

3 Collaboration Between NGOs and Businesses

Since the beginning of the 1990's there has been a gradual emergence of collaborative inter-organisational relationships between business and NGOs. These relationships have been aimed at creating change in business operations and strategy and delivering improvements to a range of broadly defined environmental and social causes. Some early and notable examples of collaboration between business and NGOs include the relationship between McDonalds and the Environmental Defense Fund working on waste reduction in the restaurant's operations between 1990 and 1991, between General Motors and the Commission for Environmentally Responsible Economies, Greenpeace working with a German fridge manufacturer on ozone-safe refrigerator technology in 1992-3 (Stafford, Polonsky, & Hartman, 2000) and the WWF-UK connecting with the UK wood product trade (Murphy & Bendell, 1997). The majority of such initiatives have focused on issues of environmental concern, however, partnerships between business and development/human rights NGOs have also emerged. Early on in Sialkot in Pakistan, a number of local NGOs co-ordinated with Save the Children Fund (UK) and UNICEF to change the employment practices of football manufacturers in the region. Although it is not the case that all business-NGO relationships have become collaborative, Bendell and Sullivan suggest that these examples "represent(s) a new form of partnership between business and charities, one that is concerned with the environmental performance of the internal operations of the business partners" (1996: 4).

In this chapter I begin an exploration of these novel forms of inter-organisational relational practice in the context of the sustainability agenda. I do so, first, by describing an interacting set of phenomenon that might be seen as factors that have enabled these relationships to emerge at the present time. The discourses of sustainability and globalisation are framed as the environmental backgrounds against which organisations from both sectors have increasingly come together. They have done so to confront and influence the changing challenges and issues with which they are presented. These might be conceived as a range of push and pull factors that have opened up the collaborative window. After this exposition I go on to consider how these relationships have been framed and understood in academic literature. I first use the simple delineation of Wood and Gray (1991) in conceiving of relational practice in terms of pre-conditions, processes and outcomes to describe the various perspectives taken in the literature. I then go on to explore this literature in a more critical light by suggesting that, like much other writing concerned with organisations/business and sustainability, the literature on NGO-business relationships emanates from rather limited notion of relational practice. I

suggest, following Srikantia and Bilmoria (1997), that this may be creating a problematic isomorphism between theory and practice.

Until this point I have talked about both sectors - NGO and business - as unified wholes. Clearly, this is not the case and there is considerable diversity of origin and form within the sectors. I have restricted my reference to NGOs as those not-for-profit organisations that have a specific concern with environmental and human development issues. Whilst this includes grassroots-based and local civil society organisations it excludes, as Bendell points out (2000c), those organisations who are working specifically towards economic purposes in the marketplace or political power in the electoral process as well as not-for-profit groups who do not have specific environmental or social objectives. Rather than sticking to any strict categorisation of NGOs, I will make promiscuous use of a range of ways in which NGOs have been placed within this broad congregation - for example North and South; development, environment and human rights; activist/campaigns and service providers etc. Like much else in our postmodern world, the boundaries between these “types” of NGOs are becoming increasingly blurred. Some of this fuzziness is, to be sure, a result of the interaction with the economic marketplace and some of it is a result of “talking” about rather than “doing”. However, the ways in which our understanding of these organisations is punctuated is important and will reflect the meaning we take from any analysis. So it will not do to merely label the NGO sector as an homogenous whole and be done with it since we run the risk of reifying a rainbow coalition of organisations and activities. With regards to business, I have focused quite heavily upon multinational and transnational corporations; similar problems of territory, scope and definition can be encountered and should be allowed for here. As with my working of NGOs categorisation it will hopefully become clear, as I work with these open frames, why I have chosen to do so.

3.1 Enabling Factors

Prior to the emergence of collaborative relationships the pattern of interaction between organisations from the two sectors could, rather unambiguously, be classified as either philanthropic or adversarial. In the case of philanthropic relationships, where businesses donated money or services (generally to development NGOs, concerned with relief and welfare assistance), NGOs were not particularly concerned about the effects of business practice in the context of their (NGO’s) aims and objectives. The emergence of more definitive anti-business and confrontational stances by environmental groups (ENGOs) during the 1960s and 1970s contrasted with the largely docile approach taken by development NGOs. Similarly, businesses

have not been particularly concerned with the impact of NGOs upon operations or strategy. Instead they have sought wherever possible to magnify cordial relationships or dampen down adversarial ones in line with public relations potentials. However, a number of movements at the macro, institutional and societal level and micro issues at the organisational and personal level have meant that the field upon which these relations are played out has changed dramatically; expectations, perceptions and realities have shifted and mutated. The response from the innovative, the brave, the new and, perhaps most of all, the precariously-positioned within both sectors has been a closer look at the opportunities offered in working with the “other”. As Murphy and Bendell (1997) have reasoned a number of changes in the social environment have affected the “social realities” of businesses and NGOs such that some have come together to forge collaborative efforts.

In the following section I explore some of the factors that have lead to the emergence of collaboration between NGOs and businesses. In doing so I seek to outline the context in which to understand these engagements. More specifically, I suggest that a system change movement associated with sustainability and NGO activity, increasing global interdependencies and the importance of relationality and signification in organisations, have together fostered an environment in which these collaborations have emerged. The various (often interpenetrating) discourses and practices from these phenomena should be considered in terms of their confluence in shaping present social realities, rather than in terms of a readily definable linear path or route taken to this point.

3.1.1 The changing nature of NGO activity

As suggested above NGOs and business have traditionally related either philanthropically or adversarially. One of the most significant factors in the emergence of collaborative relationships has been the changing experiences and understandings of organisations and individuals in the NGO sector, as some have moved from traditionally defined activities into a mode of being concerned with social systems and structures.

This transition has been mapped by Korten in his definition of three co-existent generations of NGO programme strategies (1987), subsequently expanded to four (Korten, 1990) and, then again, with the potential emergence of a fifth NGO “type” (de Senillosa, 1998). While Korten and de Senillosa focus upon development NGOs (NGDOs) it seems that environmental NGOs (ENGOs) might also be located within such a family grouping and I have accordingly adapted Korten’s framework in the following exploration. The tendency in the sustainability

agenda to bring together numerous interacting domains of ecology, development and human rights and social justice has given NGOs an institutional language for talking about their work, outside of traditionally defined straight-jackets, that is more commensurate with the messiness and complexity of real world issues and problems. We can see this in the way that a large number of NGOs have, rather eloquently, been able to integrate sustainability's various languages; for example, human rights and environment (ND-HERO Niger Delta Human and Environmental Rights), environment and development (Global Witness) (see Fabig & Boele, 1999).

First generation NGOs are defined by a focus upon relief and welfare, where the orientation is logistical management for mitigating against the immediate impacts of disaster. The limitations of this first type of activity became apparent when NGOs noticed that the immediacy of calls for disaster relief failed to contribute to meeting people's needs on a sustained basis. Thus, during the 1970s, NGOs began to undertake community development projects in, for example, preventative health or improved farming practices. The organisational focus was on project management such that would enable community self-help initiatives to flourish beyond the period of assistance. NGOs in this generation could be considered as those working for conservation projects in local areas (Murphy, 1996). Like the second generation NGOs, NGOs in this group do not

“by definition attempt to address the causes of the inadequacy of other service providers or the larger institutional policy context of the NGO's own activities. The scope is limited to individual villages or neighbourhoods and to the specific local groups the NGO is assisting” (Korten, 1987: 148).

Since the 1980s a large section of the NGO community has re-examined its basic strategies with the realisation that acting on their own they cannot hope to benefit more than a few favoured locales and that self-reliant local initiatives were only likely to be sustained if local public and private organisations were linked into a wider support system (Korten, 1987). What has emerged for NGOs is the realisation that, whilst these other strategies remain important, they must try to “build outwards from concrete innovations at grass-roots level to connect with the forces that influence patterns of poverty, prejudice and violence: exclusionary economics, discriminatory politics, selfish and violent personal behaviour, and the capture of knowledge and ideas by elites” (Edwards, Hulme, & Wallace, 1999). Thus, this shift in focus has led Northern-based NGOs to work in partnership with Southern-based NGOs. The arrangements

have tended to be divided to some extent along lines of lobbying and protest in the North and empowerment in the South (de Senillosa, 1998).

This shift represents the move from development-as-delivery to development-as-leverage (Edwards et al., 1999) through which NGOs have emerged as “new global players” (Morss, 1991) in an “associational revolution” (Fisher, 1997). Always already working upon “a particular vision of the society they wish to develop” (Fisher, 1997), the emergence of a range of, at once, exciting and anxiety-ridden globalisations has meant that the third generation NGO, most generally based in Northern countries, has found itself working strategically in a catalytic role. Here the NGO is “directing its attention to facilitating development by other organisations, both public and private, of the capacities, linkages and commitments required to address designated needs on a sustained basis” (Korten, 1987).

In the shift to fourth and fifth generations, the emphasis upon catalysis directed towards state actors in North and South (Bebbington & Farrington, 1993; Lewis, 1998; Fowler, 1997) and NGOs in the South is being supplemented with NGO action within and upon the more amorphous sphere of “transnational social movements”. In these movements for social change “mobilized groups” are “engaged in sustained contentious interaction with powerholders in which at least one state is either a target or a participant” (Tarrow, 2000 ; see also de Senillosa, 1998; Ford, 1997; Williams & Ford, 1999). It is this shift into third, fourth and fifth generation strategies, in the context of transnational movements for social change, that has been an important enabling factor for opening up an organisational remit within NGOs to work with businesses and other powerful actors.

Taking Tarrow’s definition of transnational social movement we realise that to conflate NGOs with these broader social movements in civil society would be a reductionist mistake. It could elevate the status and importance of NGOs to being considered as equivalent to a movement for sustainable development. For any “movement” there are a likely to be a family of “mobilised groups”, from grass-roots advocacy collectives, community-based organisations and large NGOs to far more ephemeral non- or dis-organised groups. In the case of sustainability, as a movement, the activities of a range of groups, actors and networks have developed into a vortex-like movement, in which form, structure and activity are at once distinct and indistinguishable.

For some (and this includes, but importantly goes beyond, the domain of the academic) all NGOs are by definition unable to contribute to any kind of anti-systemic mobilisation,

represent a neo-colonial force for subjugating the “other” through Western definitions of development, or exist simply as a “*modus vivendi*” in precarious job market (see for example Ulvia, 2000; de Senillosa, 1998; Wolfson, 1996). IN such instances their contribution to ecological and social emancipation for the sustainability movement will always tend towards the first-order eco-developmental and global management type initiatives discussed in chapter 2. Despite not knowing where NGOs sit in this whirling confusion, what we might say is that a range of NGOs (both North and South, development and environment) are tending towards a mode of being which is contributing - positively or negatively - to “a very broad, diverse, and unpredictable social movement for structural change on both the political and social levels” (de Senillosa, 1998: 40).¹

3.1.2 Globalisations and corporate resource

The approach to the NGO sector that I have proposed is to an extent predicated upon their relationship to civil society in the context of a range of “global interdependencies” (Tarrow, 2000) or globalisations. In referring to “global interdependencies” Tarrow is picking up upon a realisation that a catch-all use of “globalisation” has increasingly rendered the term vacuous. The term has been variously applied to “economic links between producers, workers and consumers across borders, to political changes that have emerged since the end of the Cold War; to transnational spread of resources and networks” (Tarrow, 2000) and to the globalisation and homogenisation of cultural norms and to an existence as “a technology driven fact” (Edwards et al., 1999). Whilst in section 3.1.1 my reference point for interdependencies was with the cultural networks within global civil society, in this section I refer more specifically to economic and political interdependencies that have enabled NGO-business collaboration (remembering, all the while, that this is the neatly drawn map not the territory that I am working with)². In this way I seek to explore the associational ties that latter generation NGOs have also developed with the market.

For Newell, economic globalisation signifies an intensified period of economic activity that reaches everywhere and presents the neoliberal Washington consensus to everyone as *the*

¹ This is a significant and important discussion and my intention here is not to marginalise or sideline the argument that NGOs are potentially non-starters when it comes to system transformation for sustainability. As I suggest to some extent this discussion is beyond the confines of purely academic argument and thus not entirely suitable for discussion in a “literature chapter”; to this end I return to the discussion in chapter 11. My point here is to suggest that the contribution of NGOs to the sustainability movement, negative or positive, is a real one and therefore I set out a place from which we can begin exploring the challenges towards understanding and perhaps rendering it more positive than negative.

² My distinction between global civil society and political and economic globalisations maps to some extent upon a three-way placement of organised sectors - non-government, state, market (Fowler, 1997), which, although useful, is by no means uncontested in theory nor “validated” by practice.

paradigm of economic governance (2000). Judge echoes and goes beyond this sentiment suggesting that it can be seen as a “fair weather” belief system reliant upon economic growth” (Judge, 2001). The consensus - economic growth, free trade and withdrawal of government intervention - has been most recently drawn upon by the UN, manifested in the development of the “Global Compact” with business.³

In developing a hyped-panacea status for Northern industrial governments, the phenomenon has opened the doors to a “competition war” across state boundaries, as governments seek to attract the economic growth and associated political approval that is suggested to come from free trade. These wars have essentially been premised upon attracting multinational capital and technology by reducing the barriers to entry and operation. The deregulation of investment criteria has been accompanied by a shift in environmental policy instruments towards the use of voluntary codes that rely upon co-operation within industry sectors (Newell, 2000). The result has been the imposition of limits upon the ability of individual governments to retain control over national, economic, monetary and fiscal policies (Washington, 1996).

The process of economic globalisation has been accompanied by the increased concentration, through knowledge and capital agglomeration, of resources and economic power amongst the world’s largest corporations. As one of the plethora of figures attesting to this, Rural Advancement Foundation International notes that of the largest corporations 200 control 28% of global economic activity and 1000 control 80% of the world’s industrial output. (cited in Judge, 2001). So, while the states have been trying to roll out the best red carpet for the corporate sector, the relative level of power of governments, as a group, has been markedly reduced. It is thus that economic globalisation has come to be seen as a threat to democracy (Rodrik, 1997; Korten, 1990, 2000).

As multinationals companies have become peers of state actors, the increasing visibility of this concentration in corporate wealth and muscle has not gone unnoticed in the emerging consciousness of a global civil society. As suggested above, NGOs have had a history of corporate engagement, generally focused upon attempts to check the power of individual companies or to tap into the market to fund core service-provision activities. However, the increased visibility of corporate influence has arguably helped to foster the emergence of latter

³ John Ruggie, Assistant Secretary General of UN suggests that the UN does not reject globalisation since “the world needs open markets...they provide the *only* hope of putting billions of poor people in the developing countries out of abject poverty”, although he adds, “this view has nothing to do with the Washington consensus and it is not an endorsement of laissez-faire economics...[nor] *unfettered* growth nor the commodification of everything under the sun” (2000, first italics in original, second italics mine).

generation NGO strategies concerned with system catalysis by focusing the sector more clearly upon the effects of industrial power upon their traditionally defined core constituencies, whether they be disempowered local communities in developing countries or endangered habitats. For Greenpeace, the impact of corporations relative to governments was impossible to ignore in the context of their ozone layer campaign; while 100 countries discussed the protection of the ozone layer, just 12 companies produced the gases that destroyed it (Rose, 1996).

Newell suggests that two specific developments were important in drawing the attention of NGOs (particularly environmental ones) towards the corporate sector. Firstly, the ineffectiveness of environmental institutions following the outputs of both the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) and the Rio+5 evaluations in 1997 caused disillusionment among NGOs. Secondly, the failure of states to regulate TNCs combined to increase the desire among NGOs to affect the global political environment (Newell, 2000). The increasing environmental and social impact of a concentrated number of organisations against the decreasing ability and desire of governments to counter balance this influence created an awareness of a governance gap (Bendell, 2000a) and a general unsettling in the NGO belly at the level of corporate control.

Perhaps some of the most jarring wake-up calls have been in the influence of corporations upon information provision through classroom education and the mass media. In what seems like a practical mapping of Lukes' third dimension of power (1974), corporations have increasingly taken a seat inside classrooms (see for example Bourque, 1995). In addition to the concern over classroom advertising for increasing educational budgets, instances of business influence upon curricula is a reality. For example, Citigroup Bank supports initiatives to "improve the teaching about information technology, in part based on the bank's need to increase usage of electronic banking systems, which are much less costly than in-branch banking" (Waddell, 2000:197).

Whatever the cause "it is now obvious to many NGO activists that most of the world's resources are owned by the private sector" (Phillips, 2000); and this refers not only to economic resource but also to knowledge (often indigenous and matriarchal) resources (Shiva, 1989; Edwards et al., 1999). In addition to these global concerns the control over local resources by multinational companies has also been regarded as a threat to the ability of local communities to enact communal values towards sustainability (Tisdell, 1997). Thus, the corporate threat to sustainability has come into clearer focus for many NGOs. However, while

some NGOs have confronted the corporate hegemony with respect to the promotion of unfettered-growth models of development with increasing aggression, the power of the market has in some areas been positively framed as an opportunity to leverage influence.

We might conceptualise the market as affording NGOs two levers to contribute to their objectives:

- i) engaging with the marketplace to fund traditionally-defined NGO activities and
- ii) engaging with the marketplace to influence the behaviour and thinking of the corporate sector.

As Bendell (2000a) suggests both of these forms of relating to the market (and hence business enterprises) can be considered along a scale from adversarial to co-operative. We could say that traditional philanthropy is an attempt by NGOs to tap into the marketplace to fund first- and second-generation NGO activity. However, the range of activities of both early and latter generation NGOs that have been fostered by this awareness of the market tend to take up more ambiguous positions along the scale from adversarial to co-operative. For example, the promotion of retail trading is increasingly seen as viable strategy for NGOs to work within the market (Wise & Penney, 2000); one might conceive of this as engaging with the marketplace to seek funding for other NGO activity, however with the development of “ethical” and “fair” trade products these moves might also be considered as competitive engagement within the market in order to influence behaviour and thinking (Edwards et al., 1999). Similarly, the emergence of micro-finance in development practice emanates from a recognition that micro-enterprise holds the key for many of the disadvantaged individuals and groups in the South. We also have the direct collaboration between NGOs and businesses, in which the NGO seeks to change corporate practices and behaviour. The difference between these three examples and traditionally defined philanthropy is in the attitude of the NGO with regard to the market; with philanthropy, economic activity is seen as an intermediary resource and business a marginal actor that can contribute towards core NGO activities - a kind of “derived demand” upon the private sector. In contrast the other two examples show the market and business actors as part of the problem or solution to which the NGO is orienting.

The institutional catalysis project of latter generation NGOs has now come to include taking the message of sustainability and impacts of neo-liberal economic globalisation to the corporate sector in order to create change in their behaviour and thinking. The relevance of this leveraging or “taking to scale” (Gaventa, 1993) has developed as a result of at least two other patterns in organisational theory and practice concerning relationality and signification.

3.1.3 Relationality in organisations in a postmodern and information-rich society

In a parallel to the associational revolution of NGOs, there has also been a gradual reconsideration of the “island” notion of business, as expounded most clearly by the Theory of the Firm and enacted, perhaps most memorably, in the Fordist project of corporate control. This reconsideration seems to have opened up the legitimacy and value for business to develop collaborative relationships with NGOs.

In the history of management theory Cyert and March’s Behavioural Theory of the Firm broke the theoretical consensus of separating an organisation from its relationships with the “other”. Their theory suggested that choices in the firm were seen as a function of behavioural decision making and learning amongst an internal organisational coalition of members (1963). However, the Behavioural Theory still regarded the external environment as a generalised input into the firm. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) helped to transform this notion of the “environment” of business as an immutable or given context for their operations. As they suggested, organisations were constituted by their dependence upon extra-organisational resources and thus were very much a function of this environment.

As an almost inevitable corollary there has been a realisation that the external environment could be influenced by businesses themselves; clearly this was not the birth of a new practice, but perhaps theory catching up with the real world. For example, Mitroff forwarded a stakeholder concept of the organisation (1983). He elaborated upon research in a number of fields from the work of Neumann into systems to Jungian archetypes, in order to propose “that the mind of the individual [organisation] and the culture of the surrounding social environment are so constantly intertwined, so intimately bound up with one another that it is virtually impossible to say with any great precision where one begins and the other leaves off” and that therefore the modern organisation was affected by and affected a range of stakeholders (Mitroff, 1983: 3). Mitroff divided stakeholders - the constituent elements of a purposeful system - into external stakeholders in society and internal stakeholders of the individual organisational psyche and reasoned that there seemed to be “no end to the number of stakeholders, internal or external that the modern institution must *deal with*.” (Mitroff, 1983, italics mine). New institutional economic theory in the form of transaction cost economics as forwarded by Williamson (1975) also made a significant contribution to this emerging paradigm of relationality in business and inter-organisational theory.

In parallel to these important texts, the relational practices of certain, mainly Japanese, manufacturing firms during the 1980s informed multinational business that they were inextricably linked with internal organisational coalitions, such as employees, and with other businesses and organisations. In order to respond to cost pressures the initial response was very much characterised by the modernist orientation towards control, drawing upon the metaphor of “dealing with” the competitive forces and power of suppliers and distributors (Porter, 1985), with the injunction that, for example, “purchasing become supply chain *management* (Kraljic, 1983, italics mine). However, with increased awareness of mutual dependence, mutual destiny and the recognition “that no business is an island” (Hakansson & Snehota, 1989), practices of *managing* and *dealing* with employees, suppliers and distributors developed into processes of collaboration and partnership with these internal and external stakeholders (Cousins, 1995). The most prominent early examples of this new orientation towards partnership came in the highly competitive and power-dependent supply and distributor locus of the automotive industry (Faye, Mellor, Kaveli, Roth, & Shah, 1997). Increasingly, during the 1980s and 1990s, businesses were told, by both theory and practice, to move away from adversarial dyadic supplier and distributor relationships towards partnership and then beyond into networks of strategic alliances for inter-organisational learning (Ford, 1997; Eisler, 1996; Hakansson & Snehota, 1995; Kanter, 1989; Lamming, 1992)

The growing importance of relationship for business during the 1980s and 1990s and the “associational revolution” in NGOs during a similar timeframe seem to reflect a movement away from an attitude of independence towards a sense of “shared destiny” (Lamming, 1992) and inter-dependence. Postmodern organisation theorists (Gergen, 1992; Boje, Gephart, & Thatchenkery, 1996) and stakeholder theorists (Calton & Kurland, 1996) have sought to develop Mitroff’s classic insight that “an organisation may be thought of as the entire set of relationships it has with itself and its stakeholders” (Mitroff, 1983: 22). Their work has taken steps towards defining and working with the idea of the relational organisation.

3.1.4 Signification and power

As suggested above, economic globalisation has led to the concentration of economic resource and power in the hands of a small number of large multinational corporations. In their search to maximise shareholder value from sales growth, multinational companies have tapped into the development of brand identity as a way of attracting and retaining consumer interest, loyalty and dollars and in erecting another barrier to entry. However, at the same time as

becoming an important asset for the large multinationals brand identity has also brought about challenges and problems.

The importance of reputation and brand identification to multinational corporate wealth is huge and is growing. Gilmore cites a survey by Greig Middleton and Co. that found that in some corporate buyouts goodwill payments for the top brands have exceeded 60% of book value; for example, Nestle was willing to pay some five times the book value for Rowntree (Gilmore, 1997). According to other research undertaken at Columbia University in the USA, in some sectors around one-third of shareholder value is accounted for by company reputation (Coates 1998 cited in Bendell & Lake, 2000: 236). Another study by the Centre for European Policy Studies found that in 1995 before the e-commerce revolution intangible assets were beginning to outstrip book assets by a growing margin (Wheeler & Elkington, 2001).

The potential downside of these brands as symbols and warehouses of acceptability, image, referent authority and ultimately economic value is that the associative power can be destructive as well as constructive. As the flip side of positive brand association-purchase couplet is a negative association and non-purchase relationship. The consumption decision of the individual (particularly middle class Westerner) for the majority of goods and services can be altered relatively instantaneously and the cognitive dissonance post-purchase can be considerable, all the while not necessarily grounded in readily identifiable rational criteria (see for example Vance Packard's significant early exploration of the power of brands 1957). In the light of a number of significant examples - such as Union Carbide in Bhopal, Exxon with the Valdez oil spill and Shell's problems in South Africa, Nigeria and the North Sea - multinationals have come to realise that as well as offering them short cuts to repeat custom through associative positive imagery their brands can also become contested and denigrated sites of value. They have thus begun to pay attention to these threats (Zadek, 1999; Klein, 2000).

What has been quickly realised is that the disasters and activities of the companies in those instances were not sufficient in their own right to cause the companies problems; as Bendell and Lake suggest NGOs and other organisations were required to act as vectors of this information and translate such into threats to reputation (2000). Additionally, it has required, simply, that enough of the purchasing public care about these issues and feel that their choice can make a difference. The advent of the consumer as activist, located in the affluent middle-classes of the Western world (Gabriel & Lang, 1995; Klein, 2000), is a trend that NGOs are increasingly trying to feed into as a way of "building constituencies for international co-

operation as a prerequisite for the success of global regimes, new forms of governance, and the sacrifices required to alter global patterns of consumption and trade” (Edwards et al., 1999).

Bendell (1998; 2000a) associates the coming together of these phenomenon to the development of a citizen’s cane, a process in which “civil regulation” (Zadek, 1999) has come to fill the vacuum left by state deregulation. This stick is based upon the power of the consumer and the threatened loss of “reputational capital”, market share and ultimately shareholder confidence and relates to the search for legitimacy or the avoidance of being rendered illegitimate. Multinational companies now have to gain their “licence to operate” from more than just government and shareholders as other stakeholders have entered the fray (Rodgers, 2000).

In order to maintain these licences to operate there have been attempts at a pre-emptive construction of business as good citizen. To achieve this perception of “corporate social performance” (Waddock & Graves, 1997) the “opinions of the leading social movements have become part of the corporate risk profile” (Goodman, 1998; see also Phillips, 2000; Waddell, 2000). Whilst there remains considerable debate about the extent to which the environment (ecological) and community *should* be considered as stakeholders and the validity of stakeholder capitalism, corporations have begun to engage in a range of strategies for integrating the opinions concerning sustainable development and “society” into their practices. The difficulty for companies is tapping into this amorphous, shifting mass of opinion that is civil society consciousness and that determines what tests must be passed to receive the “licence”. NGOs seem to offer companies one shortcut in getting closer to consumer and citizen opinion; and some NGOs have realised that they hold such potential influence.

3.2 What collaboration?

The discussion until this point has focused upon general conditions that have opened up the window for collaboration and guided/forced NGOs and business to look at each other. In this section I seek to add some depth to our understanding of the variety of and complexity in such relationships by tracing the ways in which they have been punctuated in the literature. This will allow me to return to my discussion about change, this time in the context of such relational practice.

I would like to start my exploration using Gray and Wood’s simple distinction between pre-conditions, process and outcome in their exploration of the literature concerning inter-sector,

inter-organisational problem solving (Gray, 1985; Wood & Gray, 1991). Immediately I do this I notice that there is a definitional deficit here for, whilst I have come to associate “inter-sectoral problem solving relationships” with business-NGO collaboration, I have not introduced you to this term. In fact there are a whole range of other terms which I have come to associate with the relational practices that I am exploring, including:

- a special form of collaboration involving *strategic bridging* organisations “that span the social gaps among organisations and constituencies to enable co-ordinated action” (Westley & Vrendenburg, 1991; see also Sharma, Vrendenburg, & Westley, 1994);
- *environmental alliances* with “corporations joining forces with environmentalists...to enhance their environmental images” according to a strategy of market-based environmentalism (Stafford, 1998; see also Hemphill, 1994; Lober, 1997; Milne, Iyer, & Gooding-Williams, 1996);
- *stakeholder partnership building* that allows the management of social risk (Andriof, 2000);
- *strategic alliances* between profit maximising and welfare maximising firms (Augustine, 2000);
- *environmental partnerships* as “voluntary, jointly defined activities and decision making processes among corporate, non-profit and agency organisations that aim to improve environmental quality or natural resource utilization”(Long & Arnold, 1995)
- and Wood and Gray’s *domain-level inter-organisational collaborative alliances* as strategies for organisations across sectors to cope with turbulent environments and complexities (Gray, 1985).

In addition to these various “formal” definitions we might find a range of less academic titles informative of the relational practices (or at least informative of perceptions surrounding the practices) - strange bedfellows (Hemphill, 1994), thinking partners (Murphy & Coleman, 2000) or sleeping with the enemy (Bendell & Sullivan, 1996).

3.2.1 Preconditions process and outcomes

There is much difference as well as much commonality associated with these various terms of collaboration. Later on, in section 3.4 I offer an epistemologically-minded critique of the literature that I have covered. For now I explore my reading of the literature in terms of the kinds of activities engaged in during collaboration, attempts to understand the preconditions to relationship and the outcomes of collaboration.

Outcomes

Taking this last first, Murphy and Bendell (1996) suggest that businesses are likely to collaborate with NGOs for one of three effects: process, project or product. A “process orientation” develops internal management processes such as policy on environmental issues or the use of child labour. A second effect upon business concerns an orientation towards specific “projects”, such as the work between Unilever and WWF International in the development of the Marine Stewardship Council as a way of enabling the maintenance of fish harvests (Fowler & Heap, 2000). This contrasts with a focus upon “specific products” in which, for example Greenpeace worked with Foron in Germany to develop an environmentally improved refrigerator (Stafford et al., 2000). Similarly, Waddell suggests that relationships can address a range of corporate goals from risk management and reduction, cost reduction and productivity gains, new product development, supply chain and human resource initiatives to building “barriers to entry through distinction” and fostering “change and creativity support” (Waddell, 1999).

Stafford and Hartman, conducting a content analysis of documents published on environmentalist-business partnership, create a six-level typing of relationship. Simpler relationships involve “licensing”, “corporate sponsorships” and “product endorsements”. “Task force collaboration” involves the proposal of economically feasible environmental solutions, such as MacDonaldis Waste Reduction Task Force. “Green public policy alliances” occur where environmental group(s) and business(es) collaborate to study, propose and lobby for market-based-environmentalism government policies” (Stafford, 1998), for example, General Motors’ work with EDF on Mobile Emissions Reduction Credit (Hemphill, 1994). Finally, “green-systems alliances” occur when there is collaboration to “*implement* economically feasible environmental solutions” (Stafford, 1998, italics in original).

Amongst all of these categorisations there is a huge spectrum of diversity in these various initiatives ranging from everyday operational concerns of supply and production, to managerial concerns of resource allocation and considerations of strategy and direction.

Preconditions

Given this diversity of effects the pre-conditions to partnership formation are likely to be numerous as well. As explored above in section 3.1 a number of aspects in the general “environment” that surrounds these organisations has enabled the formation of a window of opportunity for collaboration. Focusing more specifically upon individual relationships

Milliman et al (1994) propose that NGOs and businesses will possess certain organisational characteristics if they are to enter and successfully engage in these relationships. They suggest the adaptability of the organisations is an important starting point.

With respect to NGOs, consultants at SustainAbility characterise them in terms of their partnership potential according to two sets of traits - firstly, whether the NGO seeks to integrate the role of business in achieving environmental goals and secondly, whether the NGO discriminates between companies within an industry (SustainAbility, 1996; Elkington & Fennell, 1998); Elkington and Fennell have created a typology of four NGO types (dolphins, sharks, orcas and sealions) in terms of these traits of engagement. Similarly, Bendell locates NGOs across four arenas with respect to their position on a grid of engagement "style" (confrontational or collaborative) against "market orientation" (outside or inside).

Others have looked at the types of business to assess their suitability and tendencies for engagement. Businesses have been considered along the lines of the size of company, industry sector, the concentration ratio (both horizontal and vertical) in the industry, and as intimated earlier, the degree of importance and visibility to the consumer public. Elkington and Fennell develop a two-by-two matrix typology of businesses with respect to the type of engagement with society according to whether they are closed or open to dialogue and whether they are oriented towards being part of the solution for sustainability or remain part of the problem (1998). Fineman suggests that companies with environmentally hazardous production or negative environmental history have been found to be more aware of the role and legitimacy of stakeholders and, hence, of the potential for collaborative relationships (1996).

At the partnership level analysis (as opposed to organisation-level) Long and Arnold (1995) contrast a number of analytical frameworks for environmental partnerships, ranging from an approach based on activity areas to a game theory and negotiation approach. They suggest an overarching typology of precursors to partnership based on the level of conflict and core relevance to the parties. Stafford and Hartman suggest that a matrix of internal-external and political-economic considerations are likely to affect the antecedents to partnership (1998). For example, they suggest that the internal polity concerning the power base of champions is affected by external polity and economy in terms of attitudes towards tax reform and technology use for environmental protection (Stafford, 1998).

Process

In an early review of 13 articles about collaborative inter-sector relationships, Gray and Wood suggest that the process of collaboration is the area given least attention, and most often left as a “black box” (Wood & Gray, 1991); although the selected articles cover a range of theoretical standpoints, from resource dependence to microeconomics and political theory, very few attempt to deal with the interaction between participants once the preconditions of collaboration have been met. Hood et al (1993) added that while the process phase had not been addressed the analysis of environmental and organisational factors, such as commitment of top managers and perceived interdependence, had been well studied. Although Long and Arnold (1995) suggested a process approach by forwarding the “Partnership Life Cycle” comprised of three stages - initiation, execution and closure, in 1997 researchers in the area were still making similar calls: “important next questions to answer are how does the actual process of environmental collaboration work and what type of outcome does it produce”(Lober, 1997: 21).

“Process” has also been conceived in terms of a progression from protest to partnership - a conception which frames the issue at a higher level as a kind of meta-process. This has been mapped in terms of the movement of individual organisations, of particular relationship dyads as well as networks of relationships at the domain level. The examples of Greenpeace, Shell and tropical deforestation are particularly informative and resonant. Greenpeace has traditionally held an anti-business stance and protest orientation (Stafford et al., 2000). However, during the 1990s it has increasingly sought to engage in strategic change efforts with business; its protests with Shell over Brent Spar and Monsanto with respect to Genetically Modified Organisms contrast with the collaborative stance taken towards Foron Household Appliances in Germany, with whom they developed a more environmentally sound refrigerator (Stafford et al., 2000). Similarly, Shell has visibly moved from a rejectionist stance of NGOs and engagement with civil society into an active pattern of engagement with a range of NGOs; its experience with Brent Spar was initiated by protest and eventually moved into partnership as it ended up working with the Environment Council to facilitate discussion with stakeholders over disposal of the platform (Murphy & Coleman, 2000; Neale, 1997). A similar transition in relationship has been discerned with respect to the issue of tropical deforestation in which the initial interaction of protest and activism moved towards a form of relating with a collaborative, solutions-orientation; in this domain level example the participants involved changed as the process moved from protest to partnership (Bendell & Murphy, 2000; Murphy & Bendell, 1997). So here we have examples of two organisations and of a larger domain that previously experienced adversarial relationships and have now moved towards collaborative arrangements.

3.3 Process, Process, Process

Some commentators have recognised the fundamental importance of the continued presence and threat of protest to the viability of NGO-business collaboration (Fabig & Boele, 1999; Bendell, 1998; Phillips, 2000). In the above examples both Shell and the issue of tropical deforestation are currently subject to activist campaigns, while Greenpeace still engages in protest against corporate actors. These commentators reflect upon activist concerns about the co-optation. This threat can be considered at two interacting levels. The first is a concern that a specific NGO may well become subject to forces from which it was previously separated and come under the influence of the imperatives of the business sector or subject to “NGO capture” (Rodgers, 2000). This perception is linked to a second, wider concern over the co-optation of the “movement”, as defined as mobilisation for system change. The partnering organisations may be challenged by others who attempt to “hold the line” for their effect upon endangering the “movement” (Elkington & Fennell, 1998).

In this way we are brought back to my earlier discussion of first-order and second-order changes in the context of sustainability. The position of these “radicals”, characterised in terms of second-order change efforts, concerns the fundamental transformation of the neo-liberal economic growth paradigm. The majority of initiatives in which corporations have been engaged since the environmental activist movement developed its critique against them in the 1970s have been first-order change efforts in line with the eco-developmental interpretation of sustainability described in section 2.1.

These change efforts have been characterised as eco-modernisation of business and market-based environmentalism (Hartman & Stafford, 1996) in which a range of tools (such as life-cycle assessment) promoting eco-efficiency have been developed (Welford, 1995, 1998). The imperative of market-based environmentalism was exemplified early on by 3M’s Pollution Prevention Program; initiated in the 1970s the company demonstrated that many environmental initiatives were essentially cost-saving design and manufacture initiatives that had considerable and unambiguous benefits to the financial bottom lines of organisations (Royston, 1979). However, as the lowest hanging fruit in terms of environmental improvements were taken by corporations such as 3M the unambiguous financial benefits were rendered harder to come by. With the progressive emergence of the sustainability agenda, some commentators have suggested that companies “must come to terms with the new realities

of population growth, increased evidence of global warming, ozone depletion and loss of fertile soils and forests” (Schot, Brand, & Fischer, 1997: 155; Welford, 1995).

The response to the sustainability movement has been evidenced in a range of more focused corporate environmental management strategies, such as dematerialisation through design, minimisation of energy use and pollution prevention, that have sought the progressive “greening of industry” (Fuchs & Mazmanian, 1998; Hawken, 1994; Welford & Gouldson, 1993). Underlying the vast majority of corporate efforts to consider sustainability has been enlightened self-interest in the search for “sustainable competitive advantage” (Srikantia & Bilmoria, 1997; Elkington & Burke, 1997; Demordy & Hammer-Lloyd, 1995). This has been achieved through a range of strategies such as the protection of knowledge and capital resources (Wernfelt, 1984) with a view to developing long-term competitive advantage of one company over another.

With the formation of the sustainability agenda the issues of social justice and equity in development have been added to the need for environmental care as a range of extended stakeholder claims for which businesses are being required to account. The effect of combining the economic, environmental and social domains has been to create a subtle shift away from one that could merely be addressed by simple attempts of “green” product development or environmental process innovation. As the claims of local communities, human rights and development groups have presented themselves another discourse concerning corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship has emerged (for example McIntosh, Leipziger, Jones, & Coleman, 1998; Elkington, 1997). The work of organisations such as the World Business Council for Sustainable Development has nevertheless helped to maintain the imperative that economic growth and competitive market forces are the only way to improve livelihoods of the poor (see for example Schmidheiny, 1992).

As companies are seen to be talking “the higher goals of human rights, environmental sustainability and social sustainability” activists-academics ask “how are they married to the very contradictory processes of capitalism’s primary purpose - profitability via the exploitation of natural and human resources?” (Phillips, 2000: 5). In this light they are looking to make a critique of eco-efficiency based on the need for changing the underling premises, fundamental assumptions and practices of management orientation (Schot et al., 1997). Here ultimate tensions between the calls of sustainability and the capitalist system are elucidated as being ultimately antithetical and antagonistic. The “ecocentric” approach to management of Shrivastava (1995) forwards such a fundamental re-orientation away from approaches based on

eco-development and competitive advantage that “rationalise exploitation of natural resources in the name of sustainable development ” (Purser, 1997).

Many proponents of system change concerned with the hegemonic power of corporations suggest that the engagement of NGOs by business is part of backlash against the sustainability agenda and move towards the further entrenchment of corporate power and the continued reification of growth-centred market imperatives (see for example Rowell, 1996; Beder, 1997). As some see it “one reason for TNCs to offer dialogue is the disunity it creates, dividing the ‘reasonable’ from the ‘radical’ and displacing conflict between movements and TNCs. In this context unified campaigns against TNCs can quickly lose their potential” (Goodman, 1998:4). In the context of a developing discourse of “corporate social responsibility”, Zadek suggests, “business friendly NGOs may be improving the standard of TNCs in society, endorsing their activities and position through association and strengthening their defences against attack from adversarial NGOs in the future” (cited in Heap, 2000).

While Srikantia and Bilmoria (1997) note that efforts at interpreting sustainability within business in the light of such fundamental re-conceptualisation have been extremely rare, my point here is to remark that the engagement between business and NGOs occurs within the discourse of the potential and “proper” role of business in contributing to a transition towards sustainability. It is through and within these discourses that we might better understand the notion of “process”. For, as soon as we understand that the interaction processes at the micro level in the organisations are part of this discourse, we can begin to understand the numerous citations in the literature of organisational and personal challenges that are confronted by participants. We can also reframe Bendell’s concern that in the academic literature “conflict is seen as a process issue, an outcome of the paradoxes that should be managed carefully” (2000b) but one that will ultimately be resolved. A range of competing worldviews and paradigms and perspectives about change come into play in the context of these wider discourses and we can conceive of process “over time” interlinked with process “in the moment” (Bradbury, 1998).

3.3.1 Remembering the wider story: internal uncertainty

Some of the detail provided by the case reports of NGO-business collaboration points us towards this deeper story; one in which conflicts, paradoxes and challenges are significant issues of partnership, not to be managed and solved through application of methods, but worked at and engaged with. Fowler and Heap, citing the involvement of WWF in the

development of the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), suggest that there were often internal conflicts within the organisations involved over how to progress with the relationship once initiated (2000). As mentioned above, Greenpeace has been involved in multiple conflicting relationships with business. A similar problem existed for WWF in the development of the Marine Stewardship Council, where staff were worried that “a partnership between one part of WWF and one part of Unilever might give a green hue to all of Unilever’s operations, including chemicals and agricultural commodities, where WWF might be in conflict with the company” (Fowler & Heap, 2000: 139). From their experience with BP, Elkington and Fennel suggest that “across an organisation...those promoting partnership often find themselves in direct conflict with more sceptical colleagues (1998: 51). While they hint at the potential tensions, suggesting that perceptions of inconsistency in either business or NGO partner could lead to a brake on these initiatives, they ignore the potential causes and implications of this internal “schizophrenia”.

Heap (2000) suggests that challenges experienced in the engagement process require appropriate and responsive organisational capacities, while Murphy and Coleman (2000) regard the paradoxes brought out in the relationships as issues to be worked with as opposed to solved. The suggestion from these authors is that for those involved in the actual relationships these are not simple win-win efforts that exist without implication for the organisations involved.

Some evidence seems to suggest that the broader implications of their engagement are apparent to participants (and are made more so by activist NGO criticisms). The descriptions of internal confusion and uncertainty within the NGO and business (Bendell & Murphy, 2000; Elkington & Fennell, 1998; SustainAbility, 1996) seem to result, in part, from the messages coming from the wider domain of social movement for sustainability and the location of NGOs with respect to these attempts at catalysing system change. These conflicts are increasingly brought to the fore as engagement becomes more than merely a “past-time” and individuals are involved in face-to-face and moment-to-moment interaction and contact with the “other”. For example, in a study of an early relationship in Canada where Pollution Probe (an environmental NGO) became increasingly involved with Loblaws (a department store) it was suggested that:

an ideological split existed in the organisation between what Issacs (Director of Pollution Probe and internal champion of the relationship) described as a ‘radical philosophy of social change and a more mainstream philosophy which advocated

looking for environmental improvement in existing structures' including co-operation with business (Westley & Vredenburg, 1991:77).

Such shifting internal coalitions arise from the changing patterns of interaction within the organisation. Crane has addressed this to some extent by suggesting that the dynamics of collaboration may be considered using Martin's (1992) tripartite differentiation of organisational culture as integration, differentiation and fragmentation. In this context, the allocation of organisational and financial resources with respect to the mission and objectives of the NGO therefore becomes important.

Partnerships are likely to need adequate resources, "professional" staff and organisational capacity to deal with the relationships (Fowler & Heap, 2000; Elkington & Fennell, 1998). How these resources will be funded will vary according to the type of arrangement with the business and the way in which the NGO itself is funded. In an interesting and revealing twist, it has been suggested that the relatively long term needs of a business at a mining site may contrast with the more short-term campaign finance needs of some NGOs (Heap, 2000). Moreover, it presently seems that engaging in less litigation-prone activities such as corporate partnering enables larger NGOs to avoid potential financial losses through more "headline grabbing" activity (Newell, 2000). At the same time, businesses do offer a considerable wealth of funds that can be tapped into. As suggested above, the ability to fund other "core activities" through engagement with business has been identified as a driving factor by NGOs.

In their attempts to work with business Action Aid, WWF and Amnesty all experienced changed patterns of interaction between fundraising and policy/campaigning departments (Heap, 2000). In such instances individuals working with business needed to show the rest of the organisation that there was a genuine chance of creating change, of contributing to the "cause". As suggested above, it has become harder for NGOs to ignore the degree of corporate power in society and a perception of the need to influence corporate activities comes to be seen as one means towards other core activities or a core activity in itself. The growing awareness within NGOs of the effects of neo-liberal globalisation and corporate power upon the core issues of environmental sustainability, human rights and development seem in many instances to jar with emergent patterns of collaboration with business.

3.3.2 Remembering the wider story 2: levels of communication

In collaboration there is close contact and communication between individual staff about the in-the-moment process of doing collaboration. Literature suggests that if the partnership is to progress personal contact and bonding become important. Not only do the organisations need to have the capacities and openness to this form of relationship but the individuals involved need to be able to bridge the institutional and cultural boundaries (Westley & Vrendenburg, 1991; Stafford et al., 2000), individuals need to make commitments (Milliman et al., 1994; Waddell, 1999; Fowler & Heap, 2000), bond with each other (Long & Arnold, 1995) and develop strong inter-personal relations and trust (Milne et al., 1996; Murphy & Coleman, 2000; Murphy, 1996). In addition to this the individual or group involved in making such commitments within the NGO or business is also making statements, at least indirectly, about their perceptions of the likelihood of creating change, the kind of change being alluded to and the means for achieving this.

As discussed above in section 3.1.1, since latter generation NGOs have tended to be organisational representatives of broader issues and social movements the engagement involving one particular NGO cannot be regarded in isolation from the wider issue or movement. With the range of other actors involved in the movement, we could consider the involvement of any particular NGO in the context of an ecology of organisations in the civil society domain seeking change. The position of NGOs in such an ecology is likely to affect the degree to which their interactions are important⁴. Ali cites the engagement of two mining companies in Australia and Canada, both operating in areas subject to indigenous land rights (2000). In both countries there were local indigenous populations with their own representatives as well as Northern environmental NGOs seeking to form coalitions with the indigenous actors in order to ultimately engage with the two corporations. The Northern organisations were, however, working from different perspectives of the situation and representing “stakeholders with a variety of interests and values that [were] not shared” (Ali, 2000:93). As he goes on to add “this is not to doubt the sincerity of each group towards the other but rather a manifestation of differing world-views about development that are not easily reconcilable” (2000: 93).

Although I have suggested that latter generation NGOs have sought system change as part of social movements for transformation, the above example suggests that the definition of the

⁴ For example, the nature of local interdependence may vary according to how much the boundaries of the ecological system are open to outside influences, competition for resources within the system, the level of direct interaction as well as *our* very definition of what constitutes the system.

“movement” is likely to vary according to the posture of the organisation. In some instances this may not appear to be a significant problem; the visible problem domain may be small, self-contained and involve only few actors. But this perception can be quickly destroyed if we understand all of these interactions as taking part within a contested environment, as part of an emergent multi-lingual discourse and practice concerned with changing corporate control, neo-liberal economic growth paradigms and capitalism *qua* systems, all with reference to democratic paths towards ecologically grounded and socially just sustainability.

Schneidewind and Petersen use Giddens’s structuration theory to remind us that the relationships between NGOs and business involve introducing people with different value systems, beliefs and objectives and “make people question their routine actions and why they behave the way they do” (2000:220). The implication is that collaboration is said to bring routine actions into discursive consciousness⁵ and this tends to “increase the level of reflexivity of action”. The result may be an effect upon the norms of behaviour that has the potential to create a re-structuration towards sustainability (Schneidewind & Petersen, 2000:221). They bring out an extremely important point for this discussion: whilst the micro-processual activities of these relationships are being worked out, there are meta-processes that are also being “discussed”; this suggests that, by the existence of engagement, businesses and NGOs are inevitably communicating about and changing the “rules”.

3.4 Remembering the wider story 3: academic meta-comments

Schneidewind and Petersen’s work falls into the same category as the majority of literature concerning NGO-business relationships. In forgetting that the relationships may also be creating an entrenchment *against* structuration towards sustainability, Schneidewind and Petersen reveal an underlying and unquestioned positive evaluation of partnership. Similarly, Waddell and Elkington seem to suggest, in different ways, the outright win-win nature of dialogue (for example Waddell, 2000, 1999; Elkington, 1997; Elkington & Fennell, 1998). The stakeholder partnership literature seems equally to assume the overriding positive value of dialogue (Augustine, 2000; Andriof, 2000).

Typologies of businesses and NGOs involved in relationship, such as Elkington (1997) and Stafford (1998), seem to assume a level of internal consistency within the organisations involved; where there is difficulty it is suggested that this is because of the “schizophrenic”

⁵ According to Giddens most actions are undertaken in routine manner in “practical consciousness” while they register

tendencies within the organisations that could act as “brakes on partnership”. Virtually all of the authors writing about business-NGO relationships seem to suggest that while organisations are experiencing difficulties in their attempts at collaboration, once the right type of partners are brought together and are able to work through the process stages, then such relationships should progress smoothly. In a sense they seem almost to have forgotten that there is an immense issue that is still at stake here - that the future of the planet and the way to arrive at it have not yet been secured. The result is a number of dull, quite unworkable and reductionist generalisations about what steps partners should take in order to make things work out.

It seems to me that these problems arise out of the unquestioned nature of the epistemological premises that guide much inquiry not only in business-NGO relationships but also, more generally, with respect to research into businesses, sustainability and organisations. In the following section I explore this critique further. Firstly, I should note that this assessment of the epistemological silence in the literature is based upon a dialectical *understanding* and *experience* of action research and sustainability; that is to say that my critique does not rest upon some a priori categories or demands emanating from “sustainability”, for these do not exist. And this in a sense is the very essence of my point - sustainability is an ongoing experiment, “an unrepeatably global experiment” (Pezzey, 1992), and is “ontologically a pure possibility - never attainable in the present” (Enrenfeld, 1998: 42); the implication is that there are no “final answers” or “magic bullets” available.

As in all experiments there is an important attachment to “doing” in sustainability, to making practical changes. Given the import attached to creating change in the sustainability agenda, I have been quite struck by the lack of fully action-oriented research in the academic literature regarding sustainability and organisations. I do not mean to say that researchers have not considered action and change in their inquiries but, generally, the action component has been left as an adjunct, something to be reported at the completion in terms of a series of recommendations and proposals for either future research or for the implementation of findings. The traditional separation of theory from practice is at play here, as authors seek to help organisations in their search for solutions by engaging in a theoretical discourse that is at arms length (and often in a different room) from the location of action.

meaning for the actor in “discursive consciousness” (Giddens, 1984).

link to: http://www.bath.ac.uk/carpp/publications/doc_theses_links/r_shah.html

3.4.1 Objectifying voice

This separation of theory from practice is premised and exposed by the separation of knower from known and is grounded in the positivist project of objectivism. One can see this objectifying stance in virtually all of the case studies into relationships between business and NGOs where one notices the prodigious abstraction of a transcendent researcher conducting inquiry. Turcotte has studied the relationship between an environmental NGO and a number of businesses in Canada (2000); when reading the case report one is struck by Turcotte's use of the passive voice of a Researcher, objectively reporting her findings of a case study inquiry in which, as she writes, "the researcher was a participant observer" (2000: 126). One finds similar absences of voice and implicit acceptance of pure objectivity in Stafford et al's case analysis of the alliance between Greenpeace and Foron (Stafford et al., 2000), Westley and Vrendenburg's early exploration of Pollution Probe's relationship with Loblaws in Canada (1991), the two case analysis of environmental organisation relationships within and across non-profit, business and government sectors by Milne et al (1996) and in Lober's exploration of the Paper Task Force (1997).

It is not only in the research into business-NGO relations that such criticisms can be made; the niche seems to be representative of the wider domains of inquiry into sustainability and organisations. Illustrative of this is a special issue of *Business Strategy and the Environment* (Volume 10, Number 1, 2001) on corporate environmental reporting in which all of the authors use third-person, disembodied voices to forward their viewpoints. Similarly, at the 4th Annual Conference for the International Society for Third-Sector Research one found few papers working from alternative epistemologies despite the obvious tradition and experience within the third-sector itself in working with alternatives to positivist science. This was the case with general research into the third-sector as well as more specifically in terms of inquiries into the relationship between the NGOs and the market (see for example Greaves, 2000; Herman & Redina, 2000; Wise & Penney, 2000).

Often the consequences of this uncritical assumption of objectivity may not be significant since one can see the flaws all too clearly. In a comparative study of the objectivity of corporate environmental reporting in Finland that sought to examine "whether firms report equally on positive or negative environmental issues related to their operation", the authors suggest that the negative or positive value was a function of

"expected impact on the environmental image of the firm...Positive news items were for example, environmental investments, development of environmentally

friendly products or manufacturing processes. Negative news items were, for example, emissions into water or air, legal action against firms”(2001: 31)

However, as they also concede, “not all news could be unambiguously classified...many meanings we treated as a separate group of unclassified news items” (Niskanen et al., 2001: 31). The authors tally the number of positive and negative reports, draw conclusions and make recommendations based on the classified sample, without any discussion of the obvious logical “shot-in-the-foot” that they have just fired.

One sees other more well known and adulated “experts” in the sustainability and business field maintaining similar objectifying stances. For example, David Wheeler and John Elkington, two authors with a considerable degree of practical experience with business and sustainability, describe their quantitative and qualitative assessment of website sustainability reporting” based on “‘subjective’ criteria as well as objective elements in assessing the reports” (Wheeler & Elkington, 2001: 7). They do not suggest how these subjective criteria were defined except by suggesting that they were developed at the Haub Business and Sustainability Program at York University Canada, as if this is somehow adequate.

3.4.2 Power and inquiry

In taking such abstracted positions these authors allow themselves the space to maintain the assumption of a neutral objective, all-knowing researcher. The result may sometimes just be annoyingly unprofessional or unsatisfying as a piece of research, however there are a number of more significant implications that seem to result. In the last few paragraphs you may have noticed that I changed voice into a “Disembodied Objective Reviewer of Literature”. It seems to me that the result of such abstraction would be to suggest that I had recourse to some final or correct formula against which my exploration of the literature could be mapped. Importantly, the objective voice promotes the possibility of inquiry in which it is possible to have privileged access to the value-free facts of the one answer. The result is that the existence of power in the knowledge creation process is denied. As Shiva, writing about the effects upon nature and gender of reductionism in science, says:

“The fact-value dichotomy is a creation of modern reductionist science which, while being an epistemic response to a particular set of values, posits itself as independent of values. By splitting the world into facts vs. values, it conceals the real difference between two kinds of value-laden facts.” (Shiva, 1989: 27)

In the context of sustainability, the two kinds of value-laden facts might be considered as interpreting sustainability as an eco-developmental, global management initiative as opposed to the inchoate envisioning and enacting process of a locally-grounded dialectical transition towards some unknown place and future.⁶ For Purser, objectivism and the disembodied observer perpetuate the acceptance of a definition of sustainability as a global management initiative where the “locus of change is on manipulating symbols, abstractions, and things that exist out there on the surface” and “primacy is given towards changing that which can be manipulated in the external environment” (1997). However, as suggested previously, it is exactly the unknown quality of this end and the fact that we must all engage in this becoming that differentiates business-as-usual from engaging in transformation.

Moreover, given the action-oriented calls from sustainability, one result of an inability to work with unknown visions is that research finishes by focusing upon already present visions; in doing so the inquiry obscures the knots between knowledge, power and system change. From their comparative review of business and non-business literature concerning sustainability Srikantia and Bilmoria (1997) suggest that there is an hugely problematic institutional isomorphism. They argue that the field of organisation studies as an applied behavioural science, with respect to research into sustainability and business, “unwittingly legitimises the institutional practices of the Western business organisation”. The result is in a domain of study that is defined and limited by “only those phenomena that conform to a ‘dominant corporate paradigm’ implicit in the mainstream business organisation” in contrast to an alternative sustainability paradigm (Srikantia & Bilmoria, 1997). They go on to suggest five differences in the conception of sustainability in the business and non-business literatures, including the use of the firm as the focal point of analysis, as opposed to an attention to society, several societies or planetary well-being and a consideration of “time” in terms of the strategic planning horizon as opposed to inquiring with a focus upon an intergenerational time horizon.

The research into business-NGO relationships seems to accord with Srikantia and Bilmoria’s critique. For example, the focus of the work of Edwin Stafford and Cathy Hartman, similar to that taken by Milliman et al (1994) Milne et al (1996) Hemphill (1994) and a range of other researchers into sustainability, conceptualises the role of business as one of “market based environmentalism” where it undertakes “enviropreneurial” strategies (Hartman & Stafford,

⁶ Given the overt nature my association with one of these types of value-laden facts, the brief attempt at “metalogue” in which I used a disembodied voice probably only demonstrated a contorted use of the passive voice rather than fool you into thinking I had access to some “final answer”. However, it would still have framed my position within inquiry towards

1996, 1998; Stafford, 1998; Stafford & Hartman, 1996). The literature emanating from this market-based perspective tends to make only minimal reference to any wider policy outcomes and implications of these partnerships for a society in transition towards environmental sustainability and social justice. Instead it implicitly focuses upon the largely uncontested domain of shareholder wealth maximisation.

In this regard the research of David Murphy and Jem Bendell (Murphy, 1998; Murphy & Coleman, 2000; Bendell, 2000b; Bendell & Sullivan, 1996) brings a far more policy-oriented and long-term horizon to the analysis of these partnerships. Murphy and Bendell (1997) outline a number of cases and go into considerable detail regarding the origins, both in terms of particular historical relationships between partners and the broader social background of the relationships. Murphy's (1996) analysis, thus, reflects more usefully on the nature of the relationships and the meaning that they hold for society and sustainable development, while Bendell (1998) reflects on the implications for civil society. Similarly, Simon Heap suggests that there is a need for NGOs to "ensure that the strategy they adopt towards the private sector is based on a considered institutional view of the issue, since their activities are likely to be subject to external challenge" (2000:17).

3.4.3 Epistemology and inquiry

In their now oft-cited paper in the *Academy of Management Review*, Gladwin et al (1995) suggest a "sustaincentric" paradigm as an organising system for management theory and research as a synthesis of "technocentric" and "ecocentric" paradigms. They note that organisational scientists work in a field "fractured by a profound epistemological crisis: the conceptual division and resultant disassociation between humankind (and its organisations) and the remainder of the natural world" and decry the fact that "most management theorising and research continues to proceed as if organisations lack biophysical foundations"(Gladwin et al., 1995: 874). Having developed their case for the shift to a sustaincentric paradigm against a set of tentatively suggested components of sustainability they outline the implications for management theory and practice. Despite affirming that the task ahead for the academy is one of reintegration against a separated epistemological tradition, the recommendations they make - calling for a transition from "agency to communion", "exterior to interior" and "concept to implementation" - remain routed to a traditional academic epistemology; the recommendations refer exclusively to the kinds of questions that theories of management/organisation should address in the context of sustainability. They do not seem to feel that the 'profound

epistemological crisis' requires the academy to consider any questions regarding the nature of inquiry into organisations nor the connections between theory and practice.

According to Schot et al there is a growing consensus among academics in the field of sustainability, organisations and business of the need for some kind of system change (Schot et al., 1997). However, of eight research priorities that they suggest they do not make any reference to changing modes of inquiry or epistemology. In their epilogue they do add that "research priorities must aim at stimulating and underpinning communication processes between users and producers" (Schot et al., 1997: 162). Such a relational perspective of organisation research into sustainability is also hinted at by Welford in his critical research agenda for corporate environmental management and sustainable development in which "from a critical perspective it is not possible to separate the social organisation of knowledge production from the knowledge itself" (Welford, 1998: 9). And whilst Welford's (1995) earlier call for action-oriented research was echoed by Elkington (1998), neither they nor Schot et al (1997) nor Gladwin et al (1995) seem to have considered what is required of this process in terms of a dialectical relating between re-visioning understanding of our world and improving and transforming practice (Fals Borda, 2001; Reason, 1999) in the context of inquiry. Through this epistemological omission they end up falling back into a conception of sustainability as "orchestrated by top management" as opposed to one focused upon the "active participation in project planning and execution by all concerned stakeholders" (Srikantia & Bilmoria, 1997).

As a rare example of work that fits this alternative paradigm and seeks an alternative epistemology, Hilary Bradbury's inquiry with the Natural Step makes the connection between changes towards sustainable development and the epistemology-methodology couplet of a participatory worldview (Bradbury, 1998; Bradbury & Mainemelis, 1999; Bradbury, 2001). Similarly, the work of Suresh Shrivastava and colleagues resonates with an attention to following up calls for epistemological transformation with regard to sustainability in their actual research practice (Bilmoria et al., 1995; Cooperrider & Khalsa, 1997).

Individuals within NGO-business relationships are faced with problems that concern knowing about social, institutional and personal change in the context of power, social systems and worldviews. But these are hugely complex challenges. It seems that as researchers we are faced with equal challenges in knowing about "knowing about change". The challenges suggest that

"we need a way of knowing that makes us not masters but partners, co-creators....a way of knowing that gives us the power to survive the world. But we

also need a way of knowing that gives the world the power to survive us by transforming our lives” (Palmer 1992 cited in Purser, 1997).

In the next chapter, I explore the relational practices of participatory action research in detail, suggesting that they may provide us with such ways of knowing.

- Ali, S. (2000). Shades of Green: NGO coalitions, mining companies and the pursuit of negotiating power. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 79-95). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Andriof, J. (2000). *Management Of Social Risk Through Stakeholder Partnership Building*. Unpublished PhD, University of Warwick, Warwick.
- Augustine, D. (2000). *Strategic Alliances Between Profit Maximising And Welfare Maximising Firms.*, London School of Management, London.
- Bebbington, A., & Farrington, J. (1993). Governments, NGOs and agricultural development. *Journal of Development Studies*, 29(2), 199-220.
- Beder, S. (1997). *Global Spin: the corporate assault on environmentalism*. Dartington: Green Books Ltd.
- Bendell, J. (1998, July 8-11 1998). *Citizens Cane? Relations between business and civil society*. Paper presented at the ISTR 3rd Conference, Geneva.
- Bendell, J. (2000a). Civil Regulation: a new form of democratic governance for the global economy? In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 239-254). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Bendell, J. (2000b). A No Win-Win Situation? GMOs, NGOs and sustainable development. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 96-110). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Bendell, J. (Ed.). (2000c). *Terms for Endearment: business, NGOs and sustainable development*. Sheffield: Greenleaf.
- Bendell, J., & Lake, R. (2000). New Frontiers: emerging NGO activities to strengthen transparency and accountability in business. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 226-238). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Bendell, J., & Murphy, D., F. (2000). Planting the Seeds of Change: business-NGO relations on tropical deforestation. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 65-78). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Bendell, J., & Sullivan, F. (1996). Sleeping with the Enemy? Business-Environmental Partnerships for Sustainable Development: The case of the WWF 1995 Group. *Cambridge Environmental Initiative Professional Seminar Series: Environmentalist and Business Partnerships: A Sustainable Model?*, 9.

- Bilmoria, D., Cooperrider, D., L., Kaczmariski, K., Khalsa, G., Srivastava, S., & Upadhayaya, P. (1995). A Call to Organization Scholarship. The organization dimensions to global change: no limits to cooperation. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 4(1), 71-90.
- Boje, D., M., Gephart, R., P., & Thatchenkery, T., J. (Eds.). (1996). *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory*. London: Sage.
- Bourque, D. (1995). Business and Reductionism in Education. *Trumpeter*, 12(4).
- Bradbury, H. (1998). *Learning with the Natural Step*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Boston College, Boston.
- Bradbury, H. (2001). Learning with the Natural Step: action research to promote conversations for sustainable development. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.
- Bradbury, H., & Mainemelis, C. (1999). Learning History and Organizational Praxis, *Working Paper Series* (Vol. WP 99-21). Cleaveland, Ohio: Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University.
- Calton, J., & Kurland, N. (1996). A Theory of Stakeholder Enabling: giving voices to an emerging postmodern praxis of organisational discourse. In D. Boje, M. & R. Gephart, P. & T. Thatchenkery, J. (Eds.), *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory* (pp. 154-177). London: Sage.
- Cooperrider, D., L., & Khalsa, G. (1997). The Organization Dimensions of Global Environmental Change. *Organization and Environment*, 10(4), 331-341.
- Cousins, P. D. (1995). *A Discussion Paper in Conceptual Models of Relationships in Supply Chain Management Strategy*. Bath: School of Management, University of Bath.
- Cyert, R., & March, J. (1963). *The Behavioural Theory of the Firm*. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- de Senillosa, I. (1998). A new age of social movements: a fifth generation of non-governmental development organizations in the making. *Development in Practice*, 8(1), 40-53.
- Demordy, J., & Hammer-Lloyd, S. (1995). Greening New Product Development: the pathway to environmental excellence. *Greener Management International*, 11, 73-88.
- Edwards, M., Hulme, D., & Wallace, T. (1999). NGOs in a global future: marrying local delivery to worldwide leverage. *Public Administration and Development*, 19, 117-136.
- Eisler, R. (1996). Creating Partnership Futures. *Futures*, 28(7), 563-566.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with Forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford: Capstone.
- Elkington, J., & Burke, B. (1997). Ten Steps to Environmental Excellence. In P. McDonagh & A. Prothero (Eds.), *Green Management*. London: Dryden.
- Elkington, J., & Fennell, S. (1998). Partners for Sustainability. *Greener Management International*(24), 48-60.

- Enrenfeld, J. R. (1998). Greening of Industry Network Noticeboard. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 7, 43-49.
- Fabig, H., & Boele, R. (1999). The Changing Nature of NGO Activity in a Globalising World. *IDS Bulletin*, 30(3), 58-67.
- Fals Borda, O. (2001). Participatory (Action) Research in Social Theory: origins and challenges. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.
- Faye, L., Mellor, E., Kaveli, T., Roth, C., & Shah, R. (1997). *The US Automotive Distribution Channel*. Unpublished BSc. Dissertation, University of Bath, Bath.
- Fineman, S., & Clarke, K. (1996). Green Stakeholders: industry interpretations and response. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(6), 715-730.
- Fisher, W., F. (1997). Doing Good? The politics and anti-politics of NGO practices. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26, 439-464.
- Ford, I. D. (Ed.). (1997). *Understanding Business Markets*:. Dryden.
- Fowler, A. (1997). *Striking a Balance: A guide to enhancing the organizational effectiveness of non-governmental organisations in international development*. London: Earthscan.
- Fowler, P., & Heap, S. (2000). Bridging Troubled Water: the Marine Stewardship Council. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 135-148). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Fuchs, D., Andrea, & Mazmanian, D. A. (1998). The Greening of Industry : the needs of the field. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 7, 193-203.
- Gabriel, Y., & Lang, T. (1995). *The Unmanageable Consumer: contemporary consumption and its fragmentations*. London: Sage.
- Gaventa, J. (1993). The Powerful, the Powerless and the Experts. In P. Park & M. Brydon-Miller & B. Hall & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of Change* (pp. 21-40). Ontario: Oise Press.
- Gergen, K. (1992). Organization Theory in the Post Modern Era. In M. Reed & M. Hughes (Eds.), *Rethinking Organization*. London: Sage.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: outline of the Theory Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gilmore, F. (Ed.). (1997). *Brand Warriors: corporate leaders share their winning strategies*. London: Harper Collins.
- Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T. S. (1995). Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 87.
- Goodman, J. (1998, July 1998). *Transnational Politics: political consciousness, corporate power and the internationalising state*. Paper presented at the Globalisation and its discontents, Simon Fraser University and RMIT, Vancouver.

- Gray, B. (1985). Conditions Facilitating Interorganizational Collaboration. *Human Relations*, 38(10), 911-936.
- Greaves, P. (2000, 5 July). *Business and Businessmen: some trends in Mexican Corporate Philanthropy*. Paper presented at the 4th International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) Conference, Trinity College, Dublin.
- Hakansson, H., & Snehota, I. (1989). No Business Is an Island: The Network Concept of Business Strategy. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 4(3), 187-200.
- Hakansson, H., & Snehota, I. (Eds.). (1995). *Developing Business Relationships*. New York: Routledge.
- Hartman, C., & Stafford, E. (1996, Winter 1996). *Market Based Environmentalism: developing green marketing strategies and relationships*. Paper presented at the American Marketing Association's Winter Educators' Conference Proceedings.
- Hartman, C., & Stafford, E. (1998). Crafting "Enviropreneurial" Value Chain Strategies Through Green Alliances. *Business Horizons*, March-April.
- Hawken, P. (1994). *The Ecology of Commerce*. London: Phoenix.
- Heap, S. (Ed.). (2000). *NGOs Engaging with Business: a world of difference and a difference to the world*. Oxford: INTRAC.
- Hemphill, T. (1994). Strange Bedfellows Cozy up for a Clean Environment. *Business and Society Review*, 90, 28-44.
- Herman, R. D., & Redina, D. (2000, 5 July). *Love and Money: a study of donor relations to commercial activities of non-profit organisations*. Paper presented at the 4th International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) Conference, Trinity College, Dublin.
- Hood, J. N., Logsdon, J. M., & Kenner Thompson, J. (1993). Collaboration for social problem-solving: a process model. *Business and Society*, 32(1), 1-18.
- Judge, A. (2001). "Globalisation": the UN's "safe haven" for the world's marginalised - the Global Compact with multinational corporations as the UN's "Final Solution". Union of International Associations. Available: <http://www.uia.org/uiadocs/globacomp.htm> [2001, 09/02/01].
- Kanter, R. M. (1989). *When Giants Learn to Dance*. London: Simon and Schuster Ltd.
- Klein, N. (2000). *No Logo*. London: Flamingo.
- Korten, D. (1987). Third Generation NGO Strategies: a key to people centred development. *World Development*, 15 Supplement, 145-159.
- Korten, D. (1990). *Getting to the 21st Century: voluntary action and the global agenda*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Korten, D. (2000). Keynote Address for 4th International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) Conference.

- Kraljic, P. (1983). Purchasing Must Become Supply Chain Management. *Harvard Business Review*, 61(5), 109-117.
- Lamming, R., C. (1992). *Beyond Partnership - strategies for innovation and learning*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Lewis, D. (1998). Development NGOs and the Challenge of Partnership: changing relations between North and South. *Social Policy and Administration*, 32(5), 501-512.
- Lober, D. (1997). Explaining the Formation of Business-Environmental Collaborations: collaborative windows and the Paper Task Force. *Policy Sciences*, 30, 1-24.
- Long, F. J., & Arnold, M. B. (1995). *The Power of Environmental Partnerships*. USA: Dryden.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: a radical view*. London: Macmillan.
- McIntosh, M., Leipziger, D., Jones, K., & Coleman, G. (1998). *Corporate Citizenship: successful strategies for responsible companies*. London: Financial Times Management.
- Milliman, J., Clair, J. A., & Mitroff, I. (1994). Environmental Groups and Business Organizations: conflict or co-operation? *Society for Advanced Management Journal*, 59(2), 41-47.
- Milne, G. R., Iyer, E. S., & Gooding-Williams. (1996). Environmental Organization Alliance Relationships Within and Across Non-profit, Business and Government Sectors. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 15(2), 201-215.
- Mitroff, I. (1983). *Stakeholders of the Mind*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morss, E. (1991). The New Global Players: how they compete and collaborate. *World Development*, 19, 55-64.
- Murphy, D., F. (1996). In the Company of Partners. Businesses, NGOs and Sustainable Development: Towards a Global Perspective. *Cambridge Environmental Initiative Professional Seminar Series Environmentalist and Business Partnerships: A Sustainable Model?*, 9.
- Murphy, D., F. (1998). Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Business NGO relations in a changing world. Working paper for New Academy of Business.
- Murphy, D., F., & Bendell, J. (1997). *In the Company of Partners*. Bristol: Polity Press.
- Murphy, D., F., & Coleman, G. (2000). Thinking Partners: business, NGOs and the partnership concept. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 65-78). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Neale, A. (1997). Organisational Learning in Contested Environments: lessons from Brent Spar. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 6, 93-103.
- Newell, P. (2000). Globalisation and the new politics of sustainable development. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 31-39). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Niskanen, Jyrki, & Nieminen, T. (2001). The Objectivity of Environmental Reporting: a study of Finnish listed firm's environmental disclosures. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10(1), 29-36.

- Packard, V. (1957). *The Hidden Persuaders*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Pezzey, J. (1992). Sustainability: an interdisciplinary guide. *Environmental Values*, 1, 321-352.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Phillips, R. (2000, July 5-8 2000). *Engaging Corporate Citizens as a Social Movement Strategy: negotiating a position for NGOs - The Community Aid Abroad Experience*. Paper presented at the International Third Sector Research 4th International Conference, Trinity College, Dublin.
- Porter, M. (1985). *Competitive Advantage*. New York: Free Press.
- Purser, R., E. (1997). From Global Management to Global Appreciation. *Organization and Environment*, 10(4), 361-383.
- Reason, P. (1999). Integrating Action and Reflection Through Co-operative Inquiry. *Management Learning*, 30(2), 207-226.
- Rodgers, C. (2000). Making it Legit: new ways of generating corporate legitimacy in a globalising world. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 40-48). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Rodrik, D. (1997). Has Globalization Gone Too Far. *California Management Review*, 39(3), 29-53.
- Rose, C. (1996). Dangerous Illusions. *New Statesman and Society*(5 January), 31-32.
- Rowell, A. (1996). *Green Backlash: global subversion of the environment movement*. London: Routledge.
- Royston, M. (1979). *Pollution Prevention Pays*:. Pergamon Press.
- Ruggie, J. (2000). Speech on the Global Compact.
- Schmidheiny, S. (1992). *Changing Course: a global perspective on development and the environment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schneidewind, U., & Petersen, H. (2000). Change the Rules! Business-NGO partnerships and structuration theory. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 216-224). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Schot, J., Brand, E., & Fischer, K. (1997). The Greening of Industry for a sustainable future: building an international research agenda. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 6, 153-162.
- Sharma, S., Vrendenburg, H., & Westley, F. (1994). Strategic Bridging: a role for multinational corporation in third world development. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 30(4), 458-476.
- Shiva, V. (1989). *Staying Alive: women, ecology and development*. London: Zed Books.
- Shrivastava, P. (1995). Ecocentric Management for a risk society. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 118-137.
- Srikantia, P., & Bilmoria, D. (1997). Isomorphism in Organization and Management Theory. *Organization and Environment*, 10(4), 384-406.

- Stafford, E. (1998, Summer 1998). *Toward an Understanding of the Antecedents of Environmentalist-Business Co-operative Relations*. Paper presented at the American Marketing Association's Winter Educators' Conference Proceedings.
- Stafford, E., & Hartman, C. (1996). Green Alliances: strategic relations between business and environmental strategies. *Business Horizons*, 39(2), 50-59.
- Stafford, E., Polonsky, M., & Hartman, C. (2000). Environmental NGO-Business Collaboration and Strategic Bridging: a case analysis of the Greenpeace-Foron alliance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 9, 122-135.
- SustainAbility. (1996). *Strange Attractors: The Business-ENGO partnership*. SustainAbility.
- Tarrow, S. (2000). Beyond Globalization: Why creating transnational social movements is so hard and when is it most likely to happen., *web essay*. <http://antenna.nl/waterman/pages/general/tarrow.htm>; viewed 19 July 2000.
- Tisdell, C. (1997). Local Communities, Conservation and Sustainability: institutional change, altered governance and Kant's social philosophy. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 24(12), 1361(1315).
- Turcotte, M.-F. (2000). Working Non-'STOP' for Sustainable Development: Case of a Canadian environmental NGO's relationship with businesses since 1970. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 125-134). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Ulvia, M. (2000, 5 July). *Globalisation and the Role of Development NGOs in Political Participation in Bangladesh and Nepal*. Paper presented at the 4th International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) Conference, Trinity College, Dublin.
- Waddell, S. (1999). *The Evolving Strategic Benefits for Business in Collaboration with Nonprofits in Civil Society: a strategic resources capabilities and competencies perspective*, [Internet]. Intesectoral Partnerships and Organizational Futures. Available: <http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/isp/resource/evolve.html09/08/00>].
- Waddell, S. (2000). Complimentary Resources: the win-win rationale for partnership with NGOs. In J. Bendell (Ed.), *Terms for Endearment* (pp. 193-206). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.
- Waddock, S. A., & Graves, S. B. (1997). Quality of Management and Quality of Stakeholder Relations: are they synonymous. *Business and Society*, 36(3), 250-280.
- Washington, S. (1996). Globalisation and governance. *OECD Observer*, April-May 1996(199).
- Welford, R. (1995). *Environmental Strategy and Sustainable Development: The corporate challenge for the 21st century*. London: Routledge.
- Welford, R. (1998). Corporate Environmental Management, Technology Development and Sustainable Development: postmodern perspectives and the need for a critical research agenda. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 7, 1-12.

- Welford, R., & Gouldson, A. (1993). *Environmental Management and Business Strategy*. London: Pitman.
- Wernfelt, B. (1984). A Resource Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 171-180.
- Westley, F., & Vredenburg, H. (1991). Strategic Bridging: The collaboration between environmentalists and business in the marketing of green products. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 271, 65-90.
- Wheeler, D., & Elkington, J. (2001). The End of The Corporate Environmental Report? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10(1), 1-14.
- Williams, M., & Ford, L. H. (1999). The World Trade Organisation, Social Movements and the Global Environmental Management. *Environmental Politics*, Spring, 268-289.
- Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies*. New York: Free Press.
- Wise, D., & Penney, D. (2000, 5 July). *Trading by Charities and their Subsidiaries*. Paper presented at the 4th International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) Conference, Trinity College, Dublin.
- Wolfson, N. (1996). Whence these Rumbblings? Towards an understanding of the structural pre-conditions of anti-systemic mobilization, *Unpublished draft*. <http://www.psc.uva.nl/SOCIOSITE/index.html>.
- Wood, D., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 272, 139-162.
- Zadek, S. (1999). Can Corporations Be Civil. *Unpublished paper*.