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Previous relationship with donor - Previous relationship with Implementer - Prior relationships - Existing partnerships</td>
<td>- Nurturing - Relationship developed - Partnership evolution - Strengthen Relationship</td>
<td>- Friendships - Not previously worked together - Long-term association - Personal - New</td>
<td>- Working with other partners - Changes to alliance - Leveraging from existing alliance - Alliance still establishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Previous relationship - Not previously worked together</td>
<td>- Building relationships</td>
<td>- Relationship with other partners - Relationship still forming - New relationships</td>
<td>- Importance of relationships - Importance of trust - Involved in other alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Previous alliance - Previously worked together - Long-term prior relationship</td>
<td>- Cultivate relationship - Relationship developed - Strengthen existing relationship - Partnership evolution</td>
<td>- Alliances with business community - Broaden relationships - Relationships with government - Multinational alliance</td>
<td>- Aggressive about partnerships - Working in partnership - Leverage off partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- Previous working relationship</td>
<td>- Indirect - Direct</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Established good relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>Voluntary x Private</td>
<td>Voluntary x Government</td>
<td>Voluntary x Implementer</td>
<td>Voluntary x Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relationship already established</td>
<td>- Previous relationship - Preceding project - Previous alliance failed - No previous relationships</td>
<td>- Development of relationship - Cementing relationships - Alliance emerged - Developed friendships</td>
<td>- Formalised - Good relationship with government - Business relationships - Clustering - Personal</td>
<td>- Alliance stimulated by prior projects - Alliance verses individuals - Relationship problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Previous relationship</td>
<td>- Seeking closer relationships - Developing new relationships - Involvement in future alliances - Renew previous relationships</td>
<td>- Development of relationships - Partnership evolution</td>
<td>- New relationship - Friendships - personal relationships - New Linkages</td>
<td>- Importance of relationships - Ownership by partners - Partnership focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No previous relationship - Established relationship - Alliance already established - Precursor - Experience working together</td>
<td>- No previous relationship</td>
<td>- Building relationships - New relationship - Alliance growth - Evolution of alliance - Development of relationships</td>
<td>- Relationship with private sector - Active - Cohesive - Close - Personal</td>
<td>- Misuse of relationship - Importance of relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Precursors</td>
<td>- Precursor - Previous relationship - Previous project</td>
<td>- Alliance evolution</td>
<td>- Broad partnership - Equal partners - Personal relationships - New relationship</td>
<td>- Accepted by other partners - Perception of equity - Leverage relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Behaviours'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Alliance Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Good relationship - Partnership - Working together - Open relationship - True partnership</td>
<td>- Sustainability - Future focus - Shared perspectives - Dedication - Resilience - Trust</td>
<td>- Enthusiasm - Connected - Good partners - Committed - Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- True partnership - Continuing - Ongoing - Working - Open</td>
<td>- Open - Not true partnership - Strategic - Reputation - Enduring - Dedicated</td>
<td>- Value relationships - Respect each other - Building trust - Long-term cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x</td>
<td>- Good relationships</td>
<td>- Partnership</td>
<td>- Voluntary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secondary | - True partnership  
- Working together | - Synergies  
- Mutual support  
- Partners need each other | - Accepted as a true partner |
|---|---|---|
| Voluntary x Donor | - Balance  
- Alliance stimulated by prior project  
- Relationship problems | - True partnership  
- Friendship | - Ownership  
- Sense of belonging  
- True partnership  
- Empowered  
- Output driven  
- Priority focussed |
| Voluntary x Private | - Stakeholder loyalty | - Future focus  
- Based on personalities  
- Full participation  
- Enthusiasm | |
| Voluntary x Government | | - Sense of affiliation  
- Active participation  
- Openness  
- Cooperation | - Good cooperation  
- Political independence |
| Voluntary x Implementer | | - Consensus  
- Sense of belonging  
- Respect individuals  
- True partnership  
- Ownership | |
| Voluntary x Secondary | | - Sense of belonging  
- True partnership  
- Empowering  
- Ownership  
- Open door | |
Table 19. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Performance'  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Benefits for Partners</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Model</th>
<th>Alliance Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Side benefits</td>
<td>- Best practice</td>
<td>- Donor satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advantages for developing countries</td>
<td>- Successful partnership</td>
<td>- beyond expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Delivering to donor expectations</td>
<td>- Success in terms of model</td>
<td>- Return on investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribution to donor objectives</td>
<td>- Model works</td>
<td>- Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting stakeholder needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Value add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Business expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Meeting stakeholders objectives</td>
<td>- Potential for duplication</td>
<td>- Good experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relationship extends beyond alliance</td>
<td>- Perceived success in terms of model</td>
<td>- Longevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Profitability</td>
<td>- Satisfaction with model</td>
<td>- Tangible benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Raised profile</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commercial benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overtake competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Influence with government</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Side benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td>- Stakeholder benefits</td>
<td>- Perceived success of model</td>
<td>- Achieving objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting government needs and priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Addressing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Smallholder benefits</td>
<td>- Satisfaction with model</td>
<td>- Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting donor objectives</td>
<td>- Success of existing model</td>
<td>- Success in meeting objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recognition of alliance by donor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Verified success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Donor country benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Value add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recognition by government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Official recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Constrained x Secondary | - Partially meets stakeholder needs  
Meeting partner objectives | - Partial satisfaction with model  
Satisfaction with model  
Perceived success in terms of model | - Mutual benefits  
Side benefits |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Voluntary x Donor       | - Meeting stakeholder needs  
Added value for partners  
Government relationship working well | - Appropriateness of model  
Success of model | - Positive experience  
Perceived success  
Perceived lack of success  
Practical outputs  
Side benefits  
Learning experience  
Impacts  
Value add to investment |
| Voluntary x Private     | - Sustainable solutions for stakeholders  
Benefits for farmers  
Good experience for commercial partners  
Multiple benefits for farmers | - Perceived success of model | - Meeting objectives  
Partially successful  
Advantages of working together  
Profitability  
Long-term solutions  
Side benefits  
Government recognition  
Growth |
| Voluntary x Government  | - Benefits for poor farmers  
Meeting stakeholder expectations  
Facilitated negotiation with exporters  
Satisfaction with membership | - Good organisational structure  
Satisfaction with model  
Perceived success of model | - Perceived success  
Meeting objectives  
Learning  
Shared success  
Side effects |
| Voluntary x Implementer | - Meeting stakeholder needs  
Benefiting individual | - Suitability of model  
Success in terms of model  
Perceived success of model | - Recognition by government  
Meeting objectives  
Growth of alliance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>organisations</th>
<th>- Appropriate model</th>
<th>- Joint success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Perceived success of model</td>
<td>- Acknowledgement by government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appropriateness of model</td>
<td>- Success in terms of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Success in terms of model</td>
<td>- Not yet successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Secondary</td>
<td>- Advantages of model</td>
<td>- Tangible benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Robust model</td>
<td>- Meeting commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Deliverables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20. Comparison of Alliance Partner Type with Respect to the 'Alliance Relationships' Category of 'Relationship Dysfunction'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Model Dysfunction</th>
<th>Partner Interactions</th>
<th>Partner Behaviours</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Implementation Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Donor</td>
<td>- Cumbersome</td>
<td>- Government reluctance to engage with the private sector - Partners don't take advantage of alliance</td>
<td>- Conflict - Aggression - Focus on negatives - Scepticism</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dysfunction between private and public sector - Lack of human capacity - Problems of access - Bureaucracy - Withdrawal of resources - Time constraints - Lack of coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Private</td>
<td>- Lack of flexibility - Rigid model - Model is regional specific - Failure of previous model</td>
<td>- Partners not formally part of alliance - Lack of government collaboration - Government organisation dysfunction</td>
<td>- Power and control - Discrediting alliance - Frustration - Pushing own ideas - Competition - Conflicts of interest - Clash of personalities - Game playing</td>
<td>- Lack of cohesion</td>
<td>- No standard approach - Government interference - Delays - Confusion - Tension between partners - Poaching of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of understanding - Disconnect between donor and government priorities - Private sector neglected</td>
<td>- Conflict - Lack of trust - Lack of control by government partner - Power and control</td>
<td>- Member disunity</td>
<td>- Lack of consultation - Lack of harmonisation - Lack of time to establish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Implementer</td>
<td>- Dissatisfaction with model</td>
<td>- Little interaction between partners</td>
<td>- Disappointment - Corruption</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of supporting infrastructure - Processes not totally pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Type</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained x Secondary</td>
<td>- No relationship with other partners - Lack of government support</td>
<td>- Lack of motivation</td>
<td>- Partner internal dysfunction - Unmet needs of stakeholders - Technical limitations - Limited input of partners into decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Donor</td>
<td>- Rigid structure - Structure not linked to function - Dissatisfaction with model</td>
<td>- Disappointment - Polarisation - Frustration - Lack of support - Dominance - Competing agendas - Uneven power and influence - Personality clashes</td>
<td>- Bottlenecks - Inappropriate technologies - Too many partners - Changing membership - Tension between provincial and national objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Private</td>
<td>- Instability</td>
<td>- Dissatisfaction - Frustration - Concerns - Power and control - Conflict - Competition - Selective sharing of information - Partners dominance</td>
<td>- Information confidentiality - Management dysfunction - Exploitation by contractors - Bureaucracy - Lack of coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Government</td>
<td>- Multiple levels of management - Multiple structures - Dysfunctional</td>
<td>- Tension between national and international agendas - Competition</td>
<td>- Conflicting goals and objectives - Lack of contribution by some partners - Dysfunction between country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Management Arrangements</td>
<td>Between Partners</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Implementer</td>
<td>Lack of understanding by government, Resistance by government</td>
<td>Difficulty getting coverage, Conflict between public and private partners, Tension between various agendas, Conflicting role of government, Frustration, Game playing, Competition, Conflicts of interest, Power and dynamics, Hidden agendas, Opposing views, Attempt to influence alliance agenda</td>
<td>Lack of cohesion, Competing programs, Limited geographic spread, Conflicting recommendations, Competing programs, Alliance dysfunction, Duplication, Disruption of meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary x Secondary</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>- Disappointment, Antagonism, Frustration, Perceived dominance by one partner, Unequal power, Self interest, 'Clubs'</td>
<td>Tension with other programs, Uncoordinated, Lack of leadership, Disparate activities, Disconnect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>