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Abstract

by

LEODONES YBALLE DUMDUM

This research explored interorganizational partnerships among non-profit organizations that were internationally active. The inquiry intended to gain insight into the nature of and identify the factors that enhance the potential for such partnerships.

Utilizing unstructured interviews and observations informed by an appreciative inquiry philosophy, interorganizational partnership was found to be driven by forces whose strength has been largely underestimated.

Interorganizational partnership was discovered to be founded on friendship and interhuman linkages. Friendship served either as a foundation upon which partnership was began or made to grow. The relationship between organizational representatives was important to the exploration of values and co-creation of shared reality.

Interorganizational partnership was also found to be
driven very strongly by value rationality, rather than instrumental rationality. This meant that members were spurred to act based on and in the construction of shared values, beliefs, and ideology. Prominent among these shared values and beliefs were those of an integrative view of reality, of affirmation and caring.

A third prominent discovery was about the ideology of collaboration. It was the finding of this study that the partnerships were guided in their actions towards each other and to others outside of the partnership by a belief in the desirability of collaboration rather than competition. That is, the ideology of collaboration, as practiced and conceived by the partnerships studied, was seen as moving beyond traditional views of endogenous collaboration in the service of exogenous competition. Collaboration was viewed as a desirable order in the service of the satisfaction of human needs, safeguarding the environment, alleviating world hunger, or other human challenges.

Implications were explored for employing appreciative inquiry approaches to expand and deepen our understanding of the nature and centripetal forces impacting partnership efforts. This included a future look into the development stages of groups of representatives and their effect on
partnership quality. Strategies for effective participation in partnership efforts were suggested, including the careful selection of organizational representatives who are able to develop friendships with other representatives of organizations in the interorganizational group. Close interpersonal linkage was therefore also essential among organizational representatives and the leaders of the represented organization.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This work explores the phenomenon of interorganizational partnership (IP) with the help of two cases in the state of Ohio. Our exploration seeks to identify those factors that increase the potential for partnerships and the forces that strengthen these relationships. Based upon the analysis of the data obtained from the leaders and members of the two organizational sites, we will present propositions which define the nature of IPs; identify conditions which favor the initiation of IPs; and describe the processes and structures that enhance and strengthen them.

The inspiration for this endeavor came from the belief that further innovations in organizing can no longer rely on the competitive ideals which fueled numerous breakthroughs in technology. These breakthroughs have given us the false sense of omnipotence -- that we can do anything we desire, because we have possession of advanced technology to surmount and solve any problem, regardless of
gravity. We have witnessed tremendous strides in health care and medicine; people now enjoy life longer; global capacity to produce food is at an all time high.

But our technology has been largely put to use mainly in efforts to be dominant over others, to subordinate others in the service of competitive ideology, and has been proven to be just as potent a force for destruction. The same advances in technology that have produced super-tankers capable of transporting millions of gallons of oil across oceans to power our factories and farm machineries created the potential for, and actually led to, massive oil spills and unimaginable destruction to the environment because we have determined the cost of building ships with thicker, safer hulls will make us non-competitive. Technological progress has enabled us to harness the awesome power of the atom; the same technology will forever keep us at the brink of annihilation because the need to be competitive leads us to minimize costly safety and waste disposal mechanisms.

These technological advances have come about on the back of competitive ideology -- a set of values,
conceptual frames, and norms of conduct which favor and are rooted in conflict tendencies. In one of its most simple expressions, competition means the never-ending search, accumulation, and use of resources for one's benefit, with the intended or unintended consequence of shutting out others from use of the same resources because these are seen as scarce. In competition, there is a mindless pursuit for one's victory, and for the other's conquest.

The ideal of competition is traditionally seen as inherent to human nature, rather than a consequence of and a reaction to social systems or organizing processes (Kraus, 1980). Tracing the roots of competitive ideology as far back as the Greek historian Polybius (c. 250–125 B.C.), Kraus proposes that this ideology found a ready home in social Darwinist thoughts in more modern times, and from there, became an integral part of conflict theory.

Competition has grown from a small component of a larger concept of conflict theory to an integral part of conflict theory. In fact, competition is more than a natural outgrowth of conflict -- it is the very essence of conflict. The perspective that conflict always has competition at its very core gains further momentum when one examines behavior in the context of organizational settings (p. 36).

The problem with the competitive ideology is that
its proponents, usually the victors or aspiring conquerors, operate myopically, unable to see that abundance in victory can be savored only in the company of poverty. Victory is incapable of insulating one from misery and suffering; it only delays the realization that victory and misery must lie one with the other; that ultimately, the two are inseparable experiences. The sweetness of victory can not be tasted unless one also somehow experiences the agony of defeat. In the final analysis, as Thayer (in Kraus, 1980) stated, it is necessary to look elsewhere, beyond competition and its reinforcing variable -- hierarchy.

Our system of representative government is designed only to preserve hierarchy, and our economic system is based on the ideal of competition. Yet neither hierarchy nor competition has a place in our future. For both compel us to repress ourselves and each other. The organizational revolution is an attempt to end repression, and the alienation that accompanies it (p. 40).

In this sense, the global misery we experience must be acknowledged to be the direct consequence of the competitive ideal that guide our actions -- of the need and the drive to be better, to be the winner, to be number one, to be bigger, to be more dominant over others. And for as long as we continue
with our competitive paradigm, we must expect more Bhopals, more Exxon-Valdez’s, and more Chernobyls, and many other as yet unimagined or unnamed threats to our individual and collective survival.

We are witnesses, however, to a number of incidents, some well-publicized, others quietly taking place, which may hold the promise of a force and a consciousness capable of halting our headlong plunge into destruction. All these incidents are characterized by collaboration, by partnership, among individuals, organizations, countries. The cooperation between the government of Brazil, some international financial institutions, and environmental conservation organizations have led to the saving of thousands of acres of rain forests which were destined to be destroyed in the name of development; at the same time, Brazil’s foreign debt burden was lightened. The successful eradication of small pox in the world is testimony of the power of collaborative ideals to realize goals of common benefit.

This work, therefore, is premised on the assumption that the ideology of cooperation and collaboration is a more desirable foundation of
behavior than competition. It is proposed that collaborative ideals are a force capable of spawning social innovations which can address the Global Problematique with long term and sweeping success. As conceived earlier by Gardner and Millikan (1968), while specifically addressing the issue of poverty around the world, partnership already takes on a promising role in the successful approach to eradicating global poverty:

In a world divided by deep national, ideological, and racial antagonisms, the concept of a global partnership to abolish poverty has a decidedly utopian sound. Yet such a partnership is in the making and provides one of the notable victories for international cooperation in an age marked by national conflict (p. v).

Using collaborative arrangements as the basis for evaluating progress towards global development, they suggest that the increased number of "multilateral" and collaborative efforts indicate some degree of success.

But most especially, it is proposed here that our learning about and ability to develop collaborative and partnering relationships are crucial to a more friendly, more tolerant, and still achieving social system. On the level of the interperson, but also equally true on other macro levels, positive outcomes
are likely when relations are agreed to be cooperative. Some of these outcomes can be:

-- a friendly climate;
-- more self-imposed (group) achievement pressure;
-- more communication;
-- less possessiveness of ideas;
-- more listening (Kraus, 1980, p. 56).

Thus, this work seeks to learn what partnerships are, and discover the forces that nurture and strengthen its potential. Specifically, it focuses on partnership among organizations, the life-giving forces that energize organizations to relate and work with other organizations.

At this point, it is useful to acknowledge that the literature on interorganizational relations (IR), cooperation, or collaboration has not directly dealt with the phenomenon of partnerships, much less defined it as a construct. At the moment, it seems that the phenomenon of "partnership" is popularly equated with collaboration, cooperation, or concerted action. This usage of the term "partnership" among practitioners and among academics and organizational scientists leaves the concept undefined or ill-defined. For purposes of this thesis, therefore, we had to start with a vague understanding about the
nature of partnership, mainly based on learnings about collaboration and cooperation.

Two characteristics seem to be commonly accepted as descriptive of the collaborative relationships (Schermherhorn, 1975). First, they can be described by some common goals and objectives which the organizations involved have developed and committed themselves. Secondly, each organization in a collaborative arrangement agrees to contribute its share of resources towards and engage in some activities in the pursuit of these common goals.

There are some indications, though, that partnership may be conceptually associated with other elements other than common goal commitment, resource contribution, and collective effort towards the achievement of common goal. For instance, in our previous study of a Cleveland-based business partnership (Dumdum, 1987) among individual entrepreneurs, other elements such as a continuing sense of fun, high degree of trust, and joint sense of ownership characterized the partnership relationship.

Thus, we undertook the inquiry fully aware that the concept of partnership was mainly undefined. We
started the inquiry with an open mind, ready to accept new learnings and explore possible definitions beyond what the current literature indicates. In this sense, the inquiry was not guided by nor bound to any established and well-developed model about the nature of IPs. We felt the notion of partnership may be different from cooperation or collaboration, but did not have sufficient clarity at the beginning to commit to such possibility. Because of this open-minded inquiry stance, we ultimately found ourselves better able to elicit and listen to stories and descriptions of the experiences and perceptions of people. As we joined them in seeking understanding and describing their realities of partnership, the vagueness of our initial framing was in fact helpful.

However, we also started this inquiry broadly aware, once more based on our earlier study of a small-business partnership, that what we were investigating and trying to understand was definitely a dynamic phenomenon. Thus we kept in mind when we started and in the later stages of the inquiry, that we were exploring not "partnership" as a static condition, but rather "partnering", a process of building a relationship. The latter more forcefully
conveys the dynamic, on-going social process, compared to the former. With this thought, our inquiry became even more focused on capturing those moments when partnership was experienced at its best and most successful. In other words, our inquiry concentrated on the peaks and successful experiences people had of the partnering process, and avoided being trapped into describing those times when partnership was not experienced or successful.

Up to this point, we have broadly described what this thesis is about. Let us now examine some of the reasons why our examination is significant, broadly in terms of IRs, and specifically in terms of IPs.

First, developments in the world of organizations force us to focus on what transpires among them and acknowledge inter-organizational realities. In the domestic and international corporate arena, organizations are swallowing or being swallowed by others through mega-mergers and multi-billion-dollar leveraged buy-outs. In terms of international trade, organizations from various countries are working together through joint ventures to capture markets and exploit opportunities. Third World countries vie for the chance to have foreign investors establish
themselves in their territories, and decry the frequent, and often uninhibited, intervention by multinational corporations in local politics. The impact of interorganizational behavior can no longer be ignored; the students and leaders of organizations are well advised to seek enlightenment about relations between organizations and the lessons that can be learned in their spawning.

Second, and more specifically, it is clear that not all relationship-building among organizations end up in success. There are successes, as well as failures, either in terms of attaining (or not attaining) commonly set goals, or the actual benefits and costs of the relationship as far as individual organizations are concerned (Warner, 1987). Highlighting and understanding the success factors will help organizations manage their relationships better.

Third, and most significantly, we propose that modern concerns, whether in terms of social welfare, global ecosystem, world hunger and malnutrition, AIDS, terrorism, or the threat of nuclear Armageddon -- in short, the modern "Problematique" -- have attained such major
proportions that their solutions are simply beyond the capability of any single organization, institution, national power, or military might. Interorganizational collaboration is now a social imperative for human survival. We must learn how to successfully establish interorganizational collaboration beyond geographic boundaries in order to address these serious threats effectively.

But together with the basic question of survival, both for us individuals and for the organizations we have created and will continue to create, the issue of quality of human and organizational life persists as well. In terms of the learning potentials from IPs, interorganizational partnerships may present the values, ideals, and skills essential for enhancing the quality of life we strive to have. And these partnerships may contain the forces that can thrust our organizing efforts beyond co-laboration in the service of strategic organizational utilitarianism rooted in competition towards consistency in the practice of partnership and cooperation as a socially desirable arrangement because of its ability to nurture positive relationships. For scholars and practitioners alike, presenting the skills, values,
and ideals of this social "good" can inform present action and help to insure its realization (Coopperider, 1988) and prolific creation.

Literature Review

The attention given to IRs in recent years has grown steadily. Published works on IRs undoubtedly represent a major orientation among organization theorists. In the past, the "anatomy and physiology" (Evan, 1978) of organizations provided the main attraction for scholars and managers alike. Today, however, in part due to open systems theory, the role, behavior and relationships of organizations in a wider community are becoming the focus of interest.

Here, we will describe the various concerns and approaches so far evident in the literature on interorganizational relations. Three major categories can be used to describe the present state of the literature with regards interorganizational relations. First, a significant part of the literature seeks to explore and explain the motivating forces that lead to collaboration among organizations. The second stream involves explanations about the mechanisms and processes of linkage. Finally, the
third area of discussion is about strategies for inquiry. These will be discussed in more detail here.

A. Why Organizations Relate.

One significant preoccupation among scholars of IRs is the search for rational explanations and motivations for organizations to act collectively. The assumption, in most cases, is that organizations behave and make decisions in logical ways. At least four basic explanations can be identified. These are: Conflict Management, Economic Dependence, Meta-problem, and External Mandate models.

1. Conflict Management Model. One of the frequently noted reasons for IRs is the management of conflict. The significant assumption implicitly or explicitly espoused by this category of the literature is the belief in the inevitability of conflict. The work by Phillips (1978) expounds on this theme. Here, he suggests that firms, especially in oligopolistic markets, at times act as though they were members of an interfirm organization which has an identity distinct from that of individual members. It is suggested that this interfirm organization acts in implicit and subtle ways to minimize potential
conflict and competition between members. On a more constructive thought, it is suggested that deliberate and formalized efforts are needed to obtain agreements.

Phillips (1978) proposes that the inevitability of conflict is rooted in a strong sense of identity and unique set of goals among the firms. Ordinarily, these goals are conflicting ones. Therefore, firms, which can reasonably be expected to make decisions and act in ways which guarantee attainment of their own goals, will inevitably compete against each other.

Williamson (1975), following Phillips’ lead, felt that interfirm organizations resolve conflict among members. He qualified, however, the notion of inevitability as determined by environmental conditions. He suggested that "own-goal" orientation by member firms will be most likely in a turbulent and threatening environment. It is during times of environmental tranquility and stability that members are most willing to work for common interests.

Along similar lines of thinking, organizational collectives are openly proposed as a mechanism to curb interorganizational competition. The belief that
interorganizational arrangements can be effective tools to reduce competition is one basis for a variety of anti-trust laws and regulations in many countries including the United States.

Negandhi (1975) identifies two specific competitive issues directly addressed by cooperative behavior among organizations. First, IRs reduce infighting among highly similar (in terms of markets, products, and/or technology) and geographically proximate firms. Second, for heterogeneous firms in the same market area, the interfirm organization enhances the competitive capacity of the collective against other collectives from other markets. Thus, for instance, small grocery stores in Cleveland neighborhoods may organize themselves against a group of larger grocery chains although the markets for each group may not be exactly the same.

Most of the organizations cited in the literature in this model are mainly business and profit-oriented. One should not deduce from this, however, that IR as a conflict management mechanism applies mainly to profit-oriented organizations. Several of the reported studies based on the notion of conflict management include government agencies (on the
federal, state, and local levels), profit-oriented private organizations. Non-profit private voluntary organizations (with a variety of service niches, size, and funding sources) are also engaged in stiff competition among themselves. As Lorsch (1973) pointed out, conflict and competition is not a monopoly of business and industry; PVOs also find themselves in situations where they must and do compete just as fiercely against each other. In order to manage conflicts and conflictual situations, PVO’s are said to organize themselves, and often refer to these organizations as coalitions or networks.

In summary, one major stream of thinking about why interfirm behavior and organizing takes place is to minimize conflict among organizations, as well as to enhance their ability to compete against other larger and usually well organized firms.

2. Economic Dependency Model. The second significant explanation for interorganizational cooperation is economic dependency. This model has its foundation in the basic belief that resources are limited and scarce, and that the environment is uncertain. Organizational survival and growth depend on the ability of organizations to obtain resources,
both from the input- and output-side of the systems perspective (Hall and Clark, 1974), and to infuse some rationality and certainty in the environment (Thompson, 1967).

One prominent model applied to the study of interorganizational phenomena is the theory of resource exchange espoused by Blau (1964) (for a more detailed exposition of Blau's position as it applies to interorganizational relations, please see Warner, 1986). This theory proposes that organizations relate to each other in order to facilitate the exchange of resources among themselves. Interorganizational systems provide some assurance of stability in meeting resource needs of member organizations. Organizations, in this case, are viewed as both users and sources of scarce resources, whether in terms of information, funds, technical expertise, personnel, or political influence.

Van de Ven (1976) examined dyadic relationships among organizations using the exchange framework. He focused on health delivery organizations in small communities. From his findings, he suggests that: 1) organizations, in seeking to accomplish their various tasks and goals, depend upon their environment
(viewed as composed of organizations) for certain resources (see also Levine, White, and Paul, 1961; Aiken and Haige, 1968; Aldrich, 1976); 2) this resource dependency is internally based in the organization; and 3) that the dependent organization will experience constraints on its behavior. As a consequence, interorganizational relationships tend to be problematic in the long run, because the dependent organization will strain towards greater autonomy (also Guetzkow, 1966). As Schermerhorn (1975) suggests, loss of autonomy is simply one of a number of associated costs with the necessary strategy of relating with others for resource exchange purposes. This and other costs, he says, are constantly evaluated vis-a-vis the benefits to the organization and negotiations and bargaining are maintained in order to deal with cost-related issues (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967; Morris and Binstock, 1966; and Morris and Rein, 1967).

3. Meta-Problem Model. This model goes beyond the boundaries of organizations for explanations regarding interorganizational phenomena. While the models described above have their roots in needs and expectations endogenous to the organizations
themselves, the meta-problem model sees these explanations as exogenous to organizations.

Proponents of this model argue that organizations today face meta-problems, each too complex and broad that their solutions are beyond the capabilities of single organizations to fashion (Van de Ven, 1976; Trist, 1983; Warner, 1986; Turk, 1973). These problems, according to Turk, are of such magnitude that they often render meaningless the traditional concepts of political, national or regional boundaries. These are global problems, such as the threat of mankind’s annihilation due to nuclear war or accidents; massive destruction and pollution of the global environment; hunger, famine and malnutrition; the threat of AIDS; and the devastation of drugs. All of these, according to Gray (1985) are much too complex to be within the capacity of one organization to address and cope with successfully. Understanding the causes and carrying out the solution activities are too complex and require the coming together of various organizations.

Those who subscribe to this explanation view interorganizational collaboration as a problematic process (Gray, 1985; Brown, 1983, 1984). Commonly
suggested causes of the problem is the inability of organizations to communicate and agree on a commonly acceptable definition of the problem; to clarify mutual expectations; and to identify the relevant organizations who either are seriously affected by the problem (major stakeholders), or who have control over essential resources.

Related to, but somewhat different from the "meta-problem" explanation for IRs is the notion of strategic interdependence. (Litwalk and Hylton, 1962; White, Levine, and Vlasak, 1973; Evan, 1978). Simply described, strategic interdependence, based on the open-systems theory, refers to an organizational characteristic describing each as open to wanted and unwanted consequences from the decisions and actions of other organizations. This suggests that organizational leaders can no longer just project resource requirements and market potentials; they must now actually project the strategies and action orientations of others, for instance, in terms of goal setting or resource acquisition, and the most likely consequences of those strategies for their organization.

One of the most cited writers who espouse this
line of thinking is Evan (1965, 1978). Although his main concern is to define an analytical strategy, as will be discussed in the next section, he also clearly views the IR phenomenon in terms of the open-system perspective. He views IR as a complex of relationships based on the input-throughput-output construct of organizations vis-a-vis other organizations. Clearly, this implies that any organization within this system is affected by and seeks to affect the others. Thus, problems faced by some organizations can be said to impact others as well. Interorganizational collaboration then becomes a mechanism for reducing the uncertainties attendant to the identified or unidentified dependencies as organizations also address meta-problems.

4. **External Mandate.** The preceding motivating factors cited above for IR’s may have created the impression that IR’s happen voluntarily. In many cases, the relationship is, indeed, entered into voluntary by all parties involved. In a few instances, however, the relationship is more the result of some mandate or requirement emanating from an external source than organizational choice Provan (1983), for example, makes a distinction between
"federations" established voluntarily by the organizations as a result of internally perceived need to coordinate; and "mandated systems", those resulting from some legal or authority-based demand from another organization. Such mandates can be accompanied by threats of coercion (Aldrich, 1976) or of negative sanctions (Laumann, et al., 1978).

The published works often cite two types of mandate originators. One can be those organizations which are major sources of funding or other much needed resources. In the state of Ohio, for instance, a number of state agencies are engaged in cooperative activities and programs because the state legislature required them to work together as a condition for budgetary allocations.

A second source of mandate to cooperate can be parent companies in relation to subsidiaries. For example, subsidiaries in Third World countries may be required by their parent companies to work closely with non-profit organizations which are trying to expand the pool of local entrepreneurs in that country.

Whatever the source of the mandate, however, entering into collaborative relationships is done
involuntarily. This is not to say that they would not be entered into voluntarily otherwise; they may do so on their own in their own time. However, the precipitating factor for the collaborative relationship is the mandate from the parent company or the resource donor.

In summary, the literature’s response to the question of why organizations relate or cooperate can be described as mainly due to self-interested utilitarian rationality -- to satisfy the need for resources, to compete against others effectively, to reduce potential conflict among interdependent organizations, or because of some legal force.

However, describing the impetus for and motivations pushing organizations towards IRs is just one aspect of the challenge IRs pose to students of organizational life; the need to achieve one’s own goals ranks first and foremost in the search for collaborative efforts. Another aspect of the challenge, and perhaps a greater concern is the inquiry strategy required for an adequate exploration of IR phenomena. Those who support this direction of work on IRs suggest that learning about IRs would be better served by first deciding on what to focus our
inquiry efforts. The next section briefly presents the major proposals that can be found in the relevant publications.

B. Theorizing and Research Focus.

What must be the focus of inquiry is a major issue addressed by the literature. To some degree, the answer to this question is also expected to determine the kind of answers one stumbles across about the nature, function, and growth of IRs. With respect to this question, three popular streams stand out.

1. Organization-Set. This analytical preference traces its origins from the role theory developed by Merton (1957), and Gross, et al. (1958), but takes as the focus of analysis the organization or group of organizations as it relates to its environment or organization-set. One of the best known proponents of this focus is Evan (1965, 1978), who envisions IR's as the suprasystem of organizations. An organization, for him, is an open system engaging in exchange with organizations in the environment. The concept of environment, for him, seems to contain similarities with the notion of "community", such as that described by Young and Larson (1965) (see also
Bernard, 1973; and Warren, 1967) as a system of interacting groups and organizations. Evan, however, makes a clear distinction between organizations in the set (and thus are the ones which are relevant for IR inquiry) and "environing" organizations -- those with which the focal organization does not interact at all.

The organization set is described by four key elements (Figure 1). The "focal organization" is the point of reference; the input-organization set provides the resources to the focal organization for conversion or consumption. At the other end of the system is the output-organization set which receives the goods, services, or decisions and plans of the focal organization. The fourth element completing the open-system configuration is the feedback loop from the output-organization to the focal organization and then to the input organization, or directly from the output- to the input-organization set.

Several dimensions of organization-sets have been suggested as essential to generating theoretical propositions about interorganizational phenomena. These are diversity and size of the input- and
Figure 1. Organizational-Set Model
output-organization sets, and the network configuration. Size refers to the number of organizations in each set. Diversity describes the differences in functions among organizations in the set. Network configuration may be dyadic, wheel-like, all channel, and chain (Figure 2). A dyadic configuration is when the focal organization A interacts with B, an individual organization or a class of organizations. The wheel-like configuration is evident when the focal organization interacts with several organizations of a particular class, but which themselves are not interacting. An all channel network is where all members of the set interact with each other, and each is also interacting with the focal organization. Finally, when members of a set are connected in a series with the focal organization, but where the focal organization interacts only with the first organization in the series, a chain structure is evident. These differences in network configuration determine the issues and dynamics of the interaction among the organizations, as well as have significant consequences on the internal elements of the focal organization.
1. $A \rightarrow B = \text{Dyadic}$

2. $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow D = \text{Wheel}$

3. $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow D = \text{Chain}$

4. $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow D = \text{All-Channel}$

Figure 2. Variety of Network Configuration
2. Domain. Another focus of attention evident in the literature is the "domain" or the network itself. As Gray (1985) suggests, focusing on domain means that the level of analysis is "the relationships within an interorganizational system, rather than the focal organization" (p. 912). The domain focus of analysis requires knowing what the relationships are and those processes and structures which facilitate relationship building and maintenance. While generally the proponents of domain analysis do not reject set analysis, they suggest that set analysis is very restricted in its ability to bring about relevant insights into the nature of IRs, and is mainly useful in understanding the characteristics of organizations themselves.

More specifically, domain analysis takes off from the key assumption of organizational interdependence. Those who follow this approach, thus, conceive of needs and interests, not in terms of one organization, but in terms of interrelated needs among organizations. These interrelated needs serve as the basis of the condition of interdependence among organizations who in one way or another are affected by metaproblems and unanticipated and
dissonant consequences (Trist, 1977, 1983; Emery and Trist, 1965); indivisible problems (Aldrich, 1976); or messes (Ackoff, 1974) which are inherently wicked (Rittle and Webber, 1973).

Domain has also been referred to as interorganizational fields or policy systems by Warren (1967) and Milward (1982). A number of the research and published work using the concept of field or policy systems centers on the determinants of network structure (Whetten, 1981) such as network equilibrium. This equilibrium has four components: domain consensus, ideological consensus, positive evaluation, and work coordination. All interactions within the network tends towards homeostasis.

The key belief is that network development (for instance, towards some degree of interorganizational collaboration, according to Gray, 1985) is a necessary and logical consequence of effective processes and adequate structural elements. These facilitative processes and structures that must be attended to include those which impact problem definition (McCann, 1983), direction setting (Burns, 1966; Murray, 1979), or structural requisites for continued interaction (McCann, 1983; Trist, 1983; and

The most common theoretical basis for network analysis is exchange theory, discussed earlier. Cook (1977), for instance, makes the assumption "that unit exchange relations tend toward equilibrium". For example, if A has a power advantage, A’s use of power will tend to increase across transactions. However, increased use of a power advantage will eventually lead to a loss of power (Emerson, 1972), and thus, a return to equilibrium. Such a consequence is to be expected, especially within the politico-economic framework of exchange, because of resource depletion on the side of the one with the power advantage or loss of utilitarian value for the resource recipient.

Thus, while the organization-set focus attends more heavily to the nature and functions of organizations in the set, domain or network analysis is more concerned with such things as recognized interdependence, inclusion of legitimate stakeholders (Brown, 1983, 1984), or facilitating coincidence of values (Schmerhorn, 1975; Vickers, 1967; Burns, 1966).

In summary, domain analysis focuses on the complex of relationships among organizations.
Frequently, this approach falls back on exchange and equilibrium theories. Its proponents tend to be concerned with those processes and structures that strengthen the relationships.

3. **Focus on Dyads.** A third major trend in research and theorizing about IR’s shy away from either organization-set and domain analyses. There is a strong belief that basic understanding of IR’s requires concentrated attention on those factors which influence decision about the organization/s with whom one interacts. According to Paulson (1976), our knowledge about the factors that make organizations interact can be better if inquiry focuses on such things as the determinants of choice about specific organizations. Why and how do organizations choose each other rather than some other organizations?

The dyadic approach mostly relies on two theoretical models to explain the exchange of resources. The first is that of the politico-economic resource dependence model. Simply, it refers to relationships as between a weapons contracting company dependent largely on Pentagon awards of work contracts and funding, or a government agency.
dependent upon budgetary decisions by the legislative or other higher level branch of government. The second is the voluntary exchange model (Levine and White, 1961). This model describes such relationships as between universities in a consortium program arrangement.

Proponents of the dyadic approach point out that dyads are the smallest subunit and are thus amenable to being studied in a concentrated and intensive manner. The suggestion is that we focus on the antecedents and consequences of dyadic interactions (Whetten, 1981), to address Paulson’s concern. The approach, therefore, seems to lie midway between the approach that concentrates on specific organizations in a set and that which grapples with the macro phenomenon of IR networks.

Mulford (1984) suggests two very specific areas of interest in dyadic analysis, namely: the nature of resource flow, and the variables (such as the number of linkage mechanisms used) associated with the interaction. For example, one key question for Mulford is: What kind of resources and information flow between organizations?

Thus, the studies and theoretical works that take
the dyadic route attend to those properties that are comparative as well as relational. Comparative properties may include similarities or differences in organizational structure or function, values and philosophies, or size, and requires understanding of the internal properties of each member of the dyad. Relational properties include degree of reciprocity, standardization and formalization of interactions, or conflict resolution processes (Miller, 1958).

To summarize, the inquiry efforts on IR seem to follow three major routes. On the most macro level, there is domain analysis which concentrates on the complex of relationships among organizations. On the next level, there is organization-set analysis which, while still concentrating on still a network of relationships, approaches the phenomenon from the perspective of an individual organization or a class of organizations. The central point of the inquiry is the focal organization. Dyadic analysis, the third inquiry trend, focuses on interaction between two organizations, and explores the relationship mainly from the perspective of organizational or comparative and relational properties. This third approach, while not necessarily rejecting the first two, believes
that it is the most logical jump from inquiry into individual organizations.

C. **Linkage Mechanisms.**

The third most common area of interest for IR scholars is the understanding of those mechanisms which link organizations together. Generally, Schopler (1965) categorizes linkage mechanisms into two broad groups -- personal and impersonal. Mulford (1984) suggests formal versus informal (or ad hoc) mechanisms, as well as tight or loose links. It seems, however, that Mulford’s formal links category largely coincides with Schopler’s impersonal label. This category refers to such links as boundary roles (not persons) and joint project agreements (Provan, 1983).

On the other hand, and of greater significance to this work, are the more personal, nonformal linkage mechanisms in IR’s. First, there is the concept of interlocking directorates as one mechanism that express interorganizational connectedness. There is a sizable body of literature on interlocking directorates, attesting to the high level of interest in this subject (see, for instance, Jemison, 1984;
At-Twaijri and Montanari, 1987, and Schwab, et al. 1985). Suffice it to say at the expense of oversimplification, that interlocks in IR's refer to the phenomenon of having one or a number of board members who are also board members in at least one other organization. This facilitates information flow, resource exchanges, and conflict resolution among organizations with the interlock.

Another major personal and often informal linkage mechanism is the flow of personnel between organizations. One representative study on this topic was conducted by Baty, Evan, and Rothermel (1971). Their exploration focused on the flow of graduates, personnel, and faculty between schools, especially business schools. They concluded that such exchanges result in the schools enjoying the benefits of closer relationships, such as in having role models in the faculty members who were recruited from other schools. The resulting modeling from hiring and faculty exchanges served to facilitate exchange of information and programmatic collaborations between the schools; and enhanced future recruitment of faculty members from each other.

Finally, Schopler (1965) introduces the concept
of interorganizational groups, which she defines thus:

"Interorganizational groups are composed of members representing parent organizations or constituencies, who meet periodically to make decisions relevant to their common concerns, and whose behavior is regulated by a common set of expectations" (p.703).

She identifies four types of groups depending on the group origin (mandated or voluntary), and degree of external influence on group structure (high or low). Type I groups are mandated, with their task structures largely determined by external forces. Type II groups are likewise mandated groups, but they are more autonomous with regard internal structuring. Types III and IV groups are voluntary, with the former highly influenced by external constraints compared to the latter. Understanding these groups, according to Schopler, is a necessary step to understanding IR’s, and raise issues beyond mere group level development.

From the above discussion, it is clear that attempts to explain and describe IR’s in general, and IP’s, in particular, have been overly confined to utilitarian logic. But utilitarian rationality is inadequate in explaining for instance some choice making that takes place as to who will be sought
after as a partner and who will not. Hypothetically, Organization A, but not Organization B, might be viewed as a potential partner by Organization Z, even when A and B can offer the same resources. Simply put, the current explanations over-emphasize the utilitarian logic, and ignores the social aspects of IP’s. What is needed is a reframing of this phenomenon to include and discover those socio-logically relevant forces that enhance the potential for organizations to engage in partnership, and the processes which serve to nurture and strengthen it.

Initial Framing of Partnership

In the beginning, the concept of partnership used here was a simplistic one. The phenomenon was seen as involving joint and coordinated action, either voluntary, accidental or mandated, which was aimed at achieving some shared goal or solving some common problem. Figure 3 depicts this initial notion of partnership. The large circles represent individual organizations. The small inner circles depict individual representatives who strive to form what Schopler calls the "interorganizational group". The broken bidirectional lines between the large and small circles indicate formal or informal roles of
Figure 3. Initial Concept of Interorganizational Partnership
representation the individual has to this group. The external solid lines connecting the large circles represent the agreements and structures for acting and interacting (resource exchanges, problem definition, etc.) between the organizations. The solid arrows between the small circles indicate the execution by each organizational representative of the role of representing their respective organization, for instance, in defining common problems and goals, and in making choices about the solution to a common problem or achievement of a shared goal (such as paralyzing a common competitor).

As my thinking about the phenomenon progressed, however, it was clear that some essential elements needed to be incorporated.

Figure 4 shows the addition of more social elements in the conceptual frame. These elements were labeled mainly as congruent values, and affective ties. Congruent values are seen as having a capacity to attract organizations to each other and are represented by the outside solid lines in Figure 4. In the interorganizational group, affective ties are seen as critical for the representatives to undertake their work with each other. These ties are
Figure 4. Additional Elements to the Initial Conceptual Frame
represented by the solid internal lines between the small circles.

Again, this conception of the partnership phenomenon represents a tentative framing, mainly serving as the starting point for the research project. At this point, IP was defined as:

The joining of two or more organizations through perceived congruence of values resulting in commitment to and the execution of joint action, normally over a prolonged period of time.

While clearly this initial definition shared the defects of other previous definitional attempts (like being too broad as to include other kinds of relationships), I felt it helped direct attention to the realm of values, and other cultural elements in a broader way, not just the realm of common action. Furthermore, it expresses a commonly held belief in the social psychology literature that shared values serve as a basis for attraction, bonding, and joint action (see for instance Bird, 1985).

Furthermore, it clearly limits the relevant phenomenon from the very beginning to only those that are voluntary in nature. By assuming that the basis for partnership is to be found in perceptions of
value congruence denies the ability of external coercion or mandates alone to generate IP's.

Finally, the "prolonged period of time" aspect of the definition took our initial search away from "one-shot arrangements" over the short term. At this point, however, it was clear that this notion of partnership will change as the inquiry progressed. This assumption was critical because of the lack of definitional clarity from the literature.

Research Questions

Several research questions gave guidance to this inquiry. Overall, this inquiry wanted to understand the nature of partnership among and between organizations, and discover the forces that strengthen them. Specifically, the following questions guided our inquiry:

1. What is interorganizational partnership?

Recognizing that our definition of partnership among organizations is preliminary and not cast in stone, this project explores the nature of the phenomenon itself. Furthermore, it was clear to us from the beginning that the inquiry was to be influenced by the assumption that partnership was more than joint...
action based on mutual resource dependence; that it was brought about and made alive by socio-logical and spiritual forces. This assumption later on helped us pay attention to hints and overt descriptions of these forces as empirical data were obtained and analyzed.

2. What factors heighten the potential for partnerships? Discovering those factors that heighten the potential for partnership can go a long way towards the management of interorganizational interactions and the contexts in which they may occur in order to facilitate the creation of more IP’s.

3. What processes sustain and strengthen partnerships? In large measure, this question addresses the need for practical understanding of partnerships in terms of how those involved with the phenomenon may nurture and strengthen the relationship, once it is established. For instance, formalized and legalized processes of generating binding agreements or contracts may not be helpful at all -- and perhaps even detrimental -- to the quality and strength of the partnership.

The answers to these research questions should help us gain more insights not only about how
organizations in the international arena develop and nurture partnerships; our learnings should be helpful, too, in the development of partnerships among other types of organizations, and in opening up new areas for future research.

Summary

This chapter presented the common approaches and models applied to the study of interorganizational relations in general, and to cooperation specifically. First, the published works address the issue of why organizations relate, what the inquiry focus should be, and what linkage mechanisms are employed in the relationship.

Four popular explanations for IRs were detected from the literature. These are: conflict management, economic dependency, meta-problem, and external mandate models. As to inquiry focus, the literature contains three suggestions: organizational set approach, concentration on domain, and dyadic analysis. Finally, the chapter presented the initial framing that characterized the inception of this work. At that stage, we saw IPs as the joining of two or more organizations based on congruence of values resulting into joint action over a prolonged period.
of time. The chapter ends with the enunciation of the questions that guided this inquiry.

In the next chapter, we will describe how the inquiry was designed and implemented in order to obtain the answers we were looking for.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In Chapter 1, we discussed what aroused our interest in IPs, presented the common themes in the literature with regards collaboration among organizations, and enunciated the questions that guided this inquiry. In this chapter, we will discuss the research project. The chapter is divided into five major parts, namely: a) the setting of the project; b) the project participants; c) the research philosophy and design; d) the data collection process; and e) the analysis of the data.

The Setting of the Project

This project was undertaken in two non-profit organizations in the state of Ohio. These organizations frequently refer to themselves as "coalitions" of internationally-oriented organizations. As such, one of their espoused and ongoing commitments is to develop themselves as partnerships as well as to be a fertile ground for
the sprouting of partnerships between member organizations. In this sense, then, the setting was appropriate for the research project.

Moreover, these organizations were relatively in the early stages of development. OHIO IN THE WORLD (OHIO), the first organizational setting, was initiating a reorganization and strengthening program. The opportunity to witness the formative period of partnership between organizations was expected, and rightly so, to be tremendous.

The HUNGER AND DEVELOPMENT COALITION OF CENTRAL OHIO (HADCCO) was chronologically a slightly older coalition tracing its beginnings to 1981. Mainly a regional organization, it operated mainly within the Central Ohio area, with Columbus as its base of operations. It was also developmentally more mature compared to OHIO. While OHIO was still trying, in 1987, to establish itself as a state-wide coalition, HADCCO already had its own formalized structure and governance mechanisms. It showed at the start of contact with HADCCO leaders a formalized commitment to long-term operation. One of the often cited proofs of this long-term commitment is the establishment and funding of the first coalition program called the
Global Learner Center, and the hiring of full-time staff to manage the Center and to assist in the administrative work of the coalition. Finally, although at the time of this project it was in the process of reviewing and modifying its mission statement and goals, HADCCO also had a longer, albeit informal, history. A core of its initial leaders and members have previously been friends, or had worked with each other before. Thus, HADCCO presented to us the opportunity to explore a more established partnership setting and obtain a more historical perspective of the partnership process, while OHIO was expected to show us the emergence of the partnership phenomena and the factors that facilitate this emergence.

Thus, while both OHIO and HADCCO were relatively young organizations, they were sufficiently different developmentally. Such difference, we felt, enhanced the potential for learning about the life giving forces of interorganizational partnerships. In order to give a better feel of the setting for this research project, additional information needs to be given on the two organizations involved. The
remainder of this section describes these organizations in more detail.

A. OHIO IN THE WORLD.

This section tries to tell the story of OHIO, the younger of the two organizations that served as the setting for this study. Here, the story of how OHIO started, what its goals are, who its leaders and members are, will be described.

1. The Genesis of OHIO.

OHIO was conceived as a means of linking together the various international organizations and individuals actively working for international concerns in the state of Ohio. Leaders trace its beginning to about 1982, during a regional conference attended by leaders of various internationally-active organizations from various mid-western states. Here a number of Ohio-based organizations were well-represented. As one OHIO leader reminisced:

It was amazing to everyone there to see all these people from Ohio -- very active, very committed individuals in the area of international activism. And we did not know each other. We never met before, except for perhaps a few of us who came to the same meetings in the past. We saw there was so much going on in the state, and that there was a need to connect all of these people and programs and organizations. So we decided to meet again when we came back to Ohio.
Aside from awareness of having been very much isolated from each other, thereby also experiencing lack of information exchange among themselves and their organizations in the state, the OHIO founders also acknowledged a dysfunctional competitiveness among organizations, especially in the process of obtaining resources. They stated:

Voluntary organizations such as world affairs councils, hosting and exchange organizations and the like have seen each other principally as competitors for scarce resources.

The lack of cooperation has had certain consequences...the programs offered by these groups and the resources they represent have been underrecognized and underutilized.

These conference participants then resolved to do something upon their return to Ohio. During the conference, they slowly crystallized what they wanted to see happen -- a state-wide organization of internationally-oriented organizations.

Since most of the participants in the 1982 conference were involved closely with either educational institutions or community education programs on international issues, the logical area of strong interest was one of international education. Thus, as will be seen later, OHIO became very much
education-oriented in terms of organization membership and program representation.

From its beginnings in 1982, OHIO survived and exhibited limited growth for its first five years of life. Founders and leaders were able to recruit new members -- both organizations and individuals. At this point, membership seemed to be defined, as seemed to be traditional with other coalitions or networks of organizations, in terms of payment of membership fees. This, according to several members, may have contributed to some of OHIO's major difficulties which will be described later in detail.

Meetings were held in various places in Ohio, but predominantly in the Columbus area because of its central location. It seems that these meetings were mainly attempts to clarify what OHIO ought to be. Discussions around this time centered on identifying potential members, goals, legal status, and specific projects. Values, accomplishments, and needs for resources of different kinds also were focal topics during these early meetings.

As the years went by, meetings became less attended, and less frequent. When the Social
Innovations in Global Management (SIGMA) group at Case Western Reserve University hooked up with some of the OHIO leaders, they felt a strong need for strengthening it and expanding its active membership roster.

2. **Major Goals and Key Function.** OHIO represents a major effort to respond to the problem the leaders of various organizations felt. They saw for it a two-fold task, as stated in its mission statement. In response to the problem of isolationism, OHIO resolved to make each international organization and their leaders aware of each other and create opportunities for cooperation. They saw this task as primarily identifying every international actor (either organizations or individuals) in the state of Ohio, the variety of programs they undertake, and their targeted clients. Aside from the task of mutual awareness, it also took upon itself, as embodied in its statement of mission, the task of encouraging local coalition building in various communities and regions of the state, and of creating opportunities for more efficient use of resources. Efforts to address this task were concentrated on a number of approaches. Leaders committed themselves to
organizing regional and state-wide conferences of leaders and representatives of international organizations in the state. Also, they began to encourage local dialogue among the organizations in a given community and region. OHIO members were encouraged to step up efforts to identify international actors and programs in their communities -- something that most members reported to be a major unknown even in the local level. One OHIO leader made use of the local newspaper in her community to identify leaders and programs and made them known throughout the city.

But as time went by, OHIO became a burden for many. Organizational representatives started missing meetings more frequently, and an increasing number did not continue payment of their membership fees -- either they did not find what they were looking for, or lost support from their organization which previously enabled them to attend meetings regularly in the past.

But in spite of dropping attendance at meetings and decreasing membership, a number of people kept their belief in their original vision of a state-wide
organization of international organizations and leaders in the state. It was their persistence and perseverance that ultimately led to collaboration with SIGMA -- a collaboration of which this work is a part.

3. Leaders and Members. Who are these OHIO leaders and members who gave OHIO their vision, energy, and personal resources to support it during its infancy? And what were the organizations whose membership let OHIO survive the challenges of its first five years?

As earlier indicated, the leaders of OHIO were mainly those who happened to meet at the Wingspread conference in 1982. They were mainly educators, active leaders of churches and church-related community programs, officers of international exchange programs, and state-government officers.

These were, and they continue to be, very energetic individuals who had strong faith in their causes, whether they were for community involvement in student exchange programs, or for international education in local elementary and high schools.

Formally, the leadership of OHIO rests on its officers -- a president, a vice-president, secretary,
and treasurer. As of this writing, each region of the state has an officer in OHIO, except the Northwest.

The membership of OHIO was varied. There were religious, higher education, government, and community organizations. Programs represented in OHIO included human rights, peace, basic human needs, international development, international trade, and cultural understanding.

As Table 1 shows, OHIO had identified members from all the five regions of Ohio. A total of 66 organizations and 218 programs were represented in OHIO based on the entries of the OHIO 1986 International Directory.

However, as Table 1 also indicates, membership and program representation were not distributed evenly. Members tended to come most heavily from the Central Region (47% of organizations), followed by the Northeast and Southwest regions. Only six (6) or 9% of the members were from the Southeast and Northwest.

Program representation, based on categories used by the OHIO Directory, also tended to be heavy on Education (25%) and Cultural Understanding (23%). The
Table 1
Membership Profile of OHIO, 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NO. OF MEMBERS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PROGRAM TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Basic Human Needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Human Rights</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Peace</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Int. Trade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Int. Dev.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cult. Underst.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
next concentration of programs is in International Development and Basic Human Needs (both accounting for 23% of all programs).

The directory entries show a varied profile of members and programs. They also, however, indicate some of the challenges that OHIO needed to overcome, as we will discuss later.

4. Key Accomplishments. As a very young organization OHIO does not yet have an impressively long list of accomplishments. However, leaders of OHIO can point to a number of things that they consider very significant accomplishments. Foremost among these accomplishments is the feeling of support that members feel from each other as they tackle often frustrating problems.

But aside from emotional and intellectual support, members point to a number of more tangible accomplishments.

First, they are very proud of the fact that from a handful of individuals who met in 1982, they have been able to identify over 60 organizations and over 200 programs in the state of Ohio. While they believe that OHIO is still a long way from really
accomplishing one of its major goals, identifying so many programs and organizations is a major accomplishment, especially given the meager resources they had to work with.

Second, OHIO is very proud of its directory. It is a major source of basic information available to members about each other, such as their goals, programs, location, contact persons, addresses, telephone numbers, areas served, and funding sources. This directory was realized with the pooling of resources from a number of members, such as editorial talent, printing facilities, and monetary support.

Third, members were able to come out with a newsletter which basically informs members of major international events, conferences, legislative action with international implications, and other developments in the international field, either in the local, state or national levels. The newsletter is published every quarter and contains articles and news features from members about activities in their organizations, new programs, or community events.

Fourth, OHIO counts among its accomplishments a number of events spearheaded by members as a result of OHIO discussions. For instance, a couple of
community-level conferences have been held in order to make the presence of interorganizational programs and organizations better known in the community. Also, a number of exchanges of learning have occurred among OHIO members, especially in terms of introducing programs into other areas of the state. How to use international students, for instance, in the task of introducing international education to local schools, has been learned by some members from others who have done it for some time and have shown success with it.

Finally, OHIO has recently been granted tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service. This status has been a major task for the officers for a long time and had been a source of frustration until then. The granting of the status was important because it allows OHIO to receive financial and other kinds of support from others and allowing donors to enjoy tax shelter benefits from their gifts. Symbolically, this represented to OHIO leaders a heightened capacity to act and generate resources to support major activities they feel they need to have.

5. OHIO's challenges. In 1987, however, when the
relationship between OHIO and SIGMA commenced, OHIO was characterized mainly by periodic meetings and informal conversations attended by the officers and very few of the members (those who paid membership dues). Meetings were more often than not held in Columbus, the most centrally located metropolitan area of Ohio. These meetings highlighted both the strength of and organizational difficulties for OHIO. The meetings concretely brought home to people the benefit of having the supportive and cooperative circle of colleagues and friends in the international work arena. At the same time, the difficulties of expanding (and later on even maintaining) the attendance at these Columbus meetings forcefully brought home the challenge of physical distance that a state-wide networking effort posed.

While Columbus is centrally located, for most of those who attended meetings, it was a long drive -- as much as 150 miles each way. Although the drive, from personal experience, is seldom stressful during the warm months, winter driving can be risky. And for those attending the meetings without support from their organizations, the drive became financially draining.
Aside from the difficulty of getting more people from different parts of the state to consistently attend meetings in Columbus, other problems arose as well. Due to resource constraints, mainly staff and funds, the Newsletter effort also encountered difficulties. Several times, the Newsletter was in danger of not being published at all.

But most disturbing was the difficulty of getting new members and holding on to the old ones. Less and less organizations and individuals remained as dues-paying. Its seriousness became clear when even organizations based in the Columbus area could no longer be counted on to continue paying dues, and could not even send representatives regularly to meetings.

In view of these difficulties, OHIO's leaders realized the need to strengthen it. Thus, its leaders, in collaboration with the SIGMA, undertook the OHIO Appreciative Inquiry Project. This project was designed to identify the activities and programs of members and potential members; to discover and celebrate their accomplishments; and to invite individuals and organizations to be part of OHIO.
This Project has been in effect since February 1987. Since that time, an ever-expanding process of appreciative interviewing has been in effect, both among members, and among members and interested individuals -- either representing themselves or their organizations. To date, aside from the names listed in the directory, the number of organizations added to the list either as new or potential members has more than doubled.

Aside from the appreciative interviews and conversations, a number of meetings, attended by both the old members and newly contacted organizational representatives, has been held. Interest and commitment to OHIO is definitely growing. During one of the latest meetings held in Columbus in June 1989, about 35 people representing various kinds of organizations, started to address the need of bridging the distance between members which is hampering information exchange, face to face conversations and informal exploration of potentials for collaboration. Before this meeting adjourned, the Governor of Ohio stopped by and expressed his support for the OHIO effort, and shared his vision of Ohio as leading the way in America's involvement in a global
economy.

But more importantly, both for OHIO and for this research project, OHIO is clearly creating opportunities for organizations to develop partnership arrangements. As a result of meetings and appreciative interviews, organizations, through their representatives are beginning to explore partnerships or in a limited sense, collaborative programs. For example, some of the members have began discussions around a state-wide computer network connecting members all over the state. On a smaller scale, a couple of organizations have began collaborating on short-term programs, such as organizing conferences or joining resources to put out a local directory.

In this sense, there is no doubt that OHIO was a viable and exciting setting for this research project. While much of the opportunities it presented were about potential or emerging partnerships, it was this very fact itself that made OHIO a desirable setting.

B. HUNGER AND DEVELOPMENT COALITION OF CENTRAL OHIO.

The Hunger and Development Coalition of Central
Ohio (HADCCO) is a regional coalition of about 35 members -- churches, church-affiliated organizations, charities, educational institutions, and other not-for-profit organizations. It is a regional, coalition-type organization operating in the Central Ohio region and based in the Columbus area. Although HADCCO officially started in 1985, it's history dates back to the early 1980's. Its membership can be characterized as very diverse, in terms of interests, size, resource bases, or degree of formalization.

Some of HADCCO's membership are extremely small, without very complex formal organizational structure or financial sources. Other members are more formalized and large, with substantial office staff, budgets, and structure. While HADCCO, because of the predominance of churches and church-affiliated organizations in its membership, still has that "churchy" image, as cited in its latest evaluation report conducted by CODEL (a member organization), it is also clear that the coalition has attained a certain level of diversity, with a membership that has a wide range of interests and programs.

The core task for HADCCO, historically, was to address the hunger problems in various parts of the
world effectively by connecting various hunger-interested organizations in the Columbus area. Because of the major role played by local churches and their hunger relief programs in the genesis of HADCCO, the focus on hunger is understandable, and in fact reflected strongly in its name.

Specifically, it was originally seen as a way of bringing together the variety of resources, skills, and networks of the various relief organizations and fashioning them into a concerted effort. Over time, however, HADCCO’s mission evolved into what it is today — an expanded understanding of the developmental issues associated with global problems, including human rights, peace, environmental health, hunger and malnutrition, and education, among others (see Table 2 for the list of current member-organizations).

Leadership in HADCCO is vested in officers elected from among recognized organizational representatives. Aside from the officers, a number of committees are in place to carry out important tasks of the coalition. Figure 5 shows HADCCO’s organizational chart, indicating the officers and
Table 2

HADCCO List of Current Members

- Bread for the World
- CARE
- Catholic Relief Services
- Church World Service/CROP
- Coordination in Development/CODEL
- Columbus Area International Program
- Columbus Campaign for Arms Control
- Columbus Chapter of UNA/USA
- Columbus Chapter of UNICEF
- Diocese of Southern Ohio
- First Community Church
- Greater Columbus Coalition Against Apartheid
- Hunger Network in Ohio
- Hunger Project
- League of Women Voters
- Lifecare Alliance
- Lutheran Social Services
- Mershon Center - OSU
- Methodist Urban Ministries
- Metropolitan Area Church Board
- Metropolitan Nutrition Council
- Mid Ohio Food Bank
- Ohio Farm Bureau
- Ohio Hunger Task Force
- Ohio Nutrition Council
- Old Trinity Lutheran Church
- Pledge of Resistance
- St. John’s Community Kitchen
- St. Stephen’s Center for Peace
- United Church of Christ
- World Federalists
Figure 5. Organizational Chart for HADCCO
committees assigned to take care of coalition affairs.

**HADCCO versus OHIO.** In several ways, HADCCO provides a different setting for this research compared to OHIO. First, HADCCO seems to be at a more mature stage, while OHIO can be said to be very young (Greiner, 1972). HADCCO has its own staff members, although the three staff persons are hired on a part-time basis. Also, HADCCO has gotten to the point where it feels confident in its long-term viability, because of the firm support of local churches and member organizations. Because of this confidence, it has established a permanent project -- the Global Learner Center. This Center is funded by HADCCO and operated by its staff members, for the purpose of assisting both the coalition members as well as other interested members of the Columbus community in the task of expanding community awareness about international issues, about the links that exist between Ohioans and the rest of the world, and Ohio's place in the global village.

Second, HADCCO, in response to its increasingly diversifying membership profile, has reached the
point where fundamental discussions about and changes to its goals and mission are taking place. In this sense, it is revisiting what OHIO is still beginning to undertake in earnest.

Third, HADCCO has achieved greater formalization in terms of its governance compared to OHIO. While OHIO has yet to formalize the process of choosing its officers and actually do so, HADCCO has already an established set of officers and a process of choosing future ones. Definitely, this difference is associated with the fact that HADCCO’s membership is fewer in number, while OHIO’s is still expanding; and that HADCCO’s membership is concentrated in one region, while OHIO’s geographical area of interest is larger and dispersed.

Finally, and most importantly, the membership of HADCCO is relatively more stable than OHIO’s. Although new members to the coalition are possible, the membership has remained somewhat stable for some years now. OHIO’s membership, on the other hand, is still very fluid, because new members keep coming in, potential members are identified and invited; and new types of organizations are acknowledged as possible members. More importantly, the concept of membership,
except for what is contained in OHIO’s By-laws, has not been well-defined and only recently been discussed by the members and leaders beyond the act of payment of membership dues. What membership means and who should and can be members are questions whose traditional answers are being reexamined and new answers explored.

Because of HADCCO’s different level of development compared to OHIO, it offered us a unique opportunity as prospective source of some historical perspective about partnership development. HADCCO was also especially desirable because of its potential for providing genesis stories which may heighten our understanding of the factors that make partnerships happen. OHIO on the other hand was seen as presenting us with the opportunity to witness the emergence of partnerships.

In summary, the two organizations chosen afforded this research the opportunity to: 1) witness, as they emerge, what might be important factors that affect and bring about partnership; and 2) explore from the perspective of a more established partnership those factors that strengthen the
partnering relationship.

Participants in the Research

To properly introduce the participants of the research project, it is important to highlight some aspects of the OHIO Appreciative Inquiry Project, of which this research is a small component. As earlier noted, the OHIO leaders needed something to strengthen OHIO and make it a truly state-wide network. The Appreciative Inquiry Project was the vehicle chosen. It was also through this project that this researcher was able to identify and ultimately collaborate with HADCCO staff and leaders.

The OHIO Appreciative Inquiry Project (AIP) basically started in February 1987 as a result of interest among OHIO leaders in collaborating with a group of faculty and Ph.D. students in the SIGMA at Case Western Reserve University (Department of Organizational Behavior). The OHIO leaders and the SIGMA representatives then agreed on the goals and structure for the AIP.

The AIP, as earlier stated, was to identify programs, celebrate successes, and explore factors which can strengthen OHIO as a state-wide network. The OHIO was represented in the project by its
officers, and a number of founding members; the SIG was represented by this researcher, one member of the faculty as adviser and another Ph.D. student as co-worker. This group, totaling 13 individuals, became known as the Steering Committee.

The first series of semi-structured interviews started after the SIG representatives put together the initial interview protocol. The SIG people than started conducting the interviews with members of the AIP Steering Committee. Also these members were encouraged to schedule and undertake their own interviews, after witnessing and experiencing the process themselves. It was through this ever-increasing number of interviewers that the AIP was able to reach for the interview sessions 60 individuals and organization representatives from all over the state of Ohio, including those who were interviewed as part of the pilot interviews with the steering committee members.

The participants of the AIP are individuals, either representing officially their organizations (comprising 97% of the total participants) or privately themselves (3% of total), who are active in
international work. The represented organizations were either government (state, local) agencies, educational institutions, private voluntary organizations (PVO), and other non-governmental bodies. The breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVO/NGO.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 60 participants, 10 were members of the Steering Committee who took part in the first round of interviews. Two (2) were from a government agency, 3 were entrepreneurs, and the remaining 5 were in education. Thus, the total number of persons who provided interview data for this research came up to sixty (60).

A second group of participants in the research are those who were asked to fill out a survey instrument designed to primarily check some of the key interpretations we were able to extract from the interview data at that time. This group can be further broken down into two subgroups. The first
subgroup includes individuals and organizational representatives who attended the OHIO meeting of June 1989. These participants were asked to fill out the survey instrument. From the 36 people who were in the meeting, 25 instruments were completed and returned. Among the twenty five respondents, 11 were not participants in any of the previous interviews as determined during the meeting itself. However, a determination of which returned survey instruments belonged to these 11 could not be made because no means of identification was used on the instruments. Clearly, this limits our ability to analyze the data on this regard.

The second subgroup is comprised of 20 individuals representing educational institutions, PVO's, and church-affiliated organizations active in international work and who had never been to OHIO meetings. These individuals had their base of operations or offices in the Northeast Ohio region, mainly in the greater Cleveland metropolitan area.

The total number of survey respondents was 45 individuals. Table 3 profiles the survey respondents based on: 1) Type of program/s their organization
Table 3  
Profile of Survey Respondents  
(N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. By Program Type</th>
<th>B. By Org. Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Program</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Exch.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>N.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. By Org. Age</th>
<th>D. By Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.R.</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. By Position</th>
<th>E. By Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Level</td>
<td>Full-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Part-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>Volunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>N.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had; 2) Regional Base or location; 3) Size of organization; 4) Age of organization; 5) respondent’s position/rank in the organization; and 6) respondent’s employment status.

Most of the respondents (71.7%) indicated that their organizations were engaged mainly in higher education programs and activities. Fifty percent of the respondents were from the northeast region of the state (note that 20 respondents accounting for 40% of total were from the Cleveland area); 54.3% of the represented organizations in the survey were either medium or small organizations (from 1 to under 1000 total employees), with 41.3% reporting their organizations as small; and organizational age tended to be young, with 41.3 % reporting organizational age at either young or starting (0 to under 40 years old). Among the survey respondents, more than 54% indicated they were in at least supervisory positions, with 15.2% of them indicating they were at the top of their organizational hierarchy; 41.3%, however, did not provide a response to this item. Finally, two-thirds of the respondents (63%) considered themselves full-time employees in their organizations.
From Table 3, the respondents of the survey tended to be a certain group of people, more engaged with educational types of activities, and are well-placed in their organizations. While this profile is skewed, and therefore, may pose serious limitations for our findings and conclusions -- for instance with regards generalizability -- its skewness does not in itself diminish their ability to contribute to the enrichment, modification, or even discarding of key insights extracted at this time from the interview data. More importantly, this group was considered representative of the interview group, which was also mainly composed of people representing education programs. Furthermore, the respondents' ability to call on their own experiences with partnership or their idealized notion of it was deemed sufficient for the purposes of the survey process. Finally, this group of respondents can be categorized as a convenience sample made up of people who were available to this researcher at minimal cost of time, money, and effort.

The interview group was chosen mainly because the individuals were participating in the AIP interview
process, either as members or OHIO, previously active members, or prospective members. These people were described at the beginning of AIP as having varied experiences with partnership formation, were searching for or seriously thinking about partnership opportunities, or were at the initiation stage of partnership at the time of their participation in the AIP. In this sense, the sample was judged capable of providing insights into those forces that create and nurture partnership relationships.

The interview participants from HADCCO were originally part of the OHIO AIP pilot interviews with the Steering Committee. Three top officers at HADCCO later sat down with this researcher for at least two interview sessions each, and one more session to review and suggest modifications to our initial interpretations of the interview results.

Research Philosophy and Design

The purpose of this research was to explore partnerships among organizations and discover those forces which lead to the initiation and strengthening of these relationships. This is what Kerlinger (1973) refers to as an exploratory field study. In line with
his view of the purposes of exploratory studies, this research sought to gain familiarity with interorganizational partnerships and to:

1) discover what IP is;
2) identify the forces that make partnering possible; and
3) describe those forces that nurture partnerships.

The first principle that guided this research was one of theory generation, grounded in empirical evidence. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), grounded theory generation places emphasis on generation, as opposed to testing or verification of theory. As noted earlier, the concept of partnership between organizations requires description and exploration beyond current inadequate explanations. The literature on interorganizational relations does not as yet have a model that exposes the depths of partnerships beyond utilitarian explanations of resource dependence or joint problem-solving efforts.

The second principle guiding this work is one of applicability. By being applicable, as well as scholarly, the study should have an impact on and contribute to the initiation and development of partnerships. For those engaged in partnering efforts, the results of this project could be a
source of both enlightenment and challenge.

Both principles, rather than being options to be considered or not in the design of this research, are used mainly to openly express a logical and value foundation which informed the conduct of this inquiry. These principles were adopted in order to highlight the best moments and successful experiences people had with partnership efforts. In doing so, we hoped to uncover some of the mysteries of partnership which may lead to the generation of a theory and insure the generativity of such theory (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987; Cooperrider, 1986). That is, the formation of theory that can inform the creation and recreation of the reality theorized about was the aim of this work. This aim guided our choice of the inquiry mode used here.

The methods selected for this work are primarily in keeping with those of action research. More specifically, it is action research in the mode of appreciative inquiry described by Cooperrider (1986; also see Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987):

More than a method or technique, the appreciative mode of inquiry is described as a way of living with, being with, and directly participating in the varieties of organizations
we are compelled to study. Growing out of serious consideration and reflection of the ultimate mystery of being, it is argued that a reverence for life is engendered which draws the researcher to inquire beyond the superficial appearances to deeper levels of the life generating essentials and potentials of social existence (pp. 17-18).

Appreciative inquiry can be briefly described as a way of thinking and viewing things that direct attention to what is working when things are working well; to what is present, rather than what is absent; to what excites and energizes rather than what discourages and deflates; to the sources of satisfaction rather than the dissatisfiers. As a generative mode of inquiry, it encourages the emergence of common vision, consensually created social meanings, informed by people’s affirming and positive cognitions of the each other and their world.

Because of the broad and descriptive task of this work, the appreciative mode of action research can be expected to have adequate flexibility to permit examination of the variety of aspects of the partnership phenomenon. Here, our concern is to explore the deeper processes and forces that give life to and energize partnerships; such a task
requires a methodology that allows us to peak into the depths of the phenomenon we were studying. That is, our methodology must be able to uncover for us these life giving forces. Furthermore, our methodology must be unencumbered by unnecessary standards of acceptability in order for us the researchers and the providers of data to not only describe "what is" but also "what can be" -- as Cooperrider (1986) describes it, to "extend visions of possibility". He says:

"Social-organizational research is, therefore, a continuing moral concern, a concern of social reconstruction and direction... Science... is viewed as one means of helping humanity create itself... Theories gain their generative capacity by extending visions which expand to the realm of the possible..." (pp. 51-52).

Moreover, the practice of our methodology must not disable us to practice and to engender the kind of phenomena we were studying. That a partnership relationship could evolve from and because of the inquiry process was a distinct and welcome possibility. The value of learning could be doubly enriched when the inquirer and colleagues are enabled to live the very phenomenon they are trying to be enlightened about. The appreciative mode of action research offered the best opportunity for this to
happen. And in the course of over two years, partnership relationships indeed emerged and blossomed involving this researcher and OHIO and HADCCO members, thereby allowing us to tap into our own experiences; these experiences undoubtedly illumined our analysis and guided our interpretations.

Most importantly, the appreciative mode of inquiry allowed us to focus our attention mainly on what is working. Our inquiry, thus, was kept in its proper track -- in search of the essence of partnership, rather than bogging down with chronicling the reasons and negative forces which inhibit and prevent the creation of partnerships. Because our energies were focused, the inquiry process was in fact economical in its use of resources (such as people's time, energies, and funds); joyful in its conduct; and effective in its purpose.

On the other hand, the positive forces that heightened the possibility of partnership could be best understood when contrasted with the major forces that tended to inhibit it. In this way, the research
would be able to appreciate the fullness of the partnership phenomenon as it was experienced by those who tried to live it, and as I saw it.

Clearly, there is danger in such a closeness between the researcher and the focus of inquiry. Who is to know that what is reported as having been seen was seen only by the eyes of the researcher and by no one else? While the reality of the researcher’s view is not diminished by not being shared by others, its relevance is enhanced if it is validated, tempered with, recalibrated by, and joined with what others see and experience. For this reason, a mechanism was established to see to it that validation and recalibration took place throughout the interpretive process.

This mechanism consisted of a select group of individuals who were active members and leaders of both OHIO and HADCCO. These individuals were frequently consulted on the accuracy (in terms of their own experiences) of my interpretations of data, and asked to suggest their own alternative interpretations. Because of this process, the findings and conclusions contained here are truly the product of joint effort.
As earlier stated, of utmost importance to us in determining and developing our research design was our ability to generate theory about partnerships that reflect reality as construed by those who lived the phenomenon and not dis-ease us from being inventive or creative in our "speculations". And so, it was important that our effort not just result in theoretical formulations which "somehow fit with God's world" (Kaplan, 1964, p.308) but also correspond with the partners' construction of their reality. Without hesitation, this work acknowledges, as it had somewhere else in this report, the fact that the inquiry is not just to acquire and catalog information obtained; it is in Cooperrider's terms, a social phenomenon, a gutsy enterprise that speculates about the nature of human social innovations, such as that of inter-organizational partnerships. As he argues (1986):

"Hence it is argued here that science is better off abandoning the myth of 'value freedom' and that theoretical work 'must be understood as a social phenomenon, a gutsy human enterprise, not the work of robots programmed to collect pure information" (p.44).

In summary, the philosophy and design of this project follows a logic of science that seeks to
generate empirically grounded theory. It is deliberately looks for stories and evidence of success and strength. It is a philosophy of appreciative inquiry -- a mental and logical stance that seeks the source of a sense of success, and dares to speculate and imagine the possible.

As will be evident soon, however, the inquiry philosophy is not one of irresponsible daring and guess work; it had to adhere to a set of standards of excellence and rigor consistent with its underlying ideology. The relationship between myself and the members of OHIO and HADCCO had to be that of co-learners. This was deemed essential so that from the very outset, everyone knew, supported, and actively participated in the planning, conduct, and interpretation aspects of the project. Most importantly, it was important that the insights I obtained and wanted to present here were validated by and recalibrated against the experiences and understandings of those who lived what was being studied. At the same time, as a partner in the inquiry and in the AIP, I was able to maintain the high quality of my own participation in all phases of
the project. Because my own interpretations and experiences with the phenomenon was relevant too, I shared them openly with OHIO and HADCCO members during meetings that I attended. What I saw and experienced had the potential of impacting the development and growth of OHIO, as well as HADCCO. At the same time, members could, and did, react to my interpretations with questions and suggestions of alternative interpretations.

At the same time, I maintained contact with a senior Ph.D. student who was not involved with the AIP itself, and who had no contact with either the OHIO or HADCCO leaders and members. By doing this, I maintained a source of insight and interpretation that was more removed from the phenomenon studied that I was.

This standard of the conduct of the project was adhered to throughout the project duration. It is, therefore, with confidence that the insights and understanding here offered are the result of a rigorously arrived at common understanding and agreed upon interpretation of data.

The Data Collection

The collection of data was carried out with
the use of a number of approaches and stages. These will be described here in detail.

1. Interviews. The main approach to gathering data at the beginning was through semi-structured interviews. This was carried out in two stages.

The first stage of interviewing was carried out by myself and another doctoral student at Case Western Reserve University (Department of Organizational Behavior). A set of preliminary guide questions made up the Appreciative Interview Guide which was used at this stage (see Appendix A for the Interview Guide) in interviews with OHIO AIP Steering Committee members.

The first interviews were done mainly by myself and the doctoral student-colleague. After some steering committee members had been interviewed and witnessed another interview, they were asked to conduct interviews with others (mainly in their own regions of the state) of their choice among the rest of the steering committee members. These interviews lasted approximately between 90 minutes and two hours.

As much as possible, these interviews were tape
recorded, or even video taped. In all instances, notes were taken in such a way as to capture at least the essence of the interviewee’s statements and using as much as possible his/her own words. These notes and tapes were then collected and kept by SIG. The tapes and notes were then analyzed, for both content and for possible changes in the interview guide. The steering committee made suggestions for improving the instrument and revisions were introduced. The revised instrument was used for the next round of interviews; it was distributed among those in the steering committee who wanted to do their own interviews in order to guide their conversations.

Aside from the questions about personal experiences and history, this guide also asked the OHIO members to describe partnership experiences they had. This part of the instrument asked for the following:

a) descriptions of successful partnership experiences;
b) opinions about factors contributing to success of partnerships;

A third stage in the interviewing process involved open-ended, unstructured interviews with
HADCCO leaders and staff. Mainly, the direction of the interviews involved finding out:

a) the genesis story of HADCCO;
b) the nature of HADCCO programs;
c) success stories of HADCCO;
d) members' programs and success stories.

Like the other interviews, these ones were also tape recorded; notes were taken during each interview.

2. Formal Documents. The inquiry also made use of documents from the OHIO and HADCCO. These included Newsletters, minutes of meetings, OHIO Directory, Mission Statements, and in the case of HADCCO, a specific evaluation document by CODEL.

3. Observations. Numerous meetings (at least 12) with OHIO were attended. This gave me and my SIGMA colleagues some direct experiences with the processes and discussions that go on during these meetings. Such observations supplemented our interview data. Most of these meetings were in Columbus, and averaged almost once every six weeks. Attendance at these meetings can be grouped into two: the core leaders of about five, and a number of individuals who tended to come infrequently afterwards. Midway into the AIP, however, attendance seems to have increased by the
continued presence of new people from both the Columbus, Toledo, and Cleveland areas. At this stage, too, OHIO leaders were starting to seriously consider organizing more frequent regional meetings as a strategy of having more people involved. This discussion and direction is still being considered as of this writing.

4. Survey. The survey was intended to determine if the trends we saw in the analysis of interview data and observations would be validated by another group of people. This group was expected to and did come together in June of 1989 in Columbus, Ohio. As earlier noted, this group was expected to have two sub-groups: one being composed of individuals who have not been part of the AIP, and the other, of those who were part of the AIP.

The survey instrument had three main parts to it. The first described two hypothetical organizations, and two types of leaders. The descriptions of these organizations were such that they were clearly distinct from each other. One was described as having characteristics which were indicated at that time by the analysis of interview results to be important to partnership potential; the other was portrayed with
opposite characteristics. Their leaders were also characterized in a similar manner. Appendix C presents these descriptions and the specific items in the survey.

Based on these characterizations of the hypothetical organizations and leaders, the second major section of the instrument requested the respondents to rate both leaders in terms of:

a) overall potential for excellent relationship with the leader of each organization;

b) and, based on their leader preference, to indicate which items influenced their leader choice.

In the same way, the respondents were asked which organization, in their judgment "would have the greatest potential for partnership with your organization". Then they were asked to rate the extent of influence some factors had in their determination of which organization had greatest potential for partnership with their own. These factors included such things as proximity of location, accessibility for information exchange, similarity of values, and strategic proximity. Then, the respondents were asked for their rating of the
overall likelihood that "your organization will establish a partnership with each" hypothetical organization.

The third part of the instrument sought to obtain demographic information about both the individual and his/her organization. The information requested from the respondents included: location of the organization, its size of staff, age, primary program, and the respondent's employment status and position.

As earlier noted, the survey was designed to determine if the qualitative findings would be supported by other people's responses, especially from those who had not been part of the interview process or of the AIP up to this time; and also to see if those interviewed earlier would provide responses consistent with the interview results.

Thus, by employing another approach to data gathering than just interviews, we are able to check, and triangulate our data. The observations, documents, observations, and survey, together with the interviews represented for us a more concerted effort, and helped us to get into various aspects of the phenomenon of partnership. It is commonly
accepted that multiple approaches enhance and enrich the inquiry, especially since our concern is one of generating some form of theoretical beginnings that explain the nature and strengthening of partnerships.

Analysis of Data

The interviews were tape recorded and or video-taped when technically possible and allowed by the respondents. In all interviews, notes were taken about the stories, opinions expressed, and comments made during the interviews. Observation notes were also made of all interviews I personally conducted, as well as of all OHIO meetings I attended. These notes were later transferred into 5.25" floppy disks, using Wordstar Version 3.3.

1. Initial Theme. A first reading of reading of the interview notes and transcripts was undertaken in order to identify key statements, stories, or opinions regarding either 1) which were either descriptive of partnership relationships or 2) of factors that lead to and strengthen partnerships. At this point, in the absence of specific guidance from the literature as to what to look for, what felt like important statements of success or contributing
factors to success were flagged down as possibly significant information. From this first reading, some statements stood out as basically expressing similar things, and were then grouped together. Their common idea was then captured and stated as a theme. Other themes were generated in a similar manner through a second and third rereading the data documents (interviews, field notes, documents).

The themes that were surfaced were reanalyzed and grouped under key categories, using mainly categories articulated by Cooperrider (1986), especially the categories of partnership ethos, dominant social processes, and relational foundations. Taken together, these themes point to very significant factors that describe, lead to and strengthen partnerships as they were experienced by the OHIO and HADCCO members.

2. Validation of Themes. These themes were then presented to OHIO leaders and members during two meetings held in Columbus. Members were asked to evaluate the themes as to whether they described well the members' experiences. I also met with HADCCO leaders in a special meeting in Columbus and went
through the same process as the OHIO meetings. During this meeting, the themes were presented and explained for comments, suggestions, and changes.

The themes were then revised and reformulated based on the suggestions obtained during the meeting. Later, the revised themes were resubmitted to three leaders of both OHIO and HADCCO for a final review as to the themes' acceptability as accurate descriptors of their experiences. Final suggestions were made to improve the language in two major themes, and the thematic statements were thus accepted.

From these results, the beginnings of a theory about partnerships are presented (Chapter 4). As Cooperrider (1986) urged, the results led us to "grounded speculation" about what interorganizational partnership is, and helped to highlight some life-giving forces to partnership efforts.

At this point, it is clear that the research process -- from data gathering to data analysis and theme formulation -- was one of co-inquiry, indeed a partnership effort. There is no doubt that this process influenced to a large measure the success of this effort and the richness of its results. In fact, its implications for future research are tremendous,
especially given the positive impact this effort had on the leaders of OHIO and HADCCO.

In spite of the mechanisms employed during the formulation and validation phases of this work, it must be clearly stated that this researcher became very much a part of the experiences of the people who took part in the study, as they became very much a part of mine. In this sense, my own experiences helped to enrich and guide my role in the developmental task for OHIO just as my co-inquirers did. But at the same time, such closeness must be acknowledged for the possibility that undue bias seeped into this inquirer's ultimate conclusions. I believe, however, that the precautions and mechanisms intended to introduce rigor into the inquiry worked well enough to minimize the possibility that what is reported here are mainly my own experiences and not those of the people whose experiences I wanted to understand.

Impact on Researcher

Inquiry of this nature and design is bound to have significant impact on the researcher, and it certainly had on me. At this point it is helpful to
discuss this point in order to dispel from the
readers any implication of absolute separateness of
this researcher from the phenomena and people
involved. Hopefully, this discussion should also
enhance appreciation of the richness of both the
inquiry focus and the methodology employed.

As earlier presented, the inquiry was designed
around the AIP. As such, it involved this researcher
in both the process of inquiry and the process of
trying to strengthen OHIO. This duality of task
allowed me to become an intimate participant and
observer.

On the positive side, as a participant, it
allowed me to live with the others the very
phenomenon I was inquiring into. My own experiences
became important sources of insight and learning
about partnership and the factors that strengthen it.
My own frustrations and elation became valid and
useful sources of understanding; I was a true source
of data.

My participant role also brought me that much
closer to the phenomenon I was trying to observe.
Because I was genuinely a participant, others
accepted me and saw me as a member, with a definite
role to play and some contributions to make to their development. Because I was accepted, issues were discussed with me with an openness I may not have been able to enjoy otherwise. I was also able to benefit from my experiences as a participant in trying to interpret other’s actions.

On the negative side, my intimate connection with the phenomenon created some risks for the inquiry. Mainly, the risk was in the possibility that what I will experience will be generalized and presented as the only valid experience of others about the partnership. As earlier discussed in this chapter, precautionary mechanisms were put in place and utilized extensively to minimize such a risk. Interpretations of data were submitted to OHIO members, HADCCO leaders, a select group of leaders in both organizations, and an external colleague who had no ties with either organization or their members at all.

Finally, it is clear that my little influence in the development of OHIO, and to a slight degree, on HADCCO, would make it improbable that my own thinking and values did not become somehow a part of the
findings of this study. In the same way, I can say with certainty and with no regrets that the thinking and values of my co-inquirers in OHIO and HADCCO have contributed to what I saw then and what I value now. **Summary**

In summary, this chapter presented the setting of the project, described the research participants, expounded on the research philosophy underlying this work, detailed the data collection process, and explained how the data was analyzed. The overarching theme of the methodology is one of co-inquiry, with efforts focused purely on capturing those moments of success that OHIO and HADCCO members had with partnerships.

The next chapter presents the results of the study, and tries to tell the OHIO and HADCCO members’ experiences of successful partnering.
Chapter 3

RESULTS

This section presents the results from the analysis of data. They serve to highlight those life giving forces that leaders in OHIO and HADCCO experienced. As life giving forces, they engender excitement, vision, sense of purpose, and potency to those participating in the partnership effort. They are forces which these leaders identified, not because they are necessarily frequent experiential events in their partnering efforts, but because even in those rare moments of their occurrence the partnership participants sensed that those experiences embody the essence of partnership that they were constantly seeking to create and recreate. In this sense, then, partnership as a concept of social life can only be well-apprehended when we include in our inquiry its fundamental forces and energies as they ebb and swell in the constant building and creative process that goes on between and among the members.
These results are presented here in the form of themes, describing those forces that give impetus to the initiation and maintenance of partnership. These themes are organized through a framework that is perhaps unpolished and incomplete. It is our belief, as will be discussed in greater length in the section describing future research, that this framework begins to present and capture the essence of partnership; hopefully, it can also engender generative discussions, and grow in clarity and comprehensiveness as these discussions continue.

Themes which emerged from the qualitative data are grouped under three broad categories -- partnership ethos, dominant social processes, and relational foundations. These categories are mainly borrowed from the works by Cooperrider and colleagues (Cooperrider 1986; Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987). Each category will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

These thematic categories make up the organizing frame for this presentation of the data. Choice of these categories was made based
on two reasons. First, I believe the framework makes possible a coherent portrayal of the most exciting and fundamental facets observed about the interorganizational partnership phenomena under study. It presents in a clear manner our discoveries about some of the underlying vital forces that engender partnering behavior. It is expected to enable the reader to feel and visualize the dynamics and dynamism of interaction of these vital forces during those special moments as the leaders and members of OHIO and HADCCO experience success and live and actualize their vision of partnership. Portrayal of these fundamental facets and forces of partnership among organizations in this manner hopefully enables the information to induce imagery and spawn hope that may spur and enlighten more partnership efforts. In short, through this framework, the information presented is expected to provoke and transform partnering efforts.

Second, because the framework allows a coherent organization of the information from the study, it also provides more specific direction
for future inquiry into interorganizational partnerships as the succeeding chapters will discuss in detail. By organizing the information in a manner which tries to go beyond the current formulations and frames in the field of interorganizational relations, we expect to highlight concepts, not yet the foci of current thinking and research in the area of interorganizational partnership, for further clarification, and new hypotheses for exploration and testing.

The organization of the results, however is mainly an initial one, by no means exhaustive nor completed. As earlier mentioned, this study started with no clear orientation from the literature, but with a strong belief in the need to look beyond the existing framework in the IR literature. As was pointed out by Hall and Clark (1980), the state of the literature was low, and thus providing some support for the initial feeling of dissatisfaction we had with current frames.

This study tries to provide insights into the spirit of interorganizational partnership. It is not possible, and may never be, for us to say
whether we have captured the entire essence of IPs; yet that is not a major preoccupation of this work. Rather, we believe that we have captured the key forces which enhance the potential for partnership. From here, other fun-filled inquiries and conversations, deeper into the complex reality of interorganizational partnering, can be launched and illuminated. Without a doubt, our learning from the reenergized dialogue can unleash partnership’s potential.

This section is divided into three main parts. First, we will present the organizing framework for the organization of the results. Then, the second part presents in detail the key themes which emerged from the data. These themes describe significant aspects of the partnering phenomenon as described by members of OHIO and HADCCO. The third section contains the quantitative data obtained from members of OHIO and other organizations in the state. These data provide support to the qualitative results.
Fundamental Aspects of Partnering.

Figure 6 presents the key thematic categories describing the partnering phenomenon. Each represents an essential aspect of partnership. Individually, each theme describes the partnerships at their best, when people involved felt successful, energized, and highly satisfied with the partnership experience. Descriptive statements, vignettes, or quotes are given later to bring home and clarify the meaning of the themes under each category; and to convey the subtle elements in each theme as we try to convey richness of the experiences of people involved in the cases studied.

Each facet described in these themes are not linearly related to each other in the sense of unidirectional causal relationships, but rather of mutually influencing and energizing each other. Each is at once a source of vital energy and the beneficiary of the life giving capacity of other aspects.

The themes are grouped into three main categories. First, there is the thematic category
Figure 6: The Organizing Frame for the Emergent Themes
referred to here as the "partnership ethos". The themes in this category describe the basic assumptions, values, and fundamental aspirations that seemed to prevail among the people engaged in partnership building for either OHIO or HADCCO. These assumptions describe what are these individuals' view the world and of each other. These assumptions and values serve, it seems, as the ultimate interpretive and sense-making foundation people have in guiding the building of their relationship. These assumptions are most basic, and are by no means static nor carved in stone, but, rather, open to influences and potential shifts emanating from each other, their organizations, and their wider environment.

These category of themes are referred to here as the partnership ethos. The concept of ethos here is similar to what Cooperrider (1986) calls "organizational ethos" which he describes thus:

"...the deep underlying aspirations, sentiments and ideological forces shaping the newer, more cooperative forms of organizing. We refer to this complex of forces as the organizational ethos: the general human spirit serving to characterize the disposition of an organization as a dynamically formulated living social system" (p. 231).
As applied to interorganizational partnership, this thematic category describes the organizational disposition, the prevalent ambience as it were, of the partnership at its best, as described by OHIO and HADCCO members.

The second thematic category is called "the dominant social processes". Simply put, the themes under this classification describe the social processes and patterns of behavior by which members try to live and thus live up to their ideals and aspirations of partnership. What the themes portray here are also the tendencies toward certain ways of behaving and doing things toward and for each other that make their relationship uniquely one of partnership. When their partnership efforts are at their best, participants tend to describe these moments in terms of interactive orientations that portray as well as nurture and strengthen the partnering relationship they are building.

The final thematic classification is referred to here as the relational requisites. The themes in this category describe those kinds of
relationships that are essential to the partnership -- for its beginning and maintenance. These relationships are foundational in one sense -- that they provide as it were the fertile ground upon which the seeds of interorganizational partnership must be sown. They are also requisites in another sense, however. It is that without these relationships attempts at interorganizational relations will be based mainly on self-interest rather than respect and concern for others. Thus maintaining the partnership effort becomes an exercise in self-interest rather than true partnership. Simply, the relational requisites, as an initiating foundation described in this category of themes, make possible the conception of partnership in its embryonic sense; as a source of sustaining and nurturing force, these requisites make possible the growth of the idea and ideal of partnership itself.

Each of these thematic classifications describe various aspects of partnership. On their own and taken separately from the other described aspects, they may be fun to read about, but
mainly devoid of much provocative and practical meaning. Taken together, despite limitations in our linguistic system and this writer's own shortcomings for describing a complex experience of people and a whole way of living, these themes hold the seeds of our initial understanding of the essence of partnership among organizations.

THE LIFE-GIVING FORCES: EMERGENT THEMES

From the evidence so far gathered, the nature of OHIO and HADCCO, when they are at their best as partnerships of organizations and as facilitators of such relationships, can be described in terms of their ethos characterized by certain inspired qualities as described above; prevalent social processes; and their relational requisites. While these are described through ten (10) separate thematic statements, each spiritual characteristic must be construed, as earlier suggested, as an integral aspect of a dynamic whole; because each captures something that is both a cause and an effect, at once the source and beneficiary of energy in relation to
the other aspects, illuminating and capturing partnership.

A. The Partnership Ethos.

OHIO and HADCCO, at their best, are characterized by fundamental logic and rational assumptions their members bring into the partnership process. The following descriptive statements capture the overall inspired quality of OHIO and HADCCO:

The people here look at things differently. And that shows in the way they make sense of issues, in the way they look at people. There is a spiritual quality to it.

There is so much that I am troubled and concerned about related to the global condition. I have a feeling of well-being and satisfaction, though, when I am working together with these people...It is nourishment for me, refreshing, energizing.

This place (OHIO) has always been special for me. It has this special quality to it that enables me, and I am sure the others here too, to feel nourished and refreshed. I find it spiritually healing and refreshing, intellectually stimulating. I guess this is why we are all here.

Here in OHIO we have faith in each other, in our commitments, in our desire to contribute, to support... if we can just get the message out to all, I am certain everyone will join in on the task of getting rid of prejudice, in helping others... for some, our task of conversion will be easy, for others, more difficult, still for others, we will run out of time; but the chance is always there for us.
Another leader in both HADCCO and OHIO described his "gut feel" of the relevance of the spiritual aspect of organizations in general, but also in reference to the above organizations:

It is good to recognize the spiritual aspects of organizational life. It is not often that we hear that talked about, but it is there. I can't tell you exactly what that is, but I am sure if we all keep our inner eyes focused on it, we will have a clearer sense of it.

The following thematic statements capture and define this character of both OHIO and HADCCO as partnership efforts whose primary mission, among others, is to be facilitators of partnership among organizations.

A. Spirit of Integration

**Theme #1:**

**Partnership among OHIO and HADCCO, which are both globally-oriented systems requires a rational stance which assumes the inherent connectedness and wholeness of reality.**

This rational stance involves, at the broadest and most profound level, a particular belief about the nature of the world. This belief about and perspective of reality can be described as the **SPIRIT OF INTEGRATION**, which enables
members to feel and see their social reality as inherently together. Many participants in both HADCCO and OHIO view the world in a holistic manner, as opposed to a fragmentary perspective. They see parts as having meaning only in the context of the whole. According to one leader:

Whether we like it or not, we live in only one world. Anything we do, we must admit that it has an impact on others -- it is simply a question of magnitude. The more people doing it, the more perceptible the result.

I admit I was a fool, but now I see things better. I mean, I used to think of Iran and Iraq and Uganda as other planets. They were not part of my world. Think how many people take as given, even now, such notions as the World Series of baseball. As if we were a world unto our own, and the others are other worlds.

What got me to realize that this is one world, not several island worlds, is the picture of the earth from the shuttle. It’s like a soccer ball -- imagine the islands and continents as the black spots in the soccer ball. And I said, if I punch a hole through one of those spots, I am not doing something just on that particular black spot, I am doing it to the whole ball. That image got me started on this.

This holistic view enables people to identify, empathize, and feel involved with events, in their organizations, locale, region, and world. For them, such locational descriptors
are mainly linguistic tools to manage the expansive concept of "world". Someone described this point succinctly:

India, the US, Europe, Asia, these are no different than such notions of place like here, there. They only allow us to pinpoint a location. They do not imply, and should not imply more. Of course, when we want to believe in our dominance over others, then those concepts can be used to separate, categorize, hierarchize.

What this incisive statement conveys is an overdue clarification of a confused view equating distance with separateness and unconnectedness. This is a resounding renunciation and denunciation of an insular view that insists on seeing social reality, and even physical reality, as smaller units and wholes unconnected from and thus independent of each other.

Very closely associated with the holistic, as opposed to the fragmentary view of things adhered to by some people is the assumption of connectedness, in contrast to isolation. Those who agree to this assumption believe that while individual identities are important, they do not negate the linkages that exist between people, organizations, nations, environments. And some
HADCCO and OHIO members describe this point thus:

In a way we are privileged to have had the opportunity to be working where we are now. It gave us the chance to see, and what we saw are all these linkages, productive or destructive, between us and everyone else in the world. And so, one of our largest tasks is to discover, uncover, bring to light, and tell people about where their connections are to the rest of the world, and where the world is in their backyards. We don’t have to go across oceans to see the world; it is right here. Most especially, we need to nurture those constructive links, and inhibit those destructive ones.

Look, scientists say they have proof that all the continents were once one large land mass. Then we had what they called land bridges. We lost those, but that does not mean we are in isolated worlds. We have the oceans that connect us, the air, one sun....

Maybe linkage is inherently there, but mainly as a potential. It must be actualized, though. And when we do try, we need to distinguish between desirable linkage versus undesirable linkage.

These views, of the world as one whole reality, and of the world as connected, give rise to a shift in the way people look at boundaries of all sorts. The concepts of regional, national and cultural boundaries are now a key topic of discussion in OHIO and HADCCO; they are examined more closely. And by challenging the traditional understandings about boundaries, they are
subjected to or at least made open to change. Traditionally, people acknowledged that boundaries were seen as social, cultural, political, or religious mechanisms that separated. They were used as tools to enforce the insular and separatist views. One international activist compared and equated these views as "ideological prison bars and walls" that people use in order to enforce "the mirage of isolation so necessary to maintaining the fantasy" of superiority and power over others. Today, OHIO and HADCCO members feel -- while acknowledging that boundaries have some useful functions especially in maintaining sense of self -- the other equally significant function is also to "bind", to be a linking mechanism that brings about the state of being "bound" together. It enables the connection among individual persons, nations, organizations. One educator who is active in both HADCCO and OHIO describes her views of boundaries as some kind of "connecting tissue":

Take people for instance. Our skins are our physical boundaries from others. It is the
beginning and end of everyone’s concept of self. But with our skin we are able to touch and be touched by others. It makes it possible for each of us to establish some contact.

An OHIO leader describes what many feel is a necessary change in the way we view boundaries. He says:

There is so much diversity in the world and among organizations in this state. Programs are different, organizations have different boards, legal status, etc. But those things serve to maintain our respective identities, maintain our diversity. But they do not, if we don’t let them, keep us from relating to each other, from working together, from learning from each other, from supporting each other...

Others view boundaries in a more traditional sense, as one that separates. However, the shift from the rapidly obsolescent view of boundaries is evident in the notion of challenging the isolating concept of boundaries -- one which sees them as merely imprisoning, separating, and alienating mechanisms. In other words, boundaries are no longer seen as imaginary or real parameters that must be kept inviolate in their function of keeping someone away from another. They are now getting accepted to be erroneously
construed as mainly "keeping away" and limiting mechanisms. The key challenge for OHIO and HADCCO and their capacity to innovate is thus seen as resting in discovering and creating ways to transcend and minimize the separatist and imprisoning function of boundaries. Nowhere is this challenge more strongly felt than in social settings where partnering is a major preoccupation -- such as meetings and conferences attended by members of HADCCO and OHIO. The following sample statements should describe the key notion of boundaries as a challenge to be overcome:

How can we go beyond mere introductions, superficial conversations, and really go beyond our own communities, regions, counties, countries? These are key challenges for us as we seek to relate with each other, and with the rest of the world.

We know there are others out there (in the state) who can teach us, whom we can teach. But we have not cracked their walls, and maybe our own walls. Look, we still do not have business organizations represented here, except indirectly through the Department of Trade. Yet we know there is much to learn among business and non-profit organizations, and benefits.

Only in the last few years have I realized that my own understanding of boundaries -- and immediately the thing that comes to my
mind is regional, national boundaries. Come to think of it -- why did I want the Mexicans kept behind their borders? The bottom line was, for me and for many people, the fear, dislike of others sharing my life and resources here, and maybe later on endangering that same way of life. I saw them in a way as needy, and I had what they needed. I was superior, they were inferior. That may oversimplify the whole thing but I know that's how I felt. Now, I think I have grown somewhat. At times the old fear still surfaces, but now I see it when it happens and can deal with it.

However, the assumption of essential connectedness is not a blind faith. Interconnectedness is seen as needing to be operationalized, to be shown, clarified, even celebrated, in some form of acting and doing. It must be a source of action.

Maybe linkage is inherently there, but mainly as a potential. It must be actualized, though. And when we do try, we need to distinguish between desirable linkage versus undesirable linkage.

Sure, we can talk about how we need to use our borders and boundaries as means to relate and interact, as challenges. But like any other challenge, if we do not do something about it, we have not measured up to our ideals.

This logic of connectedness can be seen at work in and undergirds the incessant search for collaborative programs and activities -- a search
that by their very thrust redefines boundaries from being barriers to being media for linkages.

It is like I can see my skin as something that separates me from another person, or it can be the medium by which we can both touch each other. So my programs and activities I can use to isolate myself. But I know better -- I can develop my programs better if I can link up with others here. So really my challenge always is to find and establish lasting connections with others.

Finally, the spirit of integration, of connectedness is seen in the constant effort to move between local awareness and global awareness. A HADCCO leader represent this local-global dynamic with his idea of "Ohio in the world and the world in Ohio". He suggests:

People in Main Street believe that the world is out there, that they have to go somewhere in Africa or Europe or Asia to be a global citizen. But we need to emphasize that Main Street IS also the world. Look in every shop, in the buildings, in the cars, in everything and you see the world -- steel from Brazil or Korea, Japanese cars, jeans and shirts from the Philippines, students from every country you can think of... that's the world right in our backyard that we often miss because we look too far away all the time.

Finally, one of the tremendous achievements the international spirit of people and organizations in the state of Ohio can claim is the successful celebration of "Ohio in the World
-- the World in Ohio". Through this event, its leaders, organizers, and supporters were able to bring home to countless Americans in the streets of Columbus and Central Ohio the idea that their communities and backyards were an integral part of the world, and that they had in Main Street links to other peoples in the world.

Such is the Spirit of Integration, that complex of beliefs and logical assumptions which leaders and members of OHIO and HADCCO strive to live by and live up to. Often lying below the level of individual consciousness, this spirit drives and informs their actions -- perhaps not all the time, nor even most of the time, but at least some of the time -- so that they are able to begin relating to themselves and their world as an integrated reality.

B. Spirit of Caring

Theme # 2:

OHIO and HADCCO both as partnership efforts and as facilitators of partnerships are fundamentally defined by and exude the SPIRIT OF CARING; the inclusion of other and responsibility for mutual growth are basic goals and values.

As a consequence of, as well as nourishing,
the Spirit of Integration and connectedness, the second affective feature of OHIO and HADCCO is as arenas that spawn relationships grounded in caring. The SPIRIT OF CARING pervades those moments when partnership was truly alive and is experienced by OHIO and HADCCO participants in a variety of ways.

First and foremost, it requires a consciousness that includes others as the center of attention and the beneficiary of activity, as opposed to a mainly self-centered orientation. As such, caring can be said to be the compliment of the Spirit of Integration. It is a consciousness of the importance of others, not because others can be used to satisfy one’s vain need for attention, but because they are accepted as participants in the continuous creation of socially significant meaning.

Here one feels the desire to care -- for the people here, in other countries, in schools, etc. One reason this place is so special is because the spirit of caring is here. People here are definitely growing because of each other -- our questioning, our experiences, our strengths -- all these are made available to people. Thus, for instance, we have progressed in clarity about what we are trying to do in the world.
Everyone here has made it clear to me that they care for me, for the programs of my organization...I feel like they really believe that what we do means a lot to them too. At first I expected people to really try to steal center stage for their programs. But that has not been my experience with these people. They are special.

How has HADCCO helped us? In many ways, but most of all it has allowed us to grow in our understanding of global problems and needs. That has led to a greater clarity of our tasks and mission...We have grown, in the same way that we believe we have helped others grow.

The spirit of caring is strongly illuminated by constant attention to helping others grow. There is, first of all, the basic assumption in the potential of others for good, and for growth; where the potential for good in people is not a matter open to questioning, but rather accepted; where the realization of potential is celebrated, enhanced and given the help to flourish. People view the two meta-organizations -- these organizations of organizations that are HADCCO and OHIO -- as places where the questioning is not about whether people are good, acting with good intentions, or capable of growth; rather, the conversation is about what facilitates responsible action; about what constitutes
responsible action; and how best can others
partake in the process of creating opportunities
for enhancing each other's capacity to grow.

Here in OHIO we have faith in each other, in
our commitments, in our desire to
contribute, to support... If we can just get
the message out to all, I am certain
everyone will join in on the task of getting
rid of prejudice, in helping others... for
some, our task of conversion will be easy,
for others, more difficult, still for others
we will run out of time, but the chance is
always there for us.

In HADCCO, we realized that we need to have
a common definition of 'development'. And so
many of our meetings tend to keep going
back to that task... By doing that, by being
patient with each other, we allow not only
growth for others but also for us, because
at times, the discussions help us get back
on track; at times, it helps us to expand
earlier agreed upon ideas and tasks; at
other times, it makes us see the need for
changes in those ideas. That's why I know
this group is a caring group.

It is essential that we continue to see
potential in people -- for doing good, for
becoming better, for understanding, for
fairness, for so many good things. Otherwise,
we lose the foundations of what we are trying
to do. I don't think we are naive and believe
that everyone will DO good all the time. And
we react to those that are not good --
pollution, drug dealing, arms build up, etc.
But we also know that anyone can be helped to
grow away from drug dealing, away from
polluting activities, etc. given a chance. And
this idea is not only at work when we interact
with the poor and hungry and unschooled
somewhere in the world. It is also working
when we interact with each other here.
As opposed to a deficiency mode of apprehending reality, when individuals felt they truly cared, they found themselves engaged in an optimistic and affirmative logic, one which makes use of lenses that search for and highlight the more positive, the possible, rather than what is missing and what is not possible. OHIO and HADCCO members came alive with the introduction of AIP, because it gave them the vehicle to act upon, talk about, and live the ideals they cherished. Through the AIP they found guidance and legitimacy for their need to affirm and celebrate the others -- their history, their programs, their successes, their values.

I found it easy to understand what you and the others were saying and doing with the Appreciative Inquiry Project. I guess I and the others here have been doing appreciative inquiry, or at least been trying to. What we are doing calls for an attitude that is positive, that assumes the best potential in people. We search for those potentials, we seek to develop them.

Thus, it helped people to look for the best of what is in each other, and encouraged them to envision, together, the best of what each can be and do. An OHIO leader described this well when she said:
(We are) like an array of colors......so much diversity in culture, in ways of looking at the world, in making things. Each is unique in its own, a miracle no one would ever totally unravel. If only we can get beyond the beauty of our own miracles, we will have at least a chance to peek inside those of others and join them in appreciating theirs.

Others indicated a similar affirming stance, a positive view of people. While others found an expressive vehicle in the Appreciative Inquiry Project which the OHIO members and leaders undertook, others saw it as an exciting challenge to the negative things that they were trying to address in the world.

The appreciative inquiry project -- its underlying philosophy and values -- captures for me the image I and my colleagues here have of each other. We see each other as about something that is truly worthwhile, valuable and good. We see each other as decent human beings, trying to do our best for ourselves, our children and fellow human beings everywhere. And we see other organizations as putting their efforts and know-how for the same sense of goodness. In many ways, we individually and as representatives of our organizations represent the inevitable marriage of self-interest and responsibility towards others for their growth and well-being.

Ironically, most of the first images that got me involved with international programs were negative images. But from those images, I believe more firmly that our success has
been because we have trusted people to do what's right, to take responsible action, to see things as they can be. It is easy to freeze present images, and many times it helps. The sight of hungry children can bring in lots of donations and gifts. But beyond that, the amount of donations from children alone for different programs, volunteers, foreign and local, attest to an inherent good in people and their ability to do what's right when they see it. And that's why one of our programs is education -- both for those in our communities and for ourselves.

Caring was not only about the other people there. As our co-inquirers indicated, it also involves the assumption of being needed, that the other "needs me" for his or her growth. Such assumption holds true on both the interpersonal and interorganizational levels.

I know I have some resources, skills and values which will be of help to others here, as well as to others in other parts of the world, in other parts of Ohio. I can help people here, for instance, to understand how community networking can be done effectively. We can provide training materials for those who want it...

We have always assumed that profit-oriented organizations -- multinationals, even small businesses operating here and abroad -- are bad guys. I am sure that explains why we have not done much to include them here. But we have a lot to teach those guys. They are searching for new ideas and new approaches to dealing with international issues, with the variety of cultural contexts for their executives. We can certainly help them to be
better global citizens, to grow in their knowledge about the ways and values of a global citizen.

The assumption of being needed, however, is not equated with dominance, not of having power over the other. Rather, it assumes trust, of "being entrusted" with the growth of and by the other.

I see my role, and I’m sure others here see it in a similar way, as one of accepted responsibility. I have accepted my responsibility for my brothers -- I am their keeper. They have put their trust in me, sometimes openly, sometimes just by their presence with me, that I will try to do what helps them to grow and develop and become better. And I am referring to them as individuals and as representatives of organizations. I even feel a responsibility towards their organizations -- that’s one reason I deal with their representatives seriously -- for their own growth and development. That’s why they support their representatives here.

One of my roles here is to be a coach, a mentor, to help those I come in contact with, especially here, but everyone I come in contact with. That’s my responsibility to them, because their presence is a gift to me. Without them I will not grow either. This thought always reminds that I am not in a position to tell people what they should be against their wishes. I am to help, not decide for them. Any time I do that, I am trying to make them like me -- and that is not growth for them.

In this sense, caring is described by the members as a reciprocation, an acceptance of
one’s responsibility to and for others. One’s responsibility is to assist in the growth of the others. The source of this responsibility is the realization that the other’s presence completes one’s social experience and life, and therefore must act to reciprocate the enrichment process.

Thus, caring involves a commitment of oneself and one’s resources and skills to the service of the other’s growth and actualization. Without such commitment of resources and energy, the connection and reciprocating link of mutual caring is unacted, not re-energized and will thus decay.

In the same way that I feel a responsibility for my partner’s growth, so I entrust him with my own growth. This is unavoidable. Like one time, this guy from a country in Africa....saw snow falling for the first time in his life, and was so scared because he thought the sky was falling apart and that this was the end of the world. I can’t forget the expression of his face -- totally scared, his face became white. That started for me a strong sense of responsibility for this guy to let him understand everything that I took for granted -- like snow falling from the sky. By the same token, I trusted him to help me understand his life, the life his people had, their ideals, their beliefs, their way of making sense of life and events in their world. That partnership was a major part of my own growth, and to this day I thank God for all the people I was blessed with.
This commitment to the growth of the other is best shown in the face of obstacles, according to OHIO leaders. In overcoming obstacles one shows by deed one’s commitment to the other. In this sense, trust and caring further is enhanced. The constant search for consensus, for economic and social resources to undertake joint programs, to achieve joint goals, to support mutual growth and learning reflect and provide constant opportunity for showing and renewing one’s commitment to agreed outcomes at various levels -- personal, interpersonal, organizational, and interorganizational.

This "being entrusted" is only one face of the reciprocal entrusting process, however. Another facet that seems to stand out among OHIO members involves "entrusting" others for one’s growth. In other words, being with others in a partnership relationship involves an inherent entrusting of one’s growth to the other. One expects that others have made a commitment to one’s growth and development, as well. This story, abbreviated from a much longer and more detailed recounting by one of the stalwarts of
OHIO, captures the basics of this "entrusting" experience.

I am one of those guys who used to frequent bars and get drunk. At one point, I got hit in the head and was hurt pretty badly. There was this guy who told me I either did something with my life or else... This guy also did everything he could to show me he believed that I could make something of me. He helped me get into college....He also kept letting me know that I had the potential to make myself whatever I wanted to be. After some time, I really believed that and started to apply myself to my course work and other activities. This guy really inspired me and challenged me to straighten myself and make myself into what I wanted to be. At times, I would get discouraged, and he was always there to help me up, with advise, with money, with patience, with anger, with encouragement. I mean he was there for, he truly believed in me. He helped me become who I am now. And I learned from him some of the things about helping others learn and grow, to become who they want to be...and I have learned to trust others. And when I mean trust, I just don't wait for them to do something for me. I let them know what it is I want to be and how they can help me. My trust is that they will be willing and act on my request for help. But helping is like a continuously moving circle. I help you to help me to help you to help me....you know what I mean....until we come to some agreement, yes, a consensus, about what we all need to be helpful and caring to each other and to ourselves, the resources, the energy, the time, the emotional links, etc. that are essential to this kind of mutual growth....In this OHIO I find people who have had similar profound experiences, and therefore, are able, more so than others, to
act in the most caring and responsible way towards other OHIO members. Of course, we need to be constantly vigilant that the caring atmosphere here does not become a fertile growing ground for those who seek to grow in stature or power at the expense of others. I think that is part of our search now -- those mechanisms that allow us to care and mutually effect our growth...

Commitment, however, that derives from caring is not one that is forced upon one person or organization. Indeed, one’s commitment represents the convergence of "what I feel I am supposed to do" and what I want to do. In the words of some research participants, "I needed to do it because I wanted to". Thus, commitment is truly the expression of one’s integrity, of being whole, because one’s desires are translated into guides for action.

I feel a very strong sense of obligation to help others, here with my friends, with the organizations and communities in the state and in this country and throughout the world. But I must clearly say that this sense of obligation is not because of some external fiat; it is because I have come to believe that this is the right thing for me to do. I want to help, and there are things I must do in order to be of real help. In a way, this is like making a voluntary vow. This is what you might call a self-imposed, self-defined obligation springing from my desire to be helpful.
We are now at a point where we can no longer just rely on others telling us what we ought to do. The time has come for all of us to realize that what we must do we ought to do because we believe in it and we want it. That is the fundamental ideal that we are talking about here. Otherwise, we will continue to exploit Third World countries and peoples as dumping grounds for pollutants and cancer-causing foods, drugs, etc as long as we don’t get caught, because by doing so we serve our need to squeeze profits out of others’ misery. Imagine what we would have taught the world and what we will feel when they become the economic powers and we the Third World. One major lesson from history has always been the potential for the dominated to rise up and dominate, because they learn the lessons of domination well.

Moreover, caring as we found it in OHIO at its best moments involved some sense of obligation to oneself for growth, to self-actualize. It denoted expectations of honesty, about what one’s strengths are, who one is. It meant striving to realize one’s potentials and to seek opportunities for one’s growth.

Yes, I am here because I expect to learn from others. That is not to say however that I expect others to shoulder the entire burden of my learning. My learning and my growth -- these are my responsibilities. In the same way, my organization has heavy responsibility for its development, survival, improvement. The fact that we expect others to be there and help in our learning does not negate our part of the deal.....Whose responsibility is greater? I’m not sure that that is the proper
question, because it’s more that these responsibilities -- mine for my growth and that of others’ to help me grow; my responsibility to help them grow and their own responsibility to strive for their own growth -- are important, each in a different but essential way. That is, they are all essential, and so it’s not a question of prioritizing or ranking them; that’s not relevant.

Caring also seemed to call for honesty about one’s perceptions and judgments about the others. One needed to try and be honest about and find out more about the others, their organizations, their personal histories. At some points during earlier meetings, it was apparent that there was a struggle between members wanting others to be what they wanted them to be, versus letting them be who they were. When caring was evident, these were moments when members were able to act in the service of the others’ vision what they can be. At those moments, they felt one does not impose and force one’s vision and aspirations of what the other should be. In continuing the above story, this point is highlighted:

I realized from that moment on that I can not learn and enjoy this man if I impose my sense of what he should be, how he should act, how he should talk or what he should think. Just as it is not for me to dictate
whether my friend should be a doctor, but rather to help my friend be a doctor because he wants it. I am glad that this student I was able to help in terms of dealing with his fear of the snow and begin to enjoy it and examine it and marvel at it. That’s what my program at the College is all about. I do not ask my community to fall in love with foreign countries more than they love the USA. But rather, we give them opportunities to learn more about these countries and these people by seeing and meeting our foreign students, and interacting with them. One immediate result is the coping of the local people’s fears and doubts, and then they can be curious and learn to deal with these foreign students.

Caring, from the above statement, also involves much patience and tolerance. There is the belief and anticipation that the other will grow in his own time and way. One’s presence is therefore, construed as mainly one of providing encouragement, assistance, and stimulating experiences, for that growth to take place.

I know we will be better, our knowledge will be more, our programs will be more effective. I am certain OHIO and HADCCO will grow in knowledge, expertise and understanding. We already are better in many respects, even in areas we have not yet looked into or talked about.

We need to give others the time and space to get to where they need to be. We need to remind ourselves from time to time that we have been doing this thing for years now, while others are still starting. We have different paces in learning and growth. Patience always serves well.
Caring is not seen as a trading process, where one expects a return for what one provides. It is not a bartering process, where one expects payment for goods given. Rather, caring is viewed as a reciprocal process. One’s caring for the other activates the other’s caring.

Caring also means being able to modify one’s behavior in the light of what helps or does not help the other’s growth. Indeed, the helping behavior that OHIO members exhibited for each other tended to be enlightened and helped by the other’s expressed needs for growth.

One of the lessons we must continue to learn is that helping must be a multilateral process. When I am best able to help, it is usually because the people I am helping also helped me to better know how I can better help. Thus, many of us now are clear about what are needs are, and so are best able to tell others here how they can help us. For instance, we need to learn skills at community networking. Other here have those skills, but we need to help them become helpful to us.

Finally, caring for self is legitimizied, not judged to be egocentric. By being able to help oneself, to seek growth for oneself, is not being selfish. Growth of self is a necessary standard for one’s ability to help others.
Many believe that caring has a selfish streak in it. I think they are not only right; they have touched on a key ingredient of caring. Christ, in the Christian tradition, taught that we love our neighbor as we love ourselves. Self-love is then essential to loving others. I think the negative of self-oriented behavior and attention is when self-attention excludes others, when love of self will not be a measure and push for loving others. When love goes full cycle, that is what Christianity is all about. I try my best to live up to that belief, even when I interact with non-Christians. Who they are or are not should not stop me from helping them or caring about them. When we interact in that way, we can not escape growth and learning.

This is the Spirit of Caring that was in evidence in OHIO and HADCCO, during those moments when they were at their best as partnerships and as promoters of partnership among organizations in the state of Ohio. This Spirit embodies a complex set of values, assumptions, interpretive guides, and ideals in keeping with which the representatives of organizations hold as important each other's growth; and feel a strong sense of responsibility to make these values an integral aspect of their organizing efforts. Their organizing activities are thus characterized by this spirit of caring.
C. Spirit of Collaboration

OHIO and HADCCO, in their partnering efforts, are characterized by the Spirit of Collaboration. They constantly seek to create and nurture collaborative opportunities and, their efforts are distinguished by the need to discover new communication patterns, new structures, new approaches that enhance potential for working together, for joining skills and resources to achieve common goals.

The two organizations show heightened energy and excitement when exploring potentials for collaborative relationships. During meetings, it is evident that these organizations place a premium on joint action. As these statements highlight, joint actions, cooperative programming, even learning together, are more desirable.

We are all dreamers; we like to have things better. That is why we look forward eagerly to the future. But we also know that that future we have to fashion today. We can do it together, I really believe in that. That is why I am in this, and I am sure the same goes for the others too. We believe that we can have an impact on our future.

People believe that collaboration is desirable for several reasons. First, collaboration allows each to grow from the experiences of others. Working together
invariably makes available to others the wisdom gained from diverse activities and successes.

It is important for me to join with others here. Through the variety of experiences and programs represented here, I am enriched, and my organization will be enriched. For instance, we have no experience that we can seriously talk about, when it comes to community organizing. In (our community), there many ethnic groups, but no one knows how to tap into these groups as valuable resources for our international-community education plans. These people here can teach me and I can learn from them the skills, the approaches, etc. to community organizing.

Second, collaboration is desired because it allows people to express their deep personal and professional values about what global citizenship means. As earlier indicated in the descriptions of the integrative and caring spirit, for these people and organizations, global citizenship, among other things, requires the ability to integrate and transcend borders and boundaries. Thus it is not surprising that excitement always pervades meetings and planning sessions when they are transformed into arenas to present and join their dreams for a safe, peaceful, prosperous, healthy world society, the global village, with those of others is testimony to this logical tendency. Many of the best moments
of OHIO meetings have been described my members and leaders as moments when everyone strives to, feels capable of, and find opportunity for including their own visions "into the pot" and have a hand in fashioning the broader dream. The same characterization is made by leaders of HADCOO.

I enjoy being in OHIO meetings. At first, when I just joined, I was hesitant, not sure.... Now, I feel my own aspirations are important to this group. They value it. And I feel influential because in talking about my aspirations and expectations, I know I am also helping clarify, even expand, our common visions.

Our task as staff (in HADCOO) is to help the members have their issues and concerns included, that no one is left out. This includes such mundane tasks as keeping minutes of the meetings, giving them early reminders of next meetings so they can be ready with their own concerns...

At first I thought that OHIO was just another organization trying to be the leader in the state. But now, I know it is not there to steal the spotlight from other organizations. Rather, it encourages everyone to share the spotlight. And that is only proper. Each of us is working towards a common goal.

The leaders and members of OHIO try their best to listen and invite, to encourage participation and collaboration. I guess it is because we all realize the significance of each other's work to overall international understanding.
The activities of the two meta-organizations have always been characterized by optimism about the future, by a sense of responsibility to continually make significant contributions to the on-going creation of that future. A common sentiment of members in these two partnerships is captured in this statement:

We are all dreamers, we like to have things better. That is why we look forward eagerly to the future. But we also know that that future we have to fashion today. We can do it together, I really believe in that. That is why I am in this, and I am sure the same goes for the others, too. We believe that we can have an impact on our future.

In this sense, the OHIO and HADCCO are arenas for celebrating the potency of organizations and their members to construct future settings through the force of common aspirations. The generation of shared aspirations is seen as essential:

Through our aspirations and views of a desired world, we obtain direction and are able to bring to bear our resources and energies upon working together towards its realization. But it is important that we work deliberately towards generating such shared aspirations.

OHIO and HADCCO were both born from and
continually sustained by the belief in the ability of members to build something together. It is in this belief, in fact, that the term partnership -- part ownership -- may have its full expression, and serves as a beacon, gathering various organization and individuals together. Because they want to build together and believe they can, OHIO and HADCCO were born -- truly social innovations founded on the ideal of collaboration and partnership.

We realized several years back that hunger or infant mortality was not THE main problem of the world. There are so many things tied together -- from overpopulation and disease somewhere to local ignorance about the rest of the world here in the US... and lack of interest. So we initiated discussions with others in the community about bringing together people who were working on these different issues. Somehow this just makes sense.

The spirit of collaboration thrives under specific conditions. Clearly, for OHIO and HADCCO, this required a way of thinking and doing that was non-competitive, and by extension, non-hierarchical -- a way of thinking and valuing that was consistent with the spirit of caring and integration also. Thus, for instance, HADCCO officers, leaders, and board members are selected
in order to serve, rather than to rule. Each officer functions in order to facilitate the partnership, to enhance collaborative efforts. The same spirit of non-competition exists for OHIO.

We used to mistrust each other because we all wanted to have resources that were not readily available. The same situation exists today, about resources. But we have learned to share our resources, because we know that what each of us is doing helps our respective programs anyhow. Competition only hurts us all -- it never helps, except in the short term. And even that benefit is arguable.

In this sense, collaborative behavior assumes not only the desirability of power sharing, but that power expansion is possible and wanted. This view runs contrary to the traditional and popular assumption that power is a scarce social resource to be guarded zealously. Because power is viewed as an expandable social resource based on knowledge and expertise, power sharing is capable of being a goal, rather than power as the center of and a source of competition among member organizations and representatives.

The issue of control and power used to be a major concern for many of us. I guess we did not realize that we were trying to build our
own little empires. But somehow we realized that power can be best used if shared.

The Spirit of Collaboration was also evident in and nurtured by processes that sought consensus. Consensus seeking energized conversations; exchange of information, exploration of assumptions, opening up of communication channels, and programs that everyone can commit themselves and their organizations became facilitated by the desire to reach agreement. Consensus was valued because members believed that meaningful involvement and commitment by everyone was only possible that way -- when each member is able to express ownership of decisions, courses of action, and programs because they see their respective interests and goals having become part of and embodied in the broader set of goals and interests.

I enjoy being in OHIO meetings. At first, when I just joined, I was hesitant, not sure... Now I feel my own aspirations are important to this group. They value it. And I feel influential because in talking about my aspirations and expectations, I know I am also helping clarify our common visions.

Through our aspirations and views of a desired world, we obtain direction and are able to bring to bear our resources and energies upon working together towards its
realization. But it is important that we work deliberately towards generating such shared aspirations.

Collaboration also assumes interdependence. Related inherently with the Spirit of Integration and Caring and expressing them, the collaborative spirit assumes connectedness, that there are reciprocal needs for each other for growth and actualization.

Specifically, in the two cases, it was expressed through the tolerance for ambiguity, respect for and valuing differences, and accepting divergence. They saw that through their differences, they, together, were much enriched, and that their programs and goals were better served by their distinctive competencies.

(We are) like an array of colors... so much diversity in culture, in ways of looking at the world, in making things. Each is unique in its own, a miracle no one would ever totally unravel. If only we can get beyond the beauty of our own miracles, we will have at least a chance to peak inside those of others and join them in appreciating theirs.

Collaboration also challenges everyone to examine and reiterate their assumptions about people in general. As applies to the members of HADCCO and OHIO as well as to the leaders of
their respective organizations, representatives are more inclined towards Theory Y assumptions. Their views of people tend to be more positive and affirming.

These are responsible people, I would even say driven individuals. In many ways, they are special, but they are also like any others in the street. They have come this way because they were fortunate to have had friends, experiences who were helpful, who allowed them to travel, who challenged them to expand their visions and thinking. And so they have come to think of other people in a good light -- at least they strive to do so, and are able to catch themselves when they are thinking negatively. That’s why this project has so energized people...

The preoccupation among members is focused more on what they can do and what needs to be done, rather than vertical differentiation among the members, their programs, or their organizations. That one’s programs are more important than the others’ is not important. They strive to realize that one program is important -- as important as the others' -- to successfully addressing the broad problem or task. For example, one HADCCO leader describes the reason why his organization sought to come together with other organizations:
Our key mission was to deal with hunger in parts of the world. The more we tried to deal with it, the more we realized that hunger is only an aspect of a broader problem -- that to deal with it all, we need to work with those in other programs -- development, education, etc. It is not useful therefore to say we are more important than the others. In HADCCO we believe everyone is as important as the other.

Together with the Spirit of Caring, collaboration also encourages feedback. It allows members to learn and grow from one another. Valuing feedback makes the openness of communication channels and the development of communication skills very valued states. Such valuing is not just confined to individuals active in both HADCCO and OHIO; it is also valued with regards individuals in one's primary organization.

We need to have a way or several ways of reaching each other, of communicating to people in our communities, everywhere we need to send information, etc. The directory, the newsletter, these are fine. They serve a purpose; but for other things they are inadequate. Maybe we need to try looking into new technologies for this, into regional meetings or conferences... I don't know how we do it, but I know we have to do it.

Part of my challenge is to communicate our ideals and goals here to my superiors in the
(organization). My immediate boss is very supportive and tries to understand and gives me the support I need to do my work here. But some of our leaders are not able to understand these things well, and I need to know how I can reach them, how I can communicate with them the great ideas and activities we are planning.

Finally, the collaborative spirit expresses itself in its members' stance towards power. Members of both organizations see power as an expandable social resource. Their key concern is one of distribution and disbursement, versus power concentration or elimination. It is not even equalization that is a concern, because the issues of equalization presumes the presence of hierarchy and that power is a basis for dominance. Rather the collaborative spirit sees power as a facilitating force, and therefore, rather than be equalized, must be expanded, for everyone.

Here I don't worry about promotion or pay increases or job evaluation. We enjoy what we are doing, and I guess we all do our best. So when OHIO meetings are scheduled, I try to come, because it is restful for me.

One thing I like in OHIO is that it is a place where I can come, and talk..... and not feel that I should be careful.

For us to succeed here, everyone must be
empowered to participate fully in what we do. That is why perhaps it has been such positive experience for people. That is how I feel about this people, and that is why I keep coming back.

One thing I have learned from him (mentor) is that power can be shared, and in sharing we in fact increase it. I am the proof of that philosophy. And many times I sense that among people here.

In summary, the spiritual and socio-logical forces that characterize OHIO and HADCCO when they are at their best as partnership efforts can be described as integrative, caring, and collaborative with regards the world and their social realities.
A. **Dominant Social Processes**.

In the preceding section, the presentation of the results detailed the experiences, values, ideas, and ideo-logic realities of the leaders and members of OHIO and HADCCO as they sought to develop partnerships among their organizations. Here, the focus will be on the experiences of these leaders and members categorized under the notion of **dominant social processes**. This category will contain descriptions of processes commonly experienced by the OHIO and HADCCO leaders and members when they tried relating with each other as partners. These processes were evident in and surfaced from patterns of behavior as well as in conversations with OHIO members and HADCCO leaders. It seems that these processes reinforce as well as proceed from the spiritual and ideologic foundations of the partnering efforts described earlier.

There are three thematic categories that stood out from the qualitative data. First, it was apparent that the partnerships were characterized by the Process of Inquiry. When partnering was successfully experienced,
predominant behaviors were those where people showed a desire to know, a genuine curiosity about the experiences and realities of the other, and a sincere search for both questions and answers.

The second category of dominant social processes can be described as the Process of Affirmation. This process involves behavioral tendencies where people seek out and acknowledge the positive, the successful, and the potential for good in people. Rather than focusing on the problems, failures and the missing pieces, people recognized that successful partnership took place when they were affirming rather than negating.

The third dominant social process described by the inquiry participants was that of the Process of Co-creation. This is a process where people assume and decide to construe their action as being inherently intertwined with those of others (as influenced by the Spirit of Integration), such that any consequent reality is a joint product. When their partnership is characterized by a co-creative process, it is
this time when they feel they are able to bring to life their own vision, and enable as well the birth of those of their partners.

This section will describe these processes in more detail. Like the preceding section, these details involve the perceptions, experiences and values of those with whom we spoke and observed. The thematic descriptions, like those in the previous section, are the result of refinements introduced into the interpretation of data due to feedback and suggestions from our inquirers themselves.

A. Process of Inquiry.

Theme 4.

The partnership experiences, when at their best, were characterized by a people constantly inquiring and seeking to learn about and with each other and the world around them.

The leaders and members of OHIO and HADCCO described their best partnership moments as characterized distinctly by an affinity to inquiry, and the desire to learn.

What started all this for us years back was nothing more than the realization that there is a lot more we need to learn about the task we have taken on for ourselves. We needed to learn about these other things
because we realized these were important to our own tasks. The nice thing about this project is that it allows us to truly inquire, not for the purpose of identifying problems, and thus making others defensive. The appreciative inquiry approach has allowed us to tell people we truly are interested to know about what they do, about their successes. Now it is a lot easier for me to come up to others, even those I have never met before, and begin to know them.

It is important that people maintain their curiosity and openness to learn. Otherwise, we will be doomed to a life of arrogance and smugness about our knowledge, how much better we are over others... that will lead us nowhere.

One of the most apparent inquiry foci for OHIO and HADCCO has been that of connections. In keeping with the spirit of integration, inquiry for these organizations have been explorations about the linkages and connections that people have, or can have -- with each other and with their organizations. For those who participated in it, the Appreciative Inquiry Project was a vehicle for exploring and identifying connections. It was not surprising, then, to find so much energy and enthusiasm and hopefulness associated with the project. The fact that such positive energy was evident during the project is substantial proof that the process of inquiry,
with a conceptual framework which resonates with the deep-seated values of people, and the appropriate language, would generate a level of energy and support. As one lady said:

This is an unbelievable idea (Appreciative Inquiry). It has helped me to talk about what is going on and talk with the people in my board. It just generates such positive responses from people because they don’t feel threatened.

This project has allowed us to explore our connections in the community. Even in the small towns, we can find possible connections, with a number of organizations. This can be helpful for us especially in the beginning to connect with the business organizations -- there must be linkages there too. We just have not taken the time to find out, and talk to these people.

Inquiry processes are also on-going with regards innovative ways to exchange information. The need to exchange information among the members of the two organizations is especially a significant concern. Most meeting time with OHIO members has been used to clarify why and how to explore ways to exchange information. How can we let others know what we are doing? How can we know what others are doing? These are two of the constantly asked questions during these meetings. One of the tapes of a meeting in Columbus por-
trays this typically. It shows that the start of the meeting, with introductions being made of the people present, especially to benefit those who were new to those meetings. Then, in the middle of the process, the meeting became a lengthy presentation by a new person about the cable television technology and how it can become an information exchange medium for OHIO members. Urged on by the sincere interest among the others present, this presentation lasted for one-and-a-half hours.

Two main reasons stand out for the need to exchange information and find out more about each other. First, and obviously, there is the need to find out who is doing what, and who has what kind of resources. The following statements are quite common:

We need to know what sources of funding and other resources are out there. If we do not have the capacity to pass that kind of information around, we would not be able to carry out the programs that we want to continue. Certainly we will not be able to ask for help because we would be limited in knowing who can help; and we will not be so helpful either, because we may not be informed as to who needs what kind of help.

I might have extra volunteers in my pool,
and if I have a way of knowing who has need of these volunteers, we can maximize this resource. At the same time, if I need speakers or technical help, say with TV production of a campaign material, an effective information exchange will give me that information.

A second reason which surfaced and has become the focus of intense discussion is the growing belief that diversity is in fact a social resource of both OHIO and HADCCO. Their leaders say:

We used to believe that our view of things and our ways of doing things were the right ones. Now, for instance, we have recognized that hunger is not only a part of a broad spectrum of concerns. Now we know that our diverse views can enrich and guide our respective tasks. That’s why HADCCO is important to us.

We need to talk about the fact that we do not talk with entrepreneurs and business organizations. Are we saying they are irresponsible? Or is it that we do not know for sure what their concerns are and where they stand on international issues? If we are not sure, how can we be sure if we don’t talk with them? Just because they are for profit and we are not does not mean we should exclude them. They have a lot of wisdom to contribute, just as we have experiences that can help them.

Because organizations are located in various regions in the state, the necessity for innovative information exchange mechanisms is highlighted for the two partnerships, but most
especially for OHIO. That is why the need to bridge the information exchange gap has been a key preoccupation since the AIP started. And it has become the central issue around which many meetings have been organized.

Inquiry processes are also evident in explorations of who the others are, what they do, what their aspirations are. The development of the directory for OHIO has been a milestone. It highlighted for them the possibility of not only knowing that there are others somewhere in the state who are into international activities. It also represented an opportunity to get to know the other organizations and their key people and programs. The directory however had major limitations. It was not very eloquent and conducive to the process of knowing and understanding the fuller identity of the other organizations and their leaders. The directory was not an adequate medium for the very dynamic exchanges that members expected to support the building of partnerships.

Thus, the search for possible information exchange media branched into how people can
create possibilities for face-to-face contact that would be frequent and yet not resource draining nor disruptive of activities and responsibilities. The idea of regional OHIOs took center stage at this point. Succeeding meetings started to explore in earnest this possibility. Leaders of OHIO began to ask others during interviews if they had experiences with regards communication mechanisms that might enable members of a state-wide system to communicate with each other quickly at little financial cost.

Another area which seems to highlight the affinity for inquiry and learning in OHIO and MADCCO was about differences. Clearly, in these two meta-organizations, learning about differences was essential to their process of building partnerships. Diversity among the members -- in terms of people, programs, interests, goals, and values -- was a valuable asset.

I remember a time when we would be looking for organizations and people who thought like us, whose programs were like ours, and whose values were like ours. We still have many of those organizations today, and they have their own place and purpose. But OHIO can not be like them. And its important to
recognize that, because the people here actually value the vast diversity between us. Its the source of who we are, and what we will be depends on how well we allow our diversity to influence that.

Finally, and most importantly, the process of inquiry that characterized OHIO had for its central theme also the need to learn how to partner, how to collaborate, and how to work together with more people and organizations.

In the past we had worked under the illusion that what we were trying to accomplish is detached from and independent of other issues and problems. We were kidding ourselves. We need to join together, because this thing is so bad and vast, it’s beyond a single individual, organization or country. And maybe by learning to work together, to be partners, we will have taken the first big step towards global peace and prosperity.

In summary, the Process of Inquiry involves behavioral tendencies and norms grounded in the desire to learn. In some ways, it is seen in the effort to find effective information exchange mechanisms. It also emerges in the search for ways to have face-to-face contact in order to enhance the potential of knowing more about the other person. Finally, it manifests itself in the valuing stance people have towards diversity and differences -- viewing these not traditionally as
problems but as assets, a source of potential.

B. Process of Affirmation.

_theme5:_

OHIO and HADCCO are also characterized by interactions that affirm, value, and celebrate others, their successes, efforts, and aspirations founded on the belief that the richness of organizational life flows directly from others and what they bring into the organization.

The process of affirmation was also very much evident in the enthusiastic participation by HADCCO and OHIO leaders and members in the Appreciative Inquiry Project. The project attracted the participation, in varying degrees, of teachers, state education officials, ranking university leaders, directors of local or regional PVO’s, and some entrepreneurs.

One of the reasons given for such energetic participation has been the appeal of appreciative inquiry as a philosophy conducive to getting to know people, to the development of trust, and to minimize defensive posturing. Rather than the traditional approach of seeking problems, thereby making people defensive ordinarily, the Appreciative Inquiry helped people to identify,
and then value success, proud moments, achievements, things that people valued most. In other words, OHIO and HADCCO (and others also reported similar results in their own organizations) were able to establish that celebrating and applauding success was the desirable norm of behavior.

I would recommend to my board that we learn more about appreciative inquiry, its philosophy and values. After my experience here, I know that it will really make a difference for us. By highlighting the positive and successes of organizational members, I felt really appreciated here. I am sure the members of my organization will feel the same way.

I want to emphasize that the part of the reason there is so much enthusiasm now is because people feel welcome and appreciated. I know that the people here truly want to know about what we do well in my organization, and what I do well. That is different from other organizations I’ve been to, where you have to be very careful or else people may think you are bragging.

The celebration was not only about people’s successes and valued experiences in educating people about international issues. The project also legitimized the showering of applause for efforts at collaboration.

Affirming was evident when people talked
about the integrative, caring values and activities of their organizations and their own. It became normal for people to talk about the values of their organizations, their own personal values, which led them into international activism and responsible action. One OHIO leader, when asked about why it is important to have values as a major focus of discussion, replied:

Values are at the bottom of everything we do or say. To understand each other, and to enjoy the benefits of our differences we need to allow people to talk about their values and those of others. Once we learned how to deal with our values, the other things become easier to handle.

People also started to realize that affirmation of diversity and differences that exist between members is possible, even healthful. They are beginning to welcome different opinions. The concept of membership, for example, is now being explored seriously for its implications to inviting those who were traditionally uninvited, such as business organizations, because there values were assumed to conflict with those of member organizations. The discussion of membership is tangible proof of members’ growing acceptance of others, and at
least a willingness to create opportunities for learning about differences in values. During one OHIO meeting, for instance, these statements were made:

So far who our members are is determined mainly by who has paid the membership dues and who hasn’t. The question has been raised a number of times lately: who should we consider possible members? who should we invite as members? The payment of dues only determines the ability or desire of members to contribute financially to our needs. But membership... I guess I want to know if we will only welcome education organizations or shall we include business, industry, ethnic groups, churches, or any other organization interested in us and what we are doing.

Finally, the process of affirming and celebrating itself was given legitimacy, was extolled as THE process that became one of the vehicles to express ideals and to co-create common vision. Affirming itself became the object of affirmative attention.

With appreciative inquiry, I find it easier to talk with people about possible collaborative efforts. Through it I know the task of generating common goals is facilitated. It is like the oil in a car engine. Without it the pistons will have great difficulty generating power together. With it, it gets easier.

In summary, the process of affirmation is a social process through which organizational
representatives in OHIO and HADCCO tend towards discovering and valuing each other, their programs, successes, and efforts at collaborative efforts.

C. Process of Co-creation.

Theme 6:

Members of OHIO and HADCCO see themselves as being continuously engaged in the process of re-creating together their reality through efforts at evolving common ideals and goals. As co-creators, they engage in and value consensus generation as the most effective vehicle for co-creation.

The third dominant social process that people referred to directly or indirectly was that of being participants in the process of developing common ideals, of generating a shared view of what the future can be and should be. In short, they were referring to the process of co-creation.

We sometimes forget that we are in this together; that our common vision is the product of a lot of hard work and dialogue; we did not get to where we are today with our individual ideas. We put them together.

One of the themes that stand out when the co-creative process was in evidence describes
actions and approaches towards generating consensus. The development of agreements was pursued energetically. Meetings often lasted longer than necessary because discussions would tend to remain on single topics at a time, until consensus is reached, or until people must absolutely leave and begin their long drives home. These scenes would repeat themselves over and over, even incredibly during the harsh winter months so typical of Ohio winters. People would drive the long distances to the meetings. A few times, the meetings would feel like they ended as disappointments; yet people kept coming back, because the process of building a common vision is so appealing and seductive. It was an opportunity for them to feel influential in shaping the world, at least that part which they had direct access to.

OHIO for me is a symbol of what our world can be -- a place where everyone feels able to shape their destiny as they live and work with others. Here, I have felt able to influence things. That is because we try to arrive at consensus. That is difficult, especially with OHIO’s state-wide membership. That’s why it is important for us to learn how to maintain that level of dialogue and consensus in spite of distance.
What were they creating together? One of their creative projects was OHIO itself. (At this time, HADCCO, which was in the process of revising its mission statements, was also described by its leaders as being in the process of "recreation".) From a sketchy vision of a state-wide network that the originators started with back in 1982, OHIO members were, at the time of this research, striving to make it into the living system of partnerships and relationships as they saw it now. In striving together, with each other, they in fact imbued their commonly constructed visions with vitality and vigor.

HADCCO, too, is the consequence of this process of co-creation. Its genesis story involves the coming together of concerned individuals representing a variety of organizations. In looking for a broad umbrella that will include their diverse concerns, they created HADCCO (and are re-creating it today) -- the result of their partnership.

HADCCO started with a core of about 10 people. We did not have a clear idea about what we needed at that time. But after talking among us for a number of times, informally, we decided to establish HADCCO.
Originally we saw HADCCO as a way of connecting with others in order to support our hunger efforts. Here we slowly realized that hunger is only a part of a broader concern. Thus now we are in the process of reviewing who we are and what we have become, and we will change things, because our original mission statement for example may no longer reflect what we have made ourselves into.

In many respects, as the earlier statement of an OHIO leader suggested, the efforts of OHIO and HADCCO people to create and re-create their partnerships also represented in micro-form the broad visions of global realities they are putting together. Their partnership also represented a process whereby their dreams of a peaceful world, of cooperating and mutually enriching diversity of peoples becomes achievable. For them, world peace, global cooperation, and the vision of a global village must be co-created in their minds -- and through their commonly created vision of the global village, they can learn to create it outside of themselves.

C. Relational Requisities.

In the preceding two sections, the themes that were presented described the spiritual
forces and the dominant processes which characterized the OHIO and HADCCO when their partnership experiences were ones of success. It was clear, however, that interorganizational partnerships are initiated, maintained, and acted upon because of certain fundamental relationships already in place, or which must be in place, in order for IP to begin and go on. These relationships are frequently alluded to by the leaders and members of OHIO and HADCCO. HADCCO, because of its more mature state, has been able to more openly recognize and do something with these relationships. The themes that describe these relationships are broadly referred to here as:

a) Person-to-person Chemistry; and
b) Organization-to-organization Proximity.

Person-to-person chemistry refers to a quality of relationship between individuals involved in IP. It refers to friendships, close interpersonal ties, and history of working well together.

Organization-to-organization proximity on the other hand refers to themes describing the
closeness of organizations, whether in terms of physical distance, similarity of values and culture, or complimentarity of programs and strategic activities.

These two categories are detailed in the following section.

1. **Person-to-Person Chemistry.**

   **Theme 7:**

   **OHIO** and **HADCCO** were initiated on the foundation of and maintained by person-to-person chemistry. This refers to the personal friendships and strong interpersonal bonding among representatives of organizations, and among the same representatives and the members/leaders of their own organizations.

   Person-to-person chemistry as a group of themes refers to a foundational relationship between individuals. This relationship, important to **OHIO** and **HADCCO**, is foundational because it represents a basis, the ground as it were, upon which the process of interorganizational partnering can be initiated, take root, and be nurtured.

   On one hand, it refers to interpersonal bonds among organizational representatives. Through these bonds, of friendship, of support, a
cohesive group of representatives are able to facilitate and become an anchor for the interorganizational partnership.

These are special friends. They provide support and comfort for me.

Come to think about it, yes, those of us who initiated HADCCO were friends. Others had been people we had a working history with, and that relationship has become also one of friendship. Yes, I would say friendships are important to us at HADCCO.

I may not know a lot of people in other parts of the state. But I know there are friendships in the various communities, and those can serve as a start for the regional OHIOs that we are thinking about. In fact, that is one of the very reasons why regional OHIOs must evolve now, to take advantage of those friendships.

The quality of interpersonal bond seems to enhance the potential for establishing, as well, individual level partnerships among organizational representatives. The OHIO leaders, as expressed in the above statements, recognized how crucial these individual level friendships were to the initiation and maintenance of interorganizational partnership.

It is not enough however that representatives develop friendships among them.
It is critical that organizational representatives have or are able to develop a similar type of chemistry with the leaders of their respective organizations. This is because each organizational representative, when acting for the external group, is also functioning as the external group’s representative to his organization, and thus needs to convince, persuade, sell, sponsor, and represent to the leaders of his organization the decisions, values, and needs of the representatives’ group. As a member of the representatives’ group, he must be able to convince his organization’s leaders of the external group’s decisions and course of action, and convince them to commit resources to the proposed course of action.

It is essential for me to have some influence inside my own organization, because the decisions we make here are subject to my own superiors’ approval. If I have established solid personal and professional relationship with them, I will have no serious difficulties doing my job. Then I will be a dependable member of OHIO.

At the same time, the organizational representative must clearly make known to the group his organization’s expectations, goals, and
values. As described by the members, it is necessary to be clear among themselves about what their organizations expect from the partnership.

My first responsibility is to represent the values and goals of my organization to this group. That is why I am sent here, because we have our expectations. And I must let that be known clearly to everyone here. I will be doing everyone an unfairness if I fail to let them know what we expect. At the same time, it will help us with our tasks here if we are honest with each other about what we expect and what to expect from each other.

Thus it seems that the dual role of representation that evolves for the organizational representatives need to be recognized. Representatives need to have their organization’s interests incorporated and included in the group’s overall goals. In other words, acceptance of, and the changes that their organizations need to make depend on the ability of representatives to bring to the group the goals and values of the organization.

It is necessary for this chemistry to be present because the task of bringing together organizations into a close working relationship is a demanding task. For the representatives of
organizations, the development of themselves into a cohesive, viable group is an integral part of the task. According to one HADCCO leader:

We could never have pulled this off if not for the fact that most of us already knew each other before this. In fact about six or seven of us already had established a good history with each other. Thus it was easier to start among us. But for something like OHIO, these people mainly had to develop friendships first, or at least the beginnings of friendships before they could take OHIO and run with it.

On the other hand, this chemistry must also be present or must be developed between the organizational representative and the leaders of his own organization. The task of representation is a bi-directional responsibility for representatives. They not only represent their organizations in OHIO or HADCCO for instance. As they develop their group, they also take on the task of representing this group to the leaders and members of their own organizations.

Thus, it seems that the development of the interorganizational partnership is dependent upon both the development of the group of representatives, and the development of the group of leaders in the organizations involved. As one
HADCCO leader hypothesized, the development of IP may depend upon and follow the development of the group of representatives.

2. Organization-to-organization Proximity.

**Theme 8:**

Successes in partnership efforts were also described as determined by conditions of proximity of organizations engaged in partnering. Simply, these conditions involve physical proximity in terms of location, as well as value proximity.

This theme describes some organizational characteristics and conditions that OHIO and HADCCO leaders saw as very critical foundations for their success as partnerships.

On one hand, proximity refers to physical proximity. The nearness of organizations with each other was seen as very much helpful for the ability of HADCCO to evolve faster than OHIO for instance. The fact that HADCCO had most of its members in the Columbus metropolitan area was a major advantage. Meetings were always well attended, scheduled more regularly, and informal discussions frequent.

For OHIO, distance has been a problematic and challenging factor. Members are in different
parts of the state. To come to meetings, people needed to drive to Columbus, the most central location for all, for an hour or more each way.

But more than physical distance, organization proximity refers to the ability of organizations and their representative to come together, to exchange information, to exchange opinions and argue positions on issues. In other words, proximity refers to the ability of organizations to engage each other regularly and frequently.

Proximity also meant, for OHIO and HADCCO leaders, the fit and complementarity of organizational values with those of the others. This is one of the reasons why people needed to and debated such issues as membership. That was also the reason why OHIO had not actively sought the participation of business organizations in its activities in the past. Generally, profit-motivated organizations were traditionally viewed as environmental destroyers, exploiters, or some other negative kind of villain.

Finally, there was the traditional assumptions early on that similarity or
complementarity of values can make the relationship building process between organizations and between their representatives less burdensome and less time consuming. This was described as the offshoot of the desire of organizations to immediately jump into action, driven by a crisis mentality and short-term perspective.

OHIO and HADCCO members however were clear that similarity in values need to be defined some more and even tested, especially in terms of what the minimum degree of similarity needs to be or about what issues or aspects of life should similarity be a requisite.

In summary, interorganizational partnerships as seen through OHIO and HADCCO seem to require two foundational relationships. The first is described as person-to-person chemistry, one where interpersonal bond and friendships support the IPs. These bonds appear to be needed on both sides of the relationship; that is, between the organizational representatives, and between the representative and the leaders of his organization.
The second foundational relationship involves organization-to-organization proximity. This refers to both physical proximity, value complementarity, and ability to have frequent contact and dialogue.

**SOME CENTRIFUGAL FORCES.**

The preceding sections of this chapter may provide the impression that the two organizations which served as the setting for our inquiry are perfect organizations, or that we only saw or chose to report their positive traits and their successes. That is simply not the case.

Definitely, the inquiry sought deliberately to identify those moments of success and high energy from among all the experiences people can describe. However, we also observed these organizations to be plagued by some challenges and problems. This section will highlight some key challenges that tended to inhibit partnership among OHIO and HADCOO members. These inhibiting elements are called centrifugal forces because they tend to move members away from one another.

At this juncture, it is necessary to point out
that the experience of centrifugal forces do not necessarily mean that the centripetal forces -- those that bring members together in partnership -- are not actually experienced. Both are present, and are responsible for different types of experiences.

Overall, OHIO and HADCCO struggled against traditional, well-learned assumptions and behaviors relative to organizations and their management. Non-payment of membership dues was often interpreted as lack of commitment to common goals and values. Non-attendance at meetings was seen as lack of interest and commitment. As a result, people tended to be uninformed when the next meeting is scheduled. This resulted in fewer people coming together.

More specific challenges to partnering were also evident in both OHIO and HADCCO. First, it was very evident that physical distance tended to keep OHIO members from each other. Traveling to OHIO activities and meetings posed serious difficulties for many. Ohio winters often test the best of professional drivers; for ordinary
drivers, under which category almost all OHIO members belonged, they were often life-threatening.

Distance also restricted information exchange to some degree. People were often heard talking about how much their long distance telephone bills were. Definitely, since such calls can be quite costly, members experienced a need to manage their phone calls strictly -- "call only when it is really necessary, not just to chit-chat", as one OHIO person described it. This reduces the ability of organizational representatives to develop stronger personal ties with others in other parts of the state.

HADCCO members do not feel the full brunt of the distance challenge because while it is a regional organization, almost all its members are in the greater Columbus metropolitan area. This is one of the reasons for HADCCO’s ability to evolve faster than OHIO, according to leaders of both organizations.

Both organizations, however, seem to experience difficulties dealing with value distance. While both organizations believe in
expanding membership to include all organizations and individuals active in international issues, membership in fact tend to cluster around basic concerns that figured prominently in the genesis of each organization -- education and cultural understanding in the case of OHIO, and basic human needs in the case of HADCCO. Note once again the membership profile of both organizations as shown in tables presented earlier.

Another centrifugal force working on the organization representatives is the constant effort to perform specific, concretely defined projects. The need to act and act quickly seems very strong, since representatives of member organizations are often those whose roles in their respective organizations required an ability to act quickly and stay active over long periods of time. However, when a concrete direction or project is identified, fragmentation of the group ensues, and energy and interest levels decrease. One of the earliest examples of this took place during the meeting between SIGMA
representatives and the AIP Steering Committee members. It was agreed that a state-level conference will culminate the AIP, with SIGMA providing expertise for planning the conference. OHIO was to be responsible for generating the funds needed to successfully run the conference. As soon as the task became that concrete, and specific task assignments made, it became a major problem for those present. This led to questions about whether OHIO should continue to exist, why the cost estimate was so high, and where can OHIO find the money and who are the people to go after the money. Ultimately, the issue ended with a few volunteering to do their best to look for the money, while most declined to commit themselves to any specific responsibility. Two years later, a state-wide conference is still just an approved plan with little progress in actually being held.

There is also a clear tentativeness with the issue of membership. While the question has been raised as to whether membership ought to be by virtue of international activities and buying into OHIO's purposes or determined by payment of membership fees, succeeding meetings largely
ignored the issue. It was assumed that membership is always determined by payment of dues, as has been traditionally done in other organizations. Efforts to recruit new members, therefore, have not been as clearly guided, and is seen by some to be a way of keeping some potential members out, or even as a means for OHIO to "steal" members away from other coalitions or networks.

Another inhibiting factor to OHIO’s growth is the hesitation on the members’ part to commit their organizations to providing resources. In HADCCO, this is not the case. Certain commitments have been made explicitly, and thus the coalition knows clearly what is available.

Furthermore, OHIO members, and to a lesser extent HADCCO, are still unlearning, and at times succumb to, old habits of waiting for the leaders to determine what needs to happen next. Frequently, for instance, determining whether a meeting needs to be called is left to the officers. Members at large very rarely initiate state-wide or regional meetings. This results frequently in meetings called mainly to take care
of matters only the officers see as important; or in meetings being called because "it’s about that time already".

Finally, reliance on meetings as a main vehicle for exchanging current information about each others’ activities and major events have also raised the issue of representatives’ work schedules in their organizations. As OHIO’s and to some extent HADCCO’s membership expands, this issue acquires greater stature, as more and more individuals will be unable to join such face-to-face activities due to scheduling conflicts.

These are the key centrifugal forces that we saw in OHIO and HADCCO. But as the AIP progressed, the two organizations, and especially OHIO, through increased awareness of these forces are more and more dealing deliberately with the challenges that they present. It is in fact in the efforts to deal with these centrifugal forces that the experience of the centripetal forces are heightened.

RESULTS OF PRELIMINARY SURVEY

Based on the results of the initial analysis
of qualitative data, a preliminary survey instrument was put together in order to see if the results based on the interviews and observations can be strengthened by the opinions of others who were not part of the AIP. An opportunity presented itself in the form of a large gathering of organizational representatives during a meeting scheduled in June 1989. The rationale, as described earlier in the methods section was simply to check out whether some aspects of the those conditions when partnership was successfully experienced would be picked out by even those who were not part of the Appreciative Inquiry Project; and reiterated by those who participated in either the pilot interviews or the state-wide interviews. If the results came out strongly pointing desirability towards those aspects which were identified at that point in time (analysis of the qualitative data was continuing still), then we would have felt extremely confident with the findings.

The results of the analysis of the quantitative data are presented in this section.

First, we felt, from the interview data, that
certain types of organizations and certain types of organizational leaders will be perceived by leaders/potential representatives of other organizations as offering greater partnership potential than others. Specifically, we felt that those who have been exposed to OHIO values and ideology would tend to be attracted strongly to organizations and leaders who exhibit characteristics commonly indicated in the interviews as important factors in building partnerships. Conversely, those who have not been with OHIO would show significantly attraction, compared to the other group in terms of their attraction to the above described organization and leader type.

First, the survey instrument asked the respondents to estimate the potential for an excellent relationship between them and both SOW Leader and ICI Leader (as shown in Appendix B, a description of two types of organizations and leaders was provided).

Table 4 shows the mean of the responses obtained about which organizational leader is
Table 4
Leader and Organization with Excellent Potential for Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grp. 1</th>
<th>Grp. 2</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sow Leader</td>
<td>4.9259</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI Leader</td>
<td>1.2222</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>-7.704</td>
<td>41.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOW Org.</td>
<td>4.8519</td>
<td>4.6111</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI Org.</td>
<td>0.7037</td>
<td>2.8333</td>
<td>-10.95</td>
<td>38.53</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 is composed of OHIO members and those with prior participation in OHIO activity.
Group 2 is composed of people with no prior participation in OHIO activity.
perceived as having potential for an excellent relationship with the respondent. The leader of organization SOW was considered by all the respondents in both groups as a high potential. The mean score given to the SOW leader by Group 1 (those with prior OHIO participation) was 4.9259 (rating scale was 1 for low and 5 for high). Group 2 showed a mean rating of 4.6667 for SOW leader. It seems that the two groups differ on this item, with a computed significance level of .05.

Group 1 sees the potential for excellent relationship with ICI leader to be quite low, with a mean rating of 1.222. Group 2 on the other hand sees a moderate potential for excellent relationship with ICI leader. The comparison of both mean ratings indicate a significant difference, with a .0005 level significance level.

Respondents were also asked to rate the potential for excellent relations with two types of organizations as described in Appendix B. From Table 4, SOW organization’s potential was rated highly by the two groups. The computed significance level of .09 seems to indicate that
there is no significant difference between the mean ratings of the two groups for SOW organization. A significant difference, however, was computed (at .0005 level) between the mean ratings of Group 1 and 2 for ICI organization. Group 2's mean rating, however, for ICI was only 2.8333.

What we see from Table 4 is that both groups tend to rate SOW leader and organization highly, while ICI leader and organization tended to get low ratings of their potential for excellent relationship with the respondents. However, those who have had no prior participation in OHIO activities showed a relatively higher rating for ICI types than those in the other group.

The respondents were also asked to rate a number of factors as to whether each had a significant influence in their choice of organization and leader type. The next two tables show the results.

Table 5 presents the computed values based on the ratings given on how much each factor contributed to the respondents' leader choice.
Table 5
Factors Judged to Contribute to Perceived Potential For Excellent Relationship with SOW Leader (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grp. 1</th>
<th>Grp. 2</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2a</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>2.6111</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2b</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2c</td>
<td>3.2963</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>42.77</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2d</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>4.3889</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2e</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>4.0556</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2f</td>
<td>3.8519</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2g</td>
<td>3.9630</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2h</td>
<td>4.4074</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2i</td>
<td>3.8296</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Grouping as in Table 4.
2. Items correspond to those in Appendix B, under Part A, question 2.
Group 1 respondents highly rated these factors which were seen as characterizing SOW leader (with mean ratings of more than 3 in a 5-point scale): value congruence; potential to develop trust; dependability; benefit from networks; pragmatism; optimism; fun to be with; benefit from professional skills; and influence within the organization. Group 2 respondents rated the same factors highly (with a mean rating higher than 3.0), except "influence within his/her organization". On every factor, except that about being "fun and enjoyable to be with", the mean ratings from both groups showed no significant difference. "Fun to be with" had a computed significance level of .024, with Group 2 rating it higher than Group 1 did. Interestingly, "fun to be with" was rated more highly by Group 2 than by Group 1.

The respondents were also requested to rate a number of factors which they thought contributed to their perceived potential for excellent relationship between their organization and SOW organization. These factors were: proximity in location; accessibility for information exchange;
strategic proximity; task similarity; values similarity; willingness to share resources; complementarity of skills and know-how; similarity in core beliefs; and similarity in basic view of the world. Table 6 presents the results in detail.

As can be seen from Table 6, both respondent groups gave every factor an above-average rating. Group 1 rated "willingness to share resources" and "similarity in fundamental beliefs" the highest; the lowest rated factor was proximity in location. Group 2 rated "similarity in view of things..." the highest, and gave its lowest rating to strategic proximity. All computed levels of significance were high, ranging from .212 at the lowest and .739 at the highest -- indicating that the difference is not significant for the two groups on every item.

Overall, the survey data indicate that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents in the way they evaluate two types of leaders and organizations as to their potential for an excellent relationship.
Table 6
Factors Judged to Contribute to Perceived High Potential for Partnership with SOW Organization (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grp. 1</th>
<th>Grp. 2</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2a</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2b</td>
<td>4.1481</td>
<td>3.7222</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2c</td>
<td>3.7407</td>
<td>3.6111</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2d</td>
<td>4.0741</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2e</td>
<td>4.4444</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2f</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>4.3889</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2g</td>
<td>4.1481</td>
<td>4.0556</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2h</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2i</td>
<td>4.4074</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Basis for grouping is as in Table 4.
2. Items correspond to those in Appendix B, Question 2.
These results are surprising in that we thought the difference would be somewhat significant.

Part of the reason for the computed figures emerging the way they did and finding no evidence of significant difference may lie in the survey instrument itself. It was not pre-tested before it was given to the respondents. And, as a couple of respondents wrote in their returned questionnaire, the instrument was clearly biased and asked for responses on items that were clearly socially desirable.

Also, the timing of the administration of the survey to one set of respondents may have affected the responses. These respondents were given the instrument during lunch; the entire morning before that, there was significant background discussion as to what OHIO was about, and why it invited several experts in the computer and electronic communications field to the meeting. Just prior to lunch, the Governor of Ohio stopped by and talked about why efforts such as OHIO are important to the state, the nation and the world. While it is highly improbable to conclude about successful indoctrination in
OHIO's thinking in such a short period of time, it is possible that those without prior OHIO participation picked up on what can be socially acceptable in such a setting as OHIO.

Another possible reason is that our assumption about the groups was inaccurate. While we assumed that those with previous OHIO participation and those who did not would be quite different, such may not be the case at all. While a good number of the respondents to the survey were non-OHIO members or first time attendees at the time the instrument was administered, many of them came from organizations similar to OHIO or its member organizations. Thus, it is possible that the values, at least the ideals, of those in Group 2 were the same as those in Group 1.

Finally, it is possible as well that the lack of significant difference in fact reflects a general shift in social thinking and aspirations towards the kind of organizational characteristics, and leadership values that SOW organization and leader were described as having.
But in spite of the lack of strong differences, the ratings seem to indicate clearly a few things. First, the choice for SOW-type leader and organization with regards potential for partnership seems to be common to all, as indicated by the mean scores of both groups, in spite of somewhat significant differences in these scores. Second, the rating by both groups generally point to the relevance the various factors that they reported as influencing their leader and organization choices. In this sense, the quantitative data tend to support the interview results.

**Summary.**

This chapter presented the qualitative data obtained through interviews. The data were organized into thematic categories, each describing a significant aspect of partnership as experienced by the OHIO and HADCCO members. These categories were the partnership ethos (describing the spiritual dimension and fundamental assumptions and beliefs of partnership); the dominant social processes (containing themes that capture the processes and behavioral tendencies
described by the interviewees); and the relational foundations, which capture the relationships described by the OHIO and HADCCO members as essential to the initiation and success of partnerships.

The partnership ethos was characterized by what we called the spirits of integration, of caring, and collaboration. The predominant social processes were characterized by inquiry, affirmation, and co-creation. Lastly, the relational foundations that were described to us included what we termed person-to-person chemistry, and organization-to-organization proximity.

The results from the questionnaire were also presented. The ratings supported the interview data that people tend to find organizations and leaders whose behaviors are seen as guided by humanistic values, to be excellent potential partners. However, no significant differences were found between the responses of those who had prior participation in OHIO and those who did not.
The next chapter presents our conclusions and describes some significant implications of the findings to the concept of partnership, the inquiry approaches, and practice.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In the preceding chapter, the results of data analysis were presented. They represented data provided by members of OHIO and HADCCO members through interviews, through observations, and through discussions of thematic categories.

In this section, we will present some of the significant conclusions we arrived at about interorganizational partnerships and the forces that nurture and strengthen their potential. Here, we give vent to our tendency to undertake "grounded speculation". This chapter represents the outcomes of this grounded speculation. While it has not been the expectation of this work to capture the totality of the partnership experience we were given the good fortune to see and experience some very significant and interesting dimensions of IP. It is our hope that as others read of these important aspects, they participate in the "barn-raising" process by adding their own perspectives of partnership
among and between organizations.

KEY FINDINGS

Here the key findings are presented and discussed. These findings represent the discoveries that we obtained from OHIO and HADCCO. It must be kept in mind that these are composed of organizations which are mainly non-profit and internationally focused.

A. Value Rationality. In the course of the study and from the data, one of the findings that emerged pointed to a core driving force that can be described mainly as value rationality. This refers to a core system of ideals and values that drive and guide behavior in these organizations. As the data showed, these values and ideals include such things as learning, affirming, or caring. Because of the premium placed on learning, for instance, members are constantly searching for ways to exchange information and understand what others are about, what they are doing, and what new ways of doing things they can share with each other.

Value rationality, in this sense is opposed
to instrumental rationality, as described by Weber (1964), and Thompson (1967). Instrumental rationality tends to focus more on goals and the means of their attainment. In many ways, this leads to viewing others as means to one’s goal, and thereby treating them as instruments of goal attainment. Value rationality, on the other hand, especially in the cases we studied, direct members to look at each other as partners in life, and thus inseparable helpers in one another’s’ chosen activities.

This discovery is not so much that instrumental rationality is not operating in the organizations studied. It is simply that value rationality is ostensibly working, with no efforts at hiding its presence. Neither does this mean that in other types of settings, such as in business organizations, this value rationality is not there. It is there, only perhaps in a more muted way, and guiding behavior in a more subtle way.

However, because values are recognized as important forces that inform behavior and are out in the open, they become amenable to sharing and
modification. This will have important implications to understanding and developing IPs as will be discussed later.

B. Friendship and Interpersonal Linkage. Another major finding involves the role of friendships and interpersonal linkages in the initiation and maintenance of IPs. Once again, what stood out about this finding is not that it is totally new; rather, it was impressive that such a factor was openly and recognizably at work in the two organizations.

It was clear from the data that friendship played a significant role in the genesis of partnership, especially the ones studied. HADCCO especially was started by a core group of friends and individuals who have had prior working relationships with one another.

OHIO started with relative strangers who met each other for the first time. But its development and growth hinged upon the development of friendships among those who kept on with OHIO. After five years, when SIGMA joined OHIO in the AIP, it was clear that OHIO’s
existence relied mainly on a core of individuals who have become close friends personally.

Such a finding parallels what the business literature has been referring to as the "old boys’ network" and entrepreneurial partnerships (for instance, see Bird, 1985).

Thus, what is impressive about this point is not that it is a new discovery. Mainly it is because the importance of friendship has not been so openly recognized in the literature on IP. In Schermerhorn’s (1975) evaluation and summary of the literature, there is no mention of any work that suggests the importance of friendship and interpersonal linkages to IP. Clearly, if this is recognized, the development and understanding of the factors that nurture IPs can be enhanced.

C. Ideology of Collaboration. The third major finding from the study is the strong adherence and efforts to be consistent with the ideology of collaboration. In contrast with the ideology of competition, members kept searching for and creating opportunities for collaboration. Their core assumptions included the inherent desirability of collaboration and partnership,
and a dislike as well of the spirit and logic of competition. The strength of their belief is truly amazing.

What is also significant about this ideology is that it has been taken to a whole new level. That is, the ideal of collaboration has been explored and used to a higher level of logical and deliberate consistency, beyond endogenous collaboration for the purpose of exogenous competitive strength. The influence of the ideology is now seen in searching for opportunities to collaborate beyond all types and forms of boundaries. This is quite different from the more popular thinking and current rhetoric of collaboration internally (in the community, state, region or country) in order to compete with what is perceived as external enemies and competitors.

Because of this ideological consistency, for instance, OHIO has been able to deliberately reach out to others who members used to dislike and mistrust in the past, such as private business and multinational companies.
These findings are important because they have not been openly recognized as significant factors in the initiation and growth of partnerships in the literature. Based on these findings, and on the data, some generalizations are presented below about the nature of partnerships, especially among internationally active non-profit organizations, and the key factors that nurture these partnerships.

THE NATURE OF PARTNERSHIP

A. The Nature of Interorganizational Partnership.

One of the key questions guiding this work was about the nature of interorganizational partnerships. It was not so much that its nature was not understood, but rather it seemed that some aspects of it were either ignored or not talked about openly. The following propositions thus represent an belief that partnership, especially among organizations, is not mainly a concept of effective working arrangements. Rather, it is a special relationship characterized by bonds of common values and shared aspirations.
Proposition 1.

Interorganizational partnership is a social context where organizations are linked together by interpersonal linkages, a sense of joint ownership of common goals, values, aspirations and a shared reality, and acting together in the pursuit of those common goals, and towards the establishment of consensually defined reality.

From the findings, it is clear that the linking of organizations in partnership requires fundamentally the linking of individuals on an interpersonal level. It is because they are the carriers and enunciators of their organization's values and aspirations.

First, this link is between organizational representatives. Organizational representatives are often sent out and come together with the expressed purpose of obtaining agreements among themselves on a plan for their organizations to contribute resources, and act together with the others around some goals. Clearly, the two organizations involved in the study indicated that more than a desire to reach agreement to collaborate is needed. They recognized the critical role played by the relationship itself among the representatives of organizations.
HADCCO leaders, for instance, admit that it owes its genesis to the friendships that already existed among the founders. Its growth is also attributed to the development of friendships which evolved over the years among the growing number of members.

A slightly different genesis story describes OHIO, although the development of friendships also characterized OHIO’s growth. While many of the founding members were strangers to one another during their first meeting, personal bonds developed among them through constant contact. It is, thus, reasonable to conclude that partnerships among organizations require and are characterized by interpersonal bond.

**Proposition 2.**

The interpersonal bond serves as the ground upon which organizational linkage can take place. This interpersonal bond must exist on two sides: 1) among the representatives themselves; and 2) among the representative and the leaders of his organization.

Often, the representative’s role is construed as that of linking the organization with other organizations through ties with other
representatives. The literature on IR, especially using the concepts of interlocking directorates, linking pin, and boundary spanning, present this aspect of the linkage requirements.

While our findings are in line with this, another set of interpersonal ties need to be emphasized as equally essential. Representatives must have the requisite interpersonal bond with the organization’s elite. As the data indicated, a representative’s role also involves being able to represent the views, decisions, values, and aspirations of the "interorganizational group" -- the group of representatives -- to his own organization. It is in this group that the task of creating a shared reality, of discovering common values, is undertaken; it is within organizations, through the organizational leaders, that these common values and shared reality is integrated into the thinking and imagery of each organization, and incorporated into the organization’s activities. Thus, it was important for HADCCO to have a mechanism that formally brings out to everyone evidence of
official representative status for everyone's organizations. OHIO's leaders and members occupy key positions and roles in their respective organizations; while some participate in OHIO activities as formal representatives of their organization, others attend on the implicit assumption of a capacity to be a representative in OHIO.

The single most important finding of this study involves evidence of the vital role friendships played in the establishment and strengthening of the two partnership cases. HADCCO started with a group of friends; OHIO needed a core of individuals who soon became friends in order to survive its few years, and to kick off the process of growing and strengthening -- a process that involved largely the calling on new friends and inviting them to be a part of the effort.

Recalling the literature specifically addressing entrepreneurial partnerships (Bird, 1985), there is parallelism in this finding about IP. In the business partnership, friendship was often recognized by entrepreneurs as an essential
consideration in their choice of partners. When friends came together to establish a partnership, their history of friendship provided the starting point of trust and ease in dealing with each other that allowed the partnership to take root and flourish.

**Proposition 3.**

Interorganizational partnerships are characterized by the establishment of and commitment to common goals and shared vision, one which the member organizations have a sense of ownership because it was established and created through their joint effort -- through the process of co-creation.

1. **As Goal Creators.** Interorganizational partnerships can be said to be goal creators. Through their representatives in the interorganizational group, organizations establish together with other represented organizations a set of goals, norms, patterns of behavior, and aspirations. Indeed, this process can be called the **process of co-creation**. As Dahl (19..) suggests, at the core of collaborative relationships can be found common goals, which are common not because they were discovered to be similar but because everyone participated in
establishing them.

It is the consequence of this co-creative process which others have referred to in the literature in various ways (for instance, Cartwright and Zander's [1960] established group goals) when discussing collaboration. Through this element of shared goals, values, beliefs, and aspirations, organizations become truly owners -- co-owners, in fact -- and thus "part-(ow)ners" of their relationship, their experiences, in short, their shared reality.

2. As Goal Attainment Devices. Just as each individual organization is a goal attainment device, the partnership is likewise about attaining goals. Partnerships exhibit a pattern of activities and processes which are intended to realize goals and aspirations consensually generated by partners. It is the concerted and coordinated effort of partners as they seek to achieve their set objectives that are often the focus of attention by researchers and practitioners, mainly perhaps because it is the most visible aspect of partnerships. This does not, however, constitute the partnership but
rather highlights its existence. In other words, joint activity may be an indication that the partnership exists. Its presence, however, is not a guarantee of its existence. But when partnership exists, such joint activity should be expected.

The pursuit of common goals is also characterized by mechanisms of resource exchange. The exchange of resources, however, is important to partnerships not just for its own sake. In other words, resource exchanges take place not because they are in themselves important activities. Rather they are a way for the partners to enable each other to make as best a contribution to the attainment of common goals as possible. Partnerships, as the cases studied showed, at their best are about making every partner more able to contribute than it normally can. This clarifies what Van de Ven and Walker (1984) has been describing: that the exchange of resources can lead to a loss of power for the dominant organizations. If resources are to be consistently viewed as a power source, then its
exchange must represent a redistribution, thereby tending towards a smoothing of power distribution among the partnering organizations. And again if resource exchange has to be related with power, then the positive face of power (McClelland, 1979) as an enabling force for others who "can not otherwise do" what they want to do (McCrorcle, 1978) can be seen in action in partnerships.

B. Centripetal Forces.

Interorganizational partnerships, especially with reference to OHIO, are characterized by dynamic processes and forces, which can be described as centripetal forces. In the case of OHIO, it was clear from the beginning that there were forces that tended to bring members together in collaboration and partnership.

Likewise, there were centrifugal forces which were acting upon the OHIO as it sought to connect various international organizations in the state of Ohio. These are forces which tend to take organizations away from each other, just as particles tend to be thrown away from center in a centrifuge. These centrifugal forces were of a
number of types and sources. For instance, OHIO and HADCCO members often referred to the fact that organizations were geographically distant from each other tended to keep them apart. Also, it was pointed out a number of times that certain organizations were not included, not invited to join OHIO, because they were perceived to have different values and were perceived to be irresponsible in their attitudes, say towards the natural environment. Lack of resources also tended to bring out traditional notions of assumptions of scarcity, and thus, competitive behavior. Finally, members tended to abdicate their positions of partnership with leaders, and thus, looked up to the leaders to generate programs, activities, and work for the membership.

The challenge for OHIO and HADCCO, therefore was to identify and enhance the centripetal forces, those that tend to bring organizations together. Several of these forces were discovered and presented here.

1. Integrative Assumptions. These are the fundamental beliefs, assumptions, values, and aspirations that organizations, their leaders,
their organizational representatives have which
guide and inform their actions in relation to
others and their environment. Interorganizational
partnerships are characterized by assumptions of
integration. These assumptions are expressed in
at least two ways: in beliefs that there is only
one world, and that its parts are all connected
in some way; and in the confidence that where the
links are not immediately seen or experienced,
there is a capacity to reestablish those linkages
in our consciousness.

Such set of assumptions are fundamental to
partnership because they embody at the most
fundamental level the very essence of partnership
as an available choice. If linkage is not
possible, then partnership, as linkage, is not a
relevant option. Thus, it is by virtue of the
integrative assumption that partnership is
possible.

On the behavioral level, assumptions of
integration encourage, in fact portray as the
desirable act, the extension of invitations to
join, and the welcoming of those who are seeking
to join. It also means searching for ways to make those who are already partners to remain so.

2. Caring as Vital Force. Another centripetal force that tends to bring organizations together and strengthen their partnership is mutual caring. Through the spirit of caring, one is also guided towards the inclusion of others’ interests, their development, the enhancement of their capacity for excellent performance of chosen tasks, and their ability to contribute to the health and empowerment of others. Likewise, the spirit of caring is not one that demands the sacrifice of self-interest; rather it is one where self-interest includes the interest of others, and those of others embody those of self. Thus, caring, as a vital force in partnerships, is truly one that brings together individual interests, goals, and aspirations, integrated into a new level of common, shared goals that attract and inspire commitment from every partner.

3. Collaborative Stance. A collaborative perspective is also essential to partnerships. It asserts its centripetal energy in a number of
ways. First, in consonance with the assumptions of caring and integration, organizations further realize that the concept of self-reliance, internal adequacy, and detachment is an illusion. The presence and commitment of others are required. Therefore, the stance of collaboration is one that admits the inescapable fact that organizations need others. The collaborative spirit embodies the acceptance of this fact.

The spirit of collaboration also strengthens the linkages among organizations. As organizations come together, do things together, they acquire learnings about how collaborative activities can be planned and implemented successfully. The vitality of collaboration thus is self-replenishing. Once it takes hold, it tends to enhance itself.

4. **Learning Attitude.** Another important centripetal force that characterizes IPs is an affirming and celebrating stance towards learning. While organizations commonly experience the process of finding out about themselves and each other as a frightening and threatening
experience, requiring the mobilization of energy for defense, they tend to stay away and be by themselves. However, organizations who view each other as "museums of success" where others can learn, where everyone can celebrate efforts and successes, organizations gravitate towards each other.

An appreciative stance to inquiry does not only create a sense of safety. It also heightens the possibility of success. It stokes the embers of hope into a raging fire that propels organizations into action towards their visions of the ideal, of what they can do and become.

Finally, the affirmative stance heightens the desire for information about each other -- about new programs, new experiences, new plans. It fuels the drive to discover or create more effective ways of exchanging information, of learning about each other more easily and efficiently. Whatever channels of communication they establish, partnerships are further strengthened. These channels become one more mechanism that links organizations to one another.
5. **Consensus-Seeking.** Another centripetal force that brings organizations together in partnership comes from the members' highly developed capacity to expect and generate consensus. Also in keeping with the integrative, caring, and collaborative assumptions, consensus-seeking is a norm that defines various processes in the partnership. Decision making and communication processes are guided by the desire to arrive at agreements. The need to include as many organizations as possible and to have them represented in every major decision making event portrays this force. The need to have members represented in face-to-face settings is typical.

It is the nature of consensus that its generation involves the inclusion of one's concerns as the basis for assent. By definition, then, true consensus represents successful partnership, where every organizational is in every sense a "part-(o)mer".

5. **Similarity.** It is important to also recognize the role similarity plays in bringing organizations together. As an initial state,
similarity -- in such things as values, or activities, tend to reduce uncertainty and defensiveness that individuals and organizations have learned so well as a response to new settings. Simplicity, more positively, allows people to work with each other more comfortably.

Later, through agreements, similarities in values, goals, and norms of behavior enhance the potential for exploring and welcoming diversity and differences as assets for the development of higher order goals, and that enhance innovativeness and inventiveness. In other words, similarities provide the safety zone whereby differences can be inquired into, accepted, and valued.

6. **Group Development.** A final insight that the study provides is about the possible relationship between the development of the group of representatives and the ability of organizational partners to act together. As evident from HADCCO, and to a limited extent from OHIO, the level of development the group of representatives is in has a significant impact on the quality of partnership the organizations feel
they have, as well as on their ability to act together with the other organizations. As in the case of HADCO, its successful establishment of the Global Learner Center followed very closely the development of the representatives' group into a cohesive group. The early progress of OHIO as a partnership effort also followed closely the development of the group of founders and first members.

No definite and firm conclusion, however, can be made from the data we have obtained. Whatever it is that we have mainly point to this possibility. This can, therefore, be one area where future research can be taken.

**IMPLICATIONS TO INQUIRY**

From the above description of the nature of partnership and the centripetal forces that tend to bring organizations together, it is clear that certain significant aspects of partnerships need to be attended to more seriously than they have been up to now. Here, we will discuss what this means to inquiry in this area.

1. **On Inquiry Approach.** This work started
with some degree of dissatisfaction with the state of thinking about interorganizational partnership. Not only was partnership not a major focus of attention in the published works; whenever it was given some attention, the center of discussion was mainly on issues of resource exchange and designing and structuring for inter-organizational collaboration.

We needed to have more meaningful insight into what partnership means and what forces make it alive and successful. This required an inquiry approach that saw partnership as a social phenomenon that is replete with learning opportunities, rather than problems and conflicts to be solved, or performance to be evaluated. Appreciative inquiry allowed this effort to delve deep into the experiences of people and their organizations about partnership. By focusing on what is working when partnership is experienced, we were able to highlight some factors associated with successful partnership which tended to be glossed over -- such as the partnership ethos and the centripetal forces. By gaining access to these elements, the importance of such things as
friendships, basic assumptions of caring, integration and collaboration, have been highlighted.

It is, therefore, clear that the experience of partnership is richer than normally talked about. An appreciative inquiry approach facilitates the discovery of these rich elements. Certainly, with the same positive approach, more of the wealth of partnership can be discovered, which will help us to understand it even more.

More importantly, if we take inquiry as having an inescapable impact on the very life of the phenomenon we are studying, appreciative inquiry must be an approach that facilitates partnership. It brings out the best of everyone's experiences; it facilitates discussion and dialogue; it encourages the development of mutual trust; and it legitimizes the exposition and discussion of successes among partners. This process strengthens the partnership itself.

It is strongly suggested therefore, that future inquiry into partnership utilize the appreciative inquiry philosophy as its guiding principle.
Furthermore, we can hypothesize that an appreciative inquiry stance can have tremendous impact on the developmental process of partnerships. The ideological foundations of appreciative inquiry are very similar to the spiritual elements and life-giving forces of partnership we have identified. Its language is capable of bringing to the surface for discussion many aspects of the experience which other traditional approaches could not do. Thus, it is likely that appreciative inquiry can enhance the development partnerships, as well as strengthen the possibility of studying partnership over longer periods of time to capture its developmental progress.

2. **Focus of Inquiry.** In keeping with the above suggestion, the following foci for future research are also proposed. First, it is suggested that future research concentrate on further identifying spiritual elements in partnership, on those core assumptions, values, and beliefs that partnerships have. The more we know about those, the better our understanding of what make partnerships what they are.
Second, it is suggested that the development of the of friendships and other forms of interpersonal linkages, the interorganizational group, that group of organizational representatives, be studied for its impact on the development of partnership on the interorganizational level. That is, does the stage of development of the group affect the ability of organizations to act together? Can organizations successfully collaborate when their representatives’ group is still working on inclusion and influence issues? Answers to these questions will firmly establish the relationship between group development and partnership growth.

As indicated in our conclusions, interpersonal bonding presents an essential linkage mechanism for IP. Since the two cases studied are mainly state-wide partnerships, and in view of the centrifugal tendencies distance creates for organizations, the question must be raised about how organizations located in various parts of the globe are coping with sheer physical distance, and the tremendous resource
requirements for bridging it. Does distance slow down the progress of partnership development, given current levels (as well as differences of availability in different regions of the world) of communication technology? Is IP on a global scope a possibility only for organizations in more economically privileged parts of the world?

**IMPLICATIONS TO PRACTICE**

In keeping with our appreciative inquiry philosophy, a significant part of our concern is the applicability of our findings and conclusions. This section discusses the implications of our findings to practice and presents recommendations that are intended and expected to improve our skills at managing the process of partnership.

First, one aspect where our practice can be enhanced is in the choice of organizational representatives. It is important for organizational leaders to identify individuals who are genuinely devoted to developing friendships and other forms of interpersonal linkages.

Also, chosen representatives would be
effective in the interorganizational group if they embody and are well aware of the values, expectations, and needs of the organization; who are skilled at being an effective group member and developer; who has the ability to persuade other organizational elites and likewise integrate into organizational values and goals those of the outside group. Since the representative represents the bridge between organizations, this is the most crucial appointment that can be made.

Second, it is important to realize that bridges between organizations do not have to be of only single representatives. When possible, a number of representatives from various levels in the organization may lead to even stronger ties. As one OHIO leader described it when talking about their organization’s experience with partnership:

Our partnership with (this organization) became truly good when every member of our staff people and theirs had a chance to really interact with each other and also clarify for themselves how they can work together on their level.
Thus, the opportunity to improve the partnership by having various representatives of the different levels of the organizations interact and become excellent links can not be underrated.

Third, it is important for representatives and organizational leaders to pay attention to and actively participate in the on-going process of creating and re-creating common goals and aspirations, because it is through this creative process that partnership truly takes place.

Fourth, organizational leaders as well as representatives need to maintain the learning attitude during their interactions; and that learning by appreciatively inquiring becomes a normal experience rather than a short-lived experiment. Although the appreciative inquiry is an attractive process, old habits ingrained in evaluative and problem detecting logic have a strong tendency to recur and reintroduce themselves into the partnership processes.

In terms of leadership, both in the interorganizational group and in the respective organizations, it is important to also pay attention to the role of leaders. In the context
of the partnership logic, consensus generation is very significant. First, it allows for the creation of a shared reality. Second, it tends to empower others, to make them influential. The key role of the leader, therefore, is one where such empowerment and participation in the creative process is facilitated. Rather than dictating and determining for others, leadership in the partnership context -- as one that nurtures and encourages it -- must be one that facilitates the participation of others.

Organizational leaders and representatives must also see to it that the spirit of integration finds full expression in the growth of membership. The logic of partnership is one that is welcoming and inviting of others, in spite of differences, sometimes even because of differences, because diversity is an asset. Leaders, therefore, need to be constantly vigilant with tendencies to establish boundaries that exclude, because the assumptions behind exclusion can contradict those of partnership, and eventually cripple it.
Finally, it is important to realize that partnership is a concept we use to describe a very complex experience and process of linking different, often unpredictable individuals and organizations. It is the process of partnership that we need to maintain. The outcomes are important; but it is the maintenance of the process that allows us to go beyond temporary outcomes, to change outcomes we do not like, and to add to or replicate outcomes we like. Organizational leaders and representatives must therefore be ever conscious of the processes, and the core values, assumptions and aspirations that fuel the process.

Summary

In this chapter, we have presented our key findings, made proposals about the nature of partnerships especially among non-profit internationally active organizations, pointed out key centripetal and centrifugal forces affecting the partnership effort, and identified implications to the theorizing about, inquiry into, and practice of interorganizational partnership. It is this writer’s firm belief that
the insights and learnings from this work will go a long way towards informing future work on partnership, both mine as a researcher and partner with others, and for those who seek the path of partnership as initiators and participants.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Can you describe the key achievements of your organization?

2. When did your relationship with OHIO start and why did you join OHIO?

3. What do you think OHIO should be?

4. Please describe some of you peak experiences in OHIO.

5. Can you describe your beginnings as a global thinker and doer? What were some of the key influences that led you to your current involvement with international concerns?

6. What do you value most about yourself? About your task? About your organization?

7. Can you describe some of your experiences working with other organizations? What led to those relationships? Can you categorize any of these relationships as partnership?

8. (If partnership is mentioned) What do you mean when you say "partnership"? Think of the factors and characteristics which you think made that relationship one of partnership?

9. Given your experiences with partnership, what advice would you give in order to strengthen partnerships among organizations?
APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Part I. Organizational Descriptions

Note:

What follows is a description of two hypothetical organizations. This part is not intended to test your recall of details previously provided. At any time when you feel the need, please feel free to refer back to this part (Organizational Descriptions) to refresh your mind about each of the fictional organizations. The descriptions were intended solely to help you develop a picture of an imaginary organization as a basis for responding to questions in the succeeding parts of this instrument. No actual organization, past or present, is referred to here.

In some instances, descriptions are general enough but with specific reference to "YOU" or "Your" situation. In which case, please consider the reference as applying to your actual situation, either personally to you, or to your organization.

A. Support Over the World (SOW)

Support Over the World (SOW) is a local organization, with offices in your city. This organization subscribes to the belief that the world is one whole integrated system, and that any event or condition anywhere in the planet affects everything and everyone. It values the human and environmental diversity of the world and tries to promote the enjoyment of this diversity.

This system of beliefs guide SOW's actions and programs. Its main purpose and function is to identify international resources in the community and make them available to local organizations. Specifically, the organization identifies and keeps track of visitors from other countries, identifies their areas of expertise and interests, and facilitates their availability for conferences or conversations with local groups, such as high schools, trade groups, other international organizations and FVO's, churches, etc.

Because of the nature of its work, SOW possesses strong expertise in developing close ties with other groups, and able to identify and utilize sources of needed resources.

SOW is headed by an energetic individual whom you had met on several occasions in the past and seems likeable. Your initial impression of this person indicates a capability to appreciate your values; a congruence of key values and opinions; a shared optimism and hopefulness about the future state of things; a vision of what is not working and a commitment to do something about it; ability to nurture trust and provide emotional support.

Work with this person can be fun and enjoyable. You believe this is a person who loves to help, one who feels some responsibility for others. There is a strong sense of competence as well as influence with others in SOW. This person is up to date with information, possesses well developed professional skills, and is able to bring together resources due to an extensive network of friends and colleagues in various organizations.
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INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION, INC

International Competition, Inc. (ICI) is a not-for-profit organization organized and having its main offices 200 miles from you. The fastest way for you to communicate with ICI is through your long-distance phone facilities.

Its main beliefs, as proclaimed by its name, are founded on a view of the world as being made up of separate, competing systems -- whether in terms of nation-states, regions, or organizations. As such, it believes that the best way to deal with the diversity and challenges of dealing with others is by vigorous competition.

In keeping with these beliefs and values, ICI's main programs and activities are characterized by a strong encouragement for viewing others as competitors, and for strengthening local groups, agencies and individuals in order to compete well. ICI, for instance, advocates strong tariff barriers on imported goods in order to protect local businesses. At the same time, they provide local companies with information about how to reduce or eliminate tariff burdens imposed by other countries on the companies' goods.

ICI's leader is an individual you have met a few times in the past. He/she definitely projects the beliefs and values of ICI. With this person, competitiveness is the normal mode of action. Resources are competitively sourced and distributed. Overall, however, this organizational leader has given ICI many successes in the past.
QUESTIONS

Again, please remember that the following questions will deal with your reaction and perceptions of the two hypothetical organizations described above. If you need to re-read all or portions of the above descriptions, please feel free to do so any time. The questions are not designed to test or trick you with regards your reading ability or ability to remember details.

For questions that ask you to rate, use the following as your guide:

| low | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | high |

A. Potential for Person to Person Chemistry

1. Overall, how high is the potential for an excellent relationship between you and

   a) SOW's leader?  1  2  3  4  5
   b) ICI's leader?  1  2  3  4  5

2) Given your choice above of who you will probably have an excellent relationship with, which item below contributed to your judgement of such potential:

   a) his/her influence within his/her organization  1  2  3  4  5
   b) congruence between his/her values and mine  1  2  3  4  5
   c) I can benefit most from his/her professional skills  1  2  3  4  5
   d) I see potential to develop and nurture mutual trust  1  2  3  4  5
   e) I can benefit from his/her networking skills and linkages  1  2  3  4  5
   f) I like his/her optimism and hopefulness about the future  1  2  3  4  5
   g) He/she is pragmatic, sees the problems to be addressed  1  2  3  4  5
   h) He/she is dependable, willing to help  1  2  3  4  5
   i) He/she can be fun and enjoyable to be with  1  2  3  4  5
B. Potential for Organization to Organization Convergence

1) Which of the two hypothetical organizations above would present the greatest potential of partnership with your own primary organization?
   a) SOW  1  2  3  4  5
   b) ICI    1  2  3  4  5

2) Rate each of the factors below as to the extent of its influence upon your perception of high potential for partnership between your choice above and your organization.
   a) proximity in location  1  2  3  4  5
   b) accessibility for information exchange  1  2  3  4  5
   c) the activities of one affects those of my organization (strategic proximity)  1  2  3  4  5
   d) task similarity, key programs between my organization and my choice above are similar  1  2  3  4  5
   e) similarity in values and beliefs  1  2  3  4  5
   f) willingness to share resources  1  2  3  4  5
   g) complimentary needs for each other's skills, know-how and technology  1  2  3  4  5
   h) similarity in fundamental beliefs: valuing diversity, helping others  1  2  3  4  5
   i) similarity in view of things and the world as one unified system  1  2  3  4  5

C. Overall Potential

If each of the organizations above were real organizations, how high is the likelihood that your organization will establish a partnership with each?
   a) SOW  1  2  3  4  5
   b) ICI    1  2  3  4  5
D. Demographic Information

1. Types of Programs (Major ones): ________________________________
   (E.g. education) ________________________________
   ________________________________

2. Location of Organization: (City or Town): ________________


4. Approximate age of organization: ______

5. Your position/role in the organization: ______________________
   Full-time? Part-time? Volunteer?

Once more, thank you so much for your participation.