2-1-2016

Aligning strategic interests: Business perspective on partnership dynamics with nonprofit organizations in the context of corporate social responsibility in Egypt

Reem Mikhail

Follow this and additional works at: https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds

The American University in Cairo

School of Global Affairs and Public Policy

ALIGNING STRATEGIC INTERESTS: BUSINESS PERSPECTIVE ON PARTNERNSHIP DYNAMICS WITH NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN EGYPT

A Thesis Submitted to the

Public Policy and Administration Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Public Administration

By

REEM BASSEM FOUAD MIKHAIL

SID# 900072119

FALL 2016

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Shahjahan Bhuiyan

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this research to all those who question things. Whose intelelctual capacities drive them impractical sometimes as that train of thoughts run through their minds everyday. You are not alone, you are a thinker who thrives for learning and that makes you very special. Keep wondering about things, read in whichever field you like, use your capacities to benefit others, enrich your own knowledge and inspire those around you. And remember, there is no one size fits all answer. You will come up with your own answer and that's the beauty of questioning.

-The Author

Acknowledgment

The American University in Cairo

School of Global Affairs and Public Policy

Department of Public Policy and Administration

ALIGNING STRATEGIC INTERESTS: BUSINESS PERSPECTIVE ON

PARNTERNSHIP DYNAMICS WITH NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN THE

CONTEXT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN EGYPT

Reem Bassem Fouad Mikhail

Supervised by Dr. Shahjahan Bhuiyan

ABSTRACT

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) gained considerable hype both on practical and academic plateaus in recent decades. While, nonprofit organizations (NPOs) in specific have been active in their quest to offer alternative or complimentary services to the public, especially at times when governments fall short in delivering adequate social duties. CSR as a research arena remains untapped in a country like Egypt despite the potential of business and NPOs partnerships as one aspect. In spite of the common perception that CSR is philanthropic in nature in Egypt, this research aims to seal this gap through studying partnership mechanisms and dynamics of strategic alliances between business and NPOs in the context of CSR. Ideally, it sheds the light on strategic CSR undertakings while outlining the private sector's perspective on the needs to accomplish successful and sustainable partnerships with NPOs. Eventually, this research can be utilized as guidance for NPOs to partner with the private sector on recognizing societal needs in Egypt and bridge the void amongst the two sectors. The analysis investigates five case studies of large companies operating in Egypt and their strategic partnerships with NPOs using the Collaboration Continuum (CC) Framework of James E. Austin. While highlighting the role of NPOs, the research suggests adapting the elements of the framework in achieving more sustainable collaboration between business and NPOs in Egypt. The involvement of a third entity to disseminate information to both sectors is one recommendation offered in this study.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CSR   Corporate Social Responsibility

NPO   Nonprofit Organization

TBL   Triple Bottom Line

CRM   Cause Related Marketing

CAPMAS   Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics

MNEs   Multi National Enterprises

CVC   Collaboration Value Construct

CC   Collaboration Continuum

MENA   Middle East and North Africa

ISO   International Standards Organization

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Thematic Background

"You can manipulate consumers in into wanting, and therefore buying your products. It is a game" -Lucy Hughes, 2003. The Corporation Documentary

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) gained considerable hype both on practical and academic plateaus in recent decades. Globally, corporations are vastly growing in scale and power through their direct influence on employees, suppliers, distributors and most importantly consumers (Jamali and Keshishian, 2009). Their power and influence outweigh the governments' in certain circumstances through guiding the needs of citizens and in turn affecting their actions and behaviors. Corporations seize the tools to leverage consumer needs in the form of products and services through the substantial marketing behind them. As a result users tend to seek these products and services at whichever cost and gradually they enter a vicious pursuit of a specific lifestyle these corporations offer through their products. With such abundant influence, greater demands rise from the public regarding the way those prevailing corporations interact with society at large (Battacharya and Sen, 2004). Tracing the history of corporate development, in the 18th century individual firms were first charted by the state to perform public services on their behalf (Berle, 1947). Shortly, those firms gained access and monopoly to service delivery as private investors, which takes shape in modern corporation, as we witness it in our recent eras (Berle, 1947). Against this backdrop, other employees managed fiduciary relationships that developed as per shareholders' interest, namely managers who needed to prioritize their shareholders' welfares over the public (Friedman, 1970). Consequently and over the years, different groups called corporations upon their involvement beyond "business as usual".

In the documentary Corporation: the Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power that was presented in 2004, random citizens interviewed recognized companies as individual beings when asked about their insights of Disney for example (Achbar et al. 2004). Such perception disregards the physical reality of corporations and confirms the need to investigate corporate's responsibility towards society further. Concepts like Corporate Citizenship, Business Responsibility, Good Businesses, Conscious Capitalism, Social responsibility and Triple Bottom Line emerged by authors and practitioners as guidance for the responsibility of business (Hemingway and Maclagan, 2004; Hanson, 2011; Ruggless, 2012; Shwartz and Saiia, 2012). A collective definition of CSR is the ability of companies to observe its business operations against social, environmental and economic parameters in compliance within its fulfillment of "doing good" to society. Additionally, the development wave of CSR came across numerous forms from philanthropic to reactive to ethical to finally strategic and sustainable (Petkoski et al. 2009; Andriof, 2012). The common perception that CSR is a marginal activity was replaced by community enhancement as the core of strategic business thinking (WBCSD, SNV, 2008). Based on that, one academic opinion noted that corporation's ultimate solution in response for social demands is to craft partnerships with various stakeholders in order to realize mutual benefits for both their business and society, which is called strategic CSR (Porter and Kramer, 2006). Arguably, other authors like McElHaney denounce the approach firms adopt while implementing CSR in a dispersed manner while suggesting that they direct their efforts in fostering social and environmental causes where they can be part of the solution through their competencies (McElHaney, 2009).

Nonprofit organizations (NPOs) in specific have been active in their quest to offer alternative or complimentary services to the public, especially at times when governments fail to

deliver adequate social duties (Jamali and Keshishian, 2009). Such excavation is eminent in the case of developing countries where a manifold amount of social challenges are dominant. Moreover, NPOs became aware of the potential collaboration with business in the context of CSR to achieve common goals in the advantage of society. Nevertheless, the portrayal of CSR initiatives in academic and practice of Western countries is not being mirrored by counterpart movements in the context of countries in the Global South (Jamali & Mirshak, 2007). The limitation of literature is due to feeble drivers for CSR implementation, limited consumer awareness and social promotion, lack of community organized structure such as nonprofits in addition to the conventional economic restraints (Belal 2001; Fulop et al. 2000; Jamali et al. 2006). Whilst NPOs and businesses approached one another the former were driven by the need of funding and the latter with social credibility, their relationship took different shapes. First as philanthropic through charity donations, second as marketing campaigns through sponsorship and third through aspiring to move towards strategic partnerships where both ends meet. Nevertheless, aligning interests and establishing cross-sectorial partnerships is a demanding process especially when corporations are driven by profit maximization and social image enhancement and NPOs are concerned with lack of funding, technical resources and community development fulfillment. Such inter-organizational partnership is confrontational considering the independency amongst the two sectors in philosophies of operation and drivers. Many authors, academics and practitioners tackled this area of apprehension in order to investigate the mechanism of aligning the interests of both parties (Labib and Robert, 2014). As one author presents it, the relationship dynamics between the two sectors evolved over time by moving from the philanthropic phase to the transactional phase and finally to the integrative phase that is more strategic in nature (Austin, 2000a).

CSR as a research arena remains untapped in a country like Egypt despite the potential of business and NPOs partnerships as one aspect. Not only that, but CSR initiatives in Egypt are commonly claimed to focus on the charitable and philanthropic doings, in comparison with strategic efforts that are linked to the business core operations as outlined by several authors (Barsoum and Refaat, 2015; Porter and Kramer, 2006). This research aims to seal this gap through studying partnership mechanisms and dynamics of strategic alliances between business and NPOs in the context of CSR in Egypt. Ideally, it sheds the light on strategic CSR undertakings while outlining the private sector's perspective on the needs to accomplish successful and sustainable partnerships with NPOs. Eventually, this research can be utilized as guidance for NPOs to partner with the private sector on recognizing societal needs in Egypt and bridge the void amongst the two sectors. As a public administration masters dissertation with a focus on nonprofit management, the research presents a thorough analysis and recommendations to orient nonprofits towards managing sustainable partnerships with businesses. The literature review section presents a theoretical debate through various concepts on CSR and stages of partnerships between businesses and NPOs. The study methodology and conceptual framework used are outlined in the following chapter. While the field data is collected through five case studies of various corporates in Egypt and their partnerships with counterpart NPOs. In the analysis and discussion section, connections are drawn to the literature and recommendations are formulated. The study is sealed with concluding remarks and opportunity outlook for future research.

1.2 Statement of Problem

CSR practices in Egypt emerged in the 2000s and were introduced by the Multinational Enterprises (MNEs) due to their international obligations towards consumers and their societies

11

(Refaat, 2014). However, these practices only took a philanthropic and charitable turn given the vigorous tendency of religiosity in Egypt and caring for the less fortunate through Islamic ritual 'Zakah' and donations (Refaat, 2014). On the other hand, the practices of CSR evolved globally to better include the needs of the society since businesses were pressured to act more responsibly towards the society and respond to consumers' needs (Refaat, 2014). Such insights draw a need to explore CSR practices further in Egypt, especially strategic ones given the limited literature on the topic in developing countries contexts. Correspondingly, the rise of business and NPOs partnership flag the need to explore such research arena in the context of CSR while understanding the relationship dynamics amongst the two sectors. This study will focus on the private sector perspective, aspiring to measure the relationship dynamics against Austin's collaboration framework.

Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Emergence and Evolution of (CSR) Globally:

"The only social responsibility of firms is to increase its profits" - Milton Friedman (1970. P.1)

The emergence of CSR as a conception and its revolution to become a business strategy is a worthy contribution from the available Western literature. CSR was first coined in the west post world war II in the period between 1954 and 1960 (Caroll and Shabana, 2010). In their paper, Caroll and Shabana (2010) conducted a historical literature overview on the evolution of CSR as per the following: (1)profit maximization and trusteeship management in 1940s, (2)CSR as quality of life management in the 1950s, (3)CSR as a mean of responsiveness in the 1960s and 1970s, (4)CSR as a business ethic and link to performance in the 1980s, CSR as of a global corporate citizenship in the 1990s and 2000s, (5)and newly the incorporation of sustainability as a vital part of CSR. Aa a concept, CSR went through various stages in its formation and is still evolving to embrace the business motivations behind its entity. The developmental history of the CSR construct as per Carroll's conceptualization is commonly divided into three phases: (1)rise and extension (1950s), (2)further expansion (1960s−1970s), and (3)full-fledged proliferation (1980s−1990s) (Carroll 1999; Jamali, 2007). On the other hand, the literature contains a set of arguments for and against CSR as delineated in Caroll and Shabana's (2010) paper. To demonstrate, free market advocates like Milton Friedman (1970) argued that individuals have social responsibility unlike business and that any social responsibility from the business side is driver by the moral consciousness of employees. Business has only one social responsibility,

which is to provide employment, fight discrimination, avoid exploitation of environment, and it has the right to maximize its profits (Friedman, 1970). In his views, Friedman considered social responsibility as the role of elected governments and laws (Friedman: 6, 1970).

There is one and only one social responsibility of business - to use its resources and engage in activities to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition, without deception or fraud" (Friedman, 1970, P. 6).

In a similar argument, Reich appealed corporations to refrain from politics as a CSR strategy, given that their precise existence is an act of social responsibility by enriching the economies of societies and their engagement in politics would only add to their unnecessary power dynamic (Reich, 1998). Others argued that it is about time for businesses to take over its social responsibility and try to benefit society in strategic forms (Caroll and Shabana, 2010). The writers highlighted that there is a broad view of CSR, which shapes eventually the business case by linking the corporate strategy, and day-to-day operations while providing value to society versus a previous narrow view that emphasized the focus on profit maximization (Caroll and Shabana, 2010). They presented the business case of CSR as a mean to reduce (1)costs and risks, (2)to strengthen legitimacy and reputation, (3)to build competitive advantage and (4)to create a win-win situation for both shareholders and stakeholders (Caroll and Shabana, 2010). Other authors Suchman (1995) and Porter and Kramer (2006) asserted that CSR is a tool to gain, maintain or repair social legitimacy such as legitimacy in a pragmatic way; self-interest of the organization or moral and cognitive way; for the company to appear as proper and desirable to the society (Suchman, 1995). Similarly, Porter and Kramer (2006) discussed the alignment of the business case of CSR with the benefit of society through integrating a business strategy that creates a shared value where social benefits meet economic gains. They criticized the detachment

14

of the private sector, governments, civil society and community; noting that integration and alignment of interests is needed for the welfare of all stakeholders (Porter and Kramer, 2006). In an earlier study by the same authors in 2002, they specifically argued that the business case is manifested in developing countries through initiatives of environmental preservation that spare resources and benefit their financial bottom line (Porter and Kramer, 2002). In their article, Porter and Kramer debate the myth of strategic philanthropy as charitable activities with poor connection to company's business often to rationalize contributions to the public and reports. Most corporations are inclined to implement CSR activities that are not relevant to their core business and are primarily to make goodwill. (Porter and Kramer, 2002). According to the authors, Cause Related Marketing (CRM) as one formula of CSR can be cautiously reflected as a premature arrangement for strategic philanthropy given that companies associate their names and brands to social causes or prominent nonprofits (Porter and Kramer, 2002). Nonetheless, CRM is inadequate in terms of its strategic constituent assuming its publicity drive rather than patronage for a cause (Porter and Kramer, 2002).

By the same token, Kyte (2008) argued that the integration of CSR practices into the company's business strategy would capitalize on the financial bottom line and ensure sustainable development for the entire community. Her views are in alignment with Porter and Kramer, Kytle and Ruggie among others who emphasize that CSR is a social and environmental risk management mechanism. Kytle and Ruggie (2005) as part of the Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative of Harvard Kennedy School of Government also provide a framework for companies to adopt CSR measures as a potential tool for social risk mitigation that may jeopardize their license to operate within a given society. They argued that modern corporations are now aware of the notion of "social risk" that any behavior or action could create vulnerabilities to the

15

company's operations, which advocated for the companies to adopt strategic CSR to internalize such social risk (Kytle and Ruggie, 2005). An example of such notion is the prominent Rio Tinto Eagle Mine case that was documented by Plastrik (2012). The case study discoursed in details the doubts of the community towards the foreign company's operations and the sharp reaction by the company to sign a partnership agreement with community key actors to establish a sense of integration and harmony (Plastrik, 2012). Korhonen (2006) adds to the argument by proposing CSR measures from an ecosystem approach in which environmental, social and economic factors are interlinked.

"Consumers want a relationship, not just a transaction" –McElhaney, 2009

While scholars like Friedman state clearly that firms and business have only one responsibility, which is to make profit, many other scholars through history argued otherwise. The onsets of capitalism made companies think that their operations should mainly be concerned with making profits, reaching out to their customers and benefiting their shareholders only. However, corporations came to realize that their customers' satisfaction and observations expands beyond the product or services they receive. An illustration from the United States is that Nike in 1990 witnessed a huge boycott of customers after the New York Times and other newspapers broadcasted stories of abusive labor practices in one of their suppliers in Indonesia (Porter and Kramer, 2006). Such incident raised the Nike's awareness that it was not about making business; it was about how that business is made (Porter and Kramer, 2006). According to Frederick, CSR or the Social Responsibility of Firms and their practices first emerged in the United States during the period between 1950s and 1960s, where consumers proclaimed corporations to act more responsibly towards society and not in the mainstream charitable fashion, but to incorporate social responsibility in their day-to-day operation (Fredrick, 2006;

16

Refaat, 2014). It is worthy to mention that through the available published literature, there has not been a one author or scholar to whom the term CSR was contributed, the emergence of CSR remains however a collective contribution of many intellectual and practical experiences. Moreover, in 1970s firms needed to form policies and puts CSR as a top priority on their agendas, mainly due to many scandals, political and public pressures (Refaat, 2014). Darrag and Bassiouny (2011) argued that although there have been many available definitions of CSR in the published literature, the societal attribution of CSR and the expectations of stakeholders are the most prevailing ones. In their study on Islamic CSR, they use one case study of a company operating in the Middle East to relate Islamic CSR principles to the international debate (Darrag and Bassiouny, 2011). Moreover, they undertook an extensive review of CSR definitions as summarized in Table 1 below:

17

Author	Theoretical Perspective	Key Argument
Friedman (1970)	Agency Theory	CSR is indicative of self-servicing behavior on the part of managers, and thus, reduces shareholder wealth
Freeman (1984)	Stakeholder theory	Managers should tailor their policies to satisfy numerous constituents, not just shareholders. These stakeholders include workers, customers, suppliers, and community organizations
Donaldson (1990)	Stewardship theory	There is a moral imperative for managers to ''do the right thing'', without regard to how such decisions affect firm performance
Donaldson and Preston (1995)	Stakeholder Theory	Stressed the moral and ethical dimensions of stakeholder theory, as well as the business case for engaging in CSR
Jones (1995)	Stakeholder Theory	Firms involved in repeated transactions with stakeholders on the basis of trust and cooperation have an incentive to be honest and ethical, since such behavior is beneficial to the firm
Hart (1995)	Resource-based view of the firm	For certain companies, environmental social responsibility can constitute a resource or capability that leads to a sustained competitive advantage
Jennings and Zandbergen (1995)	Institutional theory	Institutions play an important role in shaping the consensus within a firm regarding the establishment of an ''ecologically sustainable'' organization
Baron (2001)	Theory of the firm	The use of CSR to attract socially responsible consumers is referred to as strategic CSR, in the sense that firms provide a public good in conjunction with their marketing/business strategy

Feddersen and Gilligan (2001)	Theory of the firm	Activists and NGOs can play an important role in reducing information asymmetry with respect to CSR on the part of consumers
McWilliams and Siegel (2001)	Theory of the firm	Presents a supply/demand perspective on CSR, which implies that the firm's ideal level of CSR can be determined by cost-benefit analysis
McWilliams et al. (2002)	Resource-based view of the firm	CSR strategies, when supported by political strategies, can be used to create sustainable competitive advantage
Waldman et al. (2006)	Theory of the firm/strategic leadership theory	Certain aspects of CEO leadership can affect the propensity of firms to engage in CSR. Companies run by intellectually stimulating CEOs do more strategic CSR than comparable firms

Table 1: CSR Definitions, Source: Darrag and Bassiouny, 2011 Page 364 (adopted from MCWilliams et. Al 2005:25, compiled by author)

As mentioned in Table 1, Agency theory is what Friedman suggested as corporate managers would only take part in any social responsibility out of personal interest and would be driving away from business objectives (Friedman, 1970; Darrag and Bassiouny, 2011). Freeman was concerned with the demand from manager to meet the expectations of stakeholders such as employees, suppliers, community actors that affect the business outcomes and portrayed it as stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984). Stewardship theory builds on agency theory in assuming managers in the role of "stewards", however it questions the moral aspect of managers contributing to social change through and on the expenses of the company's assets (Davids et al,

19

www.manaraa.com

1997; McWilliams et al, 2005). Barom (2001) discuss Theory of the Firm as strategic CSR attempts when an alignment between business strategy and consumers' needs is in place. Lastly, the Resource Based View (RBV) evaluates firms as a compilation of resources and capabilities that can be easily connected to profit maximization with an added social element (McWilliams et al, 2005).

An excerpt from Darrag and Bassiouny's paper summing up literature key elements with regards to CSR:

"Marrewijk (2008) classified CSR theories into three basic categories. First, the shareholder approach adopting Friedman's (1962) opinions in that a corporation's prime concern is profit maximization for the benefit of its stockholders. Second, the stakeholder approach adopting Freeman's (1984) approach in the multiple stakeholders any corporation should be accountable for because of the role each plays in affecting and effecting its operations and profits. Finally, the societal approach, which perceives corporations as responsible for the totality of society they are members within. Corporations' success depends upon the public consent they acquire from their societies granting them a ''license to operate'' to serve the overall needs of society and attain its satisfaction." (Darrag and Bassiouny, 2011, P. 365).

The "license to operate" is also discussed by other authors as social legitimacy and access of companies in any given community (Kytle and Ruggie, 2005; Suchman, 2005; Porter and Kramer, 2006; Plastrik, 2012).

Some of the interesting definitions of CSR as presented in the literature were:

European Commission's definition mentioned by Porter and Kramer in 2006 and Refaat in 2014: "the voluntary contribution of companies to a better society and a cleaner environment" (cited by Refaat, 2014, P. 5; Porter and Kramer, 2006). World Business Council for Sustainable Development: "the commitment of business to contribute to sustainable economic development, working with employees, their families, and the local communities" (Jamali and Mirshak, 2007, P. 244). In a working paper produced by Huge and Was (2011), CSR is defined as the

20

contribution of companies in sustainable development of our communities that does not jeopardize the chances of future generations to enjoy the same resources we had. Moreover, CSR as a concept is quite relevant to Corporate Citizenship, Business Responsibility, Good Businesses, Conscious Capitalism, Social responsibility and Triple Bottom Line (TBL). The latter is a concept, first coined by John Brett Elkington in 1997. In his book with an unique title "Cannibals with Forks", Elkington criticized businesses and their behavior towards society while suggesting that corporations should report on the way they operate against three pillars, namely people, planet and profit (Jeurissen, 2000). By the same token, Elkington suggested that companies should be responsible towards their employees, the environment and making profit in an ethical way (Jeruissen, 2000). Accordingly, throughout the literature different authors in various customs introduced doing business ethically and demonstrated that companies are as responsible towards the society as long as it serves their interests.

CSR played a major function in introducing the culture of social consideration to corporations and challenged the propeller of sole profit making. Friedman had a very distinctive view regarding corporations not engaging in CSR, advocating that social matters are mainly the role of governments (Friedman, 1970). In a globalized world that is moving rapidly towards continuously new technological social inventions such as Facebook, Twitter and Google, the connectivity we enjoy as individuals made it more difficult for corporations to conceal any unethical behavior, which strengthened the evolution of CSR practices and responding to consumers' needs (Waddock and Mcintosh, 2011). Investigating the topic further, corporations must react to the needs of the community given that their direct consumers are part of it which in turn, positions them as stakeholders. Same rationale applies for employees, suppliers and the environment and negligence can only lead to loss of business assets (Porter and Kramer, 2006).

21

In other words, corporations need healthy societies, clean environments that are rich in resources and satisfied consumers to keep their business growing in scale and power. Comparatively, Freeman's stakeholder theory emphasized the value and contribution of each stakeholder, although did not mention CSR per se (Freeman, 1984). In their views, Porter and Kramer claim that there are four prevailing reasons behind CSR practices that are evident in literature; (1)moral obligation, (2)sustainability, (3)license to operate and (4)reputation (Porter and Kramer, 2006). Meaning that companies should act morally while ensuring the sustainability of the environmental resources and redeeming their reputation and their social legitimate right to operate in a given society. They also present in their paper the evolution of CSR that led to shared value creation and competitive advantage concepts. The authors announced that shared value creation is a perception of solving social problems through achieving business results (Porter and Kramer, 2006). In that section, integration between nonprofits, governments and business is necessary in order to compliment one another in fulfilling the needs of business, people and society (Porter and Kramer, 2006). Although, philanthropic CSR has been the most apparent of CSR practices and initiatives across literature, it is considered to be a form of responsive CSR that reacts to the community fairly to keep the business operating and mitigate any harm, but not to really activate solutions for the benefit of the community as well (Porter and Kramer, 2006). That argument is valid under the thought that social problems of the society are not the responsibility of firms and that is what the authors suggest with regards to Strategic CSR, that is linked with the core business of the company and what it knows best (Porter and Kramer, 2006). The notion of CSR cannot solve the world problems, but including a societal dimension in any business strategy could be the answer (Porter and Kramer, 2006). An example of the above is the American Whole Foods Market Chains, which was widely cited among the literature as a

22

winner case. Whole Foods is a supermarket chain founded in the United States that offers customers an organic set of locally produced and collected variety of healthy food options (O'Toole and Vogel, 2011). Their main target group is consumers with a high sense of responsibility and awareness towards the environment and prefers nourishing diet options. Whole Foods practice CSR through buying food directly from local producers, which constitutes their strategic approach since it is related to their core business activities. Moreover, their CEO John Mackey is one of the leaders of the concept Conscious Capitalism that calls for incorporating high values in doing righteous business (O'Toole and Vogel, 2011). The assortment of CSR concepts and presentations laid in the previous paragraphs is only a reflection of social reality and complexity of the matter .By and large, CSR began in the 1950s in the West as a reaction from companies to many scandals and public pressures and moved from being a responsive practice to philanthropic and to strategic with double gains to business and the society. CSR practices are a common heated topic of discussion at this globalized era and many scholars are contributing to the evolution of the topic in utilizing its paramount benefits.

Important to note that although CSR practices are commonly mentioned in literature around the world, the definition remains however ambiguous. The contribution of authors as mentioned in the sections above steers the discussion to the direction of holding business accountable for their actions. Nonprofit social work have tremendously contributed to the advancement of societies, especially in developing countries on a small scale, however when looking at the future, businesses have the capacity to contribute to the advancement of societies given their technical expertise and potential for fund (Porter and Kramer, 2006).

2.2 Evolution of CSR in Egypt and Current Practices:

A contextual breakdown of is necessary to sketch in order to highlight the need for corporate social responsibility interventions. According to United Nations data[1], Egypt's main capital is Cairo and is known to be an influencing cultural and intellectual center in the region due to being the first Arab country to adapt to the West post Napoleon's invasion. Al Azhar Cairo's renowned mosque is leading the Arab region with regards to Islamic issues, as Egypt's main religion is Islam with knotted roots to culture. Egypt is moreover notorious for its ancient civilization and for playing a major role on shaping the Middle East Politics. During the 1950s and post the revolution, Gamal AbdelNasser led the nation towards nationalization, an Arab identity and economic self-reliance. During the time of his successor Anwar El Sadat, Egypt witnessed an economic openness policy, which provided a space for further alliances with Western countries. In the 70s, Egypt signed the peace treaty with Israel, but with the growing power of the Muslim Brotherhood and opposition, former president El Sadat was assassinated. Hosny Mubarak led the country into a peaceful stage with economic reforms and progress for over 30 years before the onset of the Arab Spring. A broad movement in the Arab region of overthrowing dictators and anticipation of democratic political changes inspired the 25th of January 2011 uprising. Many political and economic tensions and changes took place due to a series of turmoil events that ended with the overthrow of the Muslim Brotherhood in 2013. With the military intervention and current elected government led by former army chief Abelfattah Al Sisi, Egypt is slowly restoring economic stability through macroeconomic policies and increase tax revenue as examples. Nevertheless, its high bureaucratic levels have long characterized Egypt's public administration. The country holds currently a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of 282,242 million

---

[1] Source: UN Data http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=egypt accessed on 20.08.2016

24

U.S. dollars. Egypt's economy however, remains the second largest in the region after Saudi Arabia. In terms of geographical influence, Egypt's main economic activities are agricultural and tourism with cities centered along the banks of the Nile while desert land inhabits most of the country's remaining physical space.

Egypt also suffers from numerous social challenges in a variety of topics[2]. The country is rated 108 out of the list of 188 countries as per the Human Development Index of 2015, which classifies it as a developing country. Adding to that, political and economic instabilities continue to act as hurdles against Egypt's development and the government is falling short in its capabilities to intervene effectively. The increasing number of population against limited resources and economic activities results in a high segment of the population living under poverty line that accounts to 27.8% as per the United Nations data[3]. Excessive unemployment rates, low quality education, deficiency of public services, infrastructure and facilities, dull healthcare system and absence of gender equality remain patent and defiance in Egypt. Against the aforementioned features, private sector is observed as the lead change maker in the country's development (Shamseldin, 2015). Long before the recent mayhem, the government of Egypt developed awareness towards stipulating policies that create friendly environment for business operations. During the year 1991 economic reforms took place with high attentiveness to privatization of governmentally owned services while facilitating the regulatory climate of business operations on domestic and international levels (Shamseldin, 2015). Therefore, notions like CSR represent a primary prospect for the country's development, however with careful consideration of their level of impact given contextual influences.

---

[2] Source World Bank http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/egypt/overview accessed on 20.08.2016

[3] Source United Nations http://www.eg.undp.org/content/egypt/en/home/countryinfo.html accessed on 20.08.2016

In the Egyptian context, there is limited published scholarship with regards to CSR practices. According to a study on CSR dialogue in Egypt by Barsoum and Refaat (2015), CSR is perceived as a Western notion with prevailing history of philanthropic giving rooted in religious essences. The volume of societal impairments in Egypt placed amplified expectations on CSR to find solutions neglecting the social reality of its limited scope and impact in practice (Barsoum and Refaat, 2015). In the same vein, strategic CSR is always disguised by profit making purposes as the definitive goal for corporation, however in a developing country's context companies struggle to achieve strategic social objectives given the amount of pressure of social problems (Jamali and Keshishian, 2008; Dobers and Halme, 2009). As a developing country, Egypt suffers from various challenges such as high unemployment rate, economic burdens, and narrow socio-political space among others that foster the development sector to consider necessary interventions. Thus, it is crucial to explore the status of CSR in Egypt and similar developing countries in the process. Kayali (2014) in her paper, she explored CSR dynamics in Egypt highlighting its onset in the early 2000s adhering to MNEs standards, its lack of vision, its use as marketing and public relations tool and the necessity of cross-sectorial collaboration. More specifically, the Kayali (2014) emphasized the need for NGO/ business cooperation, outlining the motives of each party as NGOs seek funding and businesses demand legitimacy and reach out to the community.

According to Avina (2013), CSR arena in Egypt was further strengthened post the Arab Spring as a major sense of ownership was produced which accordingly affected the behavior of companies. Both Avina (2013) and Refaat (2014) argued that CSR practices in Egypt are mostly exclusive to cover philanthropic and charitable initiatives that mainly cater to propaganda for the private sector. Moreover, CSR published literature on Egypt is limited due to the fact that the

phenomena is relatively new, introduced in Egypt through the work of MNEs and is mainly practiced through company owners as part of the religious fabric of the society that calls on serving the less advantaged (Refaat, 2014). Darrag and Bassiouny (2011) and Dusuki (2008) presented a similar argument that Islamic CSR is prevalent in the Egyptian context based on the ethical willingness of company owners and family business traditions. Jamali and Mirshak (2006) discussed a similar notion while investigating CSR initiatives and partnerships in the context of Lebanon as a model for a developing country. The authors' findings confirm the prevalence of philanthropic and charitable CSR and absence of other economic and internal CSR measures such as responsible business practices towards the employees that are considered business strategies (Jamali and Mirshak, 2006). In their paper, Jamali and Mirshak (2006) also highlighted the valuable role the private sector can play in a developing country's context; confirming that CSR is a one way to achieve social benefits. They also proclaimed that the integration between the private sector, public institutions and the nonprofit sector; NGOs and civil society is one of the solutions to achieve effective CSR measures in Lebanon (Jamali and Mirshak, 2006). Such argument is comparable to the ideology of cross-sectorial integration by Porter and Kramer (2006).

The 25th of January 2011 uprising in Egypt was an out breaking event that changed many of the dynamics in the country. Many of the Egyptian youth occupied the streets for a period of eighteen days requesting "bread, freedom and social justice". Unemployment rates were high reaching 13% in 2014 according to a Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics CAPMAS report and youth were desperate for change. Although CSR initiatives existed in Egypt during the 2000s, according to Avina (2013) CSR was much strengthened after the Arab Spring with a major sense of belonging occupying countries after feeling the weight of an

empowered citizen, which was also reflected on the behavior of companies (Avina, 2013). Moreover, both Barsoum and Refaat (2015) in addition to Avina (2013) argue that CSR practices in Egypt were tremendously exclusive to cover philanthropic and charitable initiatives that served mainly for the purpose of propaganda for the companies and not for the true benefit of society. Studies on CSR in Egypt are highly limited mainly due to the novelty of the concept and were only introduced in Egypt through Multi Nationals Corporations MNEs and their spillover (Barsoum and Refaat, 2015). The argument prevalent in the literature however, is that CSR was practiced in Egypt by individuals and business owners because of the Islamic fabric of the society advocate for caring for the less advantaged (Refaat, 2014). Avina (2013) and Darrag and Bassiouny (2011) presented the same argument in different articles. Although regions like the Middle Eastern Egypt where societies are affected by religion in many aspects, a cautious criticism to their argument can be made since Islam is not the only religion represented in the region besides the fact that culture and religion are intertwined that the distinction between the two can be barely observed. Nevertheless, in the holly month of Ramadan, many initiatives carried out by large corporations showcase their efforts in supporting the less fortunate through donations or financial efforts that are foreseen to be short-termed and unsustainable. An example is Mobinil's campaign "Al Aydi Al Amela- The Working Hands" to employ 200,000 Egyptians and Vodafone's initiatives of "Al Elm Kuwa- Education is power" to reduce illiteracy rate in Egypt (Avina, 2013). Moreover, according to Refaat, CSR practices in Egypt lack futuristic vision are limited to the voluntarily, informal and charitable actions and lack of coordination between the various stakeholders like NPOs and governments are evident (Refaat, 2014).

2.3 Business-NPOs Partnership Dynamics

The increasing demands for business to create shared value calls upon inter-

28

organizational collaboration and cross-sectorial partnerships (Austin, 2000b; Porter and Kramer, 2006; Rivera-Santos and Ruffin, 2010). Inter-organizational collaboration in that sense encompasses corporations, governments and civil society and NPOs. The latter are defined for by the author of the study as "nongovernmental and/ or civil society organizations which work is driven by social causes and the wellbeing of communities in terms of advocacy and implementing projects while not seeking monetary gains in return of their services". As Austin (2000b) formulates it, NPOs realize they need to become as efficient as businesses while businesses comprehend the necessity to be socially responsible, which facilitates the overview of such collaboration. With regards to business and NPOs, the paucity of available information and technicality of collaboration is what hinders strategic cooperation among potential partners (Austin, 2000a). In that case, potential collaboration between business and NPOs is worthy to explore, especially in a developing country context like Egypt's. Nevertheless, the major obstruction remains the alignment of interests for both parties. Austin (2000a) confirms the scarcity of literature exploring motives and dynamics of a nonprofit and business collaboration. In his views, benefits for corporations to partner with nonprofits are categorized in four areas: (1)strategy enhancement, (2)culture construction, (3)human resource management and (4)business case (Austin, 2000a). Deconstructing Austin's ideas, one can resolve that all four elements are directly benefiting the performance of businesses and directly advancing their financial bottom line. NOPs in such partnerships also avail financial benefits, access to markets, technology, business expertise and associating their causes to prestigious company names (Austin, 1998; Kanter, 1999). Companies on the other hand, point out that they gain improved social image, high retention rate of current employees, enhanced ethical culture, elevated reach out to consumers and product development (Austin, 1998; Kanter, 1999). Businesses enhance

their brand and social presentation to the public through partnering with a nonprofit organization that is known for a good cause. Their community outreach and involvement attracts the best candidates in the market and ensures continuous high prompting level for employees. As well as establishing the values of a supportive and conscious culture due to collaboration on solving social problems through their businesses. Eventually, corporations build their business case by improving their reputation, resource deployment and access to consumers through these partnerships. Comparatively, Jamali and Keshishian (2009) argued that business take part in these partnerships to realize their CSR objectives while nonprofits aspire to meet societal promises; nonetheless they debated that in developing countries context the drive of businesses remain exclusive to the business case (Eid and Sabella, 2014). Nonprofits also suffer from a hostile and competitive environment where their financial sustainability is threatened (Melaville and Blank, 1993). Each partner as well has their assets, businesses have huge amount of resources like finances, flexibility, managerial efficiency while nonprofits are proximate to beneficiaries and their needs (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Jamali, 2003). Porter and Kramer (2006) and Caroll and Shabana (2010) presented similar claims concerning the business case of CSR and the motives of companies to cooperate with nonprofits as mentioned throughout literature review chapter. An excerpt from Jamali and Keshishian's (2009) study citing other authors on relationship dynamics between NPOs and businesses in the context of Lebanon along the same ideas:

"On the business side, the motivations traditionally revolve around increased legitimacy (Inkpen, 2002), positive reputation effects (Oliver, 1990), increased social status, and recognition (Stuart, 2000) as well opportunities for learning in the novice field of CSR (Arya and Salk, 2006). The NGO partner is motivated on the other hand by increased competition for limited funding, escalating societal needs, hostile environmental forces, and serious sustainability concerns (Melaville and Blank, 1993). It is also generally accepted that those actors wield different sets of competencies and strengths."

30

Other authors like Schmitz (2012) cultivate the perception of social and inter-organizational partnerships using comparable arguments. Schmitz (2012) emphasizes the need for NPOs and businesses to cooperate on the condition of raising accountability of he nonprofit sector. McElHaney (2009) characterize CSR as a communication tool to create a sense of ownership and relationship between brands and consumers. One of the author's recommendations to companies engaging in the CSR domain is to build partnerships with NGOs and other nonprofit organizations as they strengthen the credibility of any company while combating a social issue (McElhaney, 2009). Relatedly, Seitanidi and Crane (2007) agree that nonprofit and business collaborations are a central element in CSR implementation and the most predominant type of social partnerships. Through examining two case studies Earthwatch-Rio Tinto Partnership and Prince's Trust-Royal Bank of Scotland Partnership based in the UK, the authors found that partnerships between business and nonprofits face numerous managerial difficulties during implementation stage (Seintanidi and Crane, 2007). These complications are manifested in (1)reputational risks, (2)accountability, (3)allocation of resources and (4)organizational cultures (Seintanidi and Crane, 2007). Their research provided thorough analysis to partnership evolution and foundations affecting its success and sustainability over scrutinizing selection, design, institutionalization and implementation stages.

According to Waddock's (1988) definition of social partnerships, business and nonprofit alliance can be observed as:

"A commitment by a corporation or a group of corporations to work with an organization from a different economic sector (public or nonprofit). It involves a commitment of resources - time and effort - by individuals from all partner organizations. These individuals work co-operatively to solve problems that affect them all. The problem can be defined at least in part as a social issue; its solution will benefit all partners. Social partnership addresses issues that extend beyond

31

organizational boundaries and traditional goals and lie within the traditional realm of public policy - that is, in the social arena. It requires active rather than passive involvement from all parties. Participants must make a resource commitment that is more than merely monetary". (Waddock, 1988, P. 18)

2.4 Research Question

The main motivation behind this study is to explore the potential of businesses to be involved in developmental projects through Strategic CSR practices that will work as a win-win situation for both corporations and society while utilizing the experience of the nonprofit sector. The focus of this research paper will be the partnership dynamics between business and NPOs in the context of CSR in the particular context of Egypt. It was observed that literature on partnership dynamics between nonprofits and businesses in Egypt with a focus on CSR is rather limited. Against the backdrop of identified conceptual framework that exists in the literature, partnership dynamics in strategic alliance and CSR initiatives are to be explored from the private sector perspective. Many terms will be investigated in the process, such as shared value creation, stakeholder engagement, profitable business for development and their relativeness to the issue examined in the paper. Significance of this study lies in the implication of international literature that challenged the term strategic CSR, while its counterpart practices in Egypt remain primitive. The highlight is the contribution of private businesses to the advancement of society while creating a shared value concept between the private sector and the nonprofit sector for the sake of society. Therefore, the study is designed to focus only on the strategic CSR partnership

models aspiring to investigate those that fall into the integrative stage on James Austin's CC framework. Such orientation will work as guidance for NPOs to uncover successful partnership ingredients with business while assessing the level of maturity for a sample of alliances in the field of CSR. All in all, this research should be able to provide the nonprofit sector with recommendations to adopt in order to meet the expectations of the private sector within a developing country's environment in the context of CSR.

The list of detailed questions that shall be addressed in the research is as follow:

1. What is the role and added value of the nonprofit sector in realizing a mutual benefit in their partnership with the business sector in the context of CSR?

2. How does the relationship dynamics between nonprofit and private sector look like in Egypt while realizing such benefit of CSR from the business perspective?

3. How can an alignment of interests between the private and nonprofit sectors be achieved in such equilibrium?

Chapter 3: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Collaboration Framework by Austin

NPOs and businesses are different in nature from same-sectorial collaborations; "..the distinctions include different performance measures, competitive dynamics, organizational cultures, decision-making styles, personnel competencies, professional languages, incentive and motivational structures, and emotional content.." (Austin, 2000a, P. 93). Thus, the most widespread and integrated conceptual framework in the available literature was the work presented by James Austin (2000b). He proposes further diverse sets of linked frameworks investigating partnership evolution and conservation including The Collaboration Continuum (CC) as presented in Table 2, alliance market place and partnership drivers and enablers as presented in Table 3 (Austin, 2000b). While examining the CC, he propositions a spectrum where CSR partnerships grow into stages ranging from philanthropic, transactional and integrative (Austin, 2000b). He measures the partnership based on its positioning level on engagement, importance to mission, magnitude of recourses, scope of activities, interaction level, managerial complexity and strategic value (Austin, 2000a). The CC is anticipated to answer the

question "What kind of collaboration do we have and how might it evolve over time?" (Austin, 2000a, P. 71). The three stages require distinctive features; the philanthropic is associated with charitable giving, the transactional with resource exchange such as Cause Related Marketing (CRM) and the integrative with mission, resources and activities unification as the highest form of collaboration (Austin, 2000b).

Nature of Relationship	Stage I (Philanthropic)	Stage II (Transactional)	Stage III (Integrative)
Level of engagement	Low	→ → →	High
Importance to mission	Peripheral	→ → →	Central
Magnitude of resources	Small	→ → →	Big
Scope of activities	Narrow	→ → →	Broad
Interaction level	Infrequent	→ → →	Intense
Managerial complexity	Simple	→ → →	Complex
Strategic value	Minor	→ → →	Major

35

Table 2: Collaboration Continuum, Source: Austin, 2000a Page 72 (Compiled by author)

He also presents the Collaboration Value Construct (CVC) where four dimensions are portrayed value definition, creation, balance and renewal in answering the question of "What is the value proposition for the partnership?" (Austin, 2000a, P. 76). Most importantly, he bestows upon alliance drivers and enablers where strategy, mission and values are aligned in order to create a strategic collaboration amongst business and NPOs by answering the question "What powers the partnership?" (Austin, 2000a, P. 81). Alliance drivers are the primary forces behind the collaboration and are catalogued as alignment of strategy, mission and values, personal connections and relationships, value generation and shared visioning and continual learning (Austin, 2000b). While alliance enablers are complementary managerial elements that drive the partnership further and are categorized as focused attention, communication, organizational system, and mutual expectations and accountability (Austin, 2000b). Further explanation and demonstration of each element is complied by the author as guidance in table 4 with depiction of key characteristics. All in all and as a contribution the literature, Austin structures the partnership between nonprofit and business in strategic sense by converging on the following questions:

- Why should we collaborate?
- What type of collaboration should we undertake?
- With whom should we collaborate?
- When should we collaborate?
- How should we collaborate? (Austin, 2000b)

	Philanthropic	*Transactional*	*Integrative*
Alignment of strategy, mission, values	Minimal fit required, beyond a shared interest in a particular issue area Gratefulness and charity orientation	Overlap in mission and values Partnering mindset Relationship as tactical tool	High mission mesh Shared values Relationship as strategic tool
Personal connection and relationships	Minimal personal connection to cause or people	Strong personal connection at leadership level Expanded personal relationships throughout the organization Increased understanding and trust	Expanded opportunities for direct employee involvement in relationship Deep personal relationships and trust across organization *We* mentality replaces *us versus them*
Value generation and shared visioning	Generic resource transfer Typically unequal exchange of resources Minimal collaboration in defining activities Organizations respond to specific requests from nonprofits	Core competency transfer More direct exchange of resources Shared visioning at top of organization Projects of limited scope and risk	Joint value creation Value renewal Culture of each organization influenced by the other Projects identified and developed at all levels within the organization, with leadership support Broader scope of activities of strategic significance
Continual learning	Minimal or informal learning	More active learning about process and substance	Systematic learning and innovation Discovery ethic

Focused attention	Little top leadership attention	Top management engaged at start-up and periodically	Significant and ongoing attention from top management
Communication	Generally annually around grant process	More frequent communication between partners and externally	Explicit internal and external communication strategies and processes
Organizational systems	Corporate contact usually in community affairs or foundation; nonprofit contact usually in development	More people involved with responsibilities for specific collaboration activities	Partner relationship managers Organizational integration in execution, including shared resources
Mutual expectations and accountability	Use for stated purpose but minimal other performance expectations	Explicit performance expectations for targeted collaboration activities	High performance expectations and accountability for results Incentives for collaboration

Table 3: Collaboration Continuum: Drivers and Enablers, Source: Austin 2000a Page 91 (Compiled by author)

Alliance Element	Depiction
Strategy, mission and values alignment	Centrality, cohesion and reshaping
Personal connections and relationships	Emotional connection to social mission and counterpart
Value generation and shared visioning	Mobilization of resources, generate benefit and value for society
Continual learning	Process learning over time
Focused attention	Intense prioritization and attentiveness
Communication	Effective, efficient and frequent relationship
Organization systems	Clarity of responsibilities
Mutual expectations and accountability	Transparency of expectations and deliverables

Table 4: Elaboration on Alliance Drivers and Enablers, Source: Austin, 2000a (Adopted and compiled by author)

Similar studies conducted shed the light on CVC and CC while presenting various case studies with economic, social and environmental values, including a diversity of actors and time scales for the partnerships (Austin and Seitanidi, 2012). Another article by Seitanidi and Ryan (2007) presented a historical overview of partnerships between business and NPOs while using the CC and moving towards the integrative segment of these partnerships. They recapped their study by focusing on institutional trust amongst partners, relationship dynamics and process of interaction. While considering contextual factors of CSR in a developing country's context in the MENA region, Jamali and Keshishian (2009) drawn in their study lessons learned from business and NPO partnerships using Austin's CC as a framework. In a developing country like Lebanon for example, where their study is localized CSR suffered from modest nature, philanthropic orientation and lack of institutionalization and strategic alignment. They recommended in their

paper that partnership between the two sectors should be perceived as an opportunity where common goals are stated, expectations are negotiated and continuous mutual leaning and engagement is built (Jamali and Keshishian, 2009).

An interesting study that was conducted in Spain pursued by Arenas et al (2009) enhances the partnership discourse further by presenting social and psychological aspects (Arenas et al, 2009). They outline that CSR policy and implementation is relatively affected by misunderstanding and lack of trust among partners (Arenas et al, 2009). Through their interviews with key stakeholders in CSR within the context of Spain, their findings endorse the role nonprofits perform in CSR is dynamic however can be perceived adversely (Arenas et al, 2009). Companies reported that the lack of operational efficiency on nonprofits and information on their work, beneficiaries and missions is a hindering division for potential partnerships (Arenas et al, 2009). This fact leaves companies vulnerable to cooperate with nonprofits on the basis of personal acquaintance and general reputation as the authors argue. General issues of mistrust intensifying between nonprofits, companies and other stakeholders concerned in CSR agenda are apparent as per the conclusions of Arenas et al's study. The authors also deliberated the clash amongst different stakeholder in CSR arena regarding different philosophies and operational realities that are distinctive in nature, highlighting the necessity of further attempts of collaboration and understanding. Elucidating further, on one-hand nonprofits are known for their constant condemnation of corporations' material motives and pursue for profit on the expense of society's wellbeing, on the other hand they seek funding and sponsoring from private companies (Arenas et al, 2009). Such conflict in views and drives of nonprofits strengthen the mistrust companies' feel towards them. Also, nonprofits are regarded as "watchdogs" probing companies and their behavior while missing fundamental elements of job quality and environmental

protections themselves (Arenas et al, 2009). On the contrary of nonprofits self-interpretations of being mediators of social change, companies and other stakeholders distinguish them as enormously idealistic and disconnected from reality (Arenas et al, 2009). Meanwhile, over the history of nonprofits their main advocacy object was government in order to influence economic and social variables that contribute to social development, however their attention shifted recently to companies as chief actors in the same pursuit (Arenas et al, 2009). All findings of their study stipulate present obstacles in the discourse of cross-sectorial alliances specifically between nonprofits and businesses.

Austin's framework can be criticized as disregarding the influence of contextual factors in contributing to the elements of success for any nonprofit and business collaboration. Such contextual factors include country specific settings of socio-economic and political natures; private sector and foreign direct investment status, dominance and engagement of nonprofits and consumer awareness level. Same rationale applies to investigating relationships dynamics in developing country's context with the hindering economic factors mentioned in the pervious sections. Additionally, Austin's framework falls short in differentiating between the various typed of interactions between business and nonprofits. Negligence of social reality can be evident while assuming that practice and theory are similar in their natures (Seitanidi and Ryan, 2007). Still, his framework constitutes the most collective and thorough analysis of partnership dynamics that is available in the Western literature and can be further investigated in the context of Egypt. Nonetheless, Austin's (2000b) classification for different ingredients and stages of NPOs and business collaboration through his proposed framework conveyed a peculiar contribution to the published literature and aim for this study. His elaboration on level of engagement, interaction, communication and personal connections are directly connected to the

41

collectivist nature of culture in Egypt. His framework is also connected to what other authors suggested such as Porter and Kramer (2006) concerning shared value creation. Furthermore, the discrepancies among the operational authenticities of both sectors are tackled in the framework through components such as magnitude of resources, managerial complexity, organizational systems and mutual expectations and accountability (Austin, 2000a). Also, the evolvement of stages is relevant to the study given the variety of cases and nature of partnerships among the partners, which is suitable for the Egyptian paradigm and the scout for integrative partnerships. Austin (2000a) recognizes that his framework can be complemented through the attempt of applying the same elements to other alliances in empirical research, bearing in mind that they are not "standard operating procedures" and that there is room for deviance.

Chapter 4: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Data Collection

In order to collect data for the purpose of this study, the qualitative research approach was adopted given the descriptive and exploratory nature of the study. Moreover, qualitative research methods usually entail insights and information collected directly from the target group, which is what this study aimed to attain. Another aspect is the fact that qualitative research methods offer a medium where the research can unfold as it progresses; given that the anticipated link between the nonprofit and CSR practice of the private sector is yet to be explored in depth in the context

42

of Egypt. Case studies are deliberated on a sample of selected private sector companies that are operating in Egypt with active CSR departments and preferably in strategic partnerships with NPOs, more information on the companies are revealed in the sampling section below. According to Yin (2003), a case study is an ideal methodology when the research attempts to answer a "how" question. Thus case study information is composed through public company websites, sustainability reports and material investigated through the semi-structured interviews.

It is worthy to mention that private sector companies are used for the purpose of the study rather than the public sector companies, given the recent political and economic situation in Egypt post the January 25th uprising. Private sector companies have financial and technical assets that are more relevant to the study's objective and are more active in CSR practices. As an initial attempt to acquire information on the companies, the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) as a main player in the field of corporate responsibility and the promotion of ten principles of good business ethic (Williams, 2014). In specific, the Corporate Social Responsibility Center[4] (ECRC) was previously contacted given their expertise in the field as a pioneer and their rich database on active private sector companies in Egypt with strategic CSR departments. The scarcity of personnel and public information through the UNGC formed an institutional challenge for data collection. Therefore, as such data seem to be limited in Egypt, the snowballing approach was used instead. Therefore, the sampling frame is developed through contacting CSR experts in Egypt and relying on companies' reputation with regards to CSR.

Background information on the UNGC, as excerpted from Hammad and Kolhailah:

"In recent years, Egypt's concern for CSR was reflected in the establishment of the Egyptian

---

[4] Please refer to the following link for further information
http://www.eg.undp.org/content/egypt/en/home/operations/projects/poverty_reduction/project_sample/

Corporate Responsibility Center (ECRC). The ECRC is an initiative between the Ministry of Investment, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC). The main role of the ECRC is to spread the philosophy of social responsibility and support companies in formulating social and environmental responsible practices to develop their surrounding societies. Such role is performed through providing a variety of CSR services, for example awareness services, trainings, consultation services, knowledge management services and certification (Hammad and Kolhailah, 2012 P. 14)."

Referrals from CSR experts were used in order to map out the companies that implement CSR activities with more relevance to the research questions. Given the fact tat the research is tackling the issue from the private sector's perspective, NPOs will be only reviewed within the frame of the case studies and partnership dynamics. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews with five CSR managers as representatives from identified and selected companies are employed for the aim of the study. The rationale behind semi-structured interviews is to permit enough flexibility that would generate further data and information. Additional extracted data from the private sector's side will be an asset to the study, however it relies mainly on the availability and transparency of such data. With regards to the interviews, a semi-structured questionnaire was developed on the basis of two units. The fist comprised of general questions addressing the company CSR department, activities, motives, personnel and evolution. While the second adopted the identified partnership elements from the literature based on Austin's conceptual framework and inquiries were focusing on the partnership classified. Five CSR managers were contacted first by email, explaining the purpose of the research, the entity upholding it, researcher's background and reasoning behind selecting the company. Upon approval of participating in the study, a written consent form was communicated along with the list of proposed questions in the study. CSR managers were contacted over the phone and requested to prepare a partnership in mind out of their CSR activities history to be discussed further during the interview. All interviews conducted in the study were finalized and integrated in the study between the summer periods of 2016 in Cairo, Egypt. The data provided in this research were

anonymous following standard ethical considerations in qualitative research (Marshall and Rossman, 2011). The concealment used in the data collection is to allow companies to speak freely while discussing potentials and confronts of their nonprofit counterparts and to protect their identities and any hypothetical harm. Thus, companies are refereed to with letters as Company A, Company B with general description, status of CSR and partnership breakdown segregated in the analysis and findings chapter.

The sample used for the case studies was private sector companies with active strategic CSR alliances with NPOs extracted from the snowballing approach. As much as this might be perceived as a limitation to the study, it was again due to the fact that research in Egypt in fragmented and did not tackle freely strategic alliances or shed the light on partnership dynamics. Five case studies were characterized that are diversified in scope, scale, CSR activities and industries.

The sampling criteria were as follow:

- Private Sector companies with active CSR departments, which activities are related to their core business and are beneficial to the society; Strategic CSR
- CSR Activities that created any societal and developmental impact
- In achieving what they are aiming, the companies targeted nonprofit organizations (used their expertise and cooperated effectively in partnerships form)

Therefore the methodology of this study covered both case studies analysis and semi-structured in-depth interviews (content and narrative analysis). Sustainability reports and website content were adequately investigated to ensure more verifiable data. It is worthy to mention that the diversification of the sample-selected will was a crucial point to consider throughout the

study. In other words, in order to ensure a representative sample for the purpose of the study CSR activities, type of industry, level of operation and size of the companies were considered at the time of the selection. Sampling questions of the interviews can be found in the Table 5 below:

Sample questions for semi-structured interviews:

Interviewees	Sample Questions
Selected Private Sector Companies and their CSR departments	- What are the motives of your company to engage in CSR activities and its evolution? - Why did your company focus on CSR practices that are relevant to your core business and employed it as a strategy? - How do you think that your model of CSR is different from philanthropic or charitable acts? - Why would your company be interested in cooperating with nonprofit organizations in realizing your CSR objectives? - How would you prescribe the nature of

	your partnership with the selected nonprofit you are operating with? (Referral will be given in a simplified manner of Austin's CC framework) • What are the challenges encountered in dealing with the nonprofit sector in this regard? • What are the elements that you see are necessary for the success of such partnership with a nonprofit organization?

Table 5: Sample interview questions, Source: author (for more information, please check annex 2

Chapter 5: CASE STUDIES

5.1 Company A

"When we identify a project that is connected to both our company's operations and the community, the why in what we are offering is clear"- CSR Manager 1

Description:

Company A is in the beverages sector in Egypt and is member of international beverages global company based in the Netherlands. It started its operation in Egypt in 1897 in Alexandria and later on in 1946 the company took part in a technical agreement with a Dutch brewer company. Afterwards, in 1963 the company went national and changed its name. During the economic privatization period of Egypt, an Egyptian entrepreneur bought the company until 2002 when it was rejoined as a member to the international group once again. Ever since, the company has been developing and remodeling according to international standards with an Egyptian taste. In the meantime, a miscellaneous team of both national and international experts manages the company. It is continuing to grow towards people, brands and policies while maintaining a high and worthwhile reputation as a member of the global network. At the moment, the company owns five production plants for its diversified commodities in various parts of Egypt. All plants are functioning on the use of local materials and are operating according to international standards such as the certification of ISO with regards to safety, health and environment. Company A focused on accommodating the needs of four pillars while achieving their results; shareholders, costumers, employees and stakeholders.

The Status of CSR:

Company A's slogan is "Brewing for A Better World", which is aligned to the global strategy of their international network. Correspondingly, their corporate responsibility in Egypt is attentive to tourism, education, health and community development.

CSR activities were strong post 2002 after being acquired by the international group but were on a charitable manner such as Ramadan donations and activities were not formalized. Post 25 January Egyptian uprising, CSR department was dwelled in the global structure and the need for

it arose in Egypt. Not just a CSR department but rather in the form of a corporate affairs and communications department dealing with other stakeholders within the country. Strategy for the department was formalized and priorities for the company were outlined within the context of its operations in Egypt. Supporting tourism is one of the major projects of Company A's CSR as it creates a win-win situation for both the company and the country, given the magnitude of the tourism sector to the company's products and the economy. Tourism sector declined heavily post the Egyptian uprising due to political security matters, which affected the sales of the industry. In addition, qualified personnel employed at prestigious and prominent hotels left the industry after the Egyptian revolution and they started their own business, explored other markets, or remained unemployed due to the complications witnessed in the sector. The project was implemented in partnership with dissimilar stakeholders; governmental entities, nonprofit organizations and schools under the title "Building the Pyramid for Sustainable Tourism in Egypt". Company A is known for its responsible business such as their sustainability efforts and reporting on the implementation level in areas like water consumption, energy reservation and protecting the environment. CSR and working with the community is considered one pillar of the corporate relations and affairs department with the objective of leaving a positive impact on surrounding communities. Developing local materials and supporting local supplies and retailers is one example of their accomplishments while working with the community. Each member company needs to adjust their community work based on the representative country's local context; such as Ramadan fasting campaigns and Eid donations. The conception of "growing with the community" as a global strategy for Company A's network is set by guidelines that each member company implements differently. Cash contributions are not part of Company A's community work but rather connecting cause and value to the project they are undertaking, especially in light

49

of recent economic downturn. The project aims at enhancing and reviving the tourism sector in Egypt through training hotel staff in highly condensed touristic areas along the Red Sea. The human focus of the training is waiters as the first and most significant staff tourists interact with during their stay in Egypt. The training includes different skills development concerned with greeting, serving and dealing with guests while ensuing a pleasant stay. The project was established based on research that showed reasons tourists abstain from returning to Egypt among which is service maltreatment. According to the corporate affairs department of Company A, the project seals the gap in the tourism sector and ensures satisfactory presentation of the company's merchandises.

Partnership Analysis:

The partnership between Company A and their nonprofit counterpart inaugurated earlier before the tourism project since 2009, in the form of awareness campaigns on topics of concern to the company and Egypt, namely hepatitis C and education. In 2013 particular funds were targeted towards sponsoring a number of students in the German Hotels School in El Gouna to become high class certified waiters. The school is based on the German vocational system and equips students with multiple skills and knowledge on the tourism and services sectors in Egypt. A part of the developed curriculum as well is to teach students German language skills and provide them with the opportunity to be employed in one of the hotels post their studies. The school facilitates on the job training to students in prestigious hotels to combine a theory and practice method of teaching. Appropriately, Company A was interested in strengthening its brands relationship with consumers based on this project. The main partnership is with the nonprofit foundation whom the fund is allocated to and where implementation of the project

50

takes part. The initial idea of the project was to support each lot of students for the full duration of their studies that accounts to three years. Nevertheless, Company A changed the mindset of the partnership as an interest arose in a quicker intervention based on their predictions of an upcoming augmentation in the tourism sector in Egypt in 2014. The security situation in Egypt was stabilizing at the time post the military intervention and Egypt was back on the global news as per the corporate affairs investigation in Company A. Furthermore, another key aspect of the project was the reliance of the tourism sector in Egypt on alcoholic beverages as an attraction for foreigners. The need to serve the sector immediately directed the company to seek quicker win-win solutions that improves the sector and creates jobs. Thus, the company considered training the available calibers in the service sector knowing that business owners lack the financial capacities to train their employees due to limited training budget. By and large Company A invested through its partnership with the nonprofit organization in training around 300 waiters in more than 50 hotels until August 2016. The geographical focus remained the Red Sea line that includes key touristic destination such as Hughara, El Gouna and Sharm El Sheikh. Originally the training was designed for three weeks and due to lack of commitment from the waiters' side, it was reduced to intensive one week. Topics of the training encompassed skills development in handling angry guests, approaching guests, quality service and pleasant attitude. The venue of the training is situated to accommodate the needs of the trainees in relation to where they are currently employed.

The partnership nature between Company A and their nonprofit counterpart is based on exchanging funds and technical expertise. The nonprofit organization has an extensive network of both beneficiaries and other NGOs and civil society organizations in Egypt. One of their main elements of technical expertise is project management on the ground as per the testimony of

51

Company A's corporate affairs manager. The nonprofit's role is to finalize the contractual agreements and maintains the management of the on-going activities and their follow up while providing reports to Company A. The nonprofit organization as well is responsibly for selecting a third party implementer such as the German Hotels School in Gouna in the context of this specific partnership. The main challenge of Company A in implementing the partnership was rather other external stakeholder involved in contrast to their views on their nonprofit counterpart. Overall, the nonprofit organization was highly endorsed by Company A in the framework of their partnership for their sense of responsibility, high correspondence and result management orientation.

The following elements represent the company's view on evaluating its partnership with its nonprofit counter part:

• Level of engagement: high level of engagement, high responsiveness, reachable, providing support beyond expected, vital for the partnership
• Importance to mission: strategic alignment of missions
• Magnitude of resources: big human resources and expertise deployment, large network of relevant stakeholders
• Scope of activities: intermediate and clear
• Interaction level: high interaction level
• Managerial complexity: intermediate complexities at the onset of the partnership
• Strategic value: major strategic value
• Alignment to strategy, mission and values: high alignment, overlap of values and commitment
• Personal connection and relationships: strong connections at high management level and implementing counterparts, robust friendship ties
• Value generating and shared value: high with significant benefits to society
• Continual learning: high flexibility, openness to trial and error approach, willingness to improvise, receptivity to change of methodology
• Focused attention: high attentiveness to the project
• Communication: constant communication, follow up and updates
• Organizational systems: clear communicated responsibilities
• Mutual expectations and accountability: high clarity of expected results

5.2 Company B

"We want to transform our knowledge and expertise to the community by working through and with partners"- CSR Manager 2

Description:

Company B is a multinational professional services network based in London, UK with more than 157 offices around the globe and more than 208,000 employees. Their services are

mainly auditing services provided to organizations and individuals through delivering consulting, tax, legal, assurance, and entrepreneurial and advisory services. In the same fashion, Company B is recognized worldwide as a highly attractive employer, especially for young educated calibers. Their Cairo office branch is one of their foundations in their growing network in the Middle East Region. Their operations originated in the region 40 years ago with more than offices in 12 countries, examples are: Lebanon, Libya, Kuwait, Qatar and Oman among others. Their services are provided to a wide spectrum of sectors and industries across the region and convey the expertise of international specialists with adaptation to various cultures and contexts. Their vision is to be the business advisory firm of choice by building on years of success and fulfillment. Company B focuses on building trust and value to their stakeholders while offering solutions to challenging business difficulties through their extensive set of services.

The Status of CSR:

Global corporate responsibility for Company B is centered on behaving responsibly on issues related to their core competencies and society. Their strategy employs their skills, expertise, networks and knowledge to generate value and impact towards society. Given the fact that their core business is offering services to other corporates, they harness such leverage to influence other stakeholders to act responsibly towards the community. Their corporate responsibility agenda converges on two pillars: "being a catalyst for change" and "doing the right thing". Such agenda is implemented across the company's wide professional network by taking a part in: responsible businesses, diversity and inclusion, community engagement and environmental stewardship.

In Egypt's office, Company B has a corporate responsibility department and a corporate foundation previously called "Takatof" –"Shoulder to Shoulder", which is recently called after Company B's commercial name. Their efforts in involvement with the community commenced 11 years ago post a business celebration and individual employees philanthropy attempt. In order to achieve impact through philanthropy, those individuals searched community needs in Egypt and recognized cancer patients' necessity for blood. Additionally, disadvantaged population in Egypt requires buying blood packs, which are not always available or accessible. Their initial efforts were directing capitals to buy blood packs for those in need. The idea developed further into what they called "triple effect project" that was centered on organizing masses for blood donation campaigns. It aimed at providing unprivileged groups within Egypt with free, safe and accessible means to find blood packs. The Corporate Responsibility (CR) department was born as an outcome of these personal efforts of employees in Company B. Furthermore, these personal efforts directed Company B to establish a foundation that does not only serve their goals but any other company with interest in serving the community to achieve even superior impact. Main resources positioned with the first days of the foundation were out of employees' own salaries and Company B was contributing to counter amounts. With the development of the foundation, Company B appointed staff and set a budget to further advance their social responsibility. In 2010 with the arrival of specialized staff, the vision of Company B's corporate responsibility was formulated to serve communities in need within Egypt through a developmental eco-system. The department's leading motivation is working on entrepreneurship and environmental aspects as considered innovative and essential aspects for Egypt's development. Some of their outlined activities include startup provision services, education, environmental and sustainability awareness. Company B has a track record of joining hands with a diversity of partners from the

55

profit and nonprofit sector in achieving their goals. With regards to collaborations with nonprofits, Company B believes in their outreach abilities to different target groups and development know-how. "Sharek" –"Take Part" is one example of partnering with nonprofits and other businesses on building an online platform that links needs of civil society organizations with interested skillful employees under corporate volunteering.

Partnership Analysis:

Company B is in partnership with a nonprofit organization that works on advocacy for enhancing laws pertaining to establishing and maintaining orphanages and cooperating with governmental organizations. The partnership revolves on educating orphans on environmental and sustainability issues in a simplified manner through arts and other activities. Children are expected to make slight changes in their lifestyles by adopting modest habits that preserve energy, environment and manage their waste. Each orphanage towards the end of the project competes with other orphanages by presenting project ideas that feed in the objectives of sustainability and environment. The Nonprofit counterpart has the reach out role and knowledge of communicating the curriculums of the program to the children. Teachers that are accountable for delivering these curriculums are recruited and managed by the nonprofit. In addition, the selection of which orphanages to implement the program in falls under the duties of the nonprofit while handling logistics on the ground. All other stakeholders involved in the program are dealing directly with the nonprofit. Coupled with, Company B being a services oriented business presented pro bono organizational restructuring assistances to its nonprofit counterpart. It supported in better formulating their vision, mission, processes and managerial arrangements. Company B showed interest in their nonprofit counterparts, however given the fact that their

staff are of development background they were highly flexible and displaying tolerance towards negative aspects of nonprofit organization.

The following elements represent the company's view on evaluating its partnership with its nonprofit counter part:

• Level of engagement: high level of engagement
• Importance to mission: different missions, however not affecting the partnership
• Magnitude of resources: high human resources, volunteers and expertise deployment, always present
• Scope of activities: intermediate
• Interaction level: high interaction level
• Managerial complexity: mild
• Strategic value: high strategic value
• Alignment to strategy, mission and values: high alignment, similar values that were agreed upon at the onset of partnership
• Personal connection and relationships: strong connections at implementing staff level
• Value generating and shared value: high with significant benefits to children
• Continual learning: ongoing learning process
• Focused attention: high attentiveness to the project
• Communication: easiness in communication and empowering
• Organizational systems: clear communicated responsibilities
• Mutual expectations and accountability: high clarity of expected results

5.3 Company C

"We focus on long-term, lasting and sustainable impact through our projects"- CSR Manager 3

Description:

Company C is in the production sector of health, fabric, hygiene and home care supplies as it started through the work of two individuals during the 18th century as partners in selling

57

soap and candles. Their slogan is "touching lives, improving life" given the vigorous connection between their products and comfort at home. They specify particular attention to reputation, purposes, values, core strengths, leadership development and diversity and inclusion. They operate as a network of subsidiary companies through different brands pertaining to households, mothers and baby care. In terms of their functions in Egypt, it draws back to year 1986 and for more than 20 years up to date. With the onset of Egypt's industrial development and privatized economy, Company C was introduced as a limited liability company. Due to the excellence performance of their Egypt branch, it is considered a chief exporter and a major leading example in their Middle East network. Company C in Egypt has more than 700 direct employees and around 8,000 indirect employees through their supply chain. Some of their brands in Egypt are concerned with beauty, home care, health products and family wellbeing. No to mention, Company C's operations are centralized on individuals, employees, consumers, distributers and communities.

The Status of CSR:

At a global glance, Company C established a long-term vision towards sustainability of their work by focusing on water, waste and climate. More specifically, their vision includes powering their plants with 100% renewable energy, 100% recycled material and have 0 manufacturing and consumer waste by conserving resources. Another pillar is their social responsibility program that aim at improving the lives of individuals in their communities of operations. Their strategy is to connect these social programs to their current brands by promoting health awareness and education, endorsing healthy habits at home and attributing health instructions to their products. Besides, Company C is committed to social policies and practices that determine any partners they deal with through set of behavioral expectations

regarding animal testing and human rights. Last but not least, they have a charitable arm through brand donations to different organizations and communities. Investigating their ongoing commitment to Egypt, Company C is providing its CSR through external relations department driven by their principles and values of operations. Relationships related to governmental bodies and other stakeholders are handled through the department. Owing to Egypt's developmental challenges, education and health are considered priority areas for Company C. It tailors social programs that are connected to their brands in the framework of their connected subsidiaries. They aim to achieve high impact for the society by refraining from philanthropic acts and directing their efforts to a win-win scenario by linking their activities to their core business. According to their statements, Company C recognizes its impact as a shared value endeavor in line with their brands equity. Not only that, but Company C ensures the necessary publicity in order to earn the consumers' buy in. For example, one brand concerned with baby care is in partnership with a renowned international development organization to offer vaccinations against fatal illness in return for every sold pack. Another brand related to shower and health products is in partnership with several organizations in quest of recycling used products in a well-known unprivileged community in Cairo. Such project is both educating young Egyptians in the area through the recycling school and safeguarding the company's used products from illegal sellers and reentering the market as counterfeit products. Adding to these examples, Company C contemplates social responsibility a strategy to raise awareness and change concepts of social perceptions that create significant change in the community, which is relatively context specific.

Partnership Analysis:

Company C prides itself on its continuous pursuit of partnerships with governmental, for profit and nonprofit sectors in realizing its social responsibility objectives. In the context of one detergent brand, an on-going partnership with a socially driver nonprofit is evident. The partnership builds on the cultural fabric in Egypt and implication of celebrating feasts as social familial constructs. Every household in Egypt is keen on saving money to buy new clothes for their children in celebration of these religious events. Nevertheless, some unprivileged families are unable to provide new clothing for their children due to economic limitations. Thus a shared value conception is generated between Company C through donations of previously owned clothes and the use of Company C's detergent as a financier. Previously owned clothes are collected and renovated by the nonprofit through the funds and use of Company C's brand product. The added value of the nonprofit is the tremendous expertise on development and outreach to different governorates. Correspondingly, more families in need were able to possess clothes for 'Eid' as it grew further during the lifetime of the partnership. The nonprofit has to follow Key Performance Indicators (KPI) system presented by Company C to report and follow up on implemented activities. Company C's role is to support the cause, deploy resources and provide project overview. As explained by the company, the nonprofit was identified on the basis of its expertise and previous experience in similar social causes. By the same token, the nonprofit has no affiliation with religious entities or political parties, which guaranteed neutrality for the beneficiaries. However, Company C outlined many difficulties encountered during the implementation of the partnership. Namely, limited capabilities of the nonprofit, poor organizational system and lack of efficiency in setting targets due to the differences between business and nonprofit operational natures.

The following elements represent the company's view on evaluating its partnership with its

nonprofit counter part:

• Level of engagement: moderate level of engagement
• Importance to mission: slight
• Magnitude of resources: moderate deployment of resources
• Scope of activities: intermediate
• Interaction level: moderate
• Managerial complexity: high
• Strategic value: modest
• Alignment to strategy, mission and values: slight alignment
• Personal connection and relationships: moderate personal connections
• Value generating and shared value: high with significant shared value
• Continual learning: potential lessons learned
• Focused attention: moderate attentiveness to the project
• Communication: distress
• Organizational systems: clear responsibilities but challenges in implementation
• Mutual expectations and accountability: high clarity of expected results but difficulties in implementing

5.4 Company D

"As a communications company, we use our technologies to direct potential social contributions

and support our communities and promote social good"- CSR Manager 4

Description:

61

Company D is an international company group in the field of telecommunications and IT based in the UK that inaugurated in the 80s. The company has a strong presence around Europe, Middle East, Asia Pacific and Africa through subsidiary companies, joint ventures and other investments. Their work is considered valuable with regards to public policy given the contribution of digital infrastructure in addressing policy issues of healthcare, education and empowering vulnerable groups in any society. Moreover, their mission focuses on delivering communication services that are responsible and ethical while protecting costumers' private information. Company D entered the communications market in Egypt in the late 1990s through a consortium of partnership with the Ministry of Telecommunications and a notorious local telecommunications company. Their existence in Egypt developed further over the years to be one of the leading telecommunications and mobile operator companies. According to statistics available in 2011, they have around 40,000 customers and around 7,000 employees in Egypt. Company D also claims to have the most attractive and successful corporate social responsibility initiatives in partnership with various actors.

The Status of CSR:

With their first operations in Egypt following a global approach, corporate responsibility is considered an integral part in their strategy and business operations. Their mission in Egypt is 'Connecting and empowering people and communities, accelerating the development of Egypt'. Same as other branches of Company D, their community involvement is split into diverse

departments with a social arm through a corporate foundation. Important to note that Company D's foundation was established in Egypt during 2003 as a corporate donor nonprofit foundation supporting NGOs and other civil society organizations in contributing greatly to the development of Egypt. All in all, they demonstrate ethical and responsible behavior; promote greener environment and eco-efficiency, focus on education, wellbeing of children and employability of youth and provide sustainable and accessible products and services for differently abled. Their long-term vision is to shift from corporate responsibility to sustainable business and embrace all their social activities. Comparatively, sustainability for Company D falls under the ideology of stakeholder engagement and orientation by social investment in their services as an integral part of their business. In recent years, Company D in Egypt conducted a comparative analysis to identify their competitive advantage vis-à-vis other companies involved in social responsibility. An identification of a sustainable strategy that meets the triple bottom line of people, planet and profit derived as an outcome of their analysis. Equally important, Company D follows a shared value creation notion in their social work through fulfilling remunerations to the business and surrounding community. Disability inclusion and education are given supplementary emphasis with regards to Egypt's economic development Company D's activities. As an illustration, a mobile application called "Share El Kheir- Share the Virtuous" is launched to facilitate communication for differently abled in many aspects of life and disseminate information on accessible public spaces. The mobile application validates the shift in their activities given previous charitable acts such as Ramadan campaigns, medical caravans, corporate blood donations and assistance to orphans. Through their foundation as a social arm, Ramadan giving was channeled to more sustainable performance through the establishment of a mobile application. Any user can access the application to identify unprivileged areas in Egypt and their

63

needs ranging from food, clothes and other services and whether this area received previous donations and better direct their aids. Knowledge is power project is as well an educational project with aspects of training of teachers, better curriculums for students, literacy classes and renovating schools and their neighboring communities.

Partnership Analysis:

Company D utilizes its corporate foundation in forming partnerships with other nonprofit organizations through their wide set of social activities to ensure shared value creation. Entaleq-Go Ahead: with the motto 'Breaking Barriers' is an interactive mobile application and website with a nonprofit organization to promote accessibility to facilities in Egypt and disseminate necessary information. Not only that, but through the application accessibility and assessment reports are produced for further exploration and advocacy of increasing accessibility to public spaces. The nonprofit in this partnership is known for its policy and implementing role in promoting the inclusion of persons with disabilities in life aspects. They raise awareness on inclusion through employability, access to public spaces and support for private lives of persons with disabilities in order to facilitate their inclusion. Company D mainly offered the fund and technological suggestions in this partnership while the nonprofit brought the implementation knowledge and field information. The partnership aligns the interests of both partners given the communication services Company D provides and inclusion activities the nonprofit is seeking, which are achieved through accessibility information mobile solutions. The partnership falls under "connecting for good" element, which is one of Company D's principles in achieving social value. By all means, the mobile application does not only serve wheelchair users, but also visually impaired, deaf and mute among other differently abled. Consequently, the nonprofit follows a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system presented by the company in order to follow

64

up on agreed results. The main challenge in the partnership and with regards to nonprofit engagement is the misconception of corporates financing projects only, since Company D perceives itself more on the technical expertise and technology solution side.

The following elements represent the company's view on evaluating its partnership with its nonprofit counter part:

• Level of engagement: high level of engagement in all aspects of the project
• Importance to mission: high overlap of missions
• Magnitude of resources: high deployment of resources both financial, technological and employees involved
• Scope of activities: high
• Interaction level: high
• Managerial complexity: high
• Strategic value: high for both partners
• Alignment to strategy, mission and values: high alignment
• Personal connection and relationships: high personal connections and relationship to the social cause, nonprofit recommended by other stakeholders
• Value generating and shared value: high with significant shared value
• Continual learning: continuous learning throughout implementation
• Focused attention: high attentiveness to the project
• Communication: formal effective communication channels
• Organizational systems: clear responsibilities on the implementation level
• Mutual expectations and accountability: high clarity of expected results

5.5 Company E

"The objective is not public relations, but rather sealing a gap in the Egyptian community needs and we work through other partners"- CSR Manager 5

Description:

Company E is part of a global family business group that was founded in the 50s in the cotton trading industry. They generally operate in different fields such as automotive, real estate, consumer goods, education, IT solutions, oil and gas among others. However the local Egyptian company holding for financial investments is the one considered for the study. Company E is in the consumer goods business with a huge portfolio with over 130,000 outlets around Egypt that includes the manufacturing, marketing and distribution of tobacco. Moreover, they also manufacture dairy products and water brands besides their own label consumer brands. Another commercial component for Company E is food retail business through chains of supermarkets that serve different ends of the economic pyramid. Company E is committed to meet stakeholders' needs by adhering to a set of responsible business ethics. They are a leading example of raising awareness on business responsibility through their major position in the United Nations Global Compact Group (UNGC) as a financier and an official corporate representative in Egypt. UNGC requests and advocates for internal compliance in business conduct through a set of 10 principles; respecting human rights, labor right, environmental preservation and fighting corruption. They are also committed to achieve Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) through their business behavior. Sustainability of their operations is an integral part of their business strategy and is reported on bi-annually. Accordingly, Company E is committed to achieving developmental goals and economic reform for Egypt and the Middle East through their work.

The Status of CSR:

On the overall business group level, philanthropy, corporate responsibility and citizenship are key objectives of their work. They target the wellbeing of employees and their families,

stakeholders and tailor social programs that benefit the society at large. As a family business they initiated a CSR department officially in 2000, building on a long history of corporate giving though philanthropic activities; NGO and orphanages donations enhancing the lives of the less privileged. The department's operations are classified into external and internal CSR; the former is concerned with the outside community while the latter is focused on domestic business behavior. Grievance mechanism, consumption behavior, gender equality gap analysis and other activities are part of internal CSR. On the other hand, external CSR and social programs targeting the community are taking part through the corporate foundation. Corporate foundation for Company E was founded in 2009 as a donor NGO focusing on socio-economic development of Egypt in domains like poverty, illiteracy and disease alleviation. They also customize capacity building programs for other nonprofit organizations and channel funs to empowerment of women. It accumulates monetary contributions from different businesses within the professional group and directs the funds towards social programs to maximize their efforts and impact. On the side, each company within the group direct efforts independently in the communities they work in. External CSR is not necessarily relevant to their core business but depends on location and industry of each company within the group and is rather diversified in terms of activities. By the same fashion, CSR undertakings for Company E are centered on environment and education as priority areas for Egypt and their business. Company E speculates sustainability in their social work and ensures higher impact of results. They also utilize publicity of their activities as a technique to invite other businesses to replicate their models. For instance, they introduced alternatives for plastic bag use to protect the environment in their supermarket chains. Additionally, they sponsored the education of two students from remote governorates in Egypt at the American University in Cairo (AUC) to strengthen their knowledge and offer well-informed

67

calibers to the society. They also present programs that target environmental awareness for young generations in Egypt. Similarly, they identified villages in Egypt with no access to clean water and provided their branded clean drinking water on charitable basis.

Partnership Analysis:

A major belief of Company E is achieving developmental goals through partnerships midst nonprofits, businesses and the government. Lack of a coordinating governmental body mapping the social activities and partners involved is perceived by Company E as a major impediment to their CSR work. They envision the government of Egypt as a leading partner in mapping CSR and as a watchdog on nonprofits work to better direct private sector companies. Nonprofits offer a wide network of beneficiaries and imperative stakeholders while carrying the development know-how and expertise. Nevertheless, their lack of operational efficiency and conflicting organizational system when compared to the private sector business environment compose an obstacle to achieve successful partnerships. Company E seeks partnering with a nonprofit organization when efficient previous work is presented and when a guarantee of realizing objectives and impact is obtainable. At the same time, Company E envisages that the proliferation of nonprofit organizations post the Egyptian uprising in 2011 provided the market with a variety of options for sustainable partnerships. Company E considers identifying the right nonprofit; following up on results and objectives, strategizing clear outcomes and an alignment of mission with an assurance of sustainable results as a cornerstone in success of the collaboration. Against this background, the partnership investigated is between Company E and a nonprofit organization concerned with environmental science. Whilst education is a priority, the nonprofit organization implemented activities aiming at educating Egyptian students on environmental principles. More than 1,600 teachers in selected schools and geographical areas

68

were trained on environmental topics tailored to fit the age of students. As a consequence, more than 30,000 students were in turn taught environmental topics to raise their awareness on ecosystems, consumption habits and waste management. Company E was the sponsor of the project while the nonprofit organization managed the logistics, implementation and follow up on the project. Likewise, the nonprofit developed specific curriculums and training modules for both teachers and students. Environmental awareness goes line in line with Company E's objectives and target developmental areas. Nonetheless, weakness of the nonprofit's managerial and operational abilities with regards to budgeting, setting objectives and deliverable results were considered an hurdle in the implementation phase.

The following elements represent the company's view on evaluating its partnership with its nonprofit counter part:

- Level of engagement: moderate level of engagement in all aspects of the project
- Importance to mission: high importance
- Magnitude of resources: moderate deployment of monetary resources
- Scope of activities: moderate
- Interaction level: high follow up as part of the business
- Managerial complexity: low complexity
- Strategic value: high for both partners
- Alignment to strategy, mission and values: high alignment and vital for success and sustainability
- Personal connection and relationships: not highly vital
- Value generating and shared value: high value and impact
- Continual learning: not evident but vital for success
- Focused attention: moderate attentiveness to the project
- Communication: challenge in communication channels
- Organizational systems: clear responsibilities on the implementation level
- Mutual expectations and accountability: high clarity of expected results communicated

---

Chapter 6: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Case Study Analysis

The research analysis and discussion aim to answer the following questions:

1. What is the role and added value of the nonprofit sector in realizing a mutual benefit in

   their partnership with the business sector in the context of CSR?

2. How does the relationship dynamics between nonprofit and private sector look like in Egypt while realizing such benefit of CSR from the business perspective?

3. How can an alignment of interests between the private and nonprofit sectors be achieved in such equilibrium?

In order to formulate answers and comprehend their implications in relation to the conceptual framework and literature reviewed; an overview of partnerships examined is presented in the Table 6 below.

Overview of companies and partnerships selected

Company Name	Industry	Partnership/ Nonprofit Foundation
Company A	Beverages	Enhancing tourism sector through training existing waiters and sponsoring the education of new calibers
Company B	Auditing, consulting and advisory	Educating orphans on environmental sustainability, management and preservation

		services	Has its own nonprofit foundation
Company C	Health, fabric and home care		Providing and refurbishing old clothes to unprivileged families during cultural and religious celebrations
Company D	Telecommunications		Launching mobile application to disseminate information for differently abled inclusion
			Has its own nonprofit foundation
Company E	Financial investments		Educating teachers and students on environmental topics, waste management and consumption habits

Table 6: Overview of Companies and Partnerships Selected, Source: (sorted by author)

With regards to the role of the nonprofit counterpart, all companies investigated referred to their considerable added values with the partnerships implemented. Company A praised its nonprofit partner on their network, technical expertise and project management capabilities. Similarly, Company B showed interest and appreciation towards their partner's outreach and linkage to beneficiaries and development know-how. Shared value creation as a main driver for Company C's CSR function contributed to their backing of the partner's expertise in implementing comparable social projects. Company D in alignment with its interest commented on its partner's technical expertise with regards to project implementation and relevance of their social cause. Finally, Company E identified its counterpart on the basis of their extensive network, development know-how and technical expertise. On the other hands, companies voiced encountering stumbling blocks during their interface with nonprofit organizations. To name a few, nonprofits weakness in operational efficiency, limited capacities during the implementation phase and poor organizational systems. Company D expressed a personalized discomfort with regards to the widespread misconception amongst nonprofits that private sector as financer only. While Company E perceives allocating money to partnerships with nonprofits as a waste of

resources, as they lack budgeting skills and disburse the funds on administrative duties in lieu of on beneficiaries and project implementation. Another barrier explored during the interviews is lack of available data or a directory body concerning the type, size and mission of nonprofits operating in Egypt. Moreover, level of impact for previous projects conducted through the nonprofits remains intangible. All in all, companies selected highlighted the distinction of operational realities between nonprofits and businesses and the underlying motivations of both their work and power.

The affirmative and unfavorable aspects of cooperation with nonprofit organizations from the private sector's side are linked to the literature reviewed. Companies intend to establish partnerships with nonprofits in the framework of CSR with the motivation of achieving the business case (Caroll and Shabana, 2011). Adding to that, companies enhance their social image and strengthen their social credibility, license and legitimacy to operate when their brands are linked to a prominent socially driven nonprofit (Austin, 2000b; Kytle and Ruggie, 2005; Suchman, 2005; Porter and Kramer, 2006; McElHaney, 2009; Plastrik, 2012). Subsequently, nonprofit organizations are a major stakeholder and player in the CSR dialogue as they supply the partnerships with social development know-how and technical expertise in project implementation. Notwithstanding, nonprofits are rather criticized by the business community for their weak organizational structures and low operational efficiencies, which relates to Seintanidi and Crane (2007) proposition of managerial difficulties faced by businesses. The case studies presented above confirm and contribute to asserting that mistrust between the two sectors is a practical reality as the traditional view of corporates prevail as money driven machines and nonprofits as idealistic socially driven institutions (Arenas et al, 2009). Companies featured in the case studies also commented on nonprofit organizations often advocate for what they do not

practice; as environmental preservation and waste management, which adds to the mistrust equation.

Case studies were dissimilar in practical senses while looking at the proximity of the partnership objective and activities to the company's primary business. In the example of Company A, cooperating on enhancing the tourism sector in Egypt came as a direct correlation to their products and brand image as an alcoholic beverages firm. Their community engagement objectives; "giving back to the community" also include interacting with local producers and suppliers. Similarly, Company C's involvement in revamping previously owned clothes through the use of their detergent is considered an alignment to their products. They focus their social responsibility activities on brand equity and the strength of their products. By the same perspective, Company D's collaboration on launching a mobile application for differently abled inclusion goes hand in hand with its communication services. Shared value creation and stakeholder engagement was a key element in their corporate responsibility department, which was manifested through the partnership. While Companies B and E set environmental areas as priorities for their social responsibility their engagement with nonprofits remain however marginal to their business objectives and activities. Nonetheless, Company B as a service provider for other businesses awarded pro bono capacity building to their nonprofit counterpart as complementary benefits to their partnership.

Partnership Measured on Collaboration Continuum (CC)

Company Name	Philanthropic	Transactional	Integrative
Company A			**X**

Company B		X	
Company C		X	
Company D			X
Company E		X	

Table 7: Partnerships Measured on Collaboration Continuum, Source: (Compiled by the author based on Austin's framework of CC)

Against the elements of Collaboration Continuum (CC) of Austin's (2000b) framework, most companies interviewed and their partnerships fall either into the transactional or integrative stage or is categorized on the evolvement stage between one and the other. Nevertheless, the philanthropic stage of check writing is evident in the analysis of some cases although their resemblance on the conceptual framework is different. For example, Company C's partnership rating against the framework's elements classifies it as transactional, although it was quite philanthropic in nature as the firm was not highly involved with its nonprofit partner. Moreover, Company C's case is quite debatable as it connects directly to the business through shared value and brand equity, yet their involvement with the nonprofit counterpart is considered relatively minimal. In terms of ratings, Company A's partnership is high on engagement levels, has a strategic importance to mission, moderate scope of activities, intensive interaction level, moderate managerial complexity and major strategic value. It can be cautiously categorized as integrative as the two organizations merge slowly into one. As for Company B's partnership, it scored high on level of engagement, moderate on importance to mission, high on deployment of

75

resources, intermediate scope of activities, high on interaction level, mild on managerial complexity and high on strategic value. Such analysis leads to its categorization in the transactional phase, as the key trait remains exchange of resources. Company C's collaboration recorded moderate on level of engagement, peripheral on importance to mission, moderate on magnitude of resources deployed, intermediate on scope of activities, moderate on interaction level, high on managerial complexity and modest in terms of strategic value. One can conclude that the partnership is somewhere between philanthropic and transactional stages, given its connection to core business but poor record on the collaboration continuum. On the contrary, Company D noted high on level of engagement, strategic on importance to mission, big on magnitude of resource, broad on scope of activities, intensive on interaction level, high on managerial complexity and major on its strategic value. Consequently, Company D can be placed in the integrative stage of the Collaboration Continuum given its high alignment with partnership elements discussed. Last but not least, Company E's cooperation showed moderate level of engagement in all aspects on the project, high importance to mission, moderate deployment of resources, mild scope of activities, intensive interaction level, low managerial complexity and major strategic value. Thus, the partnership for Company E falls into the transactional stage for its moderate exchange of resources nature.

On partnership dynamics, alliance drivers and enablers were examined further in the scope of the five case studies. All companies stressed on the position of high alignment of strategy, mission and values and an overlap in some cases, which maintains the sustainability and future continuity of the relationship. Company D's partnership was focused on diversity and inclusion which was a strategic elements for both organizations' missions and values. Personal connections and relationships were underlined as strong drivers for the partnerships that

sometimes expand beyond formal interactions and reach friendship levels as in the example of Company A. By the same fashion, Company D's nonprofit partner was referred to it through connections in the field of development. At the same time, Company B mentioned that strong connections and relationship are not a prerequisite for the success of the partnership, as they do not experience strong ties with their partners. Value generation is another solid elements in the views of companies studied as it ensures the win-win situation they pursue through these partnerships. For example, Company A created social value for society through its investment in the tourism sector while further promoting its brands. Companies underscored continual learning and high flexibility for trial and error as basics of successful partnerships. Company A changed its methodology throughout the implementation phase and provided guidance and room for change to capitalize on lessons learned to achieve high gains. The modification of training existing waiters rather than new students due to the upsurge of the tourism sector and flow of visitors is an illustration. Company E experienced difficulty in employing lessons learned into the partnership due to the lack of the counterpart's abilities to incorporate feedback.

It I worthy to note that the fact of Company B's staff profile of former development employees facilitated their flexibility to continual learning and adapting to the slow pace of nonprofit organizations. High and focused attentiveness to the project also arises as a priority for companies investigated. In company D's example, the nonprofit was dedicated to launch the mobile application as it assists their core activities and supplies their beneficiaries with needed information on public accessibility. Constant, efficient and effective channels of formal and informal communication were highly endorsed by companies, highlighting the direct connection it has in reaching their social cause sooner. Company C stated its agitated experience with its partner due to distress in communication levels. Clear responsibilities and organizational systems

77

constitute another vital component of partnership success. All companies utilized agreed that setting clear roles and responsibilities at the onset of each of their partnerships is a success factor. In any event, achieving mutual expectations and accountability levels are tremendously imperative for companies especially during the implementation stage. With Company B's partnership model, involving and coordinating with external stakeholders such as orphanages was clearly communicated, as the nonprofit's responsibility, which manifested itself through out the project.

6.2 Implications

This research examined five case studies of companies' partnerships, which allows the author to draw alignment of interests for the nonprofit sector. Companies and nonprofits operate in distinct social and dynamic realities, thus their motivations, work styles and operational efficiencies are specific characteristics. In Company B's model, the CSR department was first initiated through employees' self interest in giving back to society through their blood donation campaigns and establishing a corporate foundation. It builds on similar pieces of Friedman's (1970) ideology that only individuals have social responsibilities, however it is considered a main drive for mobilizing companies' resources through ensuring the buy-in of individuals. Same logic applies to business and nonprofit alliances where personal connections and relationships manifested themselves as main drivers for reaching out to nonprofit organizations and maintaining an effective dialogue. Lack of a coordinating governmental body charting CSR initiatives while outlining benefits of cooperating with other partners and rating nonprofits' performance is considered a key challenge in alignment of partners' interests. Misplaced information results in constant uncertainty and mistrust between the partners, which in turn affects the number of partnerships existent between the two sectors. These findings are in

78

correspondence with what authors like Austin (2000b) and Arenas et al. (2009) proposed. While companies seek nonprofit partners for the development expertise and wide network of stakeholders, they convict them with weak operational efficiencies and organizational structures. Nevertheless, building a CSR team of a development background is connected to higher tolerance and flexibility towards the weakness of nonprofits as manifested in Company B. Reaching an integrative stage as per Austin's (2000b) framework can ensure the merge of business and nonprofit worlds through a high employment of resources, alignment of mission and strategy and alternation of organizational cultures. In that sense, corporates capitalize on the nonprofits proficiency of addressing social causes and mastering community outreach and nonprofits utilize the business efficiency and structure. Company B and Company D for instance supported their nonprofit counterparts through capacity building services as it directly affects the outcome of their partnerships and CSR objectives. All in all, one can settle that three ingredients are necessary for the success of business and nonprofit alliances; awareness, willingness and capacities. In other words, partners should be mindful about the added value of one another, willing to tolerate their operational differences and able to build and develop the capacities of one another throughout a meaningful partnership.

An important note out of examining the case studies is the establishment of their own corporate foundation as in the example of Company B, D and E. The initial purpose of the research is to investigate the relationship between businesses and NPOs on the basis of their legal status as for profit versus non-for profit. However, the establishment of corporate foundations questions the essence of the relationship between the two sectors. Corporates resort to creating their own nonprofit entities to facilitate their outreach to the community and its relevant stakeholders. Nevertheless, such endeavor can be perceived in various ways as either

benefiting or harming the relationship. A corporate foundation will most likely hire personnel with a development profile, which in turn affects their understanding of the field and nature of NPOs operations. However, it can also deviate the argument of business need to cooperate with nonprofits when CSR and partnerships involved are being carried out by the foundation only. Thus, the foundation collects its own funds, reach out to NPOs on the basis on being one itself and either directly or indirectly carry out the name of the corporate. Such phenomenon requires further investigation, as it is rather vague in terms of its implication on partnership dynamics. In the framework of companies studied in this paper, the consequence of utilizing corporate foundations shows positive results as it strengthened the relationship with their NPOs as counterparts.

Austin's Collaboration Continuum framework including the partnership value, drivers and enablers revealed a few disparate dimensions when investigated empirically in Egypt. Considering the sophisticated developmental environment in Egypt, mirroring CSR initiatives comparable to the ones in the West is a complex undertaking. This is due to main reasons; lack of consumer awareness, difficulties in reaching out to the community, weak governmental policies, incentives and regulations on CSR, lack of inter-organizational partnership inducements and primary motives of companies to survive economically (Jamali, 2007). Yet, these developmental challenges remain a fertile environment and a viable reasoning for private sector to take a leading part in solving social problems and gaining better access to consumers and the society at large. Thus, Austin's (2000b) framework is established in the West and specifically in the American context on the basis of existent consumer awareness and willingness of private sector to seek partnerships with nonprofits unlike the situation in Egypt. With high poverty rate, Egyptian consumers are inclined towards buying the least expensive products and services with

paying little attention to the company's ethical behavior. Moreover, the main missing element in the framework with regards to a developing country's context and specifically Egypt is influence of culture and religion on partnership dimensions. The framework highlights personal connections and relationships as one of the main drivers behind alliances, however it does not specify the collective element of cultures in the Global South as to how these personal connections are formed and developed. For instance in Egypt, though not entirely demonstrated in the case studies, is a collectivist culture where referrals to nonprofits can be based on nepotism or word of mouth, which in turns affects the type of partnerships available as well as communication and interaction levels. Moreover, the case studies revealed direct connotation to core business activities of the business, which ensures that their CSR orientation is strategic. But their scoring on the framework did not place them as integrative, which draws a linkage to be further investigated in future research between partnerships dynamics and CSR overall positioning. On the other hand, the general framework's applicability came very positive as CSR managers in the case studies were able to answer the questions on each element of the partnership easily with direct link to operational reality.

Chapter 7: FINDINGS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

7.1 Findings

Aim of this paper was to explore relationship dynamics between business and nonprofits in the context of CSR in Egypt with regards to research questions outlined above. The study sheds the light on proliferation of strategic CSR activities and dynamics of partnerships with nonprofit against the framework of Austin, named Collaboration Continuum. The study tried to establish the link between the strategic CSR and integrative stages of collaboration between business and

NPOs. Contributing to the scarce literature on CSR in Egypt, the study stimulates the thoughts that strategic initiatives are taking place aside to those of philanthropic or Islamic natures. As well as, the study tests and applicability of the framework on partnerships between businesses and nonprofits in the context of Egypt. In addition, the study questions and provokes the role on NPOs in Egypt and context of developing countries; moving from the service delivery role to the leading one in establishing cooperation with the private sector. NPOs are known to be agents of social change, thus their self-empowerment and taking initiative towards the business sector are necessary.

Most interestingly the case studies revealed that the private sector aspires to cooperate with nonprofits to enhance its social image, gain credibility and access to the community as per the business case of CSR as a mean to reduce (1)costs and risks, (2)to strengthen legitimacy and reputation, (3)to build competitive advantage and (4)to create a win-win situation for both shareholders and stakeholders (Caroll and Shabana, 2011). Businesses perceive the added value of partnering with nonprofits organizations as their technical expertise, development know-how, outreach to community and wide network of stakeholders. Remarkably enough, partnerships probed fell into the transactional and integrative stages of the framework, which shows the relative advancement of the status of partnerships in Egypt on the basis of selected cases. In supporting and bridging the gap between the two sectors, nonprofits are advised to receive the different measures of Austin's framework and use them as guidance in realizing and maintaining successful relationships with the private sector. At the same time, Future research intakes ought to scrutinize further the various elements of the framework and how can they be translated in assisting the management of nonprofits.

Nearly, some recommendations are developed by the author in order to disseminate information and findings of the study to the reach of business and NPOs in Egypt. On the theoretical import, a governmental body or entity is ought to take the lead in advising both businesses and NPOs on potential collaboration. The entity would map CSR activities and companies involved by sector and NPOs work as well. Besides, offering consultation services to both sectors on how to better collaborate with one another; using frameworks such as Austin's (2000) as material. The entity would conduct research on case studies as one method to portray lessons learned from the field. Ultimately, such entity would better direct CSR endeavors and enthuse both sectors to cooperate on solving social problems. On the practical front, using an existent structure with a correlated mandate would be the ideal scenario. An identified structure in Egypt as mentioned earlier in the study is the Egyptian Corporate Responsibility Center (ECRC). Within their current mandate and mission of "Raising Awareness, Building Commitment & Promoting Multi-Stakeholder Engagement for Corporate Responsibility and Sustainability Practices"[5], they can be the convenient entity to take on this responsibility. Nevertheless, given that their personnel and institutional settings are weak the need for a developmental organization to undertake their capacity developed rise and is recommended to take place. The third and last recommendation is considered a self- effort, either private sector to take the lead in informing their potential counterpart of prerequisite elements for the success of the partnership or NPOs to improve their capacities further while approaching businesses. Minor interventions based on the framework's components can be undertaken by NPOs to empower the partnership, such as approaching a company with an aligned mission and values, assigning one personnel for the implementation, communication and interaction with the partner and defining

---

[5] Source: Official website for ECRC http://www.ecrc.org.eg/WhoWeAre.aspx accessed on 25.08.2015

83

clear objectives for the partnership. All in all, businesses and NPOs are highly advised to reach out for one another in order to work collectively on solving social problems while paying particular attention to the kind of partnership at hand.

7.2 Limitation of the Study:

The study drew a general understanding of the relationship dynamics in partnerships between business and NPOs in the framework of strategic CSR activities in Egypt. Nevertheless, the fact that limited data and literature is available on tis topic can be both conceived as an opportunity and a challenge to the study. Collecting information from private sector companies and scouting for potential case studies that were not drawn from an existing sampling frame may withhold the credibility of the study. Yet, it is considered an adaptive study to the setting of strategic CSR initiatives in Egypt and provides a ready reference for future research on relevant topics. Participation in the case studies was set on voluntary basis as companies perceived receiving gains in the enhancement of their work with nonprofit organizations. However, the amount of information that is available to public view was rather limited and partial to seem appealing.

The research as well is characterized by broad-spectrum limitations of those in the qualitative research methods. Generalization is problematic in qualitative research, since the findings of the study may only apply to the group identified and not the overall sector. Another possible limitation is the bias of company CSR managers' selection to the partnerships investigated. Such intentional or unintentional bias could lead the research outcomes to divert

84

from one stage to another on the collaboration continuum and with regards to partnership drivers and enables influence on the findings.

REFERENCES

Achbar, M., Abbott, J., Simpson, B., Bakan, J., Filmwest Associates., & Big Picture Media Corporation. (2004). *The corporation: A documentary*. Kelowna: Filmwest Associates distributor.

Andriof J.: (2000), *Managing Social Risk through Stakeholder Partnership Building*. PhD Thesis, Warwick University.

Arenas, D., Lozano, J. M., & Albareda, L. (2009). The Role of NGOs in CSR: Mutual Perceptions Among Stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics, 88,* 1, 175-197.

Austin, J. E. (2000a). Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and businesses. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 29(1): 69–97.

Austin, J. E. (2000b). *The collaboration challenge: How nonprofits and businesses succeed through strategic alliances*. San Francisco, Calif: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Austin, J. E., & Harvard University. (1998). *Partnering for progress*. Boston: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.

Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2012). Collaborative Value Creation: A Review of Partnering Between Nonprofits and Businesses. Part 2: Partnership Processes and Outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41,* 6, 929-968.

Avina, J. (2013). The Evolution of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the Arab Spring. *The Middle East Journal, 67*(1), 77-92.

Barsoum, G., & Refaat, S. (2015). "We don't want school bags": Discourses on corporate social responsibility in Egypt and the challenges of a new practice in a complex setting. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 35,* 390-402.

Belal, A. R. (2001). A study of corporate social disclosures in Bangladesh. *Managerial Auditing Journal, 16,* 5, 274-289.

Berle, A. A. (1947). The theory of enterprise entity. *Columbia Law Review, 47,* 3.

Bhattacharya, C. B. & Sen, S. (2004). "Doing Better at Doing Good: When, Why, and How Consumers Respond to Corporate Social Initiatives," California Management Review, 47(1), 9-24.

Carroll, A. B., Shabana, K. M., & Conference Board of Canada. (2011). *The business case for corporate social responsibility*. (Conference Board research.) New York, N.Y: The Conference Board.

Darrag, M., & E-Bassiouny, N. (2005). An introspect into the Islamic roots of CSR in the Middle East: The case of Savola Group in Egypt. *Social Responsibility Journal, 9*(3), 362-378.

Dobers, P. and Halme, M. (2009). Corporate Social Responsibility and Developing Countries. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management,* (16), 237-249.

Dusuki, A. W. (2008). "What Does Islam Say about Corporate Social Responsibility?," Review of Islamic Economics, 12(1), 5-28.

Eid, N. L., & Sabella, A. R. (2014). A fresh approach to corporate social responsibility (CSR): Partnerships between businesses and non-profit sectors.*Corporate Governance (bingley), 14,* 3, 352-362.

Frederick, W. C. (2006). *Corporation Be Good! The Story of Corporate Social Responsibility*. United States of America: Dog Ear Publishing.

Freeman, R.E. (1984), Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach, Pitman, Boston, MA.

Friedman, Milton. "The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits." Applied Ethics: Critical Concepts in Philosophy 5 (2002): 57.

Fülöp, G., Hisrich, R. D., & Szegedi, K. (1999). *Business ethics and social responsibility in transition economies*. Ljubljana: Ekonomska fakulteta.

Hammad, H., & Kolkailah, S. (September 01, 2012). Can Business and Social Strategies be Truly Aligned?: A Highlight of P&G Egypt's Corporate Social Responsibility Framework. *The Mena Journal of Business Case Studies,* 1-8.

Hanson, K. O. (2011). The Long History of Conscious Capitalism. *California Management Review*, *53*(3), 77-82.

Hemingway, C., & Maclagan, P. (2004). Managers' Personal Values as Drivers of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics, 50,* 1, 33-44.

Hugé, J., & Waas, T. (2011). Corporate social responsibility for sustainable development – reflections on theory, practice and on the role of government.

Jamali, D. (2007). The Case for Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility in Developing Countries. *Business and Society Review, 112,* 1, 1-27.

Jamali, D. and T. Keshishian, (2009), "Uneasy Alliances: Lessons learned from Partnerships between businesses and NGOs in the context of CSR", Journal of Business Ethics, 84(1):277-295.

Jamali, D., & Mirshak, R. (2007). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): Theory and Practice in a Developing Country Context. Journal of Business Ethics, 7(3), 243-262.

Jeurissen, R. (2000). Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business by John Elkington Review by: Ronald Jeurissen. *Journal of Business Ethics, 23*(2), 229-231.

Kanter, R. M. (1999). From Spare Change to Real Change: The Social Sector as Beta Site for Business Innovation. *Harvard Business Review, 77,* 3, 122-133.

Kayali, D. (2014). Corporate Social Responsibility Supporting SMEs: Lessons Learned from Egypt. Maastricht School of Management, 2014/25.

Korhonen, J. (2006) "On the paradox of corporate social responsibility: how can we use social science and natural science for a new vision?." Business Ethics: A European Review 15.2: 200-214.

Kyte, R. (2008). Balancing Rights with Responsibilities: Looking for the Global Drivers of Materiality in Corporate Social Responsibility & the Voluntary Initiatives that Develop and Support them. *The American University International Law Review, 23,* 3, 559-576.

Kytle, B. and J.G. Ruggie. 2005. "Corporate Social Responsibility as Risk Management: A Model for Multinationals." Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative Working Paper No. 10. Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Labib, E. N., & Robert, S. A. (2014). A fresh approach to corporate social responsibility (CSR): partnerships between businesses and non-profit sectors.Corporate Governance: the International Journal of Business in Society, 14, 3, 352-362.

Lee, M.-D.P. (2008). A Review of the Theories of Corporate Social Responsibility: Its Evolutionary Path and the Road Ahead. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 10*(1), 53-73.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
McElhaney, K. (February 02, 2009). A Strategic Approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. *Leader to Leader, 2009,* 52, 30-36.

Melaville, A. and M. Blank: 1993, Together we can: A Guide for Crafting a Pro-Family System of Education and Human Services (US Department of Education, Washington).

Murphy, M., Arenas, D., & Batista, J. M. (August 01, 2015). Value Creation in Cross-Sector Collaborations: The Roles of Experience and Alignment. *Journal of Business Ethics, 130,* 1, 145-162.

O'Toole, J., & Vogel, D. (2011). Two and a Half Cheers for Conscious Capitalism. *California Management Review*, *53*(3), 60-76.

Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler: (1992), Reinventing Govern- ment: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector (Addison-Wesley, Reading Mass).

Petkoski, D., Jarvis, M., & Brady, C. (2009). From Corporate Philanthropy to Strategic Partnerships: The Potential of Inclusive and Sustainable Business Models in MENA.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002). The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy. *Corporate Social Responsibility : Readings and Cases in a Global Context,* 286-305.

Porter, M., & Kramer, M. (2006). Strategy and Society The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84-12.

Refaat, S. (2014). Corporate social responsibility in Egypt: A study on the current practice, challenges, and potentials. *The American University in Cairo, Digital Archive and Research Repository*.

Reich, R. B. (1998). The new meaning of corporate social responsibility. *California Management Review, 40,* 2.)

Rémi, B., & Julien, V. (2014). CSR into (new) perspective. *Foresight, 16*(2), 176-188.

Rivera-Santos, M., & Rufín, C. (2010). Odd Couples: Understanding the Governance of Firm-NGO Alliances. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94,* 1, 55-70.

Ruggless, R. (2012). Conscious capitalism. Nation's Restaurant News, 46(8), 35.

Schmitz, H. P. (2012). Corporations and NGOs: When Accountability Leads to Co-optation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 106,* 1, 9-21.

Schwartz, M., & Saiia, D. (2012). Should Firms Go "Beyond Profits"? Milton Friedman versus Broad CSR. *Business and Society Review, 117*(1), 1-31.

Seitanidi, M. M., & Crane, A. (2009). Implementing CSR Through Partnerships: Understanding the Selection, Design and Institutionalisation of Nonprofit-Business Partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics, 85,* 2, 413-429.

Seitanidi, M., & Ryan, A. (2007). A critical review of forms of corporate community involvement: From philanthropy to partnerships. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 12*(3), 247-266.

Shamseldin, A. (2006). Strengthening Corporate Social Responsibility in the MENA Region Case Study of Egypt.

Sharmin, S., Khan, N. A., & Belal, A. R. (2014). Corporate Community Involvement In Bangladesh: An Empirical Study. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 21, 1, 41-51.

Suchman, Mark C. "Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches." Academy of management review 20.3 (1995): 571-610.

Waddock, S. A.: 1988, 'Building Successful Partnerships', *Sloan Management Review*, Summer 1988, 17-23.

Waddock, S., & Mcintosh, M. (2011). Business Unusual: Corporate Responsibility in a 2.0 World. *Business and Society Review, 116*(3), 303-330.

Waddock, S.: (1989), 'Understanding Social Partnerships. An Evolutionary Model of Partnership Organisations', Administration & Society, **21**(1): 78-100.

WBCSD, SNV. 2008. Inclusive Business: Profitable Business for Development Latin America. WBCSD (World Business Council for Sustainable Development) & SNV (Netherlands Development Organisation).

Williams, O. (2014). The United Nations Global Compact: What Did It Promise? *Journal of Business Ethics, 122*(2), 241-251.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks. CA, Sage.

ANNXES

(1) Consent form

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN CAIRO
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Documentation of Informed Consent for Participation in Research Study

Project Title: ALLINGING STRATEGIC INTERESTS: BUSINESS PERSPECTIVE ON PARNTERNSHIP DYNAMICS

WITH NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN EGYPT

Principal Investigator: Reem Bassem Fouad Mikhail

01224561313

ryme@aucegypt.edu

*You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of the research is to analyze the partnership dynamics between nonprofit organizations and the private sector in the context of CSR projects in Egypt and the findings will published on AUC DAR website and in the thesis defense of researcher. The expected duration of your participation is one hour through a semi-structured interview.

The procedures of the research will be as follows: the proposed research will largely address the possibilities lie within the Corporate Social Responsibility CSR sector in Egypt in relevance to contributing to the development of the country. The study is focused on the partnership dynamics amongst different sectors in the field; specifically the partnerships between nonprofit organizations and private sector. Against the backdrop of identified conceptual framework that exists in the literature, partnership dynamics in strategic alliance and CSR initiatives are to be explored from the private sector perspective.

*There will not be certain risks or discomforts associated with this research.

*There will be benefits to you from this research. Participants in this study will benefit from the specific analysis of the partnership dynamics between their companies and identified nonprofit organizations. Such analysis will look deep into the elements of the success, failure, challenges and potentials that lie

within the partnership in the context of CSR. The final discussion and results of the research will be shared with the participants that can use the information in their companies to improve their CSR strategy and activities. Companies are becoming aware of the importance to partnership with nonprofit organizations in realizing their CSR objectives. Thus, the study outcomes will support the companies in their advancement and to save time an effort while approaching a new associate and sustaining their current partnerships.

*The information you provide for purposes of this research is confidential. All participants in the research will be given anonymous names, such as Organization A, Company B.

*If you have any questions regarding the research, please direct them to ryme@aucegypt.edu

*Participation in this study is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or the loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Signature   _____

Printed Name   _____

Date   _____

(2) Semi-structured Interviews

Each interview of the 5 case studies was scheduled for 1-1.5 hours in total. CSR managers were requested to select one partnership with a nonprofit organization where they perceive an alignment of strategies and interests to be discussed in the arrangement of the following questions:

1. Please introduce your company

2. How is company X related to its global umbrella of its mother company (if applied)?

3. What are the motives of your company to engage in CSR activities? What is your overall international strategy on CSR?

4. What was the evolution of your CSR activities and history in Egypt?

5. Why did your company focus on CSR practices that are relevant to your core business and employed it as a strategy (if applied)?

6. How do you think that your model of CSR is different from philanthropic or charitable acts?

7. Why would your company be interested in cooperating with nonprofit organizations in realizing your CSR objectives?

8. Why was nonprofit Y selected for this particular partnership?

9. How would you prescribe the nature of your partnership with the selected nonprofit you are operating with? (Referral were given in a simplified manner of Austin's CC framework; the three stages)

10. Can you name a few of success factors in the partnership from your perspective?

11. What are the challenges encountered in dealing with the nonprofit sector in the context of the partnership?

12. What are the elements that you see are necessary for the success of such partnership with a nonprofit organization?

Each element of the following based on Austin's framework were asked in separate question to capture the view of the private sector partner:

- Level of engagement

- Importance to mission

- Magnitude of resources:

- Scope of activities

- Interaction level

- Managerial complexity

- Strategic value

- Alignment to strategy, mission and values

- Personal connection and relationships

- Value generating and shared value

- Continual learning

- Focused attention

- Communication

- Organizational systems

- Mutual expectations and accountability