

# **Local Sustainability Partnerships: Understanding the Relationship Between Partnership Structural Features and Partners' Outcomes**

by

Valentina Castillo Cifuentes

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfillment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Environmental Studies

in

Sustainability Management

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2020

© Valentina Castillo Cifuentes 2020

### **Author's Declaration**

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

## **Abstract**

The number of cross-sector social partnerships (CSSPs) has increased at both global and local levels. This is due to the benefits that they bring in solving complex problems such as unsustainable development, and to the organizations that partner in CSSPs. Current research has stated that partner organizations obtain positive outcomes when they join CSSPs. In this study, outcomes are understood through a Resource-based View approach. Moreover, past research has mentioned that structural features within CSSPs - such as communication systems, monitoring and reporting, partner engagement, renewal systems, among others - help partner organizations to achieve their goals. Nevertheless, there is still a gap in the literature about the relationship between the structural features and partners' outcomes in large CSSPs.

This research studies three large CSSPs: Barcelona + Sustainable in Spain (B+S), The Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development in South Korea (GCSD), and Sustainable Montreal in Canada (SM). Each of these CSSPs has more than a hundred partners from civil society, public and private sectors. Through a mixed-methods approach, this research explores the relationship between the structural features of the three large CSSPs and the value given by the partner organizations to their achieved outcomes. Secondary data from three video interviews, and three follow-up interviews with the coordinators of the CSSPs about the structural features was analyzed through qualitative content analysis. Secondary data from 186 partner organizations of the CSSPs was collected through a survey, and it was analyzed through ANOVA Test with the purpose of finding differences in the value given by the partner organizations to their achieved outcomes. With both data sets, abductive analysis was conducted in order to analyze the relationship between the structural features and the partners' outcomes.

The results from the structural features show that the CSSPs adopted similar structural features, however, there were some main differences in monitoring and reporting, partners' engagement, and the sector composition of the partners. The results of the ANOVA Tests for the partners' outcomes show differences in community capital outcomes achieved by the partners of Sustainable Montreal, as well as differences in the physical capital outcomes achieved in GCSD. In B+S, there were differences found in the public sector regarding the achieved outcomes on financial capital. The abductive analysis results indicate that the difference shown by the partners of Sustainable Montreal in the value of their achieved outcomes is likely due to the partners' engagement, decision-making mechanisms, as well as their monitoring and reporting systems. The difference for GCSD is likely due to their monitoring and reporting, along with their partner's engagement. Lastly, for B+S, the results are likely due to the composition of the partnership.

In conclusion, this research offers seven structural features for large CSSPs that are implementing sustainable community plans. In terms of partners' outcomes, there were differences found outcomes across CSSPs, especially in GCSD and SM. However, it was not possible to find differences across sectors for each CSSP, with the exception of the public sector in B+S. Lastly, in terms of the relationship, the structural features that explain why partner organizations give different values to their achieved outcomes are partners' engagement, monitoring and reporting, decision-making, and composition of the CSSPs. Understanding the resources that partner organizations can achieve from partnering in a CSSP is crucial for engaging key partner organizations that can contribute with their resources skills to the achievement of the CSSPs' goals.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to start this acknowledgment by saying that writing this dissertation has not been easy. However, I have an amazing support system that has helped me to overcome each of the challenges throughout this process.

I am grateful for having Dr. Amelia Clarke as my supervisor. She introduced me to the fascinating world of partnerships, and made me believe that social problems can be solved if we work collaboratively. Her guidance and support have been invaluable to my personal and professional development. I want to acknowledge that my research was built upon the research of my committee member Dr. Eduardo Ordonez-Ponce, and want to thank him for his strong commit to guide my thesis and help me to improve my work. I also want to thank Dr. Olaf Weber for being part of my thesis defence in the middle of a pandemic, and to Samantha Linton for helping me with my data collection and for being a great office partner.

I feel immense gratitude towards my family in Chile, especially to my parents Leyla and José, who have always been there to support me, regardless of distance. I would like to thank Eduardo, Sole, and Marcela for sharing their wisdom, and for taking care of me as if I were a part of their family. I also want to extend my thanks to my friends, who have been there for me outside of school, and helped make my graduate experience memorable.

Lastly, I am thankful for the love and patience of Talha. This journey has been much easier with him by my side.

## Table of Contents

Author’s Declaration.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	v
List of Tables .....	ix
List of Abbreviations .....	x
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Introduction and Problem Statement .....	1
1.2. Research Question and Objectives.....	3
1.2.1. Research Question .....	3
1.2.2. General Objective .....	3
1.2.3. Specific Objectives .....	3
1.3. Contribution of Research .....	4
1.4.Thesis Outline .....	4
Chapter 2 Literature Review.....	6
2.1. Sustainable Development.....	6
2.2. Local Sustainable Development.....	9
2.3. Collaborative Strategic Management.....	11
2.4. Partnerships and Cross-Sector Social Partnerships (CSSPs) .....	12
2.4.2. Types of organizations.....	14
2.4.2.1. Public Sector .....	14
2.4.2.2. Private Sector .....	15
2.4.2.3. Civil Society Organizations .....	16
2.4.3. Partnership Structures .....	17
2.5. Partner Outcomes: A Resource-based View Approach.....	26
2.6. Partnership Structure to Partner Outcome Relationship .....	33
2.7. Summary .....	34
Chapter 3 Methods.....	36
3.1. Research Design.....	36
3.1.1. CSSPs Selected Cases.....	38

3.1.1.1. Barcelona + Sustainable (Barcelona).....	38
3.1.1.2. Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development.....	39
3.1.1.3. Sustainable Montreal .....	40
3.1.1.4. Topics for each Partnership .....	42
3.2. Qualitative Research .....	43
3.2.1. Data Collection .....	43
3.2.2. Interviews.....	44
3.2.3. Data Analysis .....	45
3.2.3.1. Coding.....	45
3.3. Quantitative Research .....	49
3.3.1. Survey Design.....	49
3.3.1.1. Survey Translation .....	50
3.3.2. Data Collection .....	50
3.3.3. Data Analysis .....	51
3.4. Explanation Building .....	53
3.5. Reliability.....	55
3.6. Limitations .....	56
3.7. Summary .....	57
Chapter 4 Results .....	58
4.1. Qualitative Data Analysis .....	58
4.1.1. Barcelona + Sustainable.....	63
4.1.2. Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development.....	64
4.1.3. Sustainable Montreal .....	66
4.2. Quantitative Data Analysis .....	67
4.3. Explanation Building: CSSPs’ Structural Features to Partners’ Outcomes Relationship	70
4.3.1. Barcelona + Sustainable and Partners’ Outcomes .....	71
4.3.2. Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development and Partners’ Outcomes .....	73
4.3.3. Sustainable Montreal and Partners’ Outcomes .....	75
4.4. Summary .....	77
Chapter 5 Discussion .....	78
5.1. Research Objective 1 .....	78

5.2. Research Objective 2 .....	83
5.3. Research Objective 3 .....	84
5.3.2. Physical Capital and Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development.....	87
5.3.3. Barcelona + Sustainable, Financial Capital and the Public Sector .....	88
Chapter 6 Conclusions .....	91
6.1. Contribution to Theory .....	91
6.2. Contribution to Practice and Recommendations.....	92
6.3. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research .....	93
6.4. Concluding Summary .....	95
References .....	96
Appendices.....	118
Appendix I: Ethics Clearance .....	120
Appendix II: Survey.....	121
Appendix III: ANOVA Test-Capitals by Sectors – Barcelona + Sustainable .....	139
Appendix IV: ANOVA Test-Capitals by Sectors – Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development .....	140
Appendix V: ANOVA Test-Capitals by Sectors – Sustainable Montreal .....	141



## List of Tables

Table 1. Structural Features for Partnership Design.....	19
Table 2. Partners Outcomes; Resource-based View Approach .....	28
Table 3. Positive and Negative Outcomes by Sector .....	28
Table 4. Topics by CSSPs.....	42
Table 5. Coding Framework .....	48
Table 6. Number of cases by CSSP and Sectors and Response Rates.....	51
Table 7. Capital indexes with each item included .....	51
Table 8. Survey's Internal Consistency Test on Outcomes.....	55
Table 9. Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP – Part I.....	59
Table 10. Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP- Part II .....	60
Table 11. Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP – Part III .....	61
Table 12. Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP.....	62
Table 13 Descriptive and ANOVA Test for Capitals by CSSPs .....	68
Table 14. Relationship Between B+S' Structural Features and Partners' Outcomes .....	72
Table 15. Relationship Between GCSD's' Structural Features and Partners' Outcomes.....	75
Table 16. Relationship Between SM' Structural Features and Partners' Outcomes.....	76

## **List of Abbreviations**

CSSP: Cross-Sector Social Partnership

B+S: Barcelona + Sustainable

GCSD: Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development

ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability

LA21: Local Agenda 21

NGO: Non-governmental Organizations

NRBV: Natural Resource-Based View

SDG: Sustainable Development Goals

SM: Sustainable Montreal

RBV: Resource-Based View

UN: United Nations

WSSD: World Summit on Sustainable Development

## **Chapter 1 Introduction**

### **1.1. Introduction and Problem Statement**

Sustainable development has become an important framework for addressing environmental, economic and social issues. In 2015, 193 United Nations members committed to the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (United Nations, 2015a). This agenda focuses on several challenges that the world is facing, such as poverty, inequalities, environmental degradation and the risks caused by climate change (United Nations, 2015a). The 17 SDGs are to be met by 2030 and they are interconnected in order to leave no one behind (United Nations, n.d.). To solve issues such as those mentioned in the SDGs, more than 10,000 local governments around the world have implemented sustainable community plans in their cities since 1992 (Rok & Kuhn, 2012). Many of these plans are collaborative in nature (MacDonald et al., 2018).

As the problems that our societies are facing today are too complex to be tackled by only one institution (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Clarke, 2014; MacDonald et al., 2018; Selsky & Parker, 2005), the literature states that organizations from civil society and the public and private sectors must collaborate to solve social, environmental and economic challenges (Alonso & Andrews, 2019; Clarke & Crane, 2018; George et al., 2016; Koschmann et al., 2012; Selsky & Parker, 2005). This is because when organizations from different sectors bring their diverse capabilities together, they create new capabilities that help solving unsustainable challenges (Alonso & Andrews, 2019; Gray & Stites, 2013). This form of collaboration when formed into an entity is called a cross-sector social partnership (CSSP) (Selsky & Parker, 2005).

Past research has shown that structural features within the partnership, such as means of communication, partner engagement strategies, decision-making structures, monitoring, and reporting, might help partner organizations to achieve their own goals (Clarke, 2011; Clarke &

MacDonald, 2019) , since the structural features of partnerships have the capacity to transform strategic goals into outcomes (Bryson et al., 2015; Clarke, 2011). Although the number of studies focused on large partnerships has increased in the past years (e.g., Clarke & MacDonald, 2019), there is a lack of research studying the structures of large cross-sector partnerships<sup>1</sup> (Branzei & Le Ber, 2014).

The number of CSSPs has been increasing at both global and local levels due to the benefits that they bring not only to sustainability in general, but also the benefits that their partners can gain from this form of collaboration, such as resources and skills (Branzei & Le Ber, 2014; Gray & Stites, 2013; Le Pennec & Raufflet, 2018; MacDonald et al., 2018). Current research indicates that partner organizations have positive outcomes when they join cross-sector partnerships (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019). In this study, the outcomes of partner organizations are understood through Resource-based View (RBV), which includes human, physical, organizational and financial capitals (Barney, 1991, 1995). Human capital refers to the knowledge developed by the people working in an organization; physical capital is related to the technology and location of a firm; organizational capital refers to the organizational culture of a firm, such as the means of reporting; and financial capital is the earning, debts and equity of an organization (Barney, 1995). Moreover, this research includes the Natural Resource-based View approach developed by Hart (1995), which adds socio-ecological resources as one of the types of resources that organizations can obtain. This type of resource has also been mentioned by Gray and Stites (2013) as community capital. Natural RBV is included since partner organizations can

---

<sup>1</sup> There is not consensus in the literature on what makes a partnership large. However, this research considers a large partnership as the collaboration of 100 and more partners from all three sectors; civil society, public and private sectors. This number is based on the category of question 8 on the "Implementation of community sustainability plans: A study on governance and outcomes" survey. More details on the definition of a large partnership is found in Chapter 6.

obtain socio-ecological resources when partnering in a CSSP that focus on social and environmental challenges (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). Despite this contribution, there is still a gap in studying the outcomes that partner organizations can obtain by participating in large CSSPs.

## 1.2. Research Question and Objectives

### *1.2.1. Research Question*

What is the relationship between the structural features of large CSSPs and how their partner organizations value their achieved outcomes during the implementation of community sustainability plans?

### *1.2.2. General Objective*

Explore the relationship between the structural features of large CSSPs and the value that their partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes during the implementation of community sustainability plans.

### *1.2.3. Specific Objectives*

1. Analyze the partnerships' structures, and determine which structural features are relevant<sup>2</sup> for each CSSP.
2. Analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes of CSSPs in general, and analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes in each CSSPs.
3. Analyze the relationship between the structural features of the CSSPs and the value that their partners give to their achieved outcomes.

---

<sup>2</sup> This research understands for *relevant structural features* as the structural features that contribute to the achievement of partners' outcomes.

### 1.3. Contribution of Research

This research studies three large sustainable community partnerships: Barcelona + Sustainable (B+S), Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development (GCSD) and Sustainable Montreal (SM).

It seeks to explore the relationship between the structural features of a CSSP and the value that their partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes. Understanding the resources that partner organizations can obtain from partnering in a CSSP is crucial for engaging key partner organizations that contribute with their resources skills to the achievement of the CSSPs' goals.

To address this question, this study uses secondary data collected from video interviews with the coordinator/director of each CSSP about their structural features, and secondary data collected through a survey about the value that partners give to their achieved outcomes. In order to fill in the gaps in the secondary data regarding the structural features, follow-up interviews were conducted with the coordinator/director of each CSSP. This study helps local governments that are implementing sustainability community plans through partnerships to understand and adopt structural features that allow them to better collaborate with their partner organizations.

This study contributes to the literature on CSSPs, and Resource-based View. It also contributes to the research related to structural features within large partnerships, and to partners' outcomes. Lastly, this research is related to implementing the SDGs #11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) and #17 (Partnerships for the Goals).

### 1.4. Thesis Outline

This thesis includes six chapters; 1) Introduction, 2) Literature Review, 3) Methodology, 4) Results, 5) Discussion, and 6) Conclusions. Chapter 2 introduces the concepts of sustainable development and local sustainable development. It also includes discussions of collaborative strategic management in CSSPs, literature related to partnership design and partnerships'

structural features and partners' outcomes. Chapter 3 provides details of research design, and it explains both the quantitative and qualitative analysis. Both analyses answer the relationship between the structural features of the three CSSPs and the value that their partner organizations give to their outcomes when implementing sustainability community plans. Chapter 4 shows the results of the content analysis of the structural features of each CSSP, along with the descriptive analyses and ANOVA Test that were used to analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes. Chapter 5 discusses the results and, finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the entire research and outlines the contributions to theory, practice and recommendations, as well as limitations and suggestions for future research.

## Chapter 2 Literature Review

The literature review chapter covers six areas that are needed for understanding the relationship between the structural features of CSSPs and the value that their partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes. This chapter starts by giving an overview of sustainable development, followed by local sustainable development. It continues by introducing collaborative strategic management, giving definitions of partnerships and cross-sector social partnerships including the type of organizations that participate in them. It also reviews the literature on partnership design and partnership structure, along with partners' outcomes. Lastly, it explores the literature related to the relationship between partnership structure and partners' outcomes.

### 2.1. Sustainable Development

During the last 40 years, the relationship between humans and the environment has become an international concern (Robert et al., 2005). As a response, in the report *Our Common Future*, the Brundtland Commission defined sustainable development as “the ability to make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (UN WCED, 1987, p.8). Since then, sustainable development has been defined in many ways and accommodated in different contexts (Deželan & Maksuti, 2014).

Experts have stated that the Brundtland definition is full of ambiguity, and it has different interpretations (Hopwood et al., 2005). However, at the same time, sustainable development has become an important framework for addressing environmental, economic and social issues (Dempsey et al., 2011). The definition includes a universal agreement regarding both human and environmental progress, and which requires stakeholder participation from different sectors to achieve sustainability (Robert et al., 2005). According to Gray & Stites (2013), the



implementation of the concept's definition relies on how sustainable development will be orientated, which directions will be followed to achieve sustainable development and how partners will be engaged to work together for sustainability.

People, planet and profit, and the “Triple Bottom Line” were the concepts coined by Elkington (1997) to refer to different aspects of sustainability. The economic bottom line relates to the impact that the practices of various organizations make to the economic system, and how that system can prosper while supporting future generations (Alhaddi, 2015). The social bottom line focuses on the benefits to the people and how fair organizational practices can have impacts within a specific community and other species (Alhaddi, 2015). Lastly, the environmental bottom line refers to the efficient use of resources within ecological limits in order to not compromise them to the future generations (Alhaddi, 2015). This thesis gives equal importance to the three bottom lines, although some studies give more importance to some aspects, for example, by defining sustainability using just the environmental bottom line (Wei et al., 2009), or by putting more emphasis on the social aspect of sustainability (Bibri, 2008).

A definition of sustainability that integrates well these three aspects is the definition of Gray and Stites (2013). By synthesizing different approaches, they understand sustainability as “improvements to the total quality of life, of both now and in the future, in a way that maintains the ecological processes on which life depends while satisfying the basic needs of all stakeholders” (Gray & Stites, 2013, p. i). In Gray and Purdy's (2018) book, they also highlight The Natural Step's Sustainability Criteria<sup>3</sup> that identify four basic conditions that help operationalize sustainability. The four basic conditions are “in a sustainable society, nature is not

---

<sup>3</sup> See more in <https://thenaturalstep.org/approach/>

subject to systematically increasing: 1) concentrations of substances extracted from the Earth's crust, 2) concentrations of substances produced by society, 3) degradation by physical means, and, in their society, 4) people are not subject to conditions that systematically undermine their capacity to meet their needs" (Gray & Purdy, 2018, p. 133).

With both the Triple Bottom Line and The Natural Step's criteria, it is possible to see efforts to address economic development while aiming for harmony and balance between ecosystems and societies. Most of the challenges that humanity faces today are due to the economic and ecological crises of industrial capitalism and urbanism (Hodson & Marvin, 2017). To overcome the consequence and to address the current environmental challenges, it is urgent to reconfigure the relationship between ecology, societies and economy (Hodson & Marvin, 2017).

Another effort to integrate economic systems, societies and the environment are the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). They were launched in 2015 by the United Nations and 193 countries (United Nations, 2015a). There are 17 SDGs and 169 targets that focus on climate change, economic inequality, innovation, sustainable consumption, peace and justice, among others (UNDP, 2019). The idea behind the SDGs is to work globally for the achievement of a sustainable development by 2030 (UNDP, 2019). The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which contains the SDGs, is a "plan of action for people, planet and prosperity that seeks to strengthen universal peace and to address the greatest challenge of eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions" (United Nations, 2015b, p. 1). To achieve the 2030 Agenda, partnerships among countries and diverse stakeholders are needed in order to meet a development that is sustainable and that leaves no one behind (UN DESA, 2018; United Nations, 2015a).

This research is aligned with Goal #11 Sustainable Cities and Communities, which seeks to build modern sustainable cities by adopting intelligent urban planning that creates safe, affordable and resilient cities with green and culturally inspiring living conditions where everybody can be accommodated (UNDP, 2019). This is because the type of partnerships that this research is studying are focused on the implementation of sustainability community plans in three global cities; Barcelona, Gwangju, and Montreal. Also, Goal #17 Partnerships for the Goals is important for this study. This goal's objective relates to strengthening the means of implementation and revitalizing partnerships, because with international support, investments and cooperation, it is easier to meet the SDGs (UNDP, 2019). This research puts emphasis on the target 17.17, which encourages and promotes effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships.

## 2.2. Local Sustainable Development

Significant attention has been paid to sustainable development at the global level; however, local development has vital effects on global sustainability (Haughton & Hunter, 2003). Since there are several issues within cities such as the increasing population living in them, the consumption of fossil fuels, unsustainable consumer behaviors, poverty and inequity, among others (Ochoa et al., 2018; Sevilla-Buitrago, 2013), it is important to consider local efforts and initiatives (Brugmann, 2007); local sustainable development and localizing the SDGs help to tackle these environmental, social and economic issues in their particular contexts, which can contribute to both the national level and the global level.

At the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992, Agenda 21 was launched and adopted by more than 178 governments around the world (Dempsey et al., 2011). Within Agenda 21 is the concept of Local Agenda 21

(LA21), which gives the possibility of re-thinking different methods of public engagement for working towards sustainable development at the local level, including action plans implemented by local authorities and their partners (ICLEI, 1997).

LA21 plans consider that many of the problems and solutions of society are embedded in their local activities (ICLEI, 2002). According to the global NGO ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI), the planning process includes multisectoral engagement, in which the coordination of local stakeholder groups moves the community towards sustainable development (ICLEI, 2002). The planning process also has consultations with community partners from different sectors of society, at the same time that non-governmental organizations and the private sector contribute in actions to be undertaken (ICLEI, 2002).

LA21 aims to achieve sustainability by implementing long-term strategic plans<sup>4</sup> through a participatory process with multi-stakeholders at the local level (ICLEI, 2002). Therefore, the accomplishment of LA21's objectives is determined by the participation and collaboration of local organizations (ICLEI, 2002). The important role of local authorities is that this level of governance allows closeness with people, teaching, mobilizing and educating them about sustainable development (Agenda 21, Chapter 28, 1992).

Additionally, there are participatory assessments of local social, environmental and economic needs (ICLEI, 2002). Lastly, multi-stakeholders' collaboration is needed to achieve the goals set out in a sustainable community plan (Michaux et al., 2011). To track the progress, monitoring

---

<sup>4</sup> A strategic plan is a formal document that details the common vision and the collaborative goals within a community. This document provides the directions and guidance to address a determined problem.

and reporting procedures are necessary to allow participants to hold each other accountable to a sustainable community action plan (Clarke, 2014).

Contemporarily, LA21s are still one of the best processes and developments to address sustainability at the local level (Wittmayer et al., 2016). Local governments are still implementing LA21s but with different names (Reckien et al., 2018).

### 2.3. Collaborative Strategic Management

The literature related to collaborative strategies argues that collaboration is helpful for solving sustainability issues since one institution cannot do it alone (Gray & Stites, 2013; Selsky & Parker, 2005). LA21s incorporate collaborative strategies in order to be implemented. Several scholars have defined collaboration as the operation in multiorganizational configurations that helps to solve problems that are easier to tackle with the participation of multiple stakeholders (Gazley, 2010; Huxham, 1993). It has also been understood as a structure and an organized process where organizations develop, implement and evaluate collective strategies that lead to the co-production of solutions (Favoreu et al., 2016). Some others have defined collaboration as the design of arrangements that facilitate and maintain worthwhile forms of collaboration where stakeholders share power and have dissimilar amounts of influence over decision-making (Jens Newig & Kvarda, 2012; Zurba et al., 2016). This research claims that collaboration do not necessarily lead to the creation of a partnership; organizations can collaborate without being partners.

Collaborative strategic management has been defined as the “joint determination of the vision and long-term collaborative goals for addressing a given social problem, along with the adoption of both organizational and collective courses of action and the allocation of resources to carry out these courses of action” (Clarke & Fuller, 2010, p. 86). Therefore, collaboration by itself can

be seen as a voluntary process or consecutive actions that allow the achievement of a goal, while collaborative strategic management is the management of the collaborative strategies, which involves adopting organizational structures that enable achieving the collaborative goals (Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Gray & Stites, 2013).

ICLEI (2002) has stated that the implementation of LA21s will need the formulation of a long-term strategic plan, as well as the participation of multi-stakeholders through a participatory process. Therefore, in this research, collaborative strategic management is used as a broad framework to better understand the implementation of collaborative strategies between stakeholders in the partnerships being studied.

#### 2.4. Partnerships and Cross-Sector Social Partnerships (CSSPs)

The relationship between partnerships and sustainable development was invoked by the declaration made at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg in 2002, where partnerships were targeted as a tool for implementing sustainable development (Eweje, 2007; Hens & Nath, 2003; Van Huijstee et al., 2007). The WSSD declaration states that sustainable development needs a long-term standpoint and participation of diverse organizations of society in different spheres of governance, such as decision-making process and implementation. The WSSD declaration adds that work towards stable partnerships that respect the independent and important roles of every participant organization is needed (WSSD, 2002).

Among academics, the conceptualization of social partnerships has been developed since the beginning of the 1990s, where it has been stated that partnerships are a voluntary, although some are mandatory (Selsky & Parker, 2005), form of collaboration where organizations from civil society organizations, public and/or private sector partner with the purpose of solving problems of mutual concern (Waddock, 1991). Two decades later, some authors have defined them as a

“collection of loosely connected or closely knit organizations that share resources,” which may help member organizations achieve some strategic objectives” (Arya & Lin, 2007, p. 698). Some others have highlighted that this form of collaboration has non-hierarchical structures, where organizations endeavour for a sustainability goal (Van Huijstee et al., 2007). Despite these definitions, this research understands a partnership as the formal entity in which organizations partner with the purpose of addressing a determined issue. In this form of collaboration, structures that enable the partnership are implemented, however, it depends on the involvement of the partners and the number of partners participating whether structures, such as decision making, are hierarchical or not.

Within the diverse frameworks focusing on partnerships, this research in particular studies CSSPs, which are a type of partnership where cross-sector organizations (i.e. involving two or three sectors from the civil society, public and private sectors) are voluntarily involved for addressing social challenges (Parmigiani & Rivera-Santos, 2011). The literature expresses that most of the issues that different societies are facing, such as the creation of sustainable communities, need strong CSSPs to solve them (Googins & Rochlin, 2000).

Due to the benefits that CSSPs bring, such as value creation and achievement of social and environmental goals (Alonso & Andrews, 2019; Clarke & Crane, 2018; George et al., 2016; Koschmann et al., 2012), the number is increasing at both the global and local level, in different formats, sizes, lengths, and numbers of partners (B. Cairns & Harris, 2011; Selsky & Parker, 2005). According to Clarke and MacDonald (2019), small CSSPs have two or three partners from two or three sectors, and large CSSPs or multi-stakeholder partnerships have multiple partners from the three sectors. Large CSSPs tend to be more inclusive since the participation of many partners is required, while the partners of small CSSPs are selected for a specific fit

(Clarke & MacDonald, 2019). The CSSPs studied in this thesis are integrated by three main sectors; civil society, public and private sectors, where the key convener is the local government.

Despite the relevance given to cross-sector partnerships to solve social, economic, and environmental challenges in the literature and in the SDGs, there is a lack of research about the impact of cross-sector partnerships (Van Tulder et al., 2016). Moreover, there is not evidence on the SDG tracker<sup>5</sup> about the worldwide progress on goal 17. The main reason of this relies on the complexity of tools that could measure the impact of cross-sector partnerships (Van Tulder et al., 2016).

#### *2.4.2. Types of organizations*

The paragraphs above outlined the understanding of partnerships in general and CSSPs in particular. In this section, the three main sectors involved in the three CSSPs being studied in this research are discussed. The distinction of these three sectors has been debated within the public administration, politics and economics fields (Boyne, 2002).

##### *2.4.2.1. Public Sector*

Public-sector organizations stand for “law and regulations, physical and social infrastructure, safety nets, peace and protection” (Lakin & Scheubel, 2010, p. 153). As stakeholders, the role they play is neither as consumers nor end users of the public agencies’ efforts (Parhizgari & Gilbert, 2004). This sector is subject to political instead of economic controls, and therefore they confront different forms of authority that might bring conflict (Boyne, 2002). Some examples of public-sector involvement are municipalities, libraries and public universities<sup>6</sup>. Research has

---

<sup>5</sup> SDG Tracker is a resource where people can track and explore progress towards the 17 SDGs through data visualizations; <https://sdg-tracker.org/>

<sup>6</sup> In other contexts, universities or libraries might be private organizations.



shown that public-sector organizations face greater bureaucracy, more formal rules, regulations and hierarchical authority structures (Boyne, 2002).

Regarding sustainability, the public sector has mostly contributed as a regulator of ecological and social issues by making legislations and guidelines to ensure that the rules are being applied, as well as ensure transparency, good governance and market-based instruments (Albareda et al., 2007; S. Cairns et al., 2015; Eberlein & Matten, 2009; Gray & Stites, 2013; Spraul & Thaler, 2019).

The primary interest of a public-sector partner in implementing an LA21 and joining a partnership is to gain support and help from local organizations to address community-wide sustainability issues under their dominion (Overseas Development Institute, 2003), since they often have a lack of knowledge and resources when delivering public goods and addressing complex social problems by themselves (Forrer et al., 2010; Overseas Development Institute, 2003), or it is outside their direct jurisdiction, but within their geographical boundary (Clarke, 2014).

#### *2.4.2.2. Private Sector*

Private organizations are usually led by a board of directors, chief executive officers, entrepreneurs and/or shareholders focused on making profit and providing value to the organization's stakeholders (Boyne, 2002; Parhizgari & Gilbert, 2004). The private sector is controlled by market forces, and the owners and shareholders have a monetary motivation for controlling and monitoring the behaviour of the managers (Boyne, 2002). At the same time, the managers are likely to benefit from a better performance because they either own the company or their payments depend on its financial success (Boyne, 2002). Some private companies involved in the partnerships being studied are multinationals such as Coca-Cola and Kia Motors, and

banks such as the National Bank of Canada, but most are local small and medium-sized enterprises (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

The involvement of the private sector in CSSPs is motivated by the desire to meet the Corporate Social Responsibility expectations of their stakeholders, as well as develop new products and services that will translate into the expansion of their business (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019; Overseas Development Institute, 2003). Current research has shown that the private sector might join a partnership with the aim of building capacity since it has positive impacts on financial outcomes (MacDonald et al., 2019).

The aim of sustainability partnerships is to address complex social issues by adding the understanding and resources of various stakeholders (Clarke & Crane, 2018). Private involvement allows improvement in efficiency, in finance, and in helping extend public service delivery (Estache & Rus, 2000; Koppenjan & Enserink, 2009).

#### *2.4.2.3. Civil Society Organizations*

Civil society organizations (CSOs) can be understood as the inclusion of “all non-market and nonstate organizations (...) in which people organize themselves to pursue shared interests in the public domain” (Tomlinson & AidWatch Canada, 2008, p. 123). They are “voluntary sector” organizations addressed and governed by citizens or constituency members, without an important government-controlled incorporation (Tomlinson & AidWatch Canada, 2008). Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are a part of civil society organizations, but both terms have been used to refer to constituency-based organizations (Tomlinson & AidWatch Canada, 2008).

Some characteristics of NGOs include social motivations, values and goals over financial ones, diverse stakeholders and an action-oriented culture (Chenhall et al., 2017). They do not seek to

produce profit; instead, they focus on social goals such as poverty reduction, community development, sustainability, health and social care, among others (Hall & O'Dwyer, 2017). The beneficiaries are, for example, local communities with social issues (Hall & O'Dwyer, 2017). Within the case studies, some NGOs involved in the partnerships are related to the development of the community, such as eco centres, cultural academies and youth associations, among others (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

NGOs have played an important role in achieving sustainable development at both international and local levels (IISD, 2013; Lempert & Nguyen, 2008). They initiate, convene, bridge and coordinate different actors into a social change process, highlighting equity, long-term security, sustainable community and inclusive human development over time and space (Gladwin et al., 1995). Some of the motivators for NGOs to join CSSPs are gaining access to partner resources and influencing CSSP platforms to allow large-scale social change and innovation (Brown et al., 2000; Yan et al., 2018).

#### *2.4.3. Partnership Structures*

Several scholars argue that the interest in partnership design has grown due to a variety of challenges related to agility (Doz & Kosonen as cited in Gulati, Puranam, & Thusman, 2012), resilience (Gulati as cited in Gulati, Puranam, & Thusman, 2012) and environmental sensitivity (Henderson and Newell as cited in Gulati, Puranam, & Thusman, 2012), among others. As it has been stated before, collaborative work is crucial to solving social problems, but just partnering with various organizations does not mean that the partnership will succeed, per se (Gray & Purdy, 2018). Therefore, the design stage is important because the foundation and key elements for the success of the partnership, such as the relationship and roles between partners, how the

partnership is designed in terms of formality, continuity, governance and coordination, as well as the allocation of resources, are sorted out in the design process (Kamiya, 2011).

One of the dimensions of the organizational design process is structures (Zheng et al., 2010).

Within the CSSP literature, structures are “a key driver of the way agendas are shaped and implemented;” they affect the things organizations do by determining key factors around influencing power and resources (Huxham & Vangen, 2000, p. 1166). They have also been referred to as a configuration of enduring and persistent activities, whose main characteristic is the regulation of roles and procedures (Ranson et al., 1980). Research has shown that an effective method of encouraging successful cross-sector collaboration is through the implementation of structures (Bryson et al., 2015) that allow the achievement of goals (Clarke, 2011). In particular, structures enable decision making within the partnership, collaboration and also help with the implementation of partners’ agreements (Berardo et al., 2014; Quick & Feldman, 2011).

In a collaborative strategic management framework article, it is possible to find the definition of partnership structures as the mechanism for the implementation of collaborative strategies (Clarke, 2011). Structures have the capacity of transforming strategic goals into outcomes, due to the interactions between different organizations, through decision making, being involved in the process and actions and by exchanging resources that are necessary in order to achieve desired outcomes (Hofer & Schendel, 1978; Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). With that said, it is possible to notice that, in general, the different fields stated in this research about structures highlight the idea of structures as processes that allow for reaching an agreement of collaborative goals and actions, and then implementing and evaluating subsequent efforts (Bryson et al., 2015). For the purpose of this study, structures are understood as the configuration of the partnership that enables its development as well as the achievement of its goals.

Some authors say that in order to build effective partnerships it is important to consider structures that are responsive to internal and external needs (Provan & Kenis, 2007). Even though effectiveness through the implementation of structures is relevant, some authors note that it is needed to understand structures more deeply (Albers, 2010). Due to the little attention being given to structures implementation (Bryson et al., 2015), this thesis revised the definition of structural features adopted by different authors, and then uses this new framework to analyze the structural features implemented by the partnerships under this research<sup>7</sup>. Each structure is discussed in the text following the table.

Table 1. *Structural Features for Partnership Design*

<b>Structural Features</b>	<b>Authors</b>	<b>Categories</b>	<b>Sub-Categories</b>
Communication systems	Al-Tabbaa, Leach, & March, 2014; Amey, 2010; Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006, 2015; Casey, 2008; Clarke, 2011; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Hartman & Dhanda, 2018; Huxham, 1993; Johnson et al., 2015; Kamiya, 2011; Koschmann, Kuhn, & Pfarrer, 2012; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010; Mohr & Spekman, 1994; Rein & Stott, 2009; Suchman, Hart, & Montagu, 2018; Waddock, 1989.	Format	Newsletter, websites, networking events, educational sessions, emails, meetings, minutes (Bryson et al., 2006; Hartman & Dhanda, 2018; Johnson et al., 2015; Kamiya, 2011; Kolk et al., 2010)
		Frequency	Accuracy, and relevant information (Mohr & Spekman, 1994)

<sup>7</sup> See more details in Sections 3.2. and 4.2.

Monitoring and reporting	Albers, 2010; Bäckstrand, 2008; Clarke, 2011; Hartman & Dhanda, 2018; MacDonald, Clarke, Huang, Roseland, & Seitanidi, 2018; Rein & Stott, 2009; Van Tulder, Seitanidi, Crane, & Brammer, 2016.	Format          Frequency	Actions or impacts; partners or partnership level
Partners' engagement	Albers, 2010; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Berardo, Heikkila, & Gerlak, 2014; Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Hall & O'Dwyer, 2017; Johnson et al., 2015; Ans Kolk et al., 2010; Kuenkel & Aitken, 2015; Mintzberg, 1979; Mohr & Spekman, 1994; Rein & Stott, 2009; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Stadler, 2016; Wassmer, Paquin, & Sharma, 2014.	Level of commitment          Adding new partners	Participation in activities(Clark e, 2011, 2012; Johnson et al., 2015; Rein & Stott, 2009)          (Kamiya, 2011)
Renewal systems	Clarke & Fuller, 2010; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010; Macdonald, 2016; Rein & Stott, 2009; Waddock, 1989	Plan renewal process	
Coordination	Albers, 2010; Arya & Lin, 2007; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Barrutia, Aguado, & Echebarria, 2007; Dietrich, Eskerod,	Secretariat	Hosted Secretariat (Barrutia et al., 2007; A. Kolk, 2014)

	Dalcher, & Sandhawalia, 2010; Fratantuono, Sarcone, Colwell, & Barracks, 2014; Gulati, Puranam, & Tushman, 2012; Kamiya, 2011; A. Kolk, 2014; Kuenkel & Aitken, 2015; Michaux, Defélix, & Raulet-Croset, 2011; Mohr & Spekman, 1994.		Separate Secretariat (Arya & Lin, 2007)
Decision-making	Almog-bar & Schmid, 2018; Babiak, 2009; Bryson et al., 2006, 2015; Cairns & Harris, 2011; Casey, 2008; Clarke, 2011; Henderson & Smith-King, 2015; Kamiya, 2011; MacDonald et al., 2018; Pittz & Adler, 2016; Rein & Stott, 2009.	Committee	Centralized; decentralized (Mintzberg, 1979)
		Partners' involvement in decision-actions	Inclusiveness (Gray, 1985; Mantere & Vaara, 2008; Pittz & Adler, 2016)
Composition of the partnership	Clarke, 2011; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Kamiya, 2011; Macdonald, 2016; Waddock, 1989.	Longevity; size; predominance of the sector	

As it is possible to see in the table above, several authors have considered *communication systems* as an important component of cross-sector partnerships. In particular, Koschmann et al. (2012) have stated that communication systems are a key factor within organizations and collaborations, are constituted through communication patterns (formats and frequency), and not through hierarchies, markets or resource flows (Koschmann et al., 2012, p. 334). For Clarke (2011), as well as for Kuenkel and Aitken (2015), new communication systems are established for the implementation phase of a partnership. A partnership for the improvement of health

finance policies in Ghana and Kenya demonstrated the importance of structured ongoing communication systems in order to develop a strong relationship and mutual understanding between the public and private sectors (Hartman & Dhanda, 2018). Some scholars have also indicated that communication with multiple stakeholders is more complex in a high-level collaboration such as joint ventures (Al-Tabbaa et al., 2014). Although Al-Tabbaa et al. (2014), as well as Hartman and Dhanda (2018), focused on small partnerships between the private and the public sector, their statements might be applicable for large CSSPs due to the complexity of their context, such as the diversity of their partners. The categories that allow for studying communication systems are through different formats that the partnership decided to communicate with the partners, and the frequency of that communication.

One of the factors that allow for successful partnerships are *monitoring and reporting systems* (Hartman & Dhanda, 2018). It has been shown that when there is a lack of these structural features within a partnership, it lowers the ability to achieve long-term goals (Rein & Stott, 2009). Rein and Stott (2009) studied six cross-sector partnerships in Southern Africa that had a lack of monitoring and evaluation processes, which made it difficult to evaluate the benefit of the partnership for the partners. As the number of partnerships has increased, it is important to focus on monitoring and reporting the outcomes of cross-sector partnerships in order to inform and support this way of solving complex social and environmental challenges, as well as their limits (Van Tulder et al., 2016).

Several authors agree that *partners' engagement* is helpful within collaboration systems to engage key partners and to attract new organizations (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Berardo et al.,



2014; Clarke, 2010, 2012; Hall & O'Dwyer, 2017; Kolk et al., 2010; Wassmer et al., 2014)<sup>8</sup>.

Engagement is understood as the level of commitment of the partners measured through the participation of activities, which is translated to how partners are engaged in the activities that the partnership delivers, and how often they participate (Johnson et al., 2015). For Clarke (2011, 2012), partner engagement and community wide-actions (which is how partners are committed to the CSSP's plan) are separated concepts, however, this research agrees with this definition of engagement, which focuses on the involvement of the partner organizations in the partnership, but also this research highlights that the commitments that partners carry on within the partnership help meeting the partnership's goals, and it is considered as one concept only. On the other side, adding new partners is also an important component of partners' engagement (Clarke, 2014). In terms of resources, new partners enable achieving the partnership's common goals, allowing the continuity of the collaboration systems (Kamiya, 2011).

*Coordination* helps to coordinate the activities where partners participate in order to achieve the partnership's goals (Albers, 2010). According to Kamiya (2011), coordination can be done through hosted secretariats, separate secretariats or without secretariats. The author describes that when a partnership has a hosted secretariat, one lead partner is in charge of the secretariat, which reflects a medium level of institutionalization. This partner provides the staff and office space, and might absorb some costs. Kamiya (2011) also states that "a hosted secretariat can be set up fairly quickly and inexpensively since this modality uses an existing structure and its resources" (p.76). On the other hand, a separate secretariat means that the partnership creates its own coordination means (Kamiya, 2011). Therefore, the secretariat is separated from the partner organizations, which have their own staff and space, although the cost for the partnership might

---

<sup>8</sup> See more on Table 1.

be higher than having a hosted secretariat (Kamiya, 2011). This modality can be considered a high level of institutionalization (Kamiya, 2011). A low level of institutionalization is reflected through partnerships that do not have a secretariat that coordinates the partnerships' activities. The way that this modality functions is that one or more partners play the role of coordinator when it is needed (Kamiya, 2011). It is quick and it does not need many resources, which might work better for a small, start-up partnership with a restricted budget (Kamiya, 2011).

*Renewal systems* are relevant for cross-sector partnerships due to their iterative and nonlinear path toward achieving goals (Clarke, 2011; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a). They create opportunities for collaborative advantage (Frisby et al., 2004), learning and building relationships (Brinkerhoff, 2002) and allow partners to adapt to new challenges (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a). According to Clarke (2014), renewal systems also help to assess how resources are being managed. Adaptation and learning processes were key for the success of two multi-stakeholder partnerships in Clarke and Fuller (2010), which were re-developed through renewal systems. Despite their importance, Clarke and MacDonald (2019) describe that there is a lack of studies focused exclusively on renewal systems. For this research, this structural feature is important due to the partnerships' large number of partners, and because the case studies have had renewals in their sustainability plans<sup>9</sup>. As local sustainable development is a long-term process, and the plans have 30+ year time horizons, updates in their plans are needed.

*Decision-making* is a collaborative arrangement set in place to govern strategy formulation and implementation (Clarke, 2011). The involvement of partners in decision-making is often related to an improved capacity for the partnership as it is able to adapt to changing circumstances

---

<sup>9</sup> See Methods chapter for more details.

(Bryson et al., 2006). In terms of allocation of authority, the question lies in who makes the decisions and at which organizational level. Mintzberg (1979) states that when power for decision making resides in one entity, then the structure is centralized. Contrarily, when the power is shared among entities, then the structure is decentralized (Mintzberg, 1979). Kamiya (2011) states that it is important in large partnerships to define which partners are going to be part of the decision-making process, because not all the partners are involved in that way. Different is the case of small partnerships, where most of the partners participate in the decision making of the partnership (Kamiya, 2011). Therefore, it is relevant to understand how, at the organizational level, the decisions to be made in the partnerships are being arranged, and how the participation rules work. Lastly, MacDonald et al. (2018) conclude that for complex contexts, such as large CSSPs, a decentralized decision making with a proper coordination and monitoring mechanism is an appropriate design.

*The composition of the partnership* is considered in this study as a structural feature. That is, longevity of the partnership size and the predominance of the partners' sector. The length of time of the partnerships is considered as the time that the partnerships have been operating, which is likely to have an effect, either positively or negatively, on their outcomes (Schreiner et al., 2009). It has been said that partners can develop relationships and processes that are needed for the implementation phase (Waddock, 1989); however, long partnerships might face partner fatigue as one of their outcomes (Macdonald, 2016). In terms of size, several authors state that the structures that partnerships implement might be different depending on the size (Albers, 2010; Clarke, 2011; Kamiya, 2011). Considering that most of the research in cross-sector partnerships has been done for small partnerships, this research contributes to the literature on the implementation of structures in large cross-sector partnerships. Lastly, due to the scope of this

research, studying the predominance of the sector in cross-sector partnerships is relevant. This is based on the literature that has demonstrated that, regarding the sector, organizations have different levels of capacity and capabilities (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b), as well as different types of outcomes (Gray & Stites, 2013). Therefore, the structures within the CSSPs examined in this research may vary regarding their composition.

## 2.5. Partner Outcomes: Resource-based View and Natural Resource-based View

### Approach for CSSPs

The literature in collaborative strategic management has offered 6 types of outcomes; plan-centric, partner-centric, process-centric, outside stakeholder-centric, person-centric and environmental-centric outcomes (Clarke & Fuller, 2010). As the aim of this research is to understand how partners value their achieved outcomes when they participate in a CSSP, the only type of outcome that is explained here is the partner-centric outcome.

There are several frameworks to understand partners' outcomes, such as resource dependency, relational view, or Resource-based View (RBV). The communality of these frameworks is that they focus on resources that can create value for the partners (Lavie, 2006). The framework to understand partners' outcomes in this research is the RBV approach. RBV considers that resources that firms consider valuable are scarce (Barney, 1991), therefore, partnerships become a strategy that allow organizations to have access to other organizations' resources (Das & Teng, 2000). RBV is based on a hierarchical classification of the partners' resources, which means that partners value some resources more than others (Hart, 1995). Resources are all the assets and attributes that allow the implementation of value-creating strategies within an organization (Hitt & Ireland as cited in Barney, 1991; Thompson & Strickland as cited in Barney, 1991). The value

assigned by the partners to some resources over others depends on the returns that these resources bring to organizations (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019).

The early stages of RBV proposed physical and human capital (Penrose, 1959). Physical capital is the tangible resources of an organization, such as facilities, equipment, land, natural resources and raw material (Penrose, 1959). Human capital refers to the knowledge developed by the human resources of the firm (Penrose, 1959). Next, the RBV approach included organizational and financial capital, referring to the former as the organizational culture of the firm, including “reporting structure, explicit management control systems, and compensation policies” (Barney, 1995, p. 50), and the latter as the “debts, equity, and retained earnings” (Barney, 1995, p. 50) of a firm. Also, this version of RBV added other characteristics to physical and human capital, such as technology and location of the firm, and intelligence and training, respectively (Barney, 1995).

It has been argued that traditional RBV has not considered environmental sustainability as one of the advantages that the firms can acquire (Barney et al., 2011; Hart, 1995), which is a resource to consider when partner organizations join CSSPs that focus on social and environmental challenges (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). Therefore, Hart (1995) introduced a Natural Resource-based View (NRBV) approach that focuses on capabilities that enable sustainable economic activities, such as pollution prevention, product stewardship and sustainable development. Gray and Stites (2013), similarly to Hart (1995), added socio-ecological resources as part of the outcomes that organizations can achieve when they join CSSPs.

This research considers the traditional RBV as a framework to understand partner outcomes, and it also integrates the approaches proposed by Hart (1995), and Gray and Stites (2013), which are

referred to as society-oriented outcomes (community capital) (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). Table 2 shows a summary of the types of capital with their specific outcomes and theoretical position.

Table 2. *Partners Outcomes; Resource-based View Approach*

Category	Outcome	Theoretical Position
Community Capital	Contribution to sustainability goals of the partnership; environmental, social and economic progress; sustainability of the community	NRBV (Gray & Stites, 2013; Hart, 1995)
Human Capital	Learning and knowledge	RBV (Barney, 1991, 1995)
Organizational Capital	Reporting systems, relationship building, reputation, recognition, influence, social capital, marketing and business opportunities, community sustainability	RBV (Barney, 1991, 1995)
Financial/Physical Capital	Cost savings, funding, improved efficiency, new markets, risks sharing	RBV (Barney, 1991, 1995)

Adapted from Ordonez-Ponce, 2018; Clarke & MacDonald, 2019

The literature on partner outcomes has stated that some outcomes are sector specific, which could also be positive and negative for them (Austin, 2000; Gray & Stites, 2013; Kolk et al., 2010). The following table shows some positive and negative outcomes for each type of organization according to Gray and Stites(2013).

Table 3. *Positive and Negative Outcomes by Sector*

	Private Sector	NGOs	Public Sector
Positive	Improve CSR reputation; ensure licence to operate;	Greater focus on efficiency and accountability	Improved project designs

	supply chain improvements	Enhanced reputation	Greater transparency and acceptance of plans
	Innovative products	Achieve needed funding	More efficient resource usage
	New Markets		Strengthen data management
	Attractiveness to employees		Meet sustainability targets
	Gain critical competencies		Garner greater public accountability
	Integrate sustainability in core business practices		Insight into economic and demographic trends
	De facto rules for regulating industries		Improve interagency coordination
Negative	Perceptions of greenwashing	Suffer tainted reputation	Need to deal with conflict
		Cooptation	Less thorough study of research
			Reduced funds

Adapted from Gray and Stites (2013, p. 50)

One of the values of joining a partnership is the idea that partners can accomplish outcomes that they could not achieve alone (Gray & Stites, 2013). The participation of partner organizations from different sectors brings benefits to CSSPs, due to the diversity of resources being brought to the CSSPs (Alonso & Andrews, 2019; Gray & Stites, 2013). Although some authors claim that the partnership itself does not prioritize strategies for the needs of the partners (Bäckstrand, 2006), recent research has shown that partners have positive results when they join a CSSP (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019; MacDonald et al., 2019).

Table 3 shows that there are some specific outcomes by sector, both positive and negative, that partner organizations could gain when they join a partnership. This research only focuses on positive outcomes, since the majority of survey respondents on partners' outcomes did not report

achieving negative outcomes<sup>10</sup>. The literature highlights that the private sector obtains improvements in supply chain, improve its reputation, open new opportunities such as new markets and gain more interest from potential employees (Austin, 2000; Gray & Stites, 2013; Kolk et al., 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005). Kolk et al. (2010) state that the outcomes of the private sector increase when all the employees are engaged in the partnership. When NGOs are participating in a partnership, they can benefit from resources such as investments and services and improve their accountability, among others (Gray & Stites, 2013; Suárez, 2011). Lastly, through partnerships, the public sector can meet its sustainability goals and improve its public accountability as well as the design of projects through public participation processes, among others (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Doelle & Sinclair, 2006; Gray & Stites, 2013).

This information shows the type of outcomes that partners can gain by sector; however, previous empirical studies in partnerships did not show differences among the resources achieved by the partners, when considering the sector they come from (Clarke, 2010; Clarke & MacDonald, 2019; Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). Moreover, following Table 3, which states that sector partners gain different types of outcomes, the following hypotheses that this study seeks to prove state as follows;

### **1) Hypotheses by CSSPs:**

*H1a: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to community capital outcomes by CSSPs.*

*H1b: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to human capital outcomes by CSSPs.*

---

<sup>10</sup> See more details in Ordonez-Ponce (2018).



*H1c: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to organizational capital outcomes by CSSPs.*

*H1d: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to financial capital outcomes by CSSPs.*

*H1e: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to physical capital outcomes by CSSPs.*

## **2) Hypotheses by sector in each CSSP:**

### **H2 = Barcelona + Sustainable**

*H2a: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to community capital outcomes by sector.*

*H2b: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to human capital outcomes by sector.*

*H2c: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to organizational capital outcomes by sector.*

*H2d: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to financial capital outcomes by sector.*

*H2e: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to physical capital outcomes by sector.*

### **H3 = Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development**

*H3a: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to community capital outcomes by sector.*

*H3b: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to human capital outcomes by sector.*

*H3c: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to organizational capital outcomes by sector.*

*H3d: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to financial capital outcomes by sector.*

*H3e: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to physical capital outcomes by sector.*

#### **H4 = Sustainable Montreal**

*H4a: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to community capital outcomes by sector.*

*H4b: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to human capital outcomes by sector.*

*H4c: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to organizational capital outcomes by sector.*

*H4d: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to financial capital outcomes by sector.*

*H4e: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to physical capital outcomes by sector.*

## 2.6. Partnership Structure to Partner Outcome Relationship

As mentioned previously, the definition of partnerships was discussed as a voluntary process where partners from all different sectors collaborate through an entity to work towards specific goals. Also, CSSPs were defined as the voluntary joining of partners that seek to address social issues. In particular, this study researches large CSSPs, i.e., more than a hundred partner organizations (from all three sectors) in Barcelona, Gwangju and Montreal.

CSSPs are likely to be successful, in terms of achieving their goals when structural features, such as communication systems, monitoring and reporting, engagement mechanism, decision-making, and coordination are implemented (Clarke, 2011). Structures have been defined as processes for the implementation of strategies that have the capacity of transforming strategic goals into outcomes as a consequence of the interaction between different organizations (Clarke, 2011; Hofer & Schendel, 1978; Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

Literature related to cross-sector partnerships argues that this type of alliance creates the necessary conditions for partners to have access to resources that are valuable for them (Arya & Lin, 2007). At the same time, partners contribute to the sustainability plan of the community by implementing the sustainability strategies that were outlined in the plan, tracking the progress of the goals and identifying opportunities for improvement, which allows for progress (Kelly & Moles, 2002). The actions of the partners in the implementation process allow for building tacit skills for sustainability by learning through the experiences they are gaining (Clarke, 2011).

The implementation of the sustainability plan relies not only on the structural features adopted, such as communication systems, monitoring and reporting, partners' engagement, renewal systems, coordination, decision making, and the composition of the CSSP, but also on a deep

understanding<sup>11</sup> of the benefits that partners can have by joining the partnership and what is necessary to do to keep them involved. Empirical research has shown that partners can gain physical/financial, human and organizational capital when they join a partnership (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019). Despite the importance of the role of the partners in the CSSPs, there is not much research related to the relationship between the structural features of a large partnership and the partners' outcomes.

There are studies that show the relationship between partnership structures to plan outcomes, where it has been demonstrated that structures are important to achieve these outcomes (Clarke, 2011). Some other studies have shown that partners achieve different types of resources based on the partnership's structural features, such as the size of the partner organization and level of partner engagement (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019; Jenxs Newig et al., 2010). However, there is still a gap in the relationship between the structural features of CSSPs and the value that partners give to their achieved outcomes. The aim of this research is to contribute to that field by researching three large CSSPs for the sustainability of Barcelona, Gwangju and Montreal.

## 2.7. Summary

Cross-Sector Social Partnerships are a form of collaboration between partner organizations from different sectors, such as civil society and the public and private sectors, that partner to solve economic, social and environmental challenges. Due to the benefits of CSSPs to solve unsustainable problems, (Alonso & Andrews, 2019; Clarke & Crane, 2018; George et al., 2016; Koschmann et al., 2012) the number of CSSPs has increased at both a global and local level (B. Cairns & Harris, 2011; Selsky & Parker, 2005).

---

<sup>11</sup> By the main convener implementing the sustainability plan, which in the three case studies of this research is the local government.

Three CSSPs were studied in this thesis; B+S, GCSD and SM. These three CSSPs integrated organizations from civil society and the public and private sectors in order to implement sustainability community plans in their cities. Collaborative work is key when solving social problems, but just partnering with organizations does not guarantee successful partnerships (Gray & Purdy, 2018). The success of a partnership depends on the design stage of the partnership formation, because elements such a structural features are sorted out in this stage (Kamiya, 2011).

The literature on partnerships' structures has stated that the implementation of structures allows for the achievement of strategic goals, such as the implementation of sustainability community plans (Bryson et al., 2015; Clarke, 2011). However, little is known about whether the structural features in a CSSP help partner organizations to achieve their own goals (Clarke, 2011; Clarke & MacDonald, 2019). Understanding what partner organizations can gain from partnering in a CSSP and which structural features allow them to gain valued resources is crucial for engaging key partners that can contribute with their resources and skills, enabling meeting partnerships' goals. Therefore, this research seeks to fill that gap by studying the relationship between the structural features of B+S, GCSD and SM, and the outcomes that their partner organizations have achieved from participating in the CSSPs.

## Chapter 3 Methods

The following chapter covers the methodology section of this research study. The objective of this study is to explore the relationship between partnerships' structure and partners' outcomes. A sequential mixed-methods approach was used to study the partnership structure and the partners' outcomes, in part using secondary data collected by previous researchers involved in the same larger project<sup>12</sup>, and supplemented by three interviews.

The chapter starts with an overview of the research design, details of the selected cases and the quantitative and qualitative methods used for data analysis. It ends with a detailed discussion of the reliability and the limitations of the research.

### 3.1. Research Design

This research is part of a larger project that aims to determine the most effective ways to design a CSSP for the achievement of sustainability goals by studying the relation between collaborative strategic plans, implementation of structural features and plans' and partners' outcomes (MacDonald et al., 2018).

In the earlier stages of the larger project, an international survey was conducted resulting in a database of 111 international CSSPs, all of which are implementing sustainability community plans (Macdonald, 2016). From that list of cases, four international CSSPs were selected to study partners' outcomes as part of the larger project objectives (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). The selecting criteria was determined within the framework of the larger project, and it was stated as follows (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018):

---

<sup>12</sup> This research and the previous research in which the secondary data was collected are part of a larger international collaborative research that aims to help local governments around the world to implement LA21s, sustainability community plans, and climate action plans more effectively. See more details in <https://uwaterloo.ca/implementing-sustainable-community-plans/>.

- The CSSPs have at least one hundred partner organizations confirmed, and these partners are from civil society, public and private sectors;
- The CSSPs have a plan time horizon of at least twenty years;
- The size of the community impacted by the partnership is from 1 to 2 million people;
- Partners are highly engaged in the partnership, contributing to some of the sustainability goals of the CSSPs (Waddock, 1991); and
- Willingness from the partnerships and partners to participate in the research.

The selection process was made as part of Dr. Ordonez-Ponce's research, and some criteria, such as the plan time horizon and the number of partners, were somewhat flexible; instead of 20 years of plan time horizon, the final criterion was 15 in order to include Montreal, and instead of 100 partners, the criterion was changed to 99 to include Gwangju. Despite this, the current researcher considered that one of the limitations of this criteria is that did not contemplate a maximum of partners within the partnerships. It is true that there is not a consensus in the literature of what makes a partnership large, but limiting the number of partners in the research criteria can contribute to having a better understanding of what would mean a large partnership in the literature related to cross-sector partnerships.

After the selection process, four partnerships complied with the criteria proposed; Barcelona + Sustainable, Bristol Green Capital Partnership, Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development, and Sustainable Montreal. However, for this research, the Bristol partnership will not be studied, since the response rate was 13% (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018), which this research consider as an under-represented sample, because it could lead to biases in the data (Leslie, 1972). The cases selection for this study is beyond the control of this researcher, since it was determined by the previous researchers as part of the objectives of the larger project. The three case studies in this

research are part of a 111 international CSSPs that have implemented sustainability community plans that the larger project has surveyed in earlier stages. Therefore, studying these particular case studies contributes to the objectives of the larger project.

### *3.1.1. CSSPs Selected Cases*

#### *3.1.1.1. Barcelona + Sustainable (Barcelona)*

The sustainable agenda in Barcelona has been priority since 1995, when The City of Barcelona committed to the creation of an LA21 (Font et al., 2001; Hernández, 2003). Three years later, The Municipal Council for the Environment and Sustainability was created with the purpose of engaging civil society to contribute to the process of the LA21 for Barcelona. The Council included representatives from the local government, the private sector, trade unions, social and environmental NGOs and universities, among others (Castiella & Franquesa, n.d.). As a result of a consultation process, the Council defined action plans for Barcelona's LA21 roadmap, where the main outcomes were reaching 100% of waste water treated, significant reduction per capita in water consumption and an increase of solar energy usage (Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2012). After 10 years of working towards sustainability, the plan was renewed in 2012, committing to a 2012-2022 plan horizon with new goals and objectives that are mainly focused on public spaces and mobility; environmental quality and health; efficiency, productivity and zero emissions; rational use of resources; good governance and social responsibility; well-being; progress and development; education and citizen action; and resilience and planetary responsibility (Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2012). Over 1,000 organizations from all sectors<sup>13</sup> have been

---

<sup>13</sup> Number of active partners per sector in 2017: Private sector: 156; Public sector: 13; Civil society: 159 (Ordóñez-Ponce, 2018).



working together to achieve Barcelona's sustainability goals as part of the partnership (Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2012).

### *3.1.1.2. Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development*

Local initiatives for sustainable development in South Korea were introduced in 1995, and Gwangju is one of the cities working for sustainability since then (Yoon, 2016). Founded in the same year, The Council for Green Gwangju has been re-named and re-inaugurated a couple of times (Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development, n.d.). Nevertheless, the current name Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development (GCSD) was chosen in 2016. One year later, the 5<sup>th</sup> Agenda for the Implementation of the UNSDGs (2017-2021) was launched within the framework of the principles of 'governance, based on public-private cooperation' and a 'democratic settlement process in the region' (Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development, 2017).

The main goals of GCSD are encouraging local participation, as well as focusing not only on environmental issues but also integrating the scope of the initiative to economic, social and cultural matters (Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development, n.d.).

The partnership had 99 organizations from all sectors<sup>14</sup> working collaboratively at the moment of the survey. It has 17 goals and 62 action plans for the period 2017-2021. The main topics are clean water, air and energy; city forests; a city safe from chemicals; recycling of materials; green and social economy; urban farming; a welfare-sharing, diverse, healthy and beautiful community; people-oriented traffic system; residential environments; and education for sustainability (Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development, 2017).

---

<sup>14</sup> Number of active partners per sector in 2017: Private sector: 20; Public sector: 32; Civil society: 47 (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

### *3.1.1.3. Sustainable Montreal*

At the Montreal Summit held in June 2002, the City of Montreal committed to sustainable development (Ville de Montréal, n.d.-a), when several organizations signed the Statement of Principle of the Montreal Community on Sustainable Development, showing their commitment to achieve sustainability and work collaboratively with the government (Clarke, 2012; Ville de Montréal, n.d.-a). Montreal's sustainability initiatives are led under the Municipality of Montreal, and it incorporates the shared commitment of the City and partner organizations to achieve sustainability (Ville de Montréal, n.d.-c).

In 2005 Montreal adopted and implemented the First Strategic Plan for Sustainable Development 2005-2009 (Ville de Montréal, n.d.-a). Thanks to the collaboration of more than 180 organizations from all sectors, they next adopted the Community Sustainable Development Plan 2010-2015 (Ville de Montréal, n.d.-a). The partner organizations worked in committees to achieve the plan's goals (Ville de Montréal, n.d.-a) on air quality and GHG emissions; residential environments; resource-management practices; sustainable-development practices; and biodiversity, natural environments and green spaces (Ville de Montréal, 2010).

With the collaboration of over 100 organizations from all sectors<sup>15</sup>, Montreal implemented its third Community Sustainable Development Plan 2016-2020, which focused on achieving a low-carbon, equitable and exemplary city, with four priorities for intervention, and 10 collective targets for implementation (Ville de Montréal, 2016). The four priorities are reducing GHG emissions and dependence on fossil fuels; adding vegetation, increasing biodiversity and ensuring the continuity of resources; ensuring access to sustainable, human-scale and healthy

---

<sup>15</sup> Number of active partners per sector in 2017: Private sector: 45; Public sector: 20; Civil society: 77 (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

neighbourhoods; and making the transition towards a green, circular and responsible economy  
(Ville de Montréal, 2016).

### 3.1.1.4. Topics for each Partnership

The following table shows a summary of the topics that the partnerships are working on.

Table 4. *Topics by CSSPs*

Barcelona + Sustainable	Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development	Sustainable Montreal
O1: Biodiversity	G1: Water-recycling City	Pr1: GHG Emissions and Dependence of Fossil Fuels
O2: Public Spaces and Mobility	G2: City Forest	Pr2: Vegetation, Biodiversity and Resources
O3: Environmental Quality and Health	G3: Air Cool City	Pr3: Sustainable, Human-scale and Healthy Neighbourhoods
O4: Efficient, Productive and Zero Emissions	G4: Safe City from Chemicals	Pr4: Green, Circular & Responsible Economy
O5: Rational Use of Resources	G5: Recycling Materials	
O6: Good Governance and Social Responsibility	G6: Green Economy	
O7: Well-being	G7: Energy-converted City	
O8: Progress and Development	G8: Urban Farming	
O9: Education and Citizen Action	G9: Social Economy	
O10: Resilience and Planetary Responsibility	G10: Welfare Community	
	G11: Sharing Community	
	G12: Equal Community	
	G13: Green Health	
	G14 People-oriented Traffic System	
	G15: Village Community	
	G16: Residential Environment	
	G17: Education for Sustainable Development	

Note: O: Objectives; G: Goals; Pr: Priority Areas. Adapted from (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

## 3.2. Qualitative Research

The following section includes the details of the qualitative research methods, including the interviews and the data analysis. The qualitative research allows for fulfilling the first research objective: *analyze the partnerships' structure, and determine which structural features are relevant for each CSSP.*

### 3.2.1. Data Collection

The information about the partnerships' structure was collected by Dr. Odeeth Lara-Morales, who has been involved in the later stages of the larger project. In June 2018, during the ICLEI World Congress in Montreal, the directors/coordinators of the three partnerships being studied were asked about the structure of their partnerships through structured interviews that were recorded by video.

The semi-structured interviews<sup>16</sup> are mainly focused on the structural design of the partnership. The first design of the questions was based on the work of Clarke (2011), on structural features for collaborative strategy implementation and on the larger project's international survey.

Therefore, the first round of data collection was focused on the organization of the partnership in terms of governance, partner engagement and actions, monitoring and reporting processes and means of communication systems. The second round of semi-structured interviews was based on the structural features framework developed by the current researcher in Chapter 2. These interviews did not ask for opinions from the directors/coordinators of the partnerships; instead, they asked for specific content about the structure of the partnership, and therefore no ethics approval was required<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Appendix I.

<sup>17</sup> See Appendix II.

### 3.2.2. Interviews

Prior to the data analysis, the interviews were read by the researcher in order to revise that the data collected was useful to answer the research objectives. As the interviews were developed based on Clarke's (2011) work, there was a gap of information regarding the seven structures that this research proposed in Chapter 2: communication systems, monitoring and reporting, partners' engagement, renewal systems, decision-making mechanisms, coordination, and composition of the CSSP. Therefore, follow-up interviews with the coordinator/director of each CSSP were needed in order to complete the structural features framework of this research. The questions were answered either by email and/or phone call<sup>18</sup>.

In order to check the validity of both questionnaires, one of the strategies used to check the accuracy of the findings was triangulating the data collected (Creswell, 2014). The first round of interview collected broader information regarding the structural features, while the second round of interviews shown the same information, however, they allowed to delve into some of the categories that were needed to understand. Some of this information was also in the website of the CSSPs, however, there were limitations in the Korean CSSP due to language barriers. Moreover, to reduce bias in the interviews, questions were focused on facts related to the structural features of each CSSPs, the same questionnaire was applied to every participant, obtaining similar results across the case studies.

---

<sup>18</sup> The request to interview the directors/coordinators of each CSSPs was done through email, with the possibility of arranging phone calls to make it easier for the participants and for speeding the process of data collection. B+S decided to proceed with a phone call, which made the interview much richer in terms of information, however, the data used was only the ones focused on the structural features which resulted in the matrix in Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12. GCSD proceeded by replying the questions by email through the partnership coordinator. In SM, the researcher used an intermediary in order to have access to the information on the structural features. The third person conducted the interview in French, and translated it to English.

### *3.2.3. Data Analysis*

This study used qualitative content analysis, following deductive and inductive category development. Deductive category development consists of selecting a research question, selecting theoretical-based definitions of categories, followed by a theoretical-based coding system, revision of categories, work throughout the text, and interpreting the results (Cho & Lee, 2014). Inductive category development is conducted when the categories or codes developed are drawn from the data collected, due to limited knowledge on the theme being studied (Cho & Lee, 2014). The coding is based on the partnership structural features previously discussed in Table 1, which are: communication systems, monitoring and reporting, partner partners' engagement, renewal systems, coordination, decision making and composition of the partnership.

Following the deductive category development, inductive categories were developed. This is because some of the codes and sub-codes under the structural features were based on the responses of each director/coordinator of the CSSPs, given that they were not found in the literature, i.e., communication systems and their formats. Some of the responses given were categorized in Yes and No answers, while in some others the complete responses of the director/coordinator were kept; however, the language was unified based on the theoretical framework used in this research, allowing the comparison of the structural features in each CSSP<sup>19</sup>.

#### *3.2.3.1. Coding*

As the data collection process was completed, the first step prior to beginning coding the data was transcribing, and then reading the interviews given by the coordinators/directors of each

---

<sup>19</sup> See Table 9 in Chapter 4 for more details.

partnership. Once this step was finalized, the researcher started to code the interviews with the deductive categories previously defined. The deductive categories are seven structural features, each with its own codes and sub-codes that were determined in the literature review process.

- 1) Communication systems have two codes: format and frequency. Format refers to the way in which the communication of the partnership is being delivered, e.g. newsletter, emails, website, meetings and social events, among others. Frequency means how often the members of the partnerships are communicating.
- 2) Monitoring and reporting share the same code names as communication systems; however, format for monitoring and reporting means whom the partnership is monitoring, e.g. only the partnership's goals, only partner's actions, or both.
- 3) Engagement mechanism codes include partners' commitment and adding new partners. The first code refers to the type of commitment the partners have to participate in the partnership, and the second code refers to what are the mechanisms that the partnerships have to add new partners to the partnership.
- 4) Renewal systems code indicates whether the partnership adopts different plans every several years and, if so, whether partners renew their commitments.
- 5) The coordination of the partnerships is coded under secretariat, and under the sub-codes are a number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff support, who host the secretariat (see coordination in literature review) and how it is funded.
- 6) Decision-making codes refer to how the decision-making committee is created, and how the involvement of partners in decision-actions is managed.



- 7) Finally, the composition of the partnerships is coded through longevity, i.e., the years that the partnership has been functioning; the size, i.e., number of partners; and predominance of sector, which means what is the sector most represented in the partnership.

Table 5. *Coding Framework*

<b>Structural Features</b>	<b>Codes</b>	<b>Sub-Codes</b>
<i>Communication Systems</i>	Format	E-newsletter, hard-copy newsletter, website, digital map, meetings, workshops, emails, social events, annual assembly, gala
<i>Monitoring and Reporting</i>	Frequency	
	Format	Partnerships' goals, partners' goals, both partnerships' and partners' goals
<i>Partners' engagement</i>	Frequency	
	Partners' Commitment	
<i>Renewal Systems</i>	Adding New Partners	
	Plan Renewal Process	
<i>Coordination</i>	Secretariat	Number of FTE staff support
		Host Funding
<i>Decision Making</i>	Committee	
<i>Composition of the Partnership</i>	Partners' involvement in decision-actions	
	Longevity	
	Size	
	Predominance of the partners	

### 3.3. Quantitative Research

The following section comprises the details of the quantitative research methods, including survey design, survey translation, database details and data analysis. The quantitative research allows for fulfilling the second research objective: *analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes of CSSPs in general, and analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes in each CSSPs.*

#### 3.3.1. Survey Design

Data about the partners' outcomes was gathered through a cross-sectional survey conducted by Dr. Eduardo Ordonez-Ponce between June 2015 and June 2017. Since the unit of analysis of this study was organizations and not people's opinions, this survey did not require ethics clearance, which was confirmed by the University of Waterloo Research Ethics Office<sup>20</sup> (Geer, 2015).

The survey<sup>21</sup> has four parts with a total of 12 main questions divided into 30 sub-questions (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). From all the sections of the survey, Part D collects information about the outcomes that the organizations have achieved as a result of remaining in the CSSP.

Organizations were asked to value the outcomes according to the 5-point Likert scale from 1 very valuable to 5 not valuable. Outcomes were organized into five groups; organizational, human, physical and financial capital were organized through Barney's (1991; 1995) RBV approach, and community capital was organized through Hart's NRBV approach (1995) and Gray and Stites' (2013) social-ecological resources.

---

<sup>20</sup> See Appendix I for more details.

<sup>21</sup> The survey instrument can be found in Appendix III.

### *3.3.1.1. Survey Translation*

Since the survey in this study is international, a protocol of survey translation was used in order to avoid translation bias (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). People knowledgeable about the project as well as the topic translated the survey. Using a source-to-target approach, the survey was translated from Canadian English into languages spoken in the selected communities: European Spanish, Korean and Canadian French (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018)<sup>22</sup>.

### *3.3.2. Data Collection*

The data collection process was developed in two stages; the first stage, an online invitation, was sent by the secretariats of the partnership to all their active partner organizations, asking them to respond to the survey online (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). The active partners are partners that are currently participating of the CSSP, and that are committed to contribute to the sustainability goals of the CSSP (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). If the number of responses needed was not reached, a second group of partners was contacted in the respective cities to increase the numbers (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

The original project at the beginning studied the four partnerships selected. However, as it was stated in the research design section, this study does not consider Bristol. Accordingly, the resulting database includes 59 partners from the private sector, 32 from the public sector and 95 from civil society organizations. Each respondent was partnering in a large cross-sector social partnership for the sustainability of Barcelona (n=85), Gwangju (n=53), or Montreal (n=48).

---

<sup>22</sup> See more details in Ordonez-Ponce (2018).

Table 6. *Number of cases by CSSP and Sectors and Response Rates*

CSSPs/ Sectors	Civil Society	Private	Public	Total
B+S	42	37	6	85 (26%)
GCSO	34	9	10	53 (54 %)
SM	19	13	16	48 (34%)
Total	95 (34%)	59 (27%)	32 (49%)	<b>186</b>

### 3.3.3. Data Analysis

This study employed SPSS software to conduct statistical analysis. Prior to starting with the quantitative data analysis, the database had already been cleaned for the purpose of this research, since the data was collected in order to address Dr. Ordonez-Ponce’s research.

The data analysis included the creation of indexes according to the types of capitals that were previously developed using RBV, including community capital. Table 7 shows the items that were included in each index. To test the validity of each index, Cronbach’s Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) test was used; if the value of the Alpha is equal to or higher than 0.7, then the index is reliable (Santos, 1999), though some studies use lower thresholds (Santos, 1999).

Table 7. *Capital indexes with each item included*

Capital Index	Item
Community	Contributing positively to all the sustainability goals of the vision
	Contributing positively to environmental challenges
	Contributing positively to social challenges
	Contributing positively to economic challenges
Human	Contributing positively to the sustainability of the community
	Gaining knowledge / Learning

	Gaining expertise
	Sharing own experiences
	Improving competencies
	Improving the sustainability of your organization
	Innovation capacity
	Building new relationships
	Improving reputation
	Gaining legitimacy
	Becoming more influential
Organizational	Having access to new markets
	Marketing opportunities
	Networking
	Collaborating with others
	Engaging with the community
	Improving relationship with authorities
	Improving relationship with NGOs
	Improving financial performance
	Reducing costs
	Funding opportunities
Financial	Developing new products/services
	Making new businesses
	Attracting new investors
	Increasing financial resources
	Increasing resources
Physical	Improving processes

Adapted from Ordonez-Ponce (2018).

Once the indexes were created, the first analyses done were descriptive. Descriptive statistics are used to describe the main characteristics of a dataset (Triola, 2010). In this research, descriptive

analyses were done with the purpose of showing the distribution of the capital indexes by CSSP and by the sectors of each CSSP. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were used for the following analyses used to compare the means of the indexes by CSSP, and then by the sectors of each CSSP. ANOVA Test is a method that tests differences between three or more population means by analyzing sample variances (Triola, 2010). The results with a small P-value ( $p < 0.05$ , with a 95% confidence interval) leads to rejecting the null hypothesis of equal means. A large P-value ( $p > 0.05$ , with a 95% confidence interval), means failing the rejection of the null hypothesis of equal means (Triola, 2010).

### 3.4. Explanation Building

This section presents the analytic technique used for analyzing the relationship between the structural features of the CSSPs, and their partners' outcomes. This analysis allows to fulfill the third research objective: *analyze how the structural features of the CSSPs are related to the value that their partners give to their achieved outcomes.*

Within the qualitative methods literature, explanation building is a technique that can be used for explanatory case studies (Yin, 2018). Explaining a phenomenon requires to presume a set of casual sequences that enable to respond the how's and/or the why's of that phenomenon (Yin, 2018). The challenge of this technique relies on the complexity and difficulty of measuring casual sequences, therefore, the explanation of the case studies needs to be a reflection of relevant theoretically propositions (Yin, 2018).

There is a gap in the literature on the explanation-building processes related to its operational terms (Yin, 2018). However, the literature emphasizes that the process is a result of inductive and deductive analysis, using the resources provided by the theoretical framework being used, along with a strong data analysis (Tavory & Stefan, 2014). As stated before, inductive analysis is

used when the data collected are used to add new knowledge to theory, while deductive analysis is used when the data analysis is based on existing theory (Cho & Lee, 2014; Tavory & Stefan, 2014). Therefore, the notion of *abduction* was introduced with the purpose of explaining the middle ground between deduction and induction (Hintikka, 1999; Timmermans & Tavory, 2012). Abductive analysis refers to the process of creating aimed inferences, hypothesis, and theories, based on the research evidence (Tavory & Stefan, 2014), and it aims to contribute to theory (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012). Abductive analysis focuses on making a preliminary guess based on both the current theory being used and the data when findings are unexpected, in which the results will be a new theory (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012). In the process of abductive analysis, new hypothesis are proposed that need to be answer by gathering new data or in further studies (Hintikka, 1999; Tavory & Stefan, 2014).

With that said, abductive analysis becomes a suitable tool for analyzing the structural features of the three CSSPs, and their partners' outcomes, as this research has one dataset focused on the structural features of the CSSPs, and another dataset for the structural features, along with an extensive literature review developed in Chapter 2. The explanation process of the relationship between the structural features and the partners' outcomes started by inferring from the results of the relevant characteristic structural features of each CSSP, and the significant results on the partners' outcomes side. By doing so, it is possible to provide explanation and hypothesis of why and how both levels are related, and how the structural features will have an impact in the outcomes that the partners gain by joining a CSSP.



### 3.5. Reliability

The reliability of a dataset relies on how consistently the results occur, and if another researcher aims to conduct the same study over the same case studies, the obtained results would be the same as the original research (Triola, 2010; Yin, 2018).

The literature recommends that for case studies, it is needed to document all the procedures followed in the case studies (Yin, 2018). One of the tools that are helpful to do so is a case study database. Thus, for the data collected on the structural features a matrix with the information of each CSSP was developed<sup>23</sup>. Also, sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.3.1 give a thorough explanation on the data reduction and the coding developed for the qualitative analysis.

To examine the reliability of the data collected on partners' outcomes, an internal consistency test was conducted. The test was applied to the capital indexes created for the outcomes, to determine whether the questions measuring each capital were reliable or not.

Table 8 shows that the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  calculated were all above 0.70, which confirms the internal consistency of the survey.

Table 8. *Survey's Internal Consistency Test on Outcomes*

Index	Items	Cronbach's $\alpha$
Community Capital	5	0.76
Human Capital	4	0.75
Organizational Capital	13	0.95
Financial Capital	7	0.97
Physical Capital	2	0.93

---

<sup>23</sup> See Section 4.1., Tables 9, 10, 11, 12.

### 3.6. Limitations

For both qualitative and quantitative research, data were collected with the purpose of fulfilling the research objectives of different projects. When secondary data are used, it is important to evaluate the limitations of the quality of the data (Hox & Boeijs, 2005). For the quantitative data, internal consistency tests were applied, and the results showed that the data are reliable<sup>24</sup>. Also, when choosing secondary data, it is important that the limitations of the original study fit in the current research (Hox & Boeijs, 2005). In that sense, the limitations of the past research relate to the use of the survey; sampled population, process of surveying, languages spoken and willingness of partners to respond to the survey were all tackled, finding no response bias (See details in Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

As mentioned earlier, one of the limitations in the selection criteria in that a maximum number of partners in the CSSPs was not determined. It may be possible that the entire configuration of the CSSPs are different based on the number of partners that they have, which it is something to consider when analyzing the results of the statistical analysis. Also, considering a limited number of partners in the case studies it would have contributed to the theoretical discussion of what makes a partnership large.

Another limitation is the generalization of the studies selected for this research. The question is whether is possible or not to generalize from three case studies? Unlike statistical generalizations, which aims to make inferences on data collected from a population, the aim of case studies is that generalization is possible to the theoretical framework used in this research (Yin, 2018). Therefore, the main purpose of doing case studies is that the results enable

---

<sup>24</sup> See Table 8.

generalizations to theory, which is denominated analytic generalizations, and not to statistical generalizations (Yin, 2018). Thus, this research allows analytic generalizations, but do not allow to generalize in terms of other case studies and/or larger samples.

### 3.7. Summary

To conclude, this chapter introduces the research design and the type of analyses used to approach both qualitative and quantitative secondary data on CSSPs; structural features and partners' outcomes. This study used descriptive analyses and ANOVA Test to analyze the value given by the partners of each CSSP to their achieved outcomes, along with content analysis to analyze the structural features of the CSSPs. A total of 186 responses were collected on the partners' outcomes, and three video interviews were conducted in order to gather information about the structural features of the CSSPs. Moreover, this section gives details of the case studies selection, and a summary of the three CSSPs selected; Barcelona + Sustainable, Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development and Sustainable Montreal.

## **Chapter 4 Results**

This chapter presents the empirical results of the data analysis conducted for the three CSSPs, and the 186 partners surveyed. This section begins by presenting the qualitative data analysis, which answers the first research objective related to the structural features of each CSSP. The second sub-section presents the quantitative data analysis which allows for answering the second research objective related to the partners' outcomes. The third sub-section offers the abduction analysis focused on the relationship between the CSSPs' structural features and the partners' outcomes, which allows for answering the third research objective.

As a reminder, each research objective is as follows;

1. Analyze the partnerships' structure, and determine which structural features are relevant for each CSSP.
2. Analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes of CSSPs in general, and analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes in each CSSPs.
3. Analyze how the structural features of the partnerships are related to the value that their partners give to their achieved outcomes.

### **4.1. Qualitative Data Analysis**

This sub-section introduces the structural features about the three case studies. This data was obtained from the video interviews, and follow-up interviews with the coordinators of each CSSP. Table 9 shows the results of the structural features in the CSSPs.

Table 9. Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP – Part I

Structural Features	Cross-Sector Social Partnerships					
	Barcelona + Sustainable		GCSD		Sustainable Montreal	
Communication Systems	Yes/No	Frequency	Yes/No	Frequency	Yes/No	Frequency
<i>E-newsletter</i>	Yes	2 times per month	Yes	1 time per month	No	-
<i>Hard-copy newsletter</i>	Yes	2 times per month	Yes	2 times per month	No	-
<i>Website</i>	Yes	Ongoing	Yes	Ongoing	Yes	Ongoing
<i>Digital Map of Partner's Contribution</i>	Yes	Ongoing	No	-	No	-
<i>Meetings</i>	Yes	When needed	Yes	Every 2 months	No	-
<i>Workshops</i>	Yes	Up to each sector	Yes	1 time per year and irregularly 1 to 4 times if necessary	No	-
<i>Emails</i>	Yes	Daily basis	Yes	2 times per month	Yes	Daily basis
<i>Social Events</i>	Yes	Ongoing	Yes	2 times per month	No	-
<i>Annual Assembly/ Gala</i>	Yes	1 time per year	Yes	1 time per year	Yes	1 time per year
<i>Other (Please Add)</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 10. Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP- Part II

<b>Monitoring and Reporting</b>	<b>Barcelona + Sustainable</b>		<b>GCS D</b>		<b>Sustainable Montreal</b>	
<i>Format</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
<i>Progress</i>	Yes – partnership’s goals	Every 10 years	Yes – partnership’s goals	Every 5 years	Yes – partnership’s goals	Every 2 years
<i>Actions</i>	Yes – partners evaluate their own action plan	Annually	Yes – partnership’s actions	Annually	Yes – partners’ goals	Every 2 years
<b>Partners’ engagement</b>	<b>Barcelona + Sustainable</b>		<b>GCS D</b>		<b>Sustainable Montreal</b>	
<i>How partners commitment is determined?</i>	When organizations join the network, they decide which endeavours they want to carry. It could be from just reporting good actions, or they can make an action plan.		The CSSP selects agendas every five years and partners decide to participate. Partners plan their action to achieve the partnership goals every year and local government supports the actions. Currently, partners are participating in achieving the fifth agenda (2017~2021).		They are responsible for carrying out an endeavour, for undertaking the action they committed to in alignment with the Sustainable Montreal 2016–2020 Plan. Commit to carrying out approximately 10 initiatives from the Plan.	
<i>Adding new partners</i>	Promoting and providing information through activities. Providing resources. Working on the goals so others can see what we are doing. Organizations can join on an ongoing basis.		Recruitment through recommendation by the GCS D every cycle. Targeted organizations can join during the recruitment process for the 5 year-plan.		Every 3 years they adopt a new plan. They reach out to the partners they target according to activities related to their actions. With concertation Montreal, they conduct recruitment through networking events and disseminating information. Organizations can join on an ongoing basis.	

Table 11. *Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP – Part III*

<b>Renewal Systems</b>	<b>Barcelona + Sustainable</b>	<b>GCS D</b>	<b>Sustainable Montreal</b>
<i>Plan Renewal Process</i>	The current plan is from 2012 to 2022, and they had another community sustainability plan from 2002 to 2012. The renewal of the plan will be in 2022, but it will include climate emergency.	They create, implement and evaluate agendas every five years. Based on the evaluation of past agendas, the following actions are decided for social change and local situation.	This is the third sustainable development plan, and every time they adopt a plan, there is a renewed commitment for partners.
<b>Coordination</b>	<b>Barcelona + Sustainable</b>	<b>GCS D</b>	<b>Sustainable Montreal</b>
<i>Secretariats</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of FTE staff support</li> <li>- Technical Secretariat: 16 people</li> <li>• Where is it hosted?</li> <li>- Ayuntamiento de Barcelona (La Fabrica del Sol)</li> <li>• How is it funded</li> <li>- Municipal government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of FTE staff support</li> <li>- 13 people</li> <li>• Where is it hosted?</li> <li>- Gwangju City Hall</li> <li>• How is it funded</li> <li>- Gwangju (local government)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of FTE staff support</li> <li>- 6 people</li> </ul> <p>For the partnership – there are 4 mobilization teams which had 1 elected person, 1 administrator and 1 citizen, plus the partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is it hosted?</li> <li>- Montreal City Hall</li> <li>• How is it funded</li> </ul> <p>The central services (Bureau de développement durable was the coordinator for the mobilization teams).</p>

Table 12. *Matrix of Structural Features by CSSP*

<b>Decision-Making</b>	<b>Barcelona + Sustainable</b>	<b>GCS D</b>	<b>Sustainable Montreal</b>
<i>Committee</i>	Participatory council that has 50 members elected by the signatories of the commitment. Each sector elects its representatives. City Council is also part of the members of the commitment and provides the technical secretariat for the project.	GCS D has nine co-presidents representing the region and 190 members. There are six committees under the Steering Committee: Policy, Education, Business, Ecological Environment, Economic Society and Community.	Coordination committee made up of people from the partner organizations and from the central services (local government), and mobilization teams. Led by an elected representative.
<i>Partners involvement in decision-actions</i>	Through a representative council of each sector involved. Partners also choose to implement actions.	Each partner is involved in the agenda, and each year develops a project plan and participates in decisions.	Partners share ideas of what actions they want to see happen, best endeavours that everyone should take. Partners decide to implement commitments.
<b>Composition of the Partnership</b>	<b>Barcelona + Sustainable</b>	<b>GCS D</b>	<b>Sustainable Montreal</b>
<i>Longevity</i>	17 years	24 years	19 years
<i>Size</i>	1,305 (2019)	115 (2019)	280 (2017)
<i>Active partners surveyed (2017)</i>	Civil Society (42) Private (37) Public Sector (6)	Civil Society (34) Private (9) Public Sector (10)	Civil Society (19) Private (27) Public Sector (33)



#### *4.1.1. Barcelona + Sustainable*

The CSSP of Barcelona + Sustainable (B+S) has been working for the city's sustainability for about 17 years, with 1,305 partners in 2019. This large CSSP counts partners from all three sectors, and from their active partners surveyed in 2017, the majority were civil society organizations and private sector businesses, with minimum participation from public sector entities.

In such a large partnership, the communication system in place is a reflection of the complexity of B+S. Table 9 shows the variety of formats that B+S has to communicate with its partners. It has both e-newsletter and hard-copy newsletter formats that are delivered 2 times per month. It also has an ongoing website and a digital map. The digital map is a tool where not only partners but also the residents of Barcelona can find sustainability initiatives, pictures of places in the city, activities related to sustainability, etc. B+S also has regular meetings and social events with its partners, communicates through email on a daily basis if needed, and has an annual gala where the partnership reports progress on its goals. Workshops are led by B+S, and each sector run its own workshop.

Regarding monitoring and reporting, Barcelona + Sustainable reports about activities, including their projects, on an annual basis. The evaluation of the progress on the partnership's goals is done every 10 years, which is the timeframe of every plan and plan renewal. They do not report or evaluate the partners' goals and outcomes due to the number of organizations participating in this CSSP.

In terms of partners' engagement, there are two categories; partners' commitment, and how new partners are being added to B+S. Barcelona + Sustainable partners commit to the CSSP through endeavours that they decide to follow during their participation, which are very flexible. The B+S coordinator mentioned that commitments could range from reporting their actions to making their

own action plan that aligns with the goals of B+S. As the CSSP has a large number of partners already, there is no need for B+S to recruit new members. The mechanism to attract new partners is providing information through activities, resources and working in the partnership's goals so other organizations can see what the CSSP is doing. Most of the people in the city knows about B+S, so the CSSP does not need to advertise their partners' engagement. New partners that want to participate in B+S can join at any time.

Regarding plan renewal, Barcelona + Sustainable is in its current plan from 2012 to 2022, and had a previous one from 2002 to 2012. However, the renewal of the plan will begin in 2020, since Barcelona has declared a climate emergency. Climate emergency planning came into force in Barcelona on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, and the climate emergency committee stated the necessity of implementing a 2020-2025 and a 2026-2030 climate action plan, in order to meet carbon neutrality by 2050 (Ajuntament de Barcelona, n.d.). This climate action plan falls under the larger B+S, and replaces the 2012-2022 plan.

The coordination of B+S is based through a technical secretariat that has 16 people, is hosted in the municipality of Barcelona and is funded by the municipal government. In addition, each sector, i.e., civil society organizations, public and private sectors, has its own coordinator hours. In terms of the decision-making mechanism, there is a committee composed of 50 members that are elected by the signatories of the commitment. Each sector elects its own representatives. City Council is also part of the committee.

#### *4.1.2. Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development*

The Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development (GCSD) has been working for Gwangju's sustainability for 24 years, with 115 partners in 2019. From the three case studies, this CSSP has

the least number of partners. From their active partners surveyed in 2017, the majority represented civil society organizations, similar to Barcelona + Sustainable. Only nine and ten respondents represented the private and the public sector, respectively.

The communication system developed by GCSD is similar to B+S. Some differences can be found in the frequency of the newsletters; its e-newsletter is delivered 1 time per month and the hard-copy newsletter is delivered 2 times per year. It also has an ongoing website and ongoing meetings. Emails and social events are every 2 months. The GCSD's workshops are run once per year, and if needed, they can run more. There is an annual gala where they report the outcomes of the CSSP. The monitoring and reporting mechanisms of GCSD are based on the CSSP's goals, which are reported every 5 years, along with annual projects that are reported and monitored every year.

The Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development creates sustainability agendas every five years, which are based on the evaluation of the past agenda and the local situation of Gwangju, therefore they can promote actual social change. The partners' engagement in place are closely connected with the plan renewal process. Two years before the implementation of a new plan, the GCSD recruits new partners through recommendation of the same council. Once the partners decide to participate, they have to plan their actions linked with the GCSD's agenda—which are supported by the local government—so they can contribute to the CSSP's sustainability goals. In terms of coordination, the GCSD has a secretariat that is hosted in the Gwangju City Hall and it is funded by the local government. Thirteen people work in the secretariat that make possible the coordination of the CSSP.

Regarding the decision-making processes, the GCSD has a steering committee with nine people that represent the Gwangju region. Under the steering committee, there are six committees that are in charge of policy, education, business, ecological environment, economic society and

community. Lastly, partner organizations are involved in decision making through their involvement in the 5-year agenda, which is that each year partner organizations develop a project plan and participate in the decisions of that plan.

#### *4.1.3. Sustainable Montreal*

Montreal's sustainability initiatives have been led by Sustainable Montreal for 25 years, with 230 partners in 2017. From its active partners being surveyed, it is possible to see that there is a more even percentage for each sector; 40% of the partners are from civil society, 27% belong to private sectors, and 33% of the partners are from the public sectors.

In Sustainable Montreal, the communication system in place is different from those of the other two CSSPs in terms of formats and frequency. Partners communicate through emails when needed, and on the Ville de Montreal website, there is a partner portal that partners can use. SM has an annual gala where it reports the CSSP's goals and the partners' accomplishments. Comparing with the other CSSPs, Sustainable Montreal is the only one that reports about its partner's commitments and accomplishments. Both outcomes, the CSSPs' and the partners', are reported every two years.

In 2017 (by the time the partners were surveyed), Sustainable Montreal was on its third sustainability community plan. Currently, it is in the process of adopting a new plan in 2020. Every time the city adopts a new sustainability community plan, there is a renewed commitment with the partner organizations. SM's partners are in charge of carrying out and endeavouring to align with the CSSP's sustainability plan. The partners' engagement to add new partners are based on the adoption of a new plan; they reach out to the organizations they have targeted regarding similarity of the organization's actions to the CSSP's goals. The recruitment is conducted through networking events and by disseminating information.

Regarding the coordination of Sustainable Montreal, the number of people working on the *Bureau du développement durable* was six. For the CSSP itself, there were four mobilization teams that are aligned on Montreal's four sustainable development challenges, which are: Low-carbon Montreal; Montreal, Green City; Montreal, Neighbourhoods that are great places to live in; Montreal: A prosperous and responsible city. The mobilization teams have one elected person, one administrator, and one citizen, plus the partners. Moreover, the bureau was the coordinator for the mobilization teams, as well. In terms of decision making, there is a coordination committee that includes people from the partner organizations, from the central services and from the mobilization teams. The participation of the partner organizations in the plan formulation decision-making processes is based on ideas they share regarding actions they want to happen for the plan.

#### 4.2. Quantitative Data Analysis

As stated in the methodology section, the main quantitative analyses were descriptive statistics and ANOVA Tests with the purpose of analyzing the value of the achieved partners' outcomes by CSSP (i.e. Barcelona + Sustainable, GCSD, and Sustainable Montreal) and the achieved partners' outcomes by the partners' sectors of each CSSP (i.e., private, public and civil society sectors). The descriptive analysis was done to give an overview of the capital indexes' distribution by CSSP and by the sectors of each CSSP. ANOVA tests were done to prove hypotheses H1a, H1b, H1c, H1d, and H1e.

Descriptive analyses show that, in general, community capital and human capital are the most valued outcomes<sup>25</sup> achieved by the partners of Barcelona + Sustainable, GCSD and Sustainable Montreal, followed by organizational, physical and financial capital. The analyses about the value that partner organizations give to outcomes by CSSP show differences in the means. The partner

---

<sup>25</sup> Likert Scale from 1 "Very valuable" to 5 "No value".

organizations of Sustainable Montreal value community capital more than the partners of GCSD and Barcelona + Sustainable. Regarding human capital, the partners of GCSD value that outcome less than the partners of the other CSSPs. In terms of organizational capital, the partners of Barcelona + Sustainable value this capital slightly less in comparison with GCSD and Sustainable Montreal's partners. Contrarily, when it comes to financial capital, the partners of Sustainable Montreal value this capital more than B+S and GCSD. Finally, the partner organizations of GCSD value physical capital less than B+S and Sustainable Montreal. See Table 13 for detailed results.

*Table 13 Descriptive and ANOVA Test for Capitals by CSSPs*

Variables	Categories	Mean
Community Capital	Barcelona + Sustainable	2.24
	Gwangju (GCSD)	2.33
	Sustainable Montreal	1.91
	<i>p</i> <0.05* Total	2.18
Human Capital	Barcelona + Sustainable	2.17
	Gwangju (GCSD)	2.29
	Sustainable Montreal	2.17
	<i>NS</i> Total	2.20
Organizational Capital	Barcelona + Sustainable	2.54
	Gwangju (GCSD)	2.32
	Sustainable Montreal	2.33
	<i>NS</i> Total	2.44
Financial Capital	Barcelona + Sustainable	3.45
	Gwangju (GCSD)	3.53
	Sustainable Montreal	3.23
	<i>NS</i> Total	3.42
Physical Capital	Barcelona + Sustainable	3.09
	Gwangju (GCSD)	3.62
	Sustainable Montreal	3.11
	<i>p</i> <0.05* Total	3.22

\* Significant at 95% confidence interval; NS: Not Significant. 1 = Very valuable, 2 = Some value, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Little value, 5 = No valuable

Through an ANOVA Test it is possible to prove statistically if the differences in how partners value their achieved outcomes are significant between the three CSSPs. The results showed that,

with a 95% confidence interval, there are significant differences in the value that partner organizations give to community capital and physical capital, rejecting the null hypothesis of equal means. With that said, it is possible to conclude that the partners of Sustainable Montreal value the outcome of community capital more than the partner organizations of GCSD and Barcelona + Sustainable, and that the partners of GCSD value physical capital less than the organizations that joined Sustainable Montreal and Barcelona + Sustainable. Therefore, only hypothesis H1a and H1e are proved in this research.

When comparing the values that partner organizations representing different sectors of society (i.e. civil society organizations, public and private sector) give to their achieved outcomes by CSSP, it is possible to see differences in the results.

Appendix IV shows the ANOVA Test for the partners of each CSSP and the value that partner organizations of Barcelona + Sustainable give to their achieved outcomes. Unlike the general results in Table 13, the most valued outcome by the partners of B+S is human capital ( $M = 2.17$ ,  $SD = 0.945$ ), followed by community capital ( $M = 2.238$ ,  $SD = 0.891$ ), organizational ( $M = 2.545$ ,  $SD = 0.839$ ), physical ( $M = 3.089$ ,  $SD = 1.133$ ), and financial capital ( $M = 3.454$ ,  $SD = 1.095$ )<sup>26</sup>.

When comparing the values of each capital by the sectors that are part of Barcelona + Sustainable, the differences in the means are not statistically significant, failing in rejecting the null hypothesis of equal means. In other words, there are no differences between the value that each sector gives to each capital. Nevertheless, there are marginal differences in the value that partners give to financial capital in the CSSP of B+S. With a 90% confidence interval, the public sector values the outcomes of financial capital less than the private sector and the civil society organizations in Barcelona +

---

<sup>26</sup> See Appendix IV.

Sustainable, rejecting the null hypothesis of equal means. Therefore, hypothesis H2a is proved in this research.

Similar to Barcelona + Sustainable, the ANOVA Test in Appendix V show that the partners of GCSD value human capital most ( $M = 2.295$ ,  $SD = 0.587$ ), followed by organizational capital ( $M = 2.322$ ,  $SD = 0.670$ ), community capital ( $M = 2.328$ ,  $SD = 0.587$ ), financial capital ( $M = 3.528$ ,  $SD = 0.776$ ), and physical capital ( $M = 3.615$ ,  $SD = 0.839$ )<sup>27</sup>. The ANOVA Test in Appendix VI show that in Sustainable Montreal the most valued outcome is community capital ( $M = 1.910$ ,  $SD = 0.694$ ), followed by human ( $M = 2.1695$ ,  $SD = 0.943$ ), organizational capital ( $M = 2.335$ ,  $SD = 0.762$ ), financial capital ( $M = 3.229$ ,  $SD = 1.083$ ), and physical capital ( $M = 3.113$ ,  $SD = 1.146$ )<sup>28</sup>. However, in both partnerships, there are not significant differences in the value that their partner organizations by sector give to the outcomes they have achieved, failing to reject the null hypothesis of equal means. Therefore, in these two CSSPs, partner organizations regardless of the sector they represent do not value differently the five types of outcomes being studied. These results do not allow for proving H2b and H2bc.

#### 4.3. Explanation Building: CSSPs' Structural Features to Partners' Outcomes Relationship

This sub-section presents the abduction analysis conducted for the relationship between the structural features of the CSSPs and the partners' outcomes. Tables 14, 15, and 16 show the relevant structural features for B+S, GCSD and SM, and the significant results in the partners' outcomes statistical analyses, respectively. This analysis was conducted by having analyzed the relevant structural features for the CSSPs, and the significant results of the ANOVA Test for partners' outcomes. With those results, the researcher made inferences about which structural

---

<sup>27</sup> See Appendix V.

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix VI.



feature explain different results in the value given by the partner organizations to their achieved outcomes.

#### *4.3.1. Barcelona + Sustainable and Partners' Outcomes*

Section 4.1.1 showed the results of the qualitative content analysis conducted for the structural features of B+S, while section 4.2. showed the results of the quantitative data analysis conducted for the partners' outcomes of the three CSSPs. These results were used to explain the relationship between the structural features of B+S and the significant results on its partners' outcomes.

.

Table 14. *Relationship Between B+S' Structural Features and Partners' Outcomes*

Structural Features		Partners' Outcomes
Communication Systems	E-newsletter, hardcopy-newsletter, website, digital map, meetings, workshops, emails, social events, and annual assembly/gala	H2d: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to <u>financial capital outcomes</u> by sector.
Monitoring and Reporting	Progress on the partnership's goals, and partners evaluate their own actions	Result of ANOVA Test: Public sector gives less value to financial capital than the other sectors in B+S
Partners' engagement	Partners decide the actions they want to take	
	Do not have advertisement on adding new partners	
Renewal Systems	Every 10 years	
Coordination	Hosted secretariat by the local government	
Decision-Making	Committee with 50 members	
	Partners participate through a council representative from each sector	
Composition of the Partnership	17 years -1305 active partners by 2019, <b>42 civil society, 37 private, and 6 public</b>	

The statistical results for the partners of B+S indicated that the organizations from the public sector give less value to financial capital than the private sectors and the civil society. These results were not the same for GCSD and SM; significant differences in the value that the public sector gives to financial capital were not found in these CSSPs. Therefore, the question was, what is different in B+S that makes the public sector value less financial capital?

When delving into the structural features of all the CSSPs, it was possible to notice that the composition of B+S was different from the other CSSPs. Out of the total number of B+S partners, only 7% belong to the public sector, while in GCSD and SM, the percentage of public sector is 19% and 33%, respectively. This data showed clearly that there is a difference in the number of partners that were public sector in B+S in comparison to the other CSSPs. Details in the database of partners' outcomes show that the public sector in B+S are universities, the board of libraries in Barcelona and a park. The majority of these organizations receive public funding and donations, among other types of resources<sup>29</sup>. Moreover, the index of financial capital is measured through seven items that are focused on improving financial performance, reducing costs, funding opportunities, developing new products/services, making new business, attracting new investors, and increasing financial resources. This suggests that these organizations do not see financial capital as a valuable outcome due to the fact that their own financial system is strong enough to not necessarily value that outcome. Meanwhile, the private sector and civil society organizations do value this outcome more when participating in B+S.

#### *4.3.2. Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development and Partners' Outcomes*

The results of the qualitative content analysis conducted for the structural features of GCSD were shown in section 4.1.2. The results of the quantitative data analysis conducted for the partners' outcomes of the three CSSPs are shown in section 4.2. Both sets of results were used to explain the relationship between the structural features of GCSD and the significant results on its partners' outcomes.

---

<sup>29</sup> Public funding and personal transfers in the case of the universities;  
Universitat Pompeu Fabra: <https://seuelectronica.upf.edu/es/economia-i-pessupost>  
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona: <https://www.uab.cat/web/gestio-economica-1345793305712.html>  
Universitat de Barcelona: <https://www.ub.edu/web/ub/ca/sites/transparencia/publicitat-activa/gestio-economica-patrimoni/pessupost/index.html>

The ANOVA Test for partners' outcomes on physical capital showed that the partners of GCSD valued that type of outcome less than the partners of the other CSSPs. Similar processes as used in B+S were followed to understand what is different in GCSD that makes its partners value physical capital less. Comparing GCSD's structural features with the structural features of the other CSSPs, it was possible to notice that the partners' engagement, in particular the commitment of the partners, are different from those used in B+S and SM. In B+S, partners have the leeway to choose any type of actions that they want to adopt, from reporting actions to actually implementing a sustainability action plan. In SM, partners have to adopt at least 10 actions from the sustainability plan. But in GCSD, partners are not asked to implement actions in their organizations; in contrast, they implement actions to contribute to the Sustainability of Gwangju. Therefore, the rest of the structural features seem not to allow that their partners improve their resources and processes.

Table 15. *Relationship Between GCSD's' Structural Features and Partners' Outcomes*

	Structural Features	Partners' Outcomes
Communication Systems	E-newsletter, hardcopy-newsletter, website, meetings, workshops, emails, social events, and annual assembly/gala	H1e: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to <u>physical capital outcomes</u> by CSSPs.
Monitoring and Reporting	Progress on partnership's goals <b>Progress on partnership's actions</b>	Result of ANOVA Test: The partners of GCSD give less value to physical capital than the partners of the others CSSPs
Partners' engagement	<b>Selection of agendas every five years.</b> <b>Recruit partners every cycle for the 5-year plan</b>	
Renewal Systems	Every five years, and the renewal process is based on the evaluation of the past agendas	
Coordination	Hosted secretariat in the local government	
Decision-Making	Steering committee, with six sub-committees  Each partner is involved in the plan through their own actions and agendas	
Composition of the Partnership	24 years – 115 partners by 2019 – 34 civil society, 9 private, and 10 public	

#### 4.3.3. *Sustainable Montreal and Partners' Outcomes*

Section 4.1.3. showed the results of the qualitative content analysis conducted for the structural features of SM, while section 4.2. showed the results of the quantitative data analysis conducted for the partners' outcomes of the three CSSPs. These results were used to explain the relationship between the structural features of SM and the significant results on its partners' outcomes.

Table 16. *Relationship Between SM' Structural Features and Partners' Outcomes*

	Structural Features	Partners' Outcomes
Communication Systems	Website, emails, annual assembly/gala	H1a: There is a significant difference in the value that partner organizations give to <u>community capital outcomes</u> by CSSPs
Monitoring and Reporting	Progress on partnership's goals <b>Progress on partners' outcomes</b>	Result of ANOVA Test: The partners of SM give more value to community capital than the partners of the other CSSPs
Partners' engagement	<b>Commitment to adopt ten actions from the overall plan</b>  <b>Recruitment through networking events, and targeting</b>	
Renewal Systems	Renew commitments for the plan and partners	
Coordination	Hosted secretariat in the local government	
Decision-Making	<b>Steering committee</b>  <b>Partners share ideas on the actions they want to see happen</b>	
Composition of the Partnership	19 years, 280 partners by 2017, 19 civil society, 13 private, 16 public	

The descriptive results for partners' outcomes, and in particular on community capital, showed that this type of outcome is the most valued by the partners of the three CSSPs. However, the ANOVA Test for community capital indicated that the partners of SM value more community capital than the partner organizations participating in the other CSSPs. Community capital is measured through five items focused on contributing to the sustainability goals of the vision, environmental challenges, social challenges, and the sustainability of the community.

These results suggested that if all the partners value community capital the most, what is different in Sustainable Montreal that it is possible to find significant differences in them? While comparing the structural features of the CSSPs, it was possible to notice that the partners' engagement of SM are stronger than the other two CSSPs. As mentioned in section 4.1.3, the commitment of the partners is based on adopting 10 actions from Montreal's sustainability plan, which ensures the partners are aligned to the plan completely. As the partnership's goals and the partners' actions are aligned, monitoring and reporting the outcomes of the partners is easier, and therefore partners can have an accountability not only from their organizations, but also from the CSSP about their own goals. When it comes to decision-making mechanisms, as the partners are implementing the actions of the sustainability plan, they have a say in the decision making regarding the types of actions they want to see happen in the sustainability plan. This configuration does not happen in the other CSSPs, which explains why, despite the fact that all the partners from every CSSP do value community capital, the partners of SM value it more. The main difference occurs on three key structural features that are stronger in comparison to the other CSSPs.

#### 4.4. Summary

The qualitative data analysis, which was conducted through content analysis, allowed identification of the differences and similarities between the structural features of Barcelona + Sustainable, Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development, and Sustainable Montreal. The quantitative data analysis showed the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes, and the differences between CSSPs and by the sectors of each CSSP. The abduction analysis conducted allowed for explaining the relationship between the structural features of each CSSP and partners' outcomes. The results of this study are discussed in the following section, in relation to the research objectives.

## Chapter 5 Discussion

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between the structural features of three large CSSPs, and the value that their partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes during the implementation of community sustainability plans. This relationship has not been the focus of the literature related to cross-sector social partnerships and strategic management (Branzei & Le Ber, 2014; Clarke, 2011; Clarke & MacDonald, 2019). Understanding the resources that partner organizations can obtain from partnering in a CSSP and which structural features contribute with that is crucial for engaging key partner organizations that contribute with their resources skills to the achievement of the CSSPs' goals. To achieve this objective, statistical analyses were conducted through descriptive analysis and ANOVA Tests with the purpose of analyzing the differences in the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes. Also, content analysis was conducted with the aim of exploring the structural features of each CSSP. With both analyses, it was possible to begin to understand which structural features are relevant for each CSSP and how they are related to the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes.

This chapter is divided into three sections, addressing the three research objectives proposed in this research.

### 5.1. Research Objective 1

*1. Analyze the partnerships' structure, and determine which structural features are relevant for each CSSP.*

Within the literature of cross-sector collaboration, the implementation of structures is considered an effective method for successful partnerships (Bryson et al., 2015). Structures enable decision-making processes, implementing partners' agreement and the achievement of strategic goals



(Berardo et al., 2014; Clarke, 2011; Quick & Feldman, 2011). Moreover, structures have the capacity of transforming strategic goals into outcomes from the interaction between organizations, due to the exchange of resources that allow for achieving desired outcomes (Hofer & Schendel, 1978; Ordonez-Ponce, 2018).

Through an extensive literature review done in Chapter 2, section 2.4.3., this research offered seven structural features for studying three large CSSPs; communication systems, monitoring and reporting, partners' engagement, renewal systems, decision making, coordination and composition of the partnership. Table 1 shows each structural feature, with their respective categories, sub-categories and theoretical frameworks. Moreover, section 4.1 focused on the results of the content analysis for the structural features of the three CSSPs.

In terms of communication systems, the literature states that structured ongoing communications systems are needed for developing a strong relationship and mutual understanding between partners (Hartman & Dhanda, 2018). Communication becomes more complex in a high-level collaboration with multiple stakeholders (Al-Tabbaa et al., 2014). This is possible to see throughout the three CSSPs, and especially in B+S, where the formats of its communication systems are more complex than the other two CSSPs due to the large number of partners participating. There are also some forms of communication that are ongoing in the three CSSPs, such as emails and newsletters, which support the idea of having a strong relationship between their partners. Although this research agrees that communication systems are a key structural feature for strengthening the relationship between partner organizations and achieving mutual understanding within CSSPs, the study did not focus on bidirectional communication.

Regarding monitoring and reporting, the literature states that when these structural features are not adopted, it is more difficult for CSSPs to achieve long-term goals (Rein & Stott, 2009). At the

same time, both mechanisms are important for the outcomes and the impact of CSSPs, due to their ability to inform how goals are achieved and the limits of solving societies' problems through partnerships (Van Tulder et al., 2016). However, it is not only relevant how the partnership monitor and report information, it is also important how this information is being used for decision making. In the three CSSPs, monitoring and reporting mechanisms are focused on the goals of the partnerships and the partners' actions; however, only SM monitors and reports the goals of its partners. This is because the actions that the partners adopt are part of Montreal's sustainability plan, which is a requirement for participating in the partnership.

The literature on partners' engagement states that this is a key structural feature for attracting organizations (Hall & O'Dwyer, 2017). However, these mechanisms also allow partners to achieve their own goals while working towards the goal of the partnership (Johnson et al., 2015; Kamiya, 2011). This research considered as partners' engagement as how committed the partners are, and adding new partner organizations to the partnership. Through analyzing the partners' engagement, it was possible to see that the majority of the structural features adopted in each CSSP were based on how partners were committed to the CSSP. In B+S, the partners' engagement give the partners flexibility for adopting actions in their own organizations or simply reporting what they have done. B+S does not recruit partners given that the CSSP is already large enough that almost all the organizations in the city are involved. In GCSD, partners also have the flexibility to decide which actions to adopt in their organization, but the way they add new partners is based on recommendation by GCSD members, where civil society groups and businesses that are registered in the government, and that have done their own sustainability activities for more than 3 years become a member of GCSD. Lastly, in SM, partners are committed to adopting 10 actions of the sustainability plan, and the CSSP seeks partners through networking events and more.

In terms of renewal systems, the literature in cross-sector partnerships states that this structural feature is relevant due to the opportunities and collaborative advantages that partners can acquire from the learning processes of the first cohort of partner organizations (Clarke, 2011; Frisby et al., 2004; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a). However, there is a lack of studies that are solely focused on renewal systems (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019). Therefore, this research integrated renewal systems as one of the structural features to be studied. However, it was not possible to analyze how relevant this structure is for the CSSPs because the data collection was conducted in one period of time, which does not allow for seeing the changes in the CSSPs after adopting another plan. Section 6.3. gives more reflection regarding this structural feature.

Regarding coordination, the literature states can be done through hosted secretariats, separate secretariats or without secretariats (Kamiya, 2011). Coordination also helps to coordinate the actions and activities of the partners so it is possible to achieve the partnerships' goals (Albers, 2010). In the three CSSPs, the coordination is through hosted secretariats that are located in the municipal government, which reflects that the coordination is highly institutionalized (Kamiya, 2011). These results suggest that it is possible that the coordination system in place does help to achieve the partnership's goals, however, it is not possible to determine whether the coordination contributes directly to achieve the partners goals.

In this research, decision making was focused on the involvement of partners and the allocation of authority in the decision-making processes of the partnership. It has been stated in the literature that in large partnerships, not all the partners are involved in the decision-making processes (Kamiya, 2011). This is possible to see in the three CSSPs, where some of them have a steering committee while only a certain number of partners participate in this process. In B+S, there are 50 members that represent the different sectors, while in GCSD there is a steering committee with 9

members, and SM also has a coordination committee that is based on the mobilization teams.

According with these results, this research agrees with the statement of MacDonald et al. (2018) that a decentralized decision making is an appropriate design for large CSSP due to the complexity of dealing with a large number of partners. Van Huijstee et al. (2007) stated that partnerships have non-hierarchical structures, however, the results of decision-making mechanisms in this research highlight adopting a hierarchical mechanism since not all the partners can be involved in the decision making of the CSSPs.

Lastly, in terms of the composition of the partnership, the literature has highlighted the outcomes that partnerships and partners can obtain depending on the longevity of the partnership (Schreiner et al., 2009), however, in this research was not possible to determine that the years that the CSSPs have been active make a difference in the partners' outcomes. Moreover, partnerships adopt different structures based on the number of partners (Albers, 2010; Clarke, 2011; Kamiya, 2011). Despite the fact that this research focused only on large CSSPs, it is possible to notice that between the three CSSPs, the structures are somewhat different, especially the ones adopted in B+S, which has the largest number of partners. The literature has stated that this is important because partners have organizations that have different levels of capacity and capabilities (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b), as well as different type of outcomes (Gray & Stites, 2013). Across the three CSSPs, the majority of their partners were from civil society, followed by the private sector and public sector. Therefore, will these resources be achieved regardless the number of partners representing each sector? For the three case studies, where the majority of the partners belong to the civil society, the most valued outcome was community capital, which may differ if the majority of the sector was either from the public or private sector.

In summary, this research analyzed the structural features of the three CSSPs using abductive analysis. The results suggest that the most relevant structural features were; 1) monitoring and reporting, in particular when these are focused on the partners' goals, 2) partners' engagement, when partners are strongly committed to the CSSPs, such as the ones in SM, 3) decentralized decision-making mechanisms, and 4) the composition of the partnership, in particular, the predominance of the sector. The literature offered in Chapter 2 states that communication systems, renewal systems and coordination are important structural features for achieving the partnership's goals and for having a better understanding of the partners' goals. However, it was not possible to determine that relevancy of these structural features for the value given to achieved outcomes in the three CSSPs.

## 5.2. Research Objective 2

*2. Analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes of CSSPs in general, and analyze the value that partner organizations give to their achieved outcomes in each CSSPs.*

This research used a Resource-based View approach to understand partners' outcomes. In RBV, partners classify their resources based on how valuable they are for their organizations (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019; Hart, 1995). Traditional RBV offers four types of resources: physical, human, organizational and financial (Barney, 1991, 1995; Penrose, 1959). The early days of RBV did not consider environmental sustainability as one of the resources that partners can obtain when participating in a CSSP; therefore, Natural Resource-based View, as well as Gray and Stites, considered socio-ecological resources as part of the outcomes to be achieved in a CSSP (Gray & Stites, 2013; Hart, 1995).

ANOVA Tests were conducted to find differences in the value given by the partner organizations of the three CSSPs to their achieved resources. The literature mentioned that the value that partners give to resources is based on how valuable those resources are for their organizations (Clarke & MacDonald, 2019; Hart, 1995). In these case studies, partner organizations give more value to the outcomes of community capital than the other outcomes. The outcomes of community capital are related to the sustainability values, as well as social and environmental challenges. The other difference found was on physical capital, where the partners of GCSD value that type of capital less than the other CSSPs. The outcomes of physical capital are related to improving resources and processes. When delving into the analysis by CSSP, ANOVA Tests were conducted by the sector of the partner organizations, resulting that the public sector in B+S value less financial capital outcomes than the civil society and the private sector.

The literature argues that partners achieve and value different outcomes based on the sector they belong to (Austin, 2000; Gray & Stites, 2013; Kolk et al., 2010). However, despite the results in B+S where the public sector value less financial capital outcomes, in the three CSSPs it was not possible to find results aligned with the literature. The results lead to question on what is different in these three CSSPs that partners give similar values to their achieved outcomes, despite the sector they belong to. In conclusion, this suggest that the configuration of these three large CSSPs does not allow that partners value their achieved outcomes differently.

### 5.3. Research Objective 3

3. Analyze how the structural features of the partnerships are related to the value that their partners give to their achieved outcomes.

### *5.3.1. Community Capital and Sustainable Montreal*

The ANOVA Test by CSSP showed that the partners of Sustainable Montreal value the outcomes of community capital more than the partners of Barcelona + Sustainable and the Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development. The RBV literature in its early stages did not consider community and environmental resources as one of the resources that partner organizations can gain when partnering in a CSSP (Barney et al., 2011; Hart, 1995). Community capital is an outcome to consider when partners join a CSSP that focuses on solving social and environmental challenges (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). In this research, community capital was measured through an index that focuses on the positive contribution from the partners to the sustainability goals of the CSSP's plan, contribution to environmental, economic and social challenges, and contribution to the sustainability of the community.

The structural features of Sustainable Montreal allow its partners to be aligned in the sustainability goals of Montreal's plan. First, the partners' engagement are very strong in comparison to the other two CSSPs. The commitment of Montreal's partners is characterized by carrying out at least 10 initiatives outlined in Montreal's sustainability plan, promoting initiatives that are part of the plan to other organizations or the public when those initiatives are part of their activities, reporting their progress, publishing their commitments on their website, and encouraging at least one of their business partners to become a partner in the sustainability plan (Ville de Montréal, n.d.-b).

Within the configuration theory, Albers (2010) stated that there are mechanisms called incentives that guarantee meeting the objectives of an organization by appealing to actors' inherent desires. The partners' engagement of Sustainable Montreal could match this definition since, by asking its partners to adopt strong endeavours, Sustainable Montreal is also appealing to the partner organizations' desires.

Afterwards, when it comes to monitoring and reporting, it becomes easier to monitor and report both the CSSP's outcomes and the partners' goals since it is part of the endeavours that the partners have to follow when they decide to be part of the CSSP. In terms of monitoring and reporting, Van Tulder et al. (2016) indicates that in order to solve complex social problems, it is necessary to monitor and report both outcomes and the impacts of the partnerships, which in Montreal's case is not only helping to monitor the CSSP's goals but also the partners.

In terms of the decision-making mechanisms, they are also aligned to the partners' engagement. Partners' involvement in decision making is based on ideas that partners share of what they would like to see happen in the CSSP. They share these ideas with the coordination committee, which is led by an elected representative from the CSSP. As the decision-making process is shared among partners instead of being held by only one entity, the structural feature is decentralized (Mintzberg, 1979). Then, coordination is based on six people from the Bureau du développement durable working along with the four mobilization teams, and it is funded by the municipality, which gives the coordination a high level of institutionalization (Kamiya, 2011).

MacDonald et al. (2018) stated that in complex contexts such as large CSSPs, decentralized decision making with a proper level of coordination and monitoring mechanisms is the appropriate design. On the other side, the literature on coordination states that high quality of coordination means that the partners share the understanding of the goals of the partnership (Dietrich et al., 2010). Having the four mobilization teams as part of the coordination system in Sustainable Montreal helps the partners better understand the goals of Montreal's sustainability plan, but it is also because it has been integrated in the action that the partner organizations have to undertake when they join the CSSP. The literature states that in order to create social value, the goals of partners from different sectors have to be aligned (Caldwell et al., 2017; Gulati et al., 2012).



The above structural features highlighted for Sustainable Montreal's goals and the goals of the partners are aligned. Its partner organizations have a thorough understanding of the actions that need to be done in order to meet the CSSP's goals. The results suggest that, as community capital is the most valued outcome by the partners of Sustainable Montreal, and in comparison with the other CSSPs, Montreal has key structural features like partners' engagement, decision-making processes, coordination systems and monitoring and reporting mechanisms that allow the CSSP to achieve its goals and its partners' goals, which are also contributing to the sustainability of Montreal.

### *5.3.2. Physical Capital and Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development*

The results of the descriptive analyses for the capital indexes showed that one of the less valued outcomes for the partner organizations of the three CSSPs is physical capital. When analyzing these results by CSSP, the ANOVA Test showed differences regarding the value that the partners of GCSD give to physical capital. In comparison to the value that all the CSSPs give to physical capital, the partners of GCSD value it less.

Within the RBV literature, physical capital is considered as the organizations' infrastructure such as plants or facilities, equipment, land, natural resources and raw material (Penrose, 1959), as well as the location and technology of the firm (Barney, 1995). In this study, physical capital was measured through a two-item index that included increasing resources and improving processes (Ordonez-Ponce, 2018). Along with financial capital, physical capital was one of the least valued outcomes for the partner organizations in the three CSSPs, and in particular, the partners of GCSD.

On the side of partnership implementation, the literature highlights that in the first stages of the partnership creation, partner organizations are required to adopt new structural arrangements and behavioural change so they can collaborate in the partnership (Gray & Purdy, 2018; Osborn &

Hagedoorn, 1997). Also, the literature states that it is necessary to implement proper structures that allow partners to meet their needs (Provan & Kenis, 2007). The literature on partnership structure highlights the capacity of structures to function as norms and rules that allow the compliance of collaborative goals and actions (Bryson et al., 2015; Clarke & Fuller, 2010). Therefore, in order to make the partner organizations obtain and value physical capital, there should be structures in place that allow that type of outcome.

Accordingly, the structural features of Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development do not lead to improving the process nor to increasing the resources of its partner organizations. The structural features in place allow collaboration in terms of implementing the sustainability community plan, but do not allow for obtaining physical capital. This is also reflected in how committed the partners of GCSD are, since its organizations implement actions to contribute to the sustainability of Gwangju, but they are not asked to adopt actions in their own organizations. This context is similar in the other CSSPs as well, but not to such an extent as in GCSD.

### *5.3.3. Barcelona + Sustainable, Financial Capital and the Public Sector*

When the dataset is analyzed separately by each CSSP, in the Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development and in Sustainable Montreal, it was not possible to find significant differences in the value that their partners, by sector, give to their achieved outcomes. However, in Barcelona + Sustainable, there were significant differences in the value that partner organizations give to financial capital. The results indicate that in B+S, the public sector gives less value to financial resources than the private sector and the civil society organizations.

The results for the case of Barcelona + Sustainable are consistent with the literature on partners' outcomes. The private sector and NGOs, contrary to the public sector, can obtain access to new

opportunities, such as the creation of new markets (Austin, 2000; Gray & Stites, 2013; Kolk et al., 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Van Tulder et al., 2016), and access to funding, resources and investments, which all fall into the category of financial capital (Barney, 1991, 1995). On the structural features, for Barcelona + Sustainable' composition regarding the predominance of the sector, only 7% of the total of partners surveyed belong to the public sector, while 49% and 43% belong to civil society organizations and the private sector, respectively. The literature has stated that organizations have different levels of capacity as well as capabilities (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b), and therefore can obtain different types of outcomes (Gray & Stites, 2013). Therefore, it is possible that both the private sector and civil society organizations have obtained more financial capital as an outcome, which makes them value that type of outcome more than the public sector involved in Barcelona + Sustainable.

It is clear that the results of B+S are aligned with the literature on partners' outcomes; however, the composition of the partnership plays a key role in this CSSP. The predominant sector in each CSSP is civil society organizations, followed by the private sector and the public sector. The distinctive character of B+S that enables those results is that the number of organizations that represent the public sector is very little. In comparison with the other CSSPs, the GCSD have only 10 partners from the public sector, but it also has only nine organizations from the private sector. As the number of these sectors is more even in the CSSP for the sustainability of Gwangju, the results are not significant. Similar context happens in Sustainable Montreal, where the distribution of partners is more even according to the sector they represent <sup>30</sup>.

The vast majority of literature on partners' outcomes states that partners are driven, obtain and value outcomes based on the sector they belong to (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Austin, 2000;

---

<sup>30</sup> See Table 8 for the composition of the CSSP in terms of predominance of partners.

Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Doelle & Sinclair, 2006; Selsky & Parker, 2005). However, the contexts where these studies have been developed are unlike the three case studies presented in this research. In particular, they have not studied large CSSPs whose main goal is to implement sustainability community plans. The main question to be asked is why, in this context, are the results not as expected? The answer relies on the characteristics of the CSSPs. The only CSSP where the results were aligned with the literature was Barcelona + Sustainable, but the composition of that CSSP is particularly different from the other two CSSPs. The public sector only represents 7% of the partner organizations participating for the sustainability of Barcelona, of which the majority are educational institutions, such as universities and the board of libraries.

More important is that, with the exception of B+S and its relationship with financial capital, in all the CSSPs, it was not possible to find differences per sector on the value given to their achieved outcomes. This suggests that, depending on the type of organizations within each sector, the value given to achieved outcomes might be different.

In summary, it is possible to see that across the three CSSPs there were specific structural features that allowed the partner organizations to give more or less value to their achieved outcomes. In the case of SM, the way that this CSSP engage with its partners and the commitment that these carry on contributes to that high value that they give to community capital. In the other side, the partners of GCSD give less value to physical capital, due to that their structural features do not allow improving their processes and increasing their resources. Lastly, in B+S the composition of the partnership plays a key factor to understand why the public sector gives less value to financial capital.

## **Chapter 6 Conclusions**

This section is a summary of contributions that this thesis has made to theory, practice and recommendations. It also presents limitations and suggestions for future research within and outside the field.

### **6.1. Contribution to Theory**

This research has several contributions to theory. In particular, it contributes to the literature on partnerships' structures and partners' outcomes within the context of the implementation of sustainability community plans.

The aim of this research was to understand the relationship between the structural features of three large CSSPs: Barcelona + Sustainable; Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development; and Sustainable Montreal, and the value that their partner organizations give to their gained outcomes during the implementation of sustainability community plans. The empirical findings show that there are key structural features within the partnership that contribute to the value that partners give to their obtained outcomes. This relationship has not been the focus on the literature for CSSPs nor on the literature for partner's outcomes, therefore one of the contributions relies on exploring this relationship in large CSSPs.

This research offered seven structural features that were considered as key within the CSSPs; communication systems, monitoring and reporting, partners' engagement, renewal systems, coordination, decision-making processes and composition of the partnership. Some of these structural features have been offered before within the collaborative strategic management literature (Al-Tabbaa et al., 2014; Albers, 2005, 2010; Almog-bar & Schmid, 2018; Bryson et al., 2015; Clarke, 2011; Kamiya, 2011; Macdonald, 2016, See more in Table 1); however, they were not studied and developed in the context of large CSSPs.

Another contribution from the empirical results is that there were no differences found in the value given by partner organizations to outcomes that could be relevant for them regarding the economic sector they represent. The RBV and NRBV literature offers five type of outcomes; community, organizational, physical, financial and organizational capital (Barney, 1991, 1995; Penrose, 1959). The literature has stated that the type of outcomes that partners can obtain from joining a partnership are related to the sector to which they belong (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Austin, 2000; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Doelle & Sinclair, 2006; Gray & Stites, 2013; Kolk et al., 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005). However, despite the results found in Barcelona + Sustainable<sup>31</sup>, where the public sector values financial capital more, partner organizations do not give more value to outcomes that are linked to the sector to which they belong. The reason behind this is that the characteristic of the public sector in B+S relies on universities, and publicly funded institutions such as the board of library and public parks. Conversely, the public sector in SM and GCSD are more diverse in terms of the organizations within the public sector.

## 6.2. Contribution to Practice and Recommendations

The practical goal of this study is to help local governments that are in the process of implementing sustainability community plans through partnerships to better understand and adopt structural features that allow them to implement their plans in collaboration with their partner organizations. This research helps them to understand the relevance of how local governments are engaging with their partners, and how they link the sustainability community plans' goals with the goals of the partner organizations. Proper partners' engagement, such as the ones adopted by Sustainable

---

<sup>31</sup> These results are at 90% confidence interval.

Montreal, allow for a higher level of commitment from the partners, which leads to value more community capital outcomes from their partner organizations.

This research encourages local governments to acquire a thorough understanding of the benefits that partners can obtain from partnering in a CSSP. This is a high-level challenge in large CSSPs, but it is needed for the purpose of meeting the CSSP's goals while partners are meeting their own objectives. Strong monitoring and reporting systems focused in both partnership and partners' goals and actions, along with a highly institutionalized coordination system and diversity in the communication formats, are key structural features that could improve the relationship with the partners.

### 6.3. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The aim of this section is to acknowledge the limitations of the research study regarding the research design chosen. Also, it highlights the potential future research to be developed in this field.

This research focused on three case studies that shared similarities, such as having a plan time horizon of at least 20 years and the size of the community impacted from 1 to 2 million people, among others (see [Section 3.1](#), for more details), which were the criteria for the case selection. However, this research did not consider as a variable the fact that the cultural context of each CSSP is highly different; the structural features of each CSSP had noticeable similarities despite this difference. The cultural context of each city could be embedded in the structural features adopted by each local government, for example, in the communication systems they adopted. Therefore, future studies may consider this factor when studying structural features in CSSPs across geographic contexts. Future studies might also consider smaller or larger population sizes in local CSSPs. Moreover, this research focused on the differences in the structural features of the CSSPs

to the different value given by partners to their achieved outcomes. Future research could consider analyze through abductive analysis the similar structural features in each CSSP and the similar value given to the achieved partners' outcomes.

Another limitation regarding research design is that the literature has mentioned that renewal systems are important within the structural features of a CSSP (Macdonald, 2016; MacDonald et al., 2019). This research included renewal systems in the structural features framework; however, it was not possible to prove any relationship with the value that partner organizations give to their gained outcomes, since the data did not allow to compare with partners that partner in the first and second plan. To fill this gap, a longitudinal study could be developed to prove whether the renewal system of the partnership affects the outcomes of its partner organizations. Moreover, further studies should consider using statistical analysis, such as multilevel modelling, to statistically prove the relationship between the structural features of CSSPs and partner outcomes. This was not possible to achieve in this study due to the constraints in the research design; there were not sufficient cases to proceed with a research design allowing multilevel modelling. A 2-level multilevel model requires samples that vary randomly, such as normal distribution, and that the observations are randomly represented by a categorical variable, e.g. a sample of partners from a population of partners within a CSSP (Centre for Multilevel Modelling, 2020).

As mentioned in section 1.1, there is no consensus in the literature on CSSPs about what makes a partnership large. This research considered that a CSSP would be large when it had more than 100 partners across sectors. Despite that, questions related to what makes a large partnership? and/or in which context would a partnership be considered large? still require answers. Some reflections from this research are that the definition of large partnerships is not only related to the number of partners participating, but also to the context of the communities in which these partnerships are



being developed. This research focused on cities with a population of over 2 million people, which had the capacity to collaborate with a large number of partners. Future research should include different size of cities and communities that are solving sustainability problems through CSSPs. The configuration of the partnerships might be completely different from these three case studies. Another limitation is that this research did not focus on the content of communication systems, and the content of monitoring and reporting. The literature on partnerships' structures highlights how important is to have these structural features in place in cross-sector partnerships, which this research considered when studying the three CSSPs. However, this research did not consider the content of the communication and reports, neither what the CSSPs do with the information they monitor. Future research should consider including this, in order to have a better understanding of these structural features in terms of their effectiveness.

#### 6.4. Concluding Summary

To conclude, this study has explored and analyzed the relationship between the structural features and the value given by their partner organizations to their gained outcomes of three large CSSPs; Barcelona + Sustainable, Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development and Sustainable Montreal. This study is based on an existing work where data was previously collected through a survey to the partners of these three CSSPs, and through three video interviews with the coordinator/director of each CSSP to gather information regarding the structural features adopted. The empirical results showed which outcomes were most and least valued by the partners of each CSSP, and how the structural features adopted help to better understand why it is possible to find differences. The results also revealed that, by CSSP, there are no differences in the value given by the partner organizations regarding their sector. When a difference was found, the results suggest that the composition of the CSSP played a key role in the results.

This research contributes to the literature on CSSPs, in particular to the structural features that they can adopt and the outcomes that partners can obtain when they participate in partnerships. It also contributes to the literature on urban sustainability, especially on how local governments can adopt strategies when seeking to implement successful sustainability community plans. Finally, it contributes to SDG 11 and SDG 17, since this research is developed in the context of CSSPs that strive for the sustainability of their cities and communities.

### References

- Ajuntament de Barcelona. (n.d.). *Pla Clima. Emergència Climàtica. Compromís i Crida a l' Acció*.
- Ajuntament de Barcelona. (2012). *Citizen Commitment to Sustainability 2012-2022*.  
<http://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/ecologiaurbana/sites/default/files/Compromiso Ciudadano por la Sostenibilidad.pdf>
- Al-Tabbaa, O., Leach, D., & March, J. (2014). Collaboration Between Nonprofit and Business Sectors: A Framework to Guide Strategy Development for Nonprofit Organizations. *International Society for Third-Sector Research* , 25, 657–678.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-013-9357-6>
- Albareda, L., Lozano, J. M., & Ysa, T. (2007). Public Policies on Corporate Social Responsibility: The Role of Governments in Europe. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(4), 391–407.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9514-1>
- Albers, S. (2005). *The Design of Alliance Governance Systems*. Springer Gabler.
- Albers, S. (2010). Configurations of Alliance Governance Systems. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 62(3), 204–233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03396805>

- Alhaddi, H. (2015). Triple Bottom Line and Sustainability: A Literature Review. *Business and Management Studies*, 1(2), 6–10. <https://doi.org/10.11114/bms.v1i2.752>
- Almog-bar, M., & Schmid, H. (2018). Cross-Sector Partnerships in Human Services : Insights and Organizational Dilemmas. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47, 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764018771218>
- Alonso, J. M., & Andrews, R. (2019). Governance by Targets and The Performance of Cross-Sector Partnerships: Do Partner Diversity and Partnership Capabilities Matter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(4), 556–579. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2959>
- Amey, M. J. (2010). Leading Partnerships: Competencies for Collaboration. *New Directions for Community College*, 149, 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.391>
- Andrews, R., & Entwistle, T. (2010). Does Cross-Sectoral Partnership Deliver? An Empirical Exploration of Public Service Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Equity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(3), 679–701. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mup045>
- Arya, B., & Lin, Z. (2007). Understanding Collaboration Outcomes From an Extended Resource-Based View Perspective: The Roles of Organizational Characteristics, Partner Attributes, and Network Structures. *Journal of Management*, 33(5), 697–723. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307305561>
- Austin, J. (2000). Strategic Collaboration Between Nonprofits and Businesses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29, 69–97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764000291S004>
- Austin, J., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2012). Collaborative Value Creation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 929–968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012454685>

- Babiak, K. M. (2009). Criteria of Effectiveness in Multiple Cross-Sectoral Interorganizational Relationships. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 32(1), 1–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2008.09.004>
- Bäckstrand, K. (2006). Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Rethinking and Effectiveness. *European Environment*, 16(5), 290–306. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.425>
- Bäckstrand, K. (2008). Accountability of Networked Climate Governance: The Rise of Transnational Climate Partnerships. *Global Environmental Politics*, 8(3), 74–102.  
<https://doi.org/10.1162/glep.2008.8.3.74>
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Barney, J. (1995). Looking Inside for Competitive Advantage. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 9(4), 49–61.
- Barney, J., Ketchen Jr., D., & Wright, M. (2011). The Future of Resource-Based Theory. *Journal of Management*, 37(5), 1299–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310391805>
- Barrutia, J. M., Aguado, I., & Echebarria, C. (2007). Networking for Local Agenda 21 Implementation: Learning from Experiences with Udaltalde and Udalsarea in the Basque Autonomous Community. *Geoforum*, 38(1), 33–48.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2006.05.004>
- Berardo, R., Heikkila, T., & Gerlak, A. (2014). Interorganizational Engagement in Collaborative Environmental Management : Evidence from the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24, 697–719.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu003>

Bibri, M. (2008). *Corporate Sustainability/CSR Communications & Value Creation: A Marketing Approach. MBA Dissertation*. Blekinge, Sweden: School of Management. Blekinge Institute of Technology.

Boyne, G. (2002). Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1), 97–122. <https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2007.0239>

Branzei, O., & Le Ber, M. J. (2014). Theory-Method Interfaces in Cross-Sector Partnership Research. In M. M. Seitanidi & A. Crane (Eds.), *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business: A Research Handbook* (pp. 229–266). Routledge.

Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2002). Government-Nonprofit Partners for Health Sector Reform in Central Asia: Family Group Practice Associations in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. *Public Administration and Development*, 22, 51–61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.206>

Brown, L. D., Khagram, S., Moore, M. H., & Frumkin, P. (2000). *Globalization, NGOs and Multi-Sectoral Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.253110>

Brugmann, J. (2007). Is There A Method in Our Measurement? The Use of Indicators in Local Sustainable Development Planning. *Local Environment*, 2(1), 59–72.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839708725512>

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of Cross-sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(SUPPL. 1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.x>

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and Implementing Cross-Sector

- Collaborations: Needed and Challenging. *Public Administration Review*, 75, 647–663.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12432>.
- Cairns, B., & Harris, M. (2011). Local Cross-Sector Partnerships: Tackling the Challenges Collaboratively. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 21(3), 311–324.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nml>
- Cairns, S., Clarke, A., Zhou, Y., & Thivierge, V. (2015). *Sustainability Alignment Manual: Using Market-Based Instruments to Accelerate Progress at the Local Level*.
- Caldwell, N., Roehrich, J., & George, G. (2017). Social Value Creation and Relational Coordination in Public-Private Collaborations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(6), 906–928. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12268>
- Casey, M. (2008). Partnership - Success factors of interorganizational relationships. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 16(1), 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2934.2007.00771.x>
- Castiella, T., & Franquesa, T. (n.d.). *A Participatory Process for Change*.  
<http://www.sostenibilitatbcn.cat/index.php/angles/106-ag21-english/414-a21-agenda21-english-participatory-process>
- Centre for Multilevel Modelling. (2020). *Sample Sizes for Multilevel Models*. University of Bristol.  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/cmm/learning/multilevel-models/samples.html>
- Chenhall, R. H., Hall, M., & Smith, D. (2017). The Role of Performance Management Systems in Non-Government Organizations (NGOs). In E. Harries (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Performance Management and Control* (pp. 397–416). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315691374-22>

- Cho, J. Y., & Lee, E. (2014). Reducing Confusion about Grounded Theory and Qualitative Content Analysis: Similarities and Differences. *The Qualitative Report*, 19, 1–20.  
<https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol19/iss32/2>
- Clarke, A. (2010). *Implementing Regional Sustainable Development Strategies: Exploring Structures and Outcomes in Cross-Sector Collaborations (Doctoral Dissertation)*. Montreal; Canada. McGill University.
- Clarke, A. (2011). Key Structural Features for Collaborative Strategy Implementation: A Study of Sustainable Development/Local Agenda 21 Collaborations. *Management & Avenir*, 50(10), 153. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.050.0153>
- Clarke, A. (2012). *Green Municipal Fund Passing go : Moving Beyond the Plan*.  
[https://fcm.ca/Documents/tools/GMF/SS\\_PassingGo\\_EN.pdf](https://fcm.ca/Documents/tools/GMF/SS_PassingGo_EN.pdf)
- Clarke, A. (2014). Designing Social Partnerships for Local Sustainability Strategy Implementation. In M. M. Seitanidi & A. Crane (Eds.), *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business : A Research Handbook* (pp. 79–102). Routledge.
- Clarke, A., & Crane, A. (2018). Cross-Sector Partnerships for Systemic Change: Systematized Literature Review and Agenda for Further Research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150, 303–313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3922-2>
- Clarke, A., & Fuller, M. (2010). Collaborative Strategic Management: Strategy Formulation and Implementation by Multi-Organizational Cross-Sector Social Partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(SUPPL. 1), 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0781-5>
- Clarke, A., & MacDonald, A. (2019). Outcomes to Partners in Multi-Stakeholder Cross-Sector Partnerships: A Resource-Based View. *Business & Society*, 58(2), 298–332.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650316660534>

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). A Leadership Framework for Cross-Sector Collaboration. *Public Management Review*, 7(2), 177–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030500090519>

Das, T. K., & Teng, B.-S. (2000). A Resource-Based Theory of Strategic Alliances. *Journal of Management*, 26(1), 31–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600105>

Dempsey, N., Bramley, G., Power, S., & Brown, C. (2011). The Social Dimension of Sustainable Development: Defining Urban Social Sustainability. *Sustainable Development*, 19(5), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.417>

Deželan, T., & Maksuti, A. (2014). Towards Our Common Future: Comparative Assessment of the Sustainable Development Strategies of the European Union, The Mediterranean and Slovenia. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 43E, 103–121.

Dietrich, P., Eskerod, P., Dalcher, D., & Sandhawalia, B. (2010). The Dynamics of Collaboration in Multipartner Projects. *Project Management Journal*, 41(34), 59–78. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20194>

Doelle, M., & Sinclair, A. J. (2006). Time For a New Approach to Public Participation in EA: Promoting Cooperation and Consensus for Sustainability. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 26, 185–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2005.07.013>

Doz, Y., & Kosonen, M. (2008). *Fast Strategy : How Strategic Agility Will Help You Stay Ahead of The Game*. Pearson/Longman.



- Eberlein, B., & Matten, D. (2009). Business Responses to Climate Change Regulation in Canada and Germany: Lessons for MNCs from Emerging Economies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 86(S2), 241–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0194-x>
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals With Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*. New Society Publishers.
- Estache, A., & Rus, de G. (2000). *Privatization and Regulation of Transport Infrastructure: Guidelines for Policymakers and Regulators*.  
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/485431468153845329/pdf/multi-page.pdf>
- Eweje, G. (2007). Strategic Partnerships Between MNEs and Civil Society: The Post-WSSD Perspectives. *Sustainable Development*, 15(1), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.295>
- Favoreu, C., Carassus, D., & Maurel, C. (2016). Strategic Management in The Public Sector: A Rational, Political or Collaborative Approach? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82(3), 435–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852315578410>
- Font, N., Gomila, F., & Subirats, J. (2001). Spain. LA21: A Question of Institutional Leadership? In W. M. Lafferty (Ed.), *Sustainable Communities in Europe* (pp. 245–265). Sterling, USA. Taylor & Francis.
- Forrer, J., Kee, J. E., Newcomer, K. E., & Boyer, E. (2010). Public Organizations Public-Private Partnerships and the Public Accountability. *Public Administration Review*, 70(3), 475–484.
- Fratantuono, M. J., Sarcone, D. M., Colwell, J., & Barracks, C. (2014). *The U.S-India Relationship: Cross-sector Collaboration to Promote Sustainable Development*.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep12128>

- Frisby, W., Thibault, L., & Kikulis, L. (2004). The Organizational Dynamics of Under-Managed Partnerships in Leisure Service Departments. *Leisure Studies*, 23(2), 109–126.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0261436042000224482>
- Gazley, B. (2010). Local Government ? Collaborative Disadvantage. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(1), 51–76.
- Geer, S. (2015). *Ethics Clearance* (pp. 2–5). University of Waterloo.
- George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and Tackling Societal Grand Challenges through Management Research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 1880–1895. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.4007>
- Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T.-S. (1995). Shifting Paradigms for Sustainable Development: Implications for Management Theory and Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 874–907. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258959>
- Googins, B. K., & Rochlin, S. A. (2000). Creating the Partnership Society: Understanding the Rhetoric and Reality of Cross-Sectoral Partnerships. *Business and Society Review*, 105(1), 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0045-3609.00068>
- Gray, B. (1985). Conditions Facilitating Interorganizational Collaboration. *Human Relations*, 38(10), 911–936. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678503801001>
- Gray, B., & Purdy, J. (2018). *Collaborating For Our Future: Multistakeholder Partnerships for Solving Complex Problems*. Oxford University Press.
- Gray, B., & Stites, J. (2013). *Sustainability through Partnerships: Capitalizing on Collaboration*. Network for Business Sustainability.

- Gulati, R. (2010). *Reorganize for Resilience: Putting Customers at the Center of Your Business*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Gulati, R., Puranam, P., & Tushman, M. (2012). Meta-Organization Design: Rethinking Design in Interorganizational and Community Contexts. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33, 571–586. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.1975>
- Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development. (n.d.). *Local Agenda 21*. Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development.
- Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development. (2017). *Gwangju Council Introduction Brochure*.
- Hall, M., & O'Dwyer, B. (2017). Accounting, Non-Governmental Organizations and Civil Society: The Importance of Nonprofit Organizations to Understanding Accounting, Organizations and Society. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 63(December), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2017.11.001>
- Hart, S. L. (1995). A Natural-Resource-Based View of the Firm. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 986–1014. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258963>
- Hartman, L. P., & Dhanda, K. K. (2018). Cross-Sector Partnerships: An Examination of Success Factors. *Business and Society Review*, 123(1), 181–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12139>
- Haughton, G., & Hunter, C. (2003). *Sustainable Cities*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203645567>
- Henderson, R., & Newell, R. (2011). *Accelerating Energy Innovation: Insights from Multiple Sectors*.
- Henderson, S. S., & Smith-King, E. J. (2015). Sectoral Decision Making: Structures, Processes and

- Trust. *Management Decision*, 53(7), 1545–1559. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-04-2015-0128>
- Hens, L., & Nath, B. (2003). The Johannesburg Conference. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 5(1–2), 7–39. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025303511864>
- Hernández, A. (2003). *Carta de las Ciudades Europeas hacia la Sostenibilidad. La Carta de Aalborg*. [http://habitat.aq.upm.es/indloc/aindloc\\_17.html](http://habitat.aq.upm.es/indloc/aindloc_17.html)
- Hintikka, J. (1999). What is Abduction? The Fundamental Problem of Contemporary Epistemology. In *Inquiry as Inquiry: A Logic of Scientific Discovery* (pp. 91–113). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9313-7\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9313-7_4)
- Hodson, M., & Marvin, S. (2017). Intensifying or Transforming Sustainable Cities? Fragmented Logics of Urban Environmentalism. *The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability*, 22(1), 8–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2017.1306498>
- Hofer, C. W., & Schendel, D. (1978). *Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts*. West Publishing Co.
- Hopwood, B., Mellor, M., & O'Brien, G. (2005). Sustainable Development: Mapping Different Approaches. *Sustainable Development*, 13, 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.244>
- Hox, J. J., & Boeije, H. R. (2005). Data Collection, Primary vs. Secondary. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*, 1, 593–599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-12-369398-5/00041-4>
- Huxham, C. (1993). Pursuing Collaborative Advantage. *The Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 44(6), 599–611. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2584516>
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined-up World. *The Academy of*

*Management Journal*, 43(6), 1159–1175.

ICLEI. (1997). *Sustainable Development Through Local Action. ICLEI Biennial Report: 1996-1997.*

ICLEI. (2002). *Local Governments' Response to Agenda 21: Summary Report of Local Agenda 21 Survey with Regional Focus.* [www.iclei.org/johannesburg2002](http://www.iclei.org/johannesburg2002)

IISD. (2013). *The Rise and Role of NGOs in Sustainable Development. Working with NGOs.* <https://www.iisd.org/business/ngo/roles.aspx>

Johnson, S., Cardona, D., Gramling, B., Hamilton, C., Hoffmann, R., & Sabir, J. (2015). Engaging the For-Profit Sector in Community-Based Participatory Research: Lessons From the Ground. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 8(4), 523–530. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2014.0062>

Kamiya, M. (2011). *Partnership Design Guide : Creating Successful Cross-Sector Collaborations.* MelonAge Inc.

Kelly, R., & Moles, R. (2002). The Development of Local Agenda 21 in the Mid-west Region of Ireland: A Case Study in Interactive Research and Indicator Development. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 45(6), 889–912. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0964056022000024398>

Kolk, A. (2014). Partnerships as a Panacea for Addressing Global Problems? On Rationale, Context, Actors, Impact and Limitations. In M. M. Seitanidi & A. Crane (Eds.), *Social Partnerships and Responsible Business : A Research Handbook* (pp. 15–43). Routledge.

Kolk, A., Van Dolen, W., & Vock, M. (2010). Trickle Effects of Cross-Sector Social Partnerships.

*Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0783-3>

- Koppenjan, J., & Enserink, B. (2009). Public-Private Partnerships in Urban Infrastructures: Reconciling. *Public Administration Review*, 69(2), 284–296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2008.01974.x>
- Koschmann, M. A., Kuhn, T. R., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2012). A Communicative Framework of Value in Cross-Sector Partnerships. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3), 332–354. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0314>
- Kuenkel, P., & Aitken, A. (2015). Key Factors for the Successful Implementation of Stakeholder Partnerships: The Case of the African Cashew initiative. In V. Bitzer, R. Hamann, & M. Hall (Eds.), *The Business of Social and Environmental Innovation* (pp. 183–197). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04051-6\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04051-6_10)
- Lakin, N., & Scheubel, V. (2010). *Corporate Community Involvement*. Greenleaf Publishing Ltd.
- Lavie, D. (2006). The Competitive Advantage of Interconnected Firms: An Extension of The Resource-based View. In *Academy of Management Review* (Vol. 31, Issue 3, pp. 638–658). <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.21318922>
- Le Ber, M. J., & Branzei, O. (2010a). (Re)Forming Strategic Cross-Sector Partnerships. *Business & Society*, 49(1), 140–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650309345457>
- Le Ber, M. J., & Branzei, O. (2010b). Value Frame Fusion in Cross Sector Interactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(SUPPL. 1), 163–195. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0785-1>
- Le Pennec, M., & Raufflet, E. (2018). Value Creation in Inter-Organizational Collaboration : An Empirical Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(4), 817–834.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-3012-7>

Lempert, D., & Nguyen, H. N. (2008). A Sustainable Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organisations. *International Journal of Sustainable Society*, 1(1), 44.

<https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSSOC.2008.020376>

Leslie, L. L. (1972). Are High Response Rates Essential to Valid Surveys? *Social Science Research*, 1(3), 323–334. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X\(72\)90080-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X(72)90080-4)

Macdonald, A. (2016). *Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships for Community Sustainability Plan Implementation: Understanding Structures and Outcomes at the Partner and Partnership Levels (Doctoral Dissertation)*. Waterloo, Canada. University of Waterloo.

MacDonald, A., Clarke, A., Huang, L., Roseland, M., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2018). Multi-stakeholder Partnerships (SDG #17) as a Means of Achieving Sustainable Communities and Cities (SDG #11). In W. Leal Filho (Ed.), *Handbook of Sustainability Science and Research* (pp. 193–209). New York, USA: Springer Publishing Company. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63007-6\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63007-6_12)

MacDonald, A., Clarke, A., Huang, L., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2019). Partner Strategic Capabilities for Capturing Value from Sustainability-Focused Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(3), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030557>

Mantere, S., & Vaara, E. (2008). On the Problem of Participation in Strategy: A Critical Discursive Perspective. *Organization Science*, 19(2), 341–358. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.02996>

Michaux, V., Defélix, C., & Raulet-Croset, N. (2011). Boosting Territorial Multi-Stakeholder Cooperation, Coordination and Collaboration: Strategic and Managerial Issues. *Management & Avenir*, 10(50), 122–136. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3917/mav.050.0122>

- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations*. Prentice-Hall.
- Mohr, J., & Spekman, R. (1994). Characteristics of Partnership Success: Partnership Attributes, Communication Behavior, and Conflict Resolution Techniques. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(4), 462–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107554709401500406>
- Nations, U. (1992). *Agenda 21*. <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/agenda21.htm>.
- Newig, Jens, & Kvarda, E. (2012). Participation in Environmental Governance: Legitimate and Effective? In K. Hogl, E. Kvarda, R. Nordbeck, & M. Pregernig (Eds.), *Environmental Governance: The Challenge of Legitimacy and Effectiveness* (pp. 29–45). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Newig, Jenxs, Günther, D., & Pahl-wostl, C. (2010). Synapses in the Network: Learning in Governance Networks in the Context of Environmental Management. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4). <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/art24/>
- Ochoa, J. J., Tan, Y., Qian, Q. K., Shen, L., & Moreno, E. L. (2018). Learning from Best Practices in Sustainable Urbanization. *Habitat International*, 78, 83–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2018.05.013>
- Ordóñez-Ponce, E. (2018). *Understanding the Strategic Engagement of Partner Organizations in Large Cross-Sector Social Partnerships Implementing Community Sustainability Plans (Doctoral Dissertation)*. Waterloo, Canada: University of Waterloo.
- Osborn, R., & Hagedoorn, J. (1997). The Institutionalization and Evolutionary Dynamics of Interorganizational Alliances and Networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(2), 261–278. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256883>



Overseas Development Institute. (2003). *Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships Issue Paper: Pulling Together to Uplift and Empower the World [PDF]*.

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/2117.pdf>

Parhizgari, A. M., & Gilbert, R. G. (2004). Measures of Organizational Effectiveness: Private and Public Sector Performance. *Omega*, 32(3), 221–229.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OMEGA.2003.11.002>

Parmigiani, A., & Rivera-Santos, M. (2011). Clearing a Path Through the Forest: A Meta-Review of Interorganizational Relationships. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1108–1136.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311407507>

Penrose, E. T. (1959). *Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. John Wiley.

Pittz, T. G., & Adler, T. (2016). An Exemplar of Open Strategy : Decision-Making Within Multi-Sector Collaborations. *Management Decision*, 54(7), 1595–1614. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-04-2015-0153>

Provan, K., & Kenis, P. (2007). Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229–252.

Quick, K. S., & Feldman, M. S. (2011). Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 31(3), 272–290.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X11410979>

Ranson, S., Hinings, B., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The Structuring of Organizational Structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392223>

Reckien, D., Salvia, M., Heidrich, O., Church, J. M., Pietrapertosa, F., De Gregorio-Hurtado, S.,

- D'alonzo, V., Foley, A., Simoes, S. G., Ska Krko Ska Lorencov, E., Orru, H., Orru, K., Wejs, A., Flacke, J., Olazabal, M., Geneletti, D., En Feliu, E., Vasilie, S., Nador, C., ... Dawson, R. (2018). How Are Cities Planning to Respond to Climate Change? Assessment of Local Climate Plans From 885 Cities in the EU-28. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *191*, 207–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.220>
- Rein, M., & Stott, L. (2009). Working Together: Critical Perspectives on Six Cross-Sector Partnerships in Southern Africa. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*, 79–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9915-9>
- Robert, K. W., Parris, T. M., & Leiserowitz, A. A. (2005). Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development What is Sustainable Development? Goals, Indicators, Values, and Practice. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, *47:3*, 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00139157.2005.10524444>
- Rok, A., & Kuhn, S. (2012). *Local Sustainability 2012: Taking stock and moving forward. Global review, ICLEI Global Report. Analysis. Sustainability.*
- Santos, J. R. A. (1999). Cronbach's Alpha: A Tool for Assessing the Reliability of Scales. *The Journal of Extension* *372*, 37(2).
- Schreiner, M., Kale, P., & Corsten, D. (2009). What Really is Alliance Management Capability and How Does it Impact Alliance Outcomes and Success? *Strategic Management Journal*, *30*(13), 1395–1419. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.790>
- Selsky, J. W., & Parker, B. (2005). Cross-Sector Partnerships to Address Social Issues: Challenges to Theory and Practice. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 849–873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279601>

- Sevilla-Buitrago, A. (2013). Debating Contemporary Urban Conflicts: A Survey of Selected Scholars. *Cities*, 31, 454–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2012.08.006>
- Spraul, K., & Thaler, J. (2019). Partnering for Good? An Analysis of How to Achieve Sustainability-Related Outcomes in Public – Private Partnerships. *Business Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0097-3>
- Stadtler, L. (2016). Scrutinizing Public–Private Partnerships for Development: Towards a Broad Evaluation Conception. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2730-1>
- Suárez, D. F. (2011). Suarez, Collaboration and Professionalization.pdf. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(2), 307–326. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpart/muq049>
- Suchman, L., Hart, E., & Montagu, D. (2018). Public-Private Partnerships in Practice: Collaborating to Improve Health Finance Policy in Ghana and Kenya. *Health Policy and Planning*, 33(7), 770–785. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czy053>
- Tavory, I., & Stefan, T. (2014). *Abductive Analysis: Theorizing Qualitative Research*. University of Chicago Press.
- Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory Construction in Qualitative Research: From Grounded Theory to Abductive Analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 30(3), 167–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275112457914>
- Tomlinson, B., & AidWatch Canada. (2008). *Working with Civil Society in Foreign Aid: Possibilities for South-South Cooperation? [PDF]*. [https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/documents/partners/civil\\_society/publications/2013\\_UNDP-CH-Working-With-Civil-Society-in-Foreign-Aid\\_EN.pdf](https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/documents/partners/civil_society/publications/2013_UNDP-CH-Working-With-Civil-Society-in-Foreign-Aid_EN.pdf)

Triola, M. (2010). *Elementary Statistics* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.

UN DESA. (2018). *Leaving No One Behind*.

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/sustainable/leaving-no-one-behind.html>

UNDP. (2019). *Sustainable Development Goals | UNDP*.

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>

United Nations. (n.d.). *About the Sustainable Development Goals - United Nations Sustainable Development*. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

United Nations. (2015a). *Historic New Sustainable Development Agenda Unanimously Adopted by 193 UN Members*. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2015/09/historic-new-sustainable-development-agenda-unanimously-adopted-by-193-un-members/>

United Nations. (2015b). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030 Agenda for Sustainable Development web.pdf](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf)

Van Huijstee, M. M., Francken, M., & Leroy, P. (2007). Partnerships for Sustainable Development: A Review of Current Literature. *Environmental Sciences*, 4(2), 75–89.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15693430701526336>

Van Tulder, R., Seitanidi, M. M., Crane, A., & Brammer, S. (2016). Enhancing the Impact of Cross-Sector Partnerships Four Impact Loops for Channeling Partnership Studies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2756-4>

Ville de Montréal. (n.d.-a). *Background on The Approach*.

[http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?\\_pageid=7137,114541572&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PO](http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=7137,114541572&_dad=portal&_schema=PO)

RTAL

Ville de Montréal. (n.d.-b). *Commitment of Partner Organizations*. Retrieved January 26, 2020,

from

[https://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?\\_pageid=7137,78111659&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PO](https://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=7137,78111659&_dad=portal&_schema=PO)

RTAL

Ville de Montréal. (n.d.-c). *Montréal's Approach*.

[http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?\\_pageid=7137,78105600&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=POR](http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=7137,78105600&_dad=portal&_schema=POR)

TAL

Ville de Montréal. (2010). *Montréal Community Sustainable Development Plan 2010-2015*.

Ville de Montréal. (2016). *Sustainable Montréal 2016-2020. Together for a Sustainable*

*Metropolis*.

[http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/pls/portal/docs/page/d\\_durable\\_en/media/documents/plan\\_de\\_dd\\_e\\_n\\_lr.pdf](http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/pls/portal/docs/page/d_durable_en/media/documents/plan_de_dd_e_n_lr.pdf)

Waddock, S. (1989). Understanding Social Partnerships. *Administration & Society*, 21(1), 78–100.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/009539978902100105>

Waddock, S. (1991). A Typology of Social Partnership Organizations. *Administration & Society*,

22(4), 480–551.

Wassmer, U., Paquin, R., & Sharma, S. (2014). The Engagement of Firms in Environmental

Collaborations : Existing Contributions and Future Directions. *Business & Society*, 53(6),

754–786. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650312439865>

WCED. (1987). *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and*

*Development*. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf>

- Wei, Y., Chen, C.-H., & Chang, W. (2009). An Investigation Into Sustainable Product Conceptualization Using a Design Knowledge Hierarchy and Hopfield Network. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, *56*(4), 1617–1626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CIE.2008.10.015>
- Wittmayer, J. M., van Steenbergen, F., Rok, A., & Roorda, C. (2016). Governing Sustainability: A Dialogue Between Local Agenda 21 and Transition Management. *Local Environment*, *21*(8), 939–955. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2015.1050658>
- WSSD. (2002). *The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development*.
- Yan, X., Lin, H., & Clarke, A. (2018). Cross-Sector Social Partnerships for Social Change: The Roles of Non-Governmental Organizations. *Sustainability*, *10*(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10020558>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Yoon, D. K. H. (2016). *Status Report of Local Sustainable Development Practices in Korea 2011-2015 [PDF]*. <http://nbsapforum.net/sites/default/files/KICSD.2016.StatusReportofLocalSustainableDevelopmentPracticesinKorea2011-2015.pdf>
- Zheng, W., Yang, B., & McLean, G. N. (2010). Linking Organizational Culture, Structure, Strategy, and Organizational Effectiveness: Mediating Role of Knowledge Management. *Journal of Business Research*, *63*(7), 763–771. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2009.06.005>

Zurba, M., Diduck, A. P., & Sinclair, A. J. (2016). First Nations and Industry Collaboration for Forest Governance in Northwestern Ontario, Canada. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 69, 1–10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FORPOL.2016.04.003>

## **Appendices**

### Appendix I: Interviews – Questionnaire I – Odeeth Lara-Morales

- 1) What type of work does the B+S/GCSD/SM do?
- 2) Do you have a priority sustainable issues that you are working on?
- 3) Who are the partners in the Gwangju Council for Sustainable Development?
- 4) How is the partnership organized, in terms of its governance?
- 5) How do you monitor progress?
- 6) How do you communicate with your partners?
- 7) What responsibilities do partners have in your partnership?
- 8) How do you involve your partners over time?

### Interviews – Questionnaire II – Follow-up questions, based in Chapter 2 theoretical framework

#### **Communication systems**

- 1) Between these formats, through which one do you communicate with your partners, and how often?

#### **Monitoring and reporting**

- 2) We know that you monitor and report about the goals of the partnership and the accomplishment of the partners, how often do you do it? Is this report available to public?

#### **Partners' engagement**

- 3) How do you involve your partners over time?
- 4) What is the commitment of the partners when they join the partnership?

#### **Renewal System**



- 5) Do you have a renewal system? If so, how often and what do you adopt in the renewal?

**Coordination**

- 6) In terms of coordination, do you have a secretariat? If so, what is the number of FTE staff support, where is it hosted, and how is it funded?

**Decision-making**

- 7) How does the decision-making process work? Are all the partners involved in the decision making, or just representatives?

**Composition of the Partnership?**

- 8) How many years have the partnership been collaborating?
- 9) To date, how many partners do you have?

## Appendix II: Ethics Clearance



November 10, 2015

Office of Research Ethics  
Needles Hall, University of Waterloo

Re: Ethics Clearance: "Cross-sector partnerships for implementing sustainable community plans: comparison between a Canadian city and international communities to determine drivers for partners to remain in the partnerships".

To whom it may concern:

Please accept this letter as confirmation that after reviewing materials associated with this project, a decision has been reached by the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo that the project proposed by Eduardo Ordonez, PhD Student in Social and Ecological Sustainability and Dr. Amelia Clarke, "Cross-sector partnerships for implementing sustainable community plans: comparison between a Canadian city and international communities to determine drivers for partners to remain in the partnerships" *does not require ethics clearance*. This decision is in line with section 2.1 of the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 (TCPS-2) Chapter 2, article and application 2.1 which states in part:

In some cases, research may involve interaction with individuals who are not themselves the focus of the research in order to obtain information. For example, one may collect information from authorized personnel to release information or data in the ordinary course of their employment about organizations, policies, procedures, professional practices or statistical reports. Such individuals are not considered participants for the purposes of this Policy. This is distinct from situations where individuals are considered participants because they are themselves the focus of the research. For example, individuals who are asked for their personal opinions about organizations, or who are observed in their work setting for the purposes of research, are considered participants ([TCPS-2, Section 2.1](#)).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sacha Geer".

Sacha Geer, PhD

Manager, Office of Research Ethics

[sgaar@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:sgaar@uwaterloo.ca) 519-888-4567 ext. 37183



## Appendix III: Survey<sup>32</sup>

### **International Research on Cross-sector Partnerships for Implementing Sustainability Community Strategies - The Partners**

A research developed by the School of Environment, Enterprise and Development at the University of Waterloo (Canada), in collaboration with XXX Partnership.

#### **Invitation**

Dear partner:

In collaboration with XXX Partnership we are inviting your organisation to participate on an international survey. As part of the research entitled “Cross-sector Social Partnerships for the Implementation of Community Sustainability Strategies: A Study on the Relationships between Collaborative Structures and Outcomes” led by Dr. Amelia Clarke at the Faculty of Environment at the University of Waterloo in Canada, the city of XXX has been selected as one of the five sustainability partnerships to participate on a survey for assessing partners and their role for achieving sustainability goals. The main purpose of this research is to contribute to the design of better and more appropriate cross-sector partnerships for partners.

This survey will provide us with information with respect to your partner organisation, its implementation structural features, drivers and outcomes achieved as a partner of Bristol. According to the information provided by XXX Partnership, your organisation is a very important partner whose answers will be highly valuable not only for this research but also for the Partnership.

We would appreciate it if you complete the attached survey, which is expected to take between ten and fifteen minutes. The questions are focused on the organisation you represent and not on your views or opinions. You may omit any questions you prefer not to answer. There are no known or anticipated risks to participating in this study. All information you provide will be considered confidential, but the aggregate findings will be shared with participating cities and the larger sustainable cities movement. The data collected through this study will be kept for a period of ten years in a locked office at the University of Waterloo.

---

<sup>32</sup> See Ordonez-Ponce (2018) for the surveys in French, Korean, and Spanish.

If you are interested in participating in this study, consent to participate is implied by responding the survey. If after receiving this letter, you have any questions, or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please feel free to contact Professor Amelia Clarke ([amelia.clarke@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:amelia.clarke@uwaterloo.ca)) or Eduardo Ordóñez ([eordonez@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:eordonez@uwaterloo.ca)) or our project website (<https://uwaterloo.ca/implementing-sustainable-community-plans/>).

Thank you in advance for your interest in this project.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Amelia Clarke

Director of the Master of Environment and Business Program; Associate Professor

Eduardo Ordóñez (MEng)

PhD student in Social and Ecological Sustainability

Faculty of Environment

University of Waterloo

In collaboration with XXX Partnership

Funded by Social Sciences and Human Resources Council of Canada

## Part A: The partner organization

(Partner: organization which has joined the partnership as a member)

### Q1. Please type the name of your organization

---

#### Q1.1. Please select your position as the one responding the survey

- Board member/Councillor
- CEO/Executive Director
- Senior administrator
- Department manager
- Sustainability Manager
- Green Champion or Green Team Representative
- Program manager
- Analyst
- Junior staff
- External advisor
- Owner
- Business Partner

Other:	
--------	--

### Q2: Do you confirm the participation of the organization you represent on BGCP?

- Yes
- No

### Q3: Please select one or several of the following economic sectors that best represent your organization

([https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cis-sic.nsf/eng/h\\_00004.html](https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cis-sic.nsf/eng/h_00004.html))

- Accommodation and Food Services
- Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services
- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting
- Arts, Entertainment and Recreation
- Construction
- Educational Services: University
- Educational Services: College
- Educational Services: School
- Educational Services: Childcare
- Finance and Insurance

- Health Care and Social Assistance: Hospital
- Health Care and Social Assistance: Medical Centre
- Information and Cultural Industries
- Management of Companies and Enterprises
- Manufacturing excluding Food Manufacturing
- Food Manufacturing
- Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction
- Other Services (except Public Administration)
- Professional, Scientific and Technical Services
- Public Administration: Federal/National Government (As a whole)
- Public Administration: Federal/National Government (As a department)
- Public Administration: Provincial Government (As a whole)
- Public Administration: Provincial Government (As a department)
- Public Administration: Local Government (As a whole)
- Public Administration: Local Government (As a department)
- Real Estate and Rental and Leasing
- Retail Trade
- Transportation and Warehousing
- Utilities
- Wholesale Trade

**Q3.1 Select the one corresponding to the size of your organization**

- Very small (1-49 full time employees)
- Small (50-99 full time employees)
- Medium (100-499 full time employees)
- Large (500+ full time employees)

**Q3.2 If an Association, please select as many as necessary**

- Chamber of commerce
- Board of trade
- Union
- Neighbourhood Committee

<b>Other:</b>	
<b>Please type the number of members:</b>	

**Q3.3 Select an Educational Institution if that is the case**

- University
- College
- School
- Childcare

**Other:**

**Q3.4 If a Non-Governmental Organization / Non for Profit Organization, please select as many as necessary**

- Environmental
- Social
- Economic
- Political
- Cultural

**Other:**

**Q4: Was your organization involved in the development of the Partnership and/or its vision and objectives?**

- Yes
- No

**Q5: How long has your organization been a partner?**

- Less than 1 year
- Between 1 and 5 years
- Between 5 and 10 years
- More than 10 years

**Q5.1: Is your organization involvement mandatory or voluntary?**

- Mandatory
- Voluntary

**Q6: Are there any formal requirements for being a partner?**

- Yes, go to Q6.1
- No, go to Q7

**Q6.1 Please select as many formal requirements as necessary**

- Commit to specific goals
- Implement a program
- Participate on working sessions and / or events
- Communicate about the partnership vision and objectives
- Commit financial resources
- Commit staff
- Build partnerships

<b>Other:</b>	
---------------	--

**Q7: Does your organization have a main contact permanently representing your organization?**

- Yes, go to Q7.1
- No, go to Part B

**Q7.1: What is his/her position in your organization?**

- Board member/Councillor
- CEO/Executive Director
- Senior administrator
- Department manager
- Program manager
- Analyst
- Junior staff
- External advisor
- Owner
- Business Partner

<b>Other:</b>	
---------------	--



**Q7.1.1: Which department does he/she work in? (Select as many as necessary)**

- Sustainability
- Environment
- Corporate Social Responsibility
- Communications
- Marketing
- Public Relations
- External Affairs
- General Management
- Human Resources
- Community Relations
- Planning
- Operations/Facilities Management
- Energy
- Natural Resources

<b>Other:</b>	
---------------	--

**Part B: Drivers to be part of the sustainability partnership**

**Q8: Drivers for your organization to become a partner**

What value did your organization assign to the following drivers when joining the partnership?

**Q8.1: Community Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Contributing positively to all the sustainability goals of the vision					
Contributing positively to environmental challenges					
Contributing positively to social challenges					
Contributing positively to economic challenges					
Contributing positively to the sustainability of the community					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q8.2: Human Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Gaining knowledge / Learning					
Gaining expertise					
Sharing own experiences					
Improving competencies					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q8.3: Organizational Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Improving the sustainability of your organization					
Innovation capacity					
Building new relationships					
Improving reputation					
Gaining legitimacy					
Becoming more influential					
Having access to new markets					
Marketing opportunities					
Networking					
Collaborating with others					
Engaging with the community					
Improving relationship with authorities					
Improving relationship with NGOs					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q8.4: Financial Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Improving financial performance					
Reducing costs					
Funding opportunities					
Developing new products/services					
Making new businesses					
Attracting new investors					
Increasing financial resources					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q8.5: Physical Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Increasing resources					
Improving processes					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q9: Are the original drivers your organization became a partner exactly the same as why it remains a partner?**

- Yes, go to Part C
- No, go to Q9.1

**Q9.1: What value does your organization assign today to the following drivers for remaining in the partnership?**

**Q9.1.1: Community Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Contributing positively to all the sustainability goals of the vision					
Contributing positively to environmental challenges					
Contributing positively to social challenges					
Contributing positively to economic challenges					
Contributing positively to the sustainability of the community					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q9.1.2: Human Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Gaining knowledge / Learning					
Gaining expertise					
Sharing own experiences					
Improving competencies					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q9.1.3: Organizational Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Improving the sustainability of your organization					
Innovation capacity					
Building new relationships					
Improving reputation					
Gaining legitimacy					
Becoming more influential					
Having access to new markets					
Marketing opportunities					
Networking					
Collaborating with others					
Engaging with the community					
Improving relationship with authorities					
Improving relationship with NGOs					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q9.1.4: Financial Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Improving financial performance					
Reducing costs					
Funding opportunities					
Developing new products/services					
Making new businesses					
Attracting new investors					
Increasing financial resources					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q9.1.5: Physical Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Increasing resources					
Improving processes					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Part C: The organization implementation structure**

(Implementation structure: organizational structures in charge of sustainability within the organization)

**Q10: Before joining the Partnership, did your organization have a structure for implementing sustainability? (e.g. a department with staff and/or budget)**

Yes, go to Q10.1  
 No, go to Q10.2

**Q10.1: Did your organization change the structure due to joining the Partnership?**

Yes, go to Q10.1.1  
 No, go to Q10.2.1

**Q10.1.1: Please select Yes or No to the following structural changes on your organization:**

	Yes	No
A new department		
New position(s)		
A cross-functional team		
Partnerships with other organizations		
Assignment of more budget		
New revenue		
Acquiring debt		
Assignment of machines		
Assignment of an office		
Assignment of infrastructure		
Implementation of Policies		
Implementation of Plans		
Implementation of Reporting		
Implementation of Monitoring & Controlling practices		

Please include if there is Other

**Q10.2: Did your organization implement a structure due to joining the Partnership?**

Yes, go to Q10.2.1  
 No, go to Part D

**Q10.2.1: Please select Yes or No to the following structural changes on your organization:**

	Yes	No
A new department		
New position(s)		
A cross-functional team		
Partnerships with other organizations		
Assignment of more budget		
New revenue		
Acquiring debt		
Assignment of machines		
Assignment of an office		
Assignment of infrastructure		
Implementation of Policies		
Implementation of Plans		
Implementation of Reporting		
Implementation of Monitoring & Controlling practices		

Please include if there is Other



**Part D: Organization outcomes**

(Outcomes: different types of benefits achieved by the organization due to being a partner)

**Q11. As a result of remaining a partner of the partnership, your organization has achieved ...**

Please rate the achieved outcomes according to the value assigned by your organization

**Q11.1: Community Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Contributing positively to all the sustainability goals of the vision					
Contributing positively to environmental challenges					
Contributing positively to social challenges					
Contributing positively to economic challenges					
Contributing positively to the sustainability of the community					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q11.2: Human Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Gaining knowledge / Learning					
Gaining expertise					
Sharing own experiences					
Improving competencies					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q11.3: Organizational Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Improving the sustainability of your organization					
Innovation capacity					
Building new relationships					
Improving reputation					
Gaining legitimacy					
Becoming more influential					
Having access to new markets					
Marketing opportunities					
Networking					
Collaborating with others					
Engaging with the community					
Improving relationship with authorities					
Improving relationship with NGOs					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q11.4: Financial Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Improving financial performance					
Reducing costs					
Funding opportunities					
Developing new products/services					
Making new businesses					
Attracting new investors					
Increasing financial resources					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q11.5: Physical Capital**

	No value	Little value	Neutral	Some Value	Very valuable
Increasing resources					
Improving processes					

If Other, please include as well as its value for the organization

**Q12. Are there any negative outcomes due to being a partner?**

Yes, go to Q13.1

No, go to page 18

**Q12.1 Please name the main negative outcomes**

**Thank you**

Thank you for taking the time of participating in this survey. This information is not only valuable for our research but also for the Secretariat. Can we follow up if we have additional questions? If yes, please leave your contact details including name, organisation and email address in the comment box below.

Appendix IV: ANOVA Test-Capitals by Sectors – Barcelona + Sustainable

<b>Capital</b>	<b>Sector</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>
Community Capital	Civil Society	2.254	0.837	0.131
	Private Sector	2.168	0.940	0.155
	Public Sector	2.567	1.023	0.418
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.238	0.891	0.097
Human Capital	Civil Society	2.152	0.937	0.146
	Private Sector	2.162	0.960	0.158
	Public Sector	2.333	1.068	0.436
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.170	0.945	0.103
Organizational Capital	Civil Society	2.672	0.861	0.134
	Private Sector	2.370	0.746	0.123
	Public Sector	2.756	1.153	0.471
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.545	0.839	0.092
Financial Capital	Civil Society	3.610	1.100	0.172
	Private Sector	3.181	1.049	0.172
	Public Sector	4.071	1.041	0.425
	<i>P&lt;0,10*</i> Total	3.454	1.095	0.119
Physical Capital	Civil Society	3.207	1.188	0.186
	Private Sector	2.959	1.108	0.182
	Public Sector	3.083	0.970	0.396
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	3.089	1.133	0.124

\* Significant at 90%

Appendix V: ANOVA Test-Capitals by Sectors – Gwangju Council for Sustainable  
Development

<b>Capital</b>	<b>Sector</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>
Community Capital	Civil Society	2.272	0.605	0.121
	Private Sector	2.400	0.600	0.227
	Public Sector	2.457	0.562	0.213
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.328	0.587	0.094
Human Capital	Civil Society	2.280	0.671	0.134
	Private Sector	2.464	0.918	0.347
	Public Sector	2.179	0.641	0.242
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.295	0.700	0.112
Organizational Capital	Civil Society	2.314	0.651	0.130
	Private Sector	2.198	0.715	0.270
	Public Sector	2.473	0.771	0.291
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.322	0.670	0.107
Financial Capital	Civil Society	3.623	0.768	0.154
	Private Sector	3.388	0.493	0.186
	Public Sector	3.327	1.052	0.398
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	3.528	0.776	0.124
Physical Capital	Civil Society	3.720	0.914	0.183
	Private Sector	3.286	0.488	0.184
	Public Sector	3.571	0.838	0.317
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	3.615	0.839	0.134

Appendix VI: ANOVA Test-Capitals by Sectors – Sustainable Montreal

<b>Capital</b>	<b>Sector</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>
Community Capital	Civil Society	1.800	0.755	0.183
	Private Sector	2.146	0.722	0.218
	Public Sector	1.850	0.573	0.165
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	1.910	0.694	0.110
Human Capital	Civil Society	2.338	1.004	0.243
	Private Sector	2.296	1.094	0.330
	Public Sector	1.813	0.632	0.182
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.169	0.943	0.149
Organizational Capital	Civil Society	2.425	0.700	0.170
	Private Sector	2.580	0.954	0.288
	Public Sector	1.981	0.559	0.161
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	2.335	0.762	0.121
Financial Capital	Civil Society	3.219	1.122	0.272
	Private Sector	3.520	1.187	0.358
	Public Sector	2.978	0.945	0.273
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	3.229	1.083	0.171
Physical Capital	Civil Society	3.294	1.213	0.294
	Private Sector	3.409	1.261	0.380
	Public Sector	2.583	0.793	0.229
	<i>p&gt;0,05</i> Total	3.113	1.146	0.181