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Abstract

Disasters can occur anywhere in the world and when they do, human lives as well as infrastructure are affected in diverse ways. The impact of disasters usually warrant an immediate response from aid agencies because human lives are at stake and that is where humanitarian logistics comes into play. Humanitarian organizations involved in relief efforts have an enormous task of responding to emergencies in a very swift manner and are constantly seeking for new and innovative ways to reach their beneficiaries with utmost satisfaction. One way of doing this is through collaboration and engaging in partnerships with private sector companies. Given the fact that humanitarian organizations and private sector companies operate in different sectors, such partnerships could be challenging yet beneficial in diverse ways. The purpose of this thesis was to analyze the cross-sector partnership between humanitarian organizations and the private sector. In order to achieve this aim, a frame of reference was developed with an operational partnership model and theory whilst examining and contrasting both humanitarian and business supply chains. Our methodology involved both primary and secondary data collection with empirical data collected from two private companies and one humanitarian organization. Data collected for the study were then analyzed in relation to the literature and models outlined in the frame of reference. The results of the study showed that the partnerships between the firms of the two sectors studied were philanthropic, long-term and mutually beneficial in diverse ways. Whilst the private companies benefit through improvements in Corporate Social Responsibility, creating public awareness of their corporate image, and brand among other benefits by engaging in the partnership, humanitarian organizations on the other hand, partner with companies which fit their expressed needs and gain benefits in both monetary and non-monetary terms. Moreover, knowledge transfer through the sharing of skills, experiences, resources and expertise are also very important elements which add to the benefits gained by both partners. In addition, the findings obtained from the respondents of the study demonstrated that trust, personal connection, regular communication and working together are very important elements which can be considered as critical success factors which sustain partnerships.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter gives the reader a general overview of the thesis by looking into the background, problem, purpose and the motivation of the study. The research questions, delimitation and finally, the structure of the thesis are also presented in this section.

1.1 Background

Disasters in the world have been increasing in number and magnitude since the 20th century. Disasters impact more than 210 million people every year, and their frequency increases year after year (Charles, Lauras & Tomasini, 2010). In 2008, the world experienced more natural hazards and their impact was one of the worst ever reported. The entire world is still coming out of the shock of the sudden earthquake with a magnitude of 9.0 and subsequent Pacific tsunami that devasted Japan on 11th March 2011 and sent its economy, the third largest in the world, into recession. A year before the Japan earthquake, Haiti had suffered a similar fate with a devastating earthquake of a magnitude of 7.0 which occurred on 12th January 2010. These are very recent large scale disasters in two different parts of the world, which have impacted millions of people and infrastructure, requiring the humanitarian community and the private sector to respond in the appropriate manner and ease the suffering of the victims affected. Though not every situation is predictable, it only becomes a disaster when communities and organizations are unable to manage the problem (Fridriksson & Hertz, 2010).

Organizations have different cultures and goals and as such, it is important they collaborate in order to share ideas and work effectively. In the business life, collaboration is used as organizations have different skills and knowledge (Fridriksson & Hertz, 2010). Companies are developing understanding and willingness to collaborate; working in strategic alliances, networks, or in projects (Fridriksson & Hertz, 2010). Ten years ago, on most occasions, humanitarian actors in the field had little knowledge on what the other was doing. Due to the fact that there are lots of stakeholders involved, this kind of knowledge is still very difficult to gather and spread (Charles et al., 2010). A lot of developments have been made recently and this is driven both by field necessities and by humanitarian organizations’ professionalization (Charles et al., 2010).

An increase in the number and complexity of disasters has made specialization and coordination important and challenging. Numerous organizations provide humanitarian aid, whether in immediate response to a disaster or in the months that follow. United Nations bodies, local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and host governments, as well as donors, commercial service providers and militaries are involved in one way or another (Jahre & Jensen, 2010).

According to Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), there has been tremendous increase in partnerships between humanitarian organizations and the private sector which they attribute to reasons such as: Recognition by humanitarian organizations that the private sector can help them with their resources and expertise and also the private sectors need to enhance their image and impact on society through responsible actions.

Two types of partnership relationships exist between humanitarian organizations and the private sector. Commercial partnership relationships involve monetary transactions an example of which is the interaction between relief organizations and suppliers of relief items or transportation companies. Philanthropic partnership relationships occur when private
sector companies support or collaborate with humanitarian organizations in ways that do not include profit making (Balcik, Beamon, Krejci, Muramatsu, & Ramirez, 2009).

In an era of rapid globalization of businesses, disasters like the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004 have driven companies to re-examine their roles and consider humanitarian activities in terms of their overall CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) strategy. Even though there are risks involved, these companies believe they can benefit both their business and society through becoming better corporate citizens (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

1.2 Problem Discussion

It is good when organizations in the corporate sector offer aid in cash and in-kind donations to humanitarian organizations whenever there is a disaster but it would be even better if they formed long-term partnerships long before there is a humanitarian crisis (Thomas & Fritz, 2006). Cross-sector partnership between both sectors may prove to be more rewarding and help save precious lives which is the goal of all the players involved in humanitarian relief chains. “Companies today are considering marrying short-term relief actions with longer-term disaster response partnerships with the humanitarian sector”. (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009, p. 132). The December 2004 South Asian earthquake and resulting Indian ocean tsunami witnessed many flaws in the system of private-public relief partnerships (Thomas & Fritz, 2006). With cash being the most flexible resource in such circumstances, aid communities primarily were looking for such donations. However, many global companies wanted to offer more than cash; provide communications or IT support and lend logistics staff or managers but found it difficult to do so due to coordination problems (Thomas & Fritz, 2006). Unsolicited supplies which were inappropriate, donated by some well-meaning donors piled up at Sri Lanka’s Colombo’s Airport, filling up warehouses and not being claimed for months (Thomas & Fritz, 2006).

Such a situation as described above could have been avoided if there had been some form of existing effective partnership or collaboration between the humanitarian relief organizations and the private sector. Thomas and Fritz (2006), clearly indicate that several corporations like Coca-Cola, British Airways, UPS, FedEx and DHL became deeply involved in the 2004 South Asian tsunami relief efforts because of established relationships that exist with aid agencies. Coca-Cola for instance converted its soft-drink production lines to bottle large quantities of drinking water using its own distribution network to have them delivered to relief sites whilst British Airways, UPS, FedEx and DHL all worked with their existing aid agency partners to supply free or subsidized transportation for relief cargo (Thomas & Fritz 2006). According to Stephenson and Schnitzer (2009), disasters of catastrophic proportion more often than not attract different independent actors who address the issue at stake and usually end up doing so based on different theories and lines of action.

Even though humanitarian logistics and business logistics share some common characteristics, yet their supply chains differ in so many ways. Having said this, it is possible for such a collaboration to be mutually beneficial to both humanitarian organizations and the private sector. It is known that knowledge and expertise transfer between organizations is beneficially mutual and widely encouraged since no company possesses all the necessary characteristics needed. Humanitarian organizations acknowledge the fact that private sectors can help with expertise and resources whilst the private sector on the other hand seeks for opportunities to improve its actions through CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).
As discussed in the background above, the type of partnership relationships between relief organizations and private sector companies falls into two main categories; commercial and philanthropic. According to Fridriksson and Hertz (2010), the type of relationship influences their willingness to cooperate. The different types of partnership relationships would be further explored in the frame of reference section.

1.3 Purpose
The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the partnership relationship between humanitarian organizations and the corporate sector.

1.4 Research Questions
The research questions formulated for this study are:

RQ1. What kind of partnership relationship do humanitarian organizations and the private sector engage in?

RQ2. What are the associated problems and benefits involved in such partnerships?

RQ3. What are the pre-requisites or requirements for such partnership relationships?

The above research questions will lead us to fulfill the purpose of this thesis and to reach our goal.

1.5 Delimitation
For the purpose of this thesis, the authors limit their scope to the partnership relations between humanitarian organizations involved in relief operations and business organizations in the preparedness, immediate response and post disaster phases of a humanitarian crisis in any part of the world. To that effect, much emphasis shall not be laid on other major actors like the militaries and local governments who each have different roles to play whenever a disaster occurs.

Moreover, talking about humanitarian organizations which is an umbrella term for non-profit organizations, only those organizations involved in disaster relief efforts shall be studied.

1.6 Disposition
The thesis is divided into the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction
This chapter gives the reader a general overview of the thesis by looking into the background, problem, purpose and the motivation of the study. The research questions, delimitation and finally, the structure of the thesis are also presented in this section.

Chapter 2: Frame of Reference
In this chapter of the thesis, we look at different theories in relation to our purpose and research questions. The theories will be used further to analyze our empirical findings. Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief summary about all that is covered in the frame of reference.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter covers the different approaches used by the authors to carry out both primary and secondary data collection in order to address the research questions formulated for the purpose of this study. Ethical issues are of primary concern here and are also discussed in this chapter. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary.

Chapter 4: Empirical Findings

The results from our empirical findings are presented in this chapter of the thesis which begins with the description of the companies and humanitarian organization used as sources of data for the study. The findings are then presented separately.

Chapter 5: Analysis

This chapter analyzes the empirical findings by relating them with the frame of reference and presents the concluding results. The analysis of the empirical findings is presented in a combined form and ends with a concluding summary.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Discussion

This is the final chapter of the thesis which sums up the whole study. An attempt is made to show how the research questions formulated for this study are answered. Moreover, it concludes the analysis based on the empirical findings in relation to the frame of reference and discusses the limitation of the study while proposing possible areas for further research.
2 FRAME OF REFERENCE
In this chapter of the thesis, we look at different theories in relation to our purpose and research questions. The theories will be used further to analyze our empirical findings. Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief summary about all that is covered in the frame of reference.

2.1 Humanitarian Supply Chains
In simple terms, supply chains connect suppliers to customers by delivering the right supplies in the right quantities to the right locations at the right time. Beamon and Balcik (2008), elaborate on the concept of supply chain by defining it to encompass all activities and processes involved with the flow and transformation of goods, from the raw material stage to the end customer. Accordingly, Martin (2005, p.6), defines supply chains as a “network of connected and interdependent organizations mutually and co-operatively working together to control, manage and improve the flow of materials and information from suppliers to end users”. Even though humanitarian supply chains do not aim at making profits, they are similar to commercial supply chains in the sense that supplies flow from donors (suppliers) through the relief chain to consumers or beneficiaries as in the case of humanitarian logistics with the same aim of satisfying the end consumers. In as much as the structure of humanitarian supply chains are similar to most commercial supply chains, the former is often unstable (Oloruntoba & Gray, 2006). Consequently, the coordination and management of disaster supply chains are in increasing demand in humanitarian logistics.

Humanitarian Logistics is defined by Thomas and Mizushima (2005, p. 60), as “the process of planning, implementing and controlling the efficient cost-effective flow and storage of goods and materials, as well as related information from point of origin to point of consumption for the purpose of meeting the end beneficiary’s requirements”. However, according to Wassenhove (2006), the goal of humanitarian supply chains is to be able to respond to multiple interventions in a swift manner and in a very short time frame. This accounts for the adaptability and agility of humanitarian supply chains. With the immediacy of information and the media spotlight, there is less tolerance for inefficiencies and mistakes in the supply chain (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009). In order to ease the pressure of high performance, humanitarian organizations have begun to break out of their silos and form cross-sector relationships with the corporate world, who usually want to assist whenever there is a disaster or an emergency. According to Kovács and Spens (2007), humanitarian logistics comprises various activities at different times in very rapidly dynamic environments for the purpose of efficiently responding to disasters.

2.2 Disaster
Humanitarians focus on helping people affected by disaster in their fight for survival and usually is non-profit seeking, greatly contrasting business logistics operations which aim at making profits. In the aftermath of a disaster, goods or supplies which are most needed are given high priority so as to enable trade-offs related to speed, transportation and cost as well as the quantities of materials which are in high demand.

Wisner and Adams (2002), define disaster as any occurrence that causes damage, ecological disruption, loss of human life, deterioration of health and health services and loss of livelihood on a scale sufficient to warrant an extraordinary response from outside the affected community or area. The frequent occurrence of disasters will never cease and no civiliza-
tion in human history has been immune from their effects which keep on increasing (Ahmad, 2007).

Wisner and Adams (2002), using WHO’s classification of disaster, groups them based on their speed of onset (sudden or slow), cause (natural or man-made) or scale (major or minor) WHO, (2002). Wassenhove (2006), uses a similar classification and groups disasters into:

1. Natural and Man-made
2. Sudden onset disasters and slow onset disasters

Table 2.1 below shows the different types of disasters as classified by Wassenhove (2006). On the one hand, sudden onset disasters which are man-made include a terrorist attack or a coup d’ état whereas the natural ones include earthquakes, tornadoes and hurricanes. On the other hand, man-made slow onset disasters include political crisis and refugee crisis whilst famine, drought and poverty fall under slow onset disasters which occur naturally.

Table 2.1 Types of disasters (source: Wassenhove, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Sudden-onset</em></th>
<th><em>Natural</em></th>
<th><em>Man-made</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>Terrorist attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>Coup d’ état</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tornadoes</td>
<td>Chemical leak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Slow-onset</em></td>
<td>Famine</td>
<td>Political crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>Refugee crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Disaster Management Cycle

According to Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), disaster management cycle comprises four steps namely: mitigation, preparedness, response and rehabilitation. Tomasini and Wassenhove’s work on disaster cycle mainly focuses on preparedness and response. This is due to the fact that preparedness addresses the strategy that is put in place to allow the implementation of a successful operational response. Figure 2.1 below addresses the disaster management cycle.
2.3.1 Mitigation

Mitigation deals with the proactive social component of emergencies, which includes laws and mechanisms that reduce the vulnerability of the population and increases their resilience. An example is establishing codes and restrictions that will facilitate the building of houses in areas that are less prone to disasters (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

2.3.2 Preparedness

Preparedness is described as putting in place response mechanisms to counter factors that society are unable to mitigate. Even though cities have building codes and regulations, which include fire safety, they cannot nullify the likelihood and the impact of a fire. As a result cities have a fire department that are prepared to attend to the need should it arise (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

2.3.3 Response

The act of attending to the fire is referred to as response. Response is very complex from a logistical point of view during disasters. This is because humanitarians do have no knowledge of where, when, and how big the next disaster will be. The worst is they do not even know how many people will be affected and how long it will last. Accurate data for both demand and supply can be scarce during the course of a relief operation and this places much stress on people and also affects organizations’ capability to cope with this huge problem (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

2.3.4 Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation comes after response, when society supported by existing institutions and infrastructure try to restore some normality to the victims’ lives. This is an improvement that
prevents or reduces the odds that those living in shattered buildings will lose their homes again (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

2.4 The Partnership Model

The partnership model is a structured iterative process used to build and sustain business relationships. When used effectively and efficiently, the model could give companies a competitive advantage. The model has three major elements which are the drivers, facilitators and components that lead to outcomes (Lambert, Emmelhainz & Gardner, 1996).

The model may not be recent or current but is still widely used in today’s contemporary business environment and has proven to be successful. The benefits gained from the efficient and effective application of the model are enormous and not only measured in monetary terms. Having said that, since humanitarian organizations do not aim at making profits, using this model to manage their partnership relationships with partners in the private sector may prove very successful in terms of the non-monetary benefits which can be gained from it. Figure 2.2 below illustrates the partnership model.

Figure 2.2 The Partnering Process (Source: Lambert, Emmelhainz & Gardner, 1996)
2.4.1 Drivers
It is very obvious that drivers are the reasons why companies enter into partnerships with each other. Companies believe that they will receive benefits by entering into partnership with each other and that these benefits will not be possible without a partnership. The primary benefits which drive the desire to partner include: asset/cost efficiencies, customer service improvements and profit stability/growth (Lambert et al., 1996).

2.4.2 Facilitators
Although drivers provide the motivation to partner, the probability of building a successful partnership is reduced if corporate environments are not supportive of close relationships. Facilitators are elements of a corporate environment that allow a partnership to grow and strengthen. Facilitators cannot be developed in the short run and they serve as a foundation for good partnership. Facilitators may exist or not exist and their extent of existence determines whether a partnership succeeds or fails (Lambert et al., 1996). Examples of facilitators are corporate compatibility and mutuality.

2.4.3 Components
According to Lambert et al. (1996), components are the activities and processes that management establishes and controls throughout the life of the partnership. Components build and sustain the partnership. Every partnership has the same basic components, but they are implemented and managed differently. Components make the relationship operational and assist managers to create the benefits of partnering. Components comprises planning, communications, trust and commitment.

2.4.4 Outcomes
Outcomes are the extent to which the firms have achieved the expected drivers (asset/cost efficiencies, customer service improvements and profit stability/growth). Partnerships, if established properly and effectively managed usually improves performance for both parties (Lambert et al., 1996). The outcomes usually vary depending on the drivers that initially motivated the development of the partnership. It is important to bear in mind that, a partnership is not required to achieve satisfactory outcomes from a relationship. Normally, organizations go for multiple arms’ length relationships that meet their needs and provide benefits to them (Lambert et al., 1996).

2.5 Cross-Sector Partnerships
Throughout this thesis, partnership and collaboration are used interchangeably. Dictionary definitions of partnerships are very thorough hence, used by the authors to give an insight into what partnerships are really about. Collins COBUILD Learner’s Dictionary (2001), defines partnership as a relationship in which two or more people, organizations or countries work together as partners. It is worth noting that this definition falls short on what motivates partnerships or the driving factor. The American Heritage Dictionary (2000), further elaborates on partnerships by defining it as a relationship between individuals and groups that is characterized by mutual cooperation and responsibility, as for the achievement of a specified goal. Incorporating the two definitions above, cross-sector partnerships between humanitarian organizations and the corporate sector can only be possible if the needs for mutual benefits are acknowledged.

The term cross-sector may mean different things to different people. However, for the sake of this study, the authors make reference only to humanitarian organizations and the pri-
vate corporate sector when using the term cross-sector. With the increasing complexity of disasters, collaboration through partnerships with the private sector becomes ever more important (Wassenhove, 2006). OCHA (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs) and the World Economic Forum have set aside guiding principles for collaboration between humanitarian organizations and private sector companies. These principles do not only act as guidelines but also encourage businesses to engage in cross-sector partnerships with humanitarian organizations to foster development and the well-being of the beneficiaries.

2.6 Pre-requisites or Requirements for Partnerships

On the one hand, companies tend to be highly selective when choosing their partners. Competence and a reputation for efficiency is a very important selection factor for companies when choosing their partners (Binder & Witte, 2007). Private sector companies are more interested in selecting humanitarian organizations that are very competent and also have a high reputation for efficiency in performing their relief duties as their partners. Moreover, companies choose partners that suit their strategic branding needs. Corporate image and brand identity are some of the reasons why private sector companies enter into partnerships with humanitarian organizations. For this reason, private sector companies will partner with humanitarian organizations that will raise their corporate brand image (Binder & Witte, 2007).

On the other hand, humanitarian organizations as well do consider a number of factors before getting into partnerships with private sector companies. Talking about humanitarian organizations, one can get an insight of such requirements by considering the case of Oxfam. Oxfam International (2007), a humanitarian organization considers cross-sector partnerships between humanitarian organizations and the private sector to be a very valuable resource and recommends a number of requirements both for its own engagement and that of other relief agencies with the private sector.

First and foremost, there should be ethical screening of private sector companies that are willing to support humanitarian relief agencies. Oxfam International places trust and accountability on a high pedestal, thus requires potential partners of both sectors to be highly accountable and even proposes private sector companies to learn and internalize the norms of the humanitarian organizations and the Red Cross Code of Conduct.

Another requirement for involvement in the partnership between the two sectors is a common vision shared by both the private sector and the humanitarian organization. With both partners thinking in the same direction, Oxfam believes the process for forming the partnership relationship is facilitated (Oxfam International, 2007).

2.7 Obstacles to Partnering

Even though there are many benefits for creating partnerships, there are also lots of obstacles in forming this relationship. Most of the obstacles to successful cross-sector partnerships are as a result of the cultural differences between the sectors. Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), have identified some obstacles to cross-sector partnerships between humanitarian organizations and the corporate private sector which are discussed below.

2.7.1 Lack of mutual understanding

Each sector has its own context and this is due to the fact that they have different working conditions and objectives. For example, the partnership between TNT, the global transpor-
tation and logistics company based in The Netherlands, and WFP (World Food Program). While TNT and WFP may have logistics in common, both companies have their own unique techniques of going about it. Both companies might have different goals and objectives such as speed, cost, lives saved, beneficiaries and so forth, whilst their decision-making processes might be more or less bureaucratic or politically sensitive. Their different ways of working can create bottlenecks in the system when they work together (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

### 2.7.2 Roles and Responsibilities

According to Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), humanitarian agencies may be reluctant to let private partners take on responsibilities that are critical for their operation (for example, deploying the first post-disaster team and flying in the first set of goods in the midst of chaos). On the other hand, companies are interested in getting involved in areas that are reasonably low cost and easy for them to do with relatively high visibility. For example, sending their surplus inventory into a disaster area quickly while the cameras are still rolling, regardless of how it may fit the needs on the ground. Due to this, many partnerships fail to work.

### 2.7.3 Management of Partnership Relationships

Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), cite the lack of an interface to enforce protocols and regulations as a challenge which further creates confusion as to when to engage with each other. A proper interface needs to be designed in order to build trust, promote mutual respect and enhance the development of a common language and goals. A typical example is in the area of transport management which accounts for the second largest cost after human resources in the humanitarian sector. Corporate businesses involved in transportation have a lot of expertise in this area and can transfer this knowledge to the humanitarian sector but a proper platform or interface which can bridge the cultural differences between the two organizations have to be established beforehand.

### 2.7.4 Commitment at All Levels

It is usually the top-level management that decides whether to enter into a partnership or not. Even though the decision is made at the top, this poses a problem if employees at the operational level are not included in the decision-making. Partnerships start from the top-down but grow from the bottom-up. This implies that even though top management is fully committed to the partnership, employees at the operational level might not have the same level of commitment (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

### 2.7.5 Lack of Transparency and Accountability

Humanitarian organizations and private sector companies have conflicting objectives and interests. This is so because each sector has different values and also reports to different stakeholders. It is said that private sector companies usually want to obtain much publicity as possible thereby being in the spotlight where as humanitarian organizations want to remain neutral and impartial from political and economic agendas and put much focus on their humanitarian principles during relief operations. Consequently, it would be difficult for the relationship to work if both companies put or find themselves in a position where they have to compete for media coverage and airtime (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove, 2009).
Tennyson (2003), has outlined the sources of obstacles and provided an example for each which is illustrated in table 2.2 below:

Table 2.2 Obstacle sources (source: Tennyson, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF OBSTACLE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GENERAL PUBLIC                         | • Prevailing attitude of skepticism  
• Rigid/preconceived attitudes about specific sectors/partners  
• Inflated expectations of what is possible                      |
| NEGATIVE SECTORAL CHARACTERISTICS (ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED) | • Public sector: bureaucratic and intransigent  
• Business sector: single-minded and competitive  
• Civil society combative and territorial |
| PERSONAL LIMITATIONS (OF INDIVIDUALS LEADING THE PARTNERSHIP) | • Inadequate partnering skills  
• Restricted internal/external authority  
• Too narrowly focused role/job  
• Lack of belief in the effectiveness of partnering |
| ORGANIZATIONAL LIMITATIONS (OF PARTNERING ORGANIZATIONS) | • Conflicting priorities  
• Competitiveness (within sector)  
• Intolerance (of other sectors) |
| WIDER EXTERNAL CONSTRAINTS             | • Local social/political/economic climate  
• Scale of challenge(s)/speed of change  
• Inability to access external resources |

2.8 Corporate Social Responsibility

CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility), which is an issue of utmost importance for CEO’s these days, is one way of fostering closer collaboration with businesses. There are advantages and disadvantages associated with this type of cooperation (Wassenhove, 2006). For example, how can firms align their own needs and the needs of their shareholders with those of humanitarians? There is no clear definition for CSR even though different authors have proposed diverse definitions. McWilliams, Siegel and Wright (2006), define CSR as situations where the firm goes beyond its compliance and engage in actions that benefit lots
of people in the society, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law. CSR has also been defined by the World Business Council as the continuing commitment by business to behave in an ethical manner and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and that of their families as well as the local community and society at large (cited in Krishnan & Balachandran, 2006). CSR encourages firms not to solely focus on maximizing profits but also lay much importance on improving the economic and social standards of the community in their countries of operation. According to Porter and Kramer (1999), the more social improvements are conveyed to a company’s business, the more economic benefits it generates. This indicates that, Porter and Kramer are firm advocates of the principle that CSR activities should be aligned with a company’s strategy and play to its core competencies if the relationship is to work effectively.

There are several things that motivate business actors to engage in disaster relief. Corporations usually stress on their corporate websites and sustainability reports that, they want to contribute to humanitarian efforts because they are committed to certain ethical principles (Rieth, 2009). In the past, when corporations contributed to humanitarian efforts, it was seen as a public relations campaign or strategic philanthropy (Rieth, 2009).

However, over the past two decades, society’s expectations of corporations have changed due to corporate violations of human rights, social standards and the environment. This view has had consequences in disaster relief operations, while the public did not immediately look up onto business actors for additional donations. Some business corporations have rather made relief a virtue out of potential necessity, and looked for potential areas to exploit in all fields of activities to improve their public image (Rieth, 2009). These corporations have increasingly started donating money and also looked into their core competencies to assess whether they could be used in disaster relief operations.

By being in the spotlight, most companies decided to proactively achieve two things at once. Firstly, they want to meet public expectations of being good corporate citizens and to behave truly ethically in helping those in need in the aftermath of natural disasters. Secondly, they want to improve their corporate image and benefit from intangibles such as a better corporate reputation and employee motivation (Rieth, 2009).

2.9 Commercial Partnership Relationships

Humanitarian relief is considered to be a multi-billion market for commercial service companies (Balcik, et al., 2009). Humanitarian organizations engage in different forms of commercial relationships. The most common form of relationship is vertical relationships with suppliers and transportation providers. Commercial relations are administered by both humanitarian organizations and the private sector through the traditional processes for procurement and this relationship is controlled by contractual agreements between both parties (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009). The relationship is established on the expressed needs of the humanitarian organization requesting the goods or services and as such it is subject to market conditions. Some of the companies in the commercial sector may have an interest or they might want to be chosen as preferred suppliers over the others. In order to do this, these companies try to provide better offers to the humanitarian organizations and build long-term relations with them. Some of the companies invest more in getting to know their clients’ businesses (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

Although long-term agreements may probably exist between some suppliers and relief organizations, most relief agencies do not prefer binding pre-disaster commitments for
supply purchases, but may rather place simple requirements on held stock (Balcik et al., 2009). This is the case with dormant relationships where humanitarian organizations and commercial service providers do not play any active role in the relationship until the need arises for purchases to be made. Keeping extra stock could turn out to be very expensive as warehouses would be needed to stock the purchases. Even though WFP has long-term agreements with some suppliers for purchasing non-food items, these agreements do not guarantee maximum nor minimum purchasing amounts, but do contractually bind the supplier to stock extra supplies (Balcik et al., 2009). Preparations necessary for post-disaster procurement includes identifying a list of candidate suppliers that can make available relief items with the desired specifications. These suppliers are entered into the system and they become eligible to submit bids. An example is the UN’s Global Marketplace, that was launched in 2004 by fifteen UN agencies, where suppliers can be registered, view procurement notices, and obtain information about previously awarded contracts electronically (Balcik et al., 2009). Another current initiative is the Global Fleet Forum, that was launched jointly by WFP, IFRC (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies), and World Vision International in 2003, whose objective is to enhance discussion of common problems in operating vehicle fleets and to identify potential collaborative practices to increase operational effectiveness and efficiency.

2.10 Philanthropic Partnership Relationships

Philanthropic partnership is a relationship where private sector companies interact with the global relief chain in other ways than providing commercial supplies. For example, a private sector company may engage in a vertical or horizontal relationship with a humanitarian organization and provide the humanitarian organization with monetary or in-kind donations such as supplies, staff or other resources (Balcik et al., 2009). Furthermore, Balcik et al. (2009), state that relationships that are based on donations are typically short-term and covers only the disaster relief period. This typically means that the relationship and ties between the two partners ceases after the disaster crisis has been resolved.

However, it could also happen that the private sector company and the humanitarian organization may form strategic partnerships. In this relationship (Strategic or long-term partnerships), the private sector company shares its expertise and resources to improve relief chain logistics in a more systematic way. According to Balcik et al. (2009), this relationship is usually long-term and involves significant resource commitment and joint planning and they use the umbrella term “philanthropic” to classify both strategic partnerships and partnerships based on charitable-based donations between private sector companies and humanitarian organizations. However, other authors like Thomas and Fritz (2006), differentiate between the two and use philanthropic partnerships for donation-based partnerships and integrative partnerships to refer to strategic partnerships.

The private sector company engages in disaster relief for various reasons such as brand image, corporate social responsibility, staff motivation and so on (Rieth, 2009). A good example is the relationship between Abbot Laboratories and the American Red Cross. Abbot provides a variety of products, from antibiotics to baby food to the Red Cross in the event of a disaster. Even though Abbot is helping to reduce suffering during disasters, the company also benefits by achieving increased visibility through the distribution of branded products, joint press releases, speaking engagements, and enhanced goodwill of its employees (Thomas & Fritz, 2006).

According to Balcik et al. (2009), some of the logistics companies and humanitarian organizations that work together as strategic partners include Federal Express and the American
Red Cross, DHL and Mercy Corps, and DHL and IFRC. Most of the logistics partnerships support transportation and warehousing processes during relief operations.

Figure 2.3 below developed by Balcik et al. (2009), shows the classification of relationships in the global relief chain based on the types of relief actors involved. The figure depicts how the private sector, led by one company or a group of companies engages in either a philanthropic, commercial or both types of partnership relationships with the relief actors which could be either international or local organizations. The figure also shows a relationship existing between international relief actors involving a group or cluster of relief NGO’s or agencies led by an umbrella organization like the United Nations, a group of relief NGO’s or even a single relief agency and local relief actors like the local government and military or local relief agencies. The inter-relationship and collaboration amongst the different relief actors play a major positive role when they are on the field bringing relief to victims affected by a disaster.

**Figure 2.3 Relief Chain Relationships (Source: Balcik et al, 2009)**

### 2.11 Combination of Commercial and Philanthropic Partnership relationships

Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), acknowledge a situation whereby companies choose to have multiple interaction points. Some partnerships between humanitarian organizations and the private sector can be a combination of both commercial and philanthropic relationship. For example, some companies may establish a CSR partnership that is public but also have programs that are purely commercial (for example, supplying services on a commercial basis) and beseech anonymous contributions from employees (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

The UN’s business website (2010), which is the organization’s newly created website to facilitate private sector partnerships, looks at partnership types from different perspectives.
and classifies them differently whilst acknowledging that a partnership relationship could be multi-faceted, involving several types.

Table 2.3 below shows the different partnership types and some examples of how this type of relationship functions between the UN and its partners in the private sector. From the table, it can be deduced that apart from the usual philanthropic and commercial partnership types, other types of partnerships can exist as well between humanitarian organizations and the private sector depending on a needs assessment basis. Moreover, the various partnership types shown in the table aim at being strategic and foster long-term relationships between the UN and the companies in the private sector.

Table 2.3 Partnership Types (source: Business.un.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERSHIP TYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy of Global Issues</td>
<td>Partnership type between companies and UN to combat global issues like poverty, HIV/AIDS and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Opportunities in low income communities/countries</td>
<td>A kind of philanthropic partnership where companies consider recipients, often from developing countries or low income communities as clients and partners than just aid beneficiaries. Such opportunities are used to foster growth and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and guidelines development</td>
<td>A kind of partnership between the UN and the private sector (construction industry) where both sides ensure that standard codes for building projects for example are strictly adhered to. This ensures that structures are not built in disaster-prone areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funding</td>
<td>A partnership type overseeing the funding of UN projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of services and personnel</td>
<td>Partnership between the UN and the private sector where corporate capacity is linked with key areas of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of goods</td>
<td>Partnership between the UN and the private sector where the latter provides the former with goods during disaster relief operations. Long-term relationships permits poverty alleviation and development through this partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.12 Summary of Frame of Reference

This chapter introduced humanitarian logistics and supply chains as well as business logistics and supply chains, drawing similarities and differences between them. Disasters and their impact on human life and property including the various ways of classifying them
have also been discussed and illustrated using the classification proposed by Wassenhove (2006), which classifies disasters into natural and man-made which occur suddenly or slowly.

Furthermore, the partnership model by Lambert et al. (1996), is used to illustrate how partnerships are built and maintained. The model is a structured iterative process with three major elements which are the drivers, facilitators and components that lead to outcomes. Drivers are the reasons why partnerships are built whilst other factors like a supportive environment facilitates the process with joint activities and other initiatives by the partners acting as the components which sustain the partnership leading to the outcome of the partnership. Finally, there is a feedback or control mechanism which can be used to reflect on the process and make necessary changes where appropriate.

The chapter also gives a definition of cross-sector partnership in the context of this thesis which is the partnership between humanitarian organizations and the corporate private sector. The different pre-requisites or requirements needed for the partners to engage in this relationship are also discussed as well as the obstacles and benefits to partnering.

Finally, the chapter concludes with the different types of partnership relationships which could possibly exist between the two sectors, leading us to the next chapter which portrays our methodology and the way we carried out our data collection.
3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter covers the different approaches used by the authors to carry out both primary and secondary data collection in order to address the research questions formulated for the purpose of this study. Ethical issues are of primary concern here and are also discussed in this chapter. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary.

3.1 Research Approach

The two main research approaches used to carry out scientific studies are inductive and deductive research. The approaches used are distinct with induction being based on empirical evidence and deduction based on logic (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). Sometimes, depending on the nature of the study, a researcher could use both induction and deduction based research approaches (Sekaran, 2003).

This study implored the inductive approach in that it is conducted in an explorative manner and based on conclusions drawn from empirical findings. According to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2010), this type of research is often associated and common with qualitative type of research and proceeds from assumptions to conclusions. However, since inductive approach is based on conclusions drawn from some empirical findings, one can never be 100 per cent certain about the results (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010).

3.2 Research Design

Ghauri and Grønhaug (2010, p. 54), state that “the research design is the overall plan for relating the conceptual research problem to relevant and practical empirical research”. Furthermore, they explain that the chosen research design can be perceived as the overall strategy to get the information wanted and this reveals the type of research design which could be exploratory, descriptive or causal. The research design chosen affects or influences the research activities to be undertaken relating to how or what data should be collected. There are two research types; qualitative and quantitative research. Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007), define qualitative research as a data collection technique which deals with interviews or data analysis procedure or implores the use of non-numerical data. In sharp contrast to this, quantitative research is a data collection technique which deals with questionnaires or a data analysis procedure which implores the use of numerical data (Saunders et al., 2007). They further explain that combining both approaches (mixed approach) can give better results to generalize on and thus increase the credibility of the research.

The research design and strategy used for the purpose of this study is qualitative and explorative in nature as the problem being studied is only partially understood. The study is qualitative in the sense that the technique used for data collection is interview-based and uses non-numerical data. Conducting the study in an exploratory manner will give a clearer view and an in-depth analysis of the kind of partnership relationship between humanitarian organizations and the corporate sector.

3.3 Ethical Concerns

Ethics are moral principles and values which govern the way researchers conduct their study (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). Researchers should understand the moral responsibility they have in being honest and accurate about their work and also being open about the strengths, weaknesses and to what extent their results can be considered reliable. According
to Ghauri and Gronhaug (2010), a number of ethical issues have to be of prime importance to the researcher when conducting research studies. These include but are not limited to: making the nature of the study clear to the participants and involving them with their consent, preserving participants’ identity, use of deception and the use of force to get information.

In conducting this study, the authors paid particular attention to the issue of ethical concerns cited above and were guided by its principles throughout the different stages of the research process. One way through which this was achieved by the authors was by using different communication methods like e-mail, face-to-face and telephone calls to make the nature of our study clear to participants in order to get their consent for involvement. Moreover, the authors never used force to get the information needed during the data collection process but nonetheless, tried to persuade or convince the participants to see the need for the interview and the importance of the study.

3.4 Primary Data

Primary data are original first hand data collected by a researcher for the problem at hand. In as much as primary data is consistent with the research at hand, its major drawback is its time-consuming nature and the willingness of respondents to give their feedback. For the purpose of this thesis, the authors implored the use of semi-structured interviews as the primary source of data collection.

3.4.1 Semi-structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews are interview types which fall between structured and unstructured interviews and are preferably used when the topic being researched is of a sensitive nature and the respondents are from divergent backgrounds (Welman & Kruger, 2001). Interview guides are usually used with semi-structured interviews.

Based on the nature and topic of our study, it was deemed more appropriate to carry out a semi-structured interview in order to have the flexibility to control the interview process and at the same time, offer the interviewees the opportunity to provide answers without any limitations. (See appendices for interview questions).

A face-to-face interview was the initial plan for our primary data collection but after making contacts with some of the companies and humanitarian organizations we intended to include in the study, we were made to understand that they preferred interview questions sent through e-mails and telephone interviews. To that effect, we carried out both telephone and e-mail interviews with representatives of the companies used for our study.

3.4.1.1 Advantages and Disadvantages of Semi-structured Interviews

One of the main advantages of using semi-structured interviews is the fact that respondents are given the freedom to express themselves freely without any limitations. Moreover, interviewees can always ask the interviewer to clarify any question they do not understand or are not comfortable with. On the part of the researcher, semi-structured interviews provide the perfect opportunity to ask follow-up questions in order to get more information about a particular question which has not been fully answered.

However, semi-structured interviews have a couple of drawbacks too. One main disadvantage is its time-consuming nature and the unwillingness of respondents to participate. Unwillingness or reluctance to participate could be attributed to the fact that usually, interviews for such studies are not anonymous as compared to questionnaires which if used for
a similar study, are anonymous and cannot be attributed to any particular individual. Another drawback is the expensive nature of such interviews if carried out especially through the face-to-face technique and travelling expenses have to be borne by the researcher if the company or organization is located far away.

3.4.1.2 Limitations of Interview Techniques Used

However, there are some considerations to take into account when it comes to both e-mail and telephone interviews as they have their own limitations. With e-mail interviews, it is not possible to record and transcribe the interview process as the answers are sent back through e-mail and furthermore, it is possible for the respondent to forget to answer the questions hence reminders should be sent as appropriate and enough time ought to be given to respondents to answer and return the questions by mail. In addition, verbal communication is absent and it may be difficult to ask for clarification on questions which are answered briefly.

On the other hand, telephone interviews do not have to be too long, in fact, they should be straight to the point so as not to distract or bore the interviewee (Williamson, 2002). Moreover, it is not possible to observe the interviewee’s body language for signs of uneasiness just like with e-mail interviews. Furthermore, in order not to be met with non-refusal from the respondent for different reasons, the researcher should call at an appropriate time of the day which is convenient for telephone interviews.

3.5 Secondary Data

In as much as primary data is very important for research studies, the role that secondary data (even though it may have been collected previously for other purposes) plays cannot be undermined. Ghauri & Grønhaug (2010), emphasize that secondary data are not only useful to find information for solving our research problem but also give a clearer and better understanding by explaining the problem. More often than not, research studies usually begin by searching the literature and the authors embarked on their thesis journey by studying a host of literature in relation to our topic for the sole purpose of getting a better understanding of the research problem area.

3.5.1 Literature Review

The literature search and review identify, locate, synthesize and analyze the conceptual literature as well as completed articles, conference papers, books, theses and other materials about the research topic and problem (Williamson, 2002). The literature review formed an integral part of this thesis and assisted in identifying the gap from previous research and gave the authors a clearer view of the specific problem being studied.

Alongside the above mentioned secondary sources, the authors used key words related to the topic as well to search the internet and related web pages for databases with information about the research topic and problem. According to Bryman and Bell (2007), choosing key words to search the literature helps facilitate and define the boundaries of the research field. Listed below are databases and some keywords used for the literature search.

3.5.1.1 Databases

1. Advanced Google Scholar
2. Diva Essays
3. Google
4. JULIA (Jönköping University Library)
3.5.1.2 Keywords

1. Cross-sector collaboration
2. Cross-sector partnership
3. Humanitarian organizations and private sector
4. Corporate-humanitarian partnership
5. Disaster relief logistics and private sector companies
6. Cross-sector partnership requirements

3.5.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Secondary Data

Secondary data used as a means of data collection is convenient for research purposes and less time consuming since it helps to identify the gap in the research and how it can be bridged. Other advantages include the high quality of information which can be retrieved and analyzed in a relatively short period of time.

However, secondary data is not always reliable as information retrieved may not be current hence not suitable for the purpose of the research. Thus information retrieved must be cross-checked in order to be assured of its current and accurate nature.

3.6 Choice of sample

The sample for this study was non-randomly chosen. The authors non-randomly selected two private sector companies and one humanitarian organization to participate in this study. The purpose for choosing more than one company was to find out whether the kind of partnership relationship the firms engage in differ or is the same. Selecting the firms non-randomly ensured that, firms from the private sector and the humanitarian sector had a chance to participate in this study.

Moreover, we wanted to focus on firms in both sectors which partner with each other. According to Nordqvist (2005), deciding the number of cases is the result of a balanced interaction between the breadth and depth of the cases. By implication, even though selecting more firms would have given a wider scope, at the same time, it would have made it difficult for the authors to thoroughly analyze the individual firms given the limited time frame available to complete the thesis. Thus by selecting the three firms, we were able to thoroughly study and analyze each firm in order to better understand the partnership relationship.

3.6.1 SWECO and MSF (Médecins Sans Frontières)/Läkare Utan Gränser

We settled for SWECO in the private sector and MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser in the humanitarian sector which partner with each other. Läkare Utan Gränser is the Swedish branch of MSF. We contacted Rebecka Gunner, the Information Chef of SWECO by e-mail on the 7th of April 2011 and she agreed to a telephone interview which was carried out at 10:00 on the 15th of April 2011.

The contact with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser was first made by e-mail on the 23rd of February 2011. Elisabeth Falk, in charge of the Office Volunteer department agreed to an e-mail interview and the questions were sent to her on the 7th of April 2011 but we never got any response from her. A series of follow-up calls were made and we were finally informed
on the 18th of April 2011 by Katharina Ervanius, MSF’s Corporate Fundraiser in Stockholm that due to time constraints and a heavy workload, it would be impossible to grant us an interview. However, she advised us to consult their website since the information we were seeking could be retrieved from there and the authors had to eventually settle for that.

3.6.2 Ericsson

Ericsson partners with a number of humanitarian organizations including the (UN) United Nations and some of its bodies, OCHA (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs), UNICEF and WFP in Rome. They also partner with IFRC. Our first contact with Ericsson was made by phone on the 24th of March 2011. Stig Lindström, working with Ericsson Response which is the division of the company that handles humanitarian issues based on a CSR programme initiative agreed to a telephone interview which was carried out on 2011-05-10 at 13:00.

Illustrated below in table 3.1 is a summary of the interviews carried out during the data collection process.

Table 3.1 Summary of Data Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Company/Organization</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWECO</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Rebecka Gunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-04-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-05-2011</td>
<td>Ericsson Response</td>
<td>E-mail, phone</td>
<td>Stig Lindström</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-04-2011</td>
<td>MSF /LäkareUtan Gränser</td>
<td>Retrieved from organization’s webpage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.3 Non-cooperation

We made several attempts to contact WFP in Rome through e-mails and but all were futile and we had to abort the idea. In a bid to get more humanitarian organizations to participate in the study, we contacted UNICEF but we were informed that they did not have enough resources for an interview and thus could not be of help to us. Moreover, we contacted the Swedish Red Cross in Stockholm but the timing was wrong as they were undergoing re-structuring. Hanna Qvarnström, in charge of Human Resources informed us that they were in the middle of a reorganization and no one capable of answering our questions was available.

Last but not the least, an attempt was made to contact DHL in Stockholm but we were informed that the department that deals with humanitarian issues is at their headquarters. Hence, we were directed to their headquarters in Bonn, Germany, which proved to be cumbersome thus, the idea had to be aborted.

In the final weeks of this study, we made an attempt to contact the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), which is a governmental humanitarian organization for an interview but once again, the timing was wrong as it was a very busy period for them. We were given
a later date which was not conducive for us because of the limited time we had left on our hands to wrap up the study.

Finally, due to time constraints imposed on us by the time frame of this thesis, we had to carry on with our study with just one humanitarian organization as opposed to two private sector companies.

3.7 Credibility of Research

A thesis or study of this nature should be carried out in a credible manner and three important aspects of credibility include generalizability, reliability and validity.

3.7.1 Validity and Reliability

Validity refers to the extent to which data collection methods measure what it intends to measure or capture (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2010; Saunders et al., 2007). There are two aspects of validity commonly used for measurements in business research methods: internal and external validity. On the one hand, whilst internal validity deals with the extent to which we can infer that a causal relationship exists between two or more variables, external validity on the other hand relates to the extent that the findings can be generalized to particular persons, settings and times as well as to the whole population (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2010).

Reliability refers to how stable or consistent the findings of a measurement are and if it can produce the same results when carried out in other settings (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2010).

By studying a wide variety of literature in order to get a broad view and a better understanding of the issue being studied and gathering primary data from respondents who are representatives of selected credible organizations in the two sectors under study, the authors were able to carry out their study on the collaboration between humanitarian organizations and the corporate private sector. Moreover, to ensure the reliability and validity of data retrieved from secondary sources, the authors had to cross-check all the retrieved information in order to know if it is current and accurate. This was done to fulfill the aspect of credibility.

3.8 Summary of Methodology Chapter

The methodology chapter began by introducing the different research approaches and designs used in carrying out scientific research and explained why the authors used an inductive approach and settled for the qualitative research type as opposed to quantitative. Moral issues of ethical concern governing the way research studies ought to be carried out are of primary concern and are discussed by the authors, explaining how they were used in the data collection process.

Moreover, the two different data collection techniques; primary and secondary, were both used by the authors and are discussed thoroughly. The authors used both primary and secondary data collection techniques in order to get full access to the information needed which would not have been possible by using just one technique as the topic being studied was only partially understood. Using semi-structured interviews as the main primary data source, the authors gathered information from respondents which served as empirical data. For the secondary data, the authors by consulting different databases, retrieved the right information needed, from different scientific articles and reports. Different textbooks were
also used to conduct the study as well as relevant materials from different webpages and websites.

Finally, the chapter concluded with a discussion on the validity and reliability of the research, which defines its credibility. The next section that follows presents the findings of the study.
4 EMPirical FINDINGS

The results from our empirical findings are presented in this chapter of the thesis which begins with the description of the companies and humanitarian organization used as sources of data for the study. The findings are then presented separately.

4.1 SWECO

Sweco is an international consulting engineering company, providing qualified consulting services with high knowledgeable contents. Services offered by Sweco include architecture, structural engineering, building service systems, infrastructure, water and environment, project management, energy systems, geographic information systems, and industrial engineering. Sweco has carried out projects in more than one hundred (100) countries.

Our interviewee from SWECO is Rebecka Gunner, who is the Information Chef of SWECO in Sweden.

4.1.1 Kind of Partnership Relationship

Sweco is a private sector company that partners with Läkare Utan Gränser/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) a renowned organization in the humanitarian sector. According to Rebecka Gunner, their partnership with MSF is a long-term relationship which stretches for a period of three (3) years and is evaluated every six(6) months. Consequently, SWECO collaborates at all phases (preparedness, response, recovery) with MSF during a humanitarian crisis. SWECO classifies their partnership with MSF as a corporation partnership.

From the interview with Rebecka Gunner, we gathered that SWECO provides different kinds of assistance to MSF and vice versa to make the partnership mutual. SWECO provides staff ranging from engineers to logistics personnel, cash donations and transportation services to MSF.

4.1.2 Problems and Benefits of the Partnership

According to our interviewee, SWECO entered into the partnership to gain new experience for their employees as they work abroad or internationally amongst people with different cultures. Upon their return from these international assignments, the staff can use the new experience gained to help in their business internationally.

So far, the partnership is working very well to their expectations and no problems have emerged. SWECO however, sees it as a challenge informing their employees about the prospectives and opportunities of going away on such assignments and so far, some of their staff have taken up the challenge and worked on these international assignments.

On the benefits derived from the partnership with MSF, our interviewee stressed that SWECO staff gained new experience from working abroad. Moreover, with MSF being a renowned brand name in the humanitarian sector, partnering with them gives SWECO a good brand image for their corporation.

4.1.3 Pre-requisites or Requirements for the Partnership

From the interview, we gathered that before the partnership was formed, SWECO had some requirements that had to be met before entering into the partnership. Investigations had to be carried out on their intended partner to know the kind of organization they would be dealing with. In terms of ethical issues, SWECO wants to know if their intended
partner has a good public image and also if there are any risks in entering into partnership with them.

Rebecka Gunner acknowledged that both partners are different in the sense that they are a private sector company whilst their partner is an organization the humanitarian sector, hence, they have different values. However, they both work abroad and have shared ideas about making the world a better place. They are working together to improve the lives of people in the society.

In terms of sustaining the relationship, SWECO organizes joint activities such as planning with its partners at the beginning of every year with a follow-up and evaluation on these activities every three months.

SWECO communicates regularly with its partners so as to make the partnership effective.

4.2 Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF)/Läkare Utan Gränser

Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) is a medical humanitarian organization that saves lives and eases the suffering of people affected by crises, wars and natural disasters. Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) was founded in 1971 in Paris and is an international network consisting of nineteen sections in as many countries, with field projects in more than eighty countries around the world. Läkare Utan Gränser, which is the Swedish section of MSF was formed in 1993 by three Swedish doctors. The objective of Läkare Utan Gränser is to raise funds, recruit street workers and to conduct press and PR work.

4.2.1 Kind of Partnership Relationship

Läkare Utan Gränser/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) is an organization in the humanitarian sector that has partnerships with the following organizations; SWECO, PostkodLotteriet, Banco Humanfonden, Walleniusrederierna, GodEl, GodFond, Calligraphen, and Agoodtshirt, which are all companies in the private sector. However, SWECO is Läkare Utan Gränser’s first main partner in the private sector. Läkare Utan Gränser collaborates at all phases (preparedness, response and recovery) with SWECO when a humanitarian crisis occurs. The information obtained from the company’s website (www.lakareutangranser.se), shows that the partnership between Läkare Utan Gränser and SWECO is a long-term relationship. According to Therese Engström, MSF Sweden’s Fundraising Coordinator, it is the first time that her organization has proactively contacted a company they are very eager to form a deeper long-term partnership with (Medical News Today, 2009).

Läkare Utan Gränser receives different kinds of support from SWECO. SWECO provides support such as staff, cash donation and transportation services to Läkare Utan Gränser.

4.2.2 Problems and Benefits of the Partnership

The partnership provides some benefits to Läkare Utan Gränser and vice versa. Since SWECO is an international consultancy firm and Läkare Utan Gränser is a humanitarian organization, there is shared knowledge between both firms when they work together. Läkare Utan Gränser gets some additional benefits from SWECO such as staff, cash donations and transportation services. Rebecka Gunner, the Information Chef of SWECO, informed the authors of this thesis about the benefits that Läkare Utan Gränser receives from SWECO.

The authors also gathered that the partnership between both partners has no problems and they are happy with the partnership.
4.2.3 Pre-requisites or Requirements for the Partnership

The information gathered from Läkare Utan Gränser's website indicates that SWECO's employees undergo the same recruitment process as all other applicants with Läkare Utan Gränser. According to Rebecka Gunner, the information chef of SWECO, before the partnership was formed Läkare Utan Gränser performed some screening on their company to know which kind of organization they are entering into partnership with and ethical issues such as the operations of SWECO and also if SWECO has had any troubles with the media.

According to information obtained from Rebecka Gunner, even though both companies work in different sectors and have different values, they both have shared ideas about making the world a better place. Also in terms of sustaining the relationship, Läkare Utan Gränser communicates regularly with SWECO to make the partnership effective.

4.3 Ericsson

Ericsson is a world-leading provider of telecommunications equipment and services related to mobile and fixed network operators globally. The company has over one thousand (1000) networks in more than a hundred and seventy five (175) countries utilizing their network equipment and 40% of all mobile calls are made through their systems. Ericsson is one of the few companies worldwide offering end-to-end solutions for all major mobile communication standards (www.ericsson.com). Ericsson has set aside a division called Ericsson Response that handles humanitarian issues based on a CSR initiative programme.

4.3.1 Ericsson Response

Ericsson Response was founded in April 2000 at the request of company employees interested in using their experience and skills in disaster relief situations on a voluntary basis. In a relief operation, Ericsson Response volunteers primarily focus on the IT and telecom support in the disaster-stricken area and work in this area on the disaster site alongside their partners.

Our interview was conducted with a staff at Ericsson Response. Our interviewee, Stig Lindström is responsible for operations, partnerships and CSR.

4.3.2 Kind of Partnership Relationship

Ericsson Response partners with UN bodies including WFP, OCHA, UNICEF. They also partner with IFRC. According to Stig Lindström, Ericsson Response collaborates with their partners at the preparedness and initial stages of an emergency or the response phase. Ericsson Response has a long-term relationship with all their partners and they offer in-kind donations to them. The partnership relationship has been in existence since the year 2000.

Ericsson Response provides different kinds of assistance such as GSM (Global System for Mobile Communications) coverage and wireless network to their partners for free when they are involved in a disaster relief operation as well as technical staff for the installation of these equipments.

4.3.3 Problems and Benefits of the Partnership

We ascertained from the interview that the partnership between Ericsson response and its partners has no problems and has been running smoothly.
According to Stig Lindström, the company benefits from the partnership. The benefits achieved by the company is the enhancement of its brand image and CSR towards society. Ericsson employees working as volunteers also add another dimension to their jobs, making them to feel more motivated.

4.3.4 Pre-requisites or Requirements for the Partnership

Ericsson did not set aside any requirements for the partnerships they engaged in mainly because they knew the kind of organization they wanted to partner with from the onset and already knew some of the workers with the humanitarian organizations. Hence according to our interviewee, no requirements were needed for the partnership.

Ericsson carries out close activities together with their partners. One of such activities involves the sending of Information and Communication Technology specialists to Tanzania to work with WFP in support of the “ONE UN” initiative programme currently running in that country and in Mozambique and Rwanda as well (www.ericsson.com).

In order to sustain the partnership, Ericsson and its partners maintain regular communication and also organizes a one week basic training course for all its volunteer workers. This one week training exercise is a group work activity and the volunteers are trained on how to set up and maintain wireless network, GSM and other ICT tools needed for communication when a disaster relief operation is being carried out.
5 Analysis

This chapter analyzes the empirical findings by relating them with the frame of reference and presents the concluding results. The analysis of the empirical findings is presented in a combined form and ends with a concluding summary.

5.1 Kind of Partnership Relationship

SWECO is in a partnership with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser, which is a renowned organization in the humanitarian sector. It is known generally that companies are highly selective when it comes to partner selection. According to Binder and Whitte (2007), private sector companies usually form partnerships with humanitarian organizations that will raise their corporate brand image. According to Lambert et al. (1996) partnership model, reasons such as creating awareness for the company’s brand image through the formation of partnerships are called drivers. These drivers can be accounted for the reasons why SWECO formed a partnership with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser being a renowned organization and having the tendency to raise their corporate image and brand.

SWECO’s partnership with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser is a long-term partnership that stretches over a three-year period subject to evaluation every six months. Collaboration between the two firms takes place at all phases of a humanitarian crisis (preparedness, response and recovery). This is made possible due to the long-term partnership that exists between them. SWECO provides assistance to MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser in diverse ways including cash donations, staff and transportation services. This relationship can be classified as a philanthropic partnership relationship since according to Balcik et al. (2009), philanthropic partnership is a relationship where private sector companies interact with humanitarian organizations in other ways other than providing commercial supplies.

Hence we can deduce that the partnership between SWECO and MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser where SWECO provides cash donations, staff and transportation services, falls under philanthropic partnership even though SWECO calls it a corporation partnership.

According to Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), philanthropic partnership is established on the expressed needs of the humanitarian organization and is echoed by Therese Engström, the Fundraising Coordinator at MSF Sweden where she states that her organization’s eagerness to form a deeper long-term relationship with a partner in the private sector prompted them to partner with SWECO. Consequently, with the partnership being a long-term relationship, collaboration takes place at all phases (preparedness, response and recovery) of a humanitarian crisis which is very important and crucial in case of an emergency. Collaborating at all phases of the disaster management cycle by implication means disaster victims get on-going aid during the rehabilitation process which helps them recover and return to their normal daily lives (Tomasini & Wassenhove, 2009).

Ericsson Response is in a partnership relationship with big and renowned humanitarian organizations such as WFP, UNICEF, OCHA and the IFRC. Binder and Witte (2007), acknowledge that companies are highly selective in selecting their partners. Ericsson Response has a long-term relationship with their partners and they collaborate with them at the preparedness and response phases of the disaster management cycle. Being in a long-term partnership relationship with their partners facilitates or enables Ericsson to collaborate with them at the preparedness and response phases of a disaster. Ericsson Response offers in-kind donations such as GSM (Global System for Mobile Communications) coverage and wireless network to their partners. They also provide staff for the installation of the
According to Balcik et al. (2009), Philanthropic partnership is a relationship whereby a private sector company engages in a vertical or horizontal relationship with a humanitarian organization and offer the humanitarian organization with monetary or in-kind donations such as supplies, staff or other resources. From the above, we can say that the relationship between Ericsson Response and its partners is a philanthropic partnership.

### 5.2 Problems and Benefits of the Partnership

During the interview with Rebecka Gunner, she mentioned that the partnership between SWECO and MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser has been working well so far and no problems have emerged. We see this partnership as a huge success since no obstacles have been encountered and it is working out as expected. Although Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009) identified some problems such as lack of mutual understanding, roles and responsibilities, management of the partnership, commitment at all levels and lack of transparency and accountability, none of these have surfaced in the cross-sector partnership between SWECO and MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser. Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009), largely attributed that these problems arise because of cultural differences between the two sectors.

Talking about the benefits of the partnership, SWECO entered into the partnership to gain new experience for their employees. By working together, there is a transfer of knowledge between the two sectors through the sharing of expertise and resources. Balcik et al. (2009), state that private sector companies enter into partnerships with humanitarian organizations to share expertise and encourage knowledge transfer. Rebecka Gunner stressed that with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser being a renowned brand name in the humanitarian sector, partnering with them raises SWECO’s brand image. The private sector companies enter into partnership with humanitarian organizations for reasons such as brand image, corporate social responsibility, staff motivation and so on (Rieth, 2009). By partnering with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser, SWECO gains more benefits in non-monetary terms by improving the company’s Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). This directly relates to what Krishnan and Balachandran (2006), acknowledge as CSR where they agree that businesses behave ethically by contributing to economic development through the improvement of the quality of life of their workforce and their communities and societies at large without solely focusing on the maximization of profits.

Moreover, with the huge cultural differences existing between the humanitarian sector and the private sector, one would naturally expect some conflicts and obstacles when they collaborate and form long-term partnerships. However, the partnership between MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser and SWECO has been working well so far with no emerging problems. This could be attributed to the fact that working together abroad on projects with people from different backgrounds helps the different staff adapt and learn to accommodate each other.

The benefits gained from the partnership between MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser and its partner SWECO are both monetary and in non-monetary terms. This kind of relationship according to Balcik et al. (2009) is a philanthropic partnership as discussed above since MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser receives resources other than commercial supplies from SWECO. MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser receives sizeable cash donations from SWECO as well as transportation services and staff including logisticians. By working with staff from SWECO, there is a transfer of knowledge and shared expertise between the two sectors which directly relate to the statement by Balcik et al. (2009), that the two sectors enter into partnerships to share expertise, resources and transfer knowledge.
In addition, we learned from our interviewee at Ericsson Response, Stig Lindström, that the relationship between Ericsson and its partners has no problems and that the partnership has been a success. Even though Tennyson (2003) and Tomasini and Wassenhove (2009) have outlined some obstacles to partnerships, none of these obstacles are evident in the relationship between Ericsson Response and their partners.

The benefits achieved by Ericsson Response in the relationship with their partners are the enhancement of the company’s brand image and CSR towards society. Their employees also feel more motivated at work. Private sector companies engage in disaster relief for various reasons such as brand image, corporate social responsibility, staff motivation and so on (Rieth, 2009). Since Ericsson Response is in a partnership with well-known humanitarian organizations such as WFP, OCHA, UNICEF and IFRC, this enhances the company’s brand image. By engaging in CSR, it also leads to economic benefits for Ericsson Response. According to Porter and Kramer (1999), the more social improvements conveyed to a company’s business, the more it leads to economic benefits as well.

5.3 Pre-requisites or Requirements for Partnership

A number of requirements have to be met before a partnership is formed. We learned from Rebecka Gunner that SWECO had some requirements that had to be met before they entered into partnership with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser. SWECO performs ethical screening on their intended partner to determine if there are any risks in forming the partnership and if their would be partner has a good public image. Binder and Witte (2007), acknowledge that private companies look for selection criteria such as efficiency, competency and a good public image in their partners before entering into partnership as this will raise their corporate brand image.

To strengthen the partnership between the two sectors, with both partners having different values and backgrounds, SWECO maintains that working together with a shared idea of improving the livelihoods of affected victims, helps strengthen the partnership. This is in conjunction with what Lambert et al. (1996), refer to as facilitators in their partnership model which serve as a good foundation for a partnership.

In terms of sustaining the partnership, SWECO organizes joint activities with MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser. These activities include joint planning at the beginning of every year with a follow-up and evaluation every three months. Communication is a two-way process in the partnership and SWECO communicates regularly with their partner to maintain the partnership. According Lambert et al. (1996), activities that sustain a partnership are planning, communication, trust and commitment.

On the other hand, MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser screened SWECO to determine what kind of company they were entering into partnership with. This is a useful selection criterion, as MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser needed to ascertain if SWECO has had any troubles with the media and the kind of operations they carry out. According to Binder and Witte (2007), companies are highly selective in choosing their partners. A lot of screening is carried out on the intended partner to determine if the partner is fit to enter into a partnership with. Competency and efficiency are therefore very important selection criteria (Binder & Witte, 2007).

MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser and SWECO work together to improve the lives of people in the society. They both have a shared idea of making the world a better place and alleviating
the suffering of disaster victims. This is in conjunction with what Lambert et al. (1996), refer to as facilitators which strengthen a partnership.

In sustaining the partnership, MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser communicates frequently with SWECO and participates in joint activities with them. Lambert et al. (1996), state that components such as communication, planning and commitment sustain a partnership.

However, Ericsson did not have any requirements for engaging in partnership since they already knew the kind of organization they wanted to partner with from the beginning.

As part of the performance of activities together with their partners, Ericsson sends Information and Communication Technology specialists to Tanzania to work with WFP in support of the “ONE UN” initiative programme running in that country and in Mozambique and Rwanda as well. These close activities between Ericsson and its partners strengthen the partnership. According to Lambert et al. (1996), facilitators such as corporate compatibility and mutuality strengthen partnership between organizations.

In sustaining the partnership, Ericsson and its partners maintain regular communication and they also organize a one-week basic training course for all its volunteer workers. Lambert et al. (1996), mention that planning, communication, trust and commitment are components which sustain a partnership.

5.4 Summary of Analysis

Humanitarian organizations and the private sector engage in different kinds of partnerships based on a needs assessment basis. On the one hand, while the private companies aim at raising their corporate image, brand and CSR among other benefits by engaging in the partnership, humanitarian organizations on the other hand partner with companies which fit their expressed needs in both monetary and non-monetary terms. Moreover, knowledge transfer through the sharing of skills, experiences, resources and expertise are also very important elements which add to the benefits gained by both partners.

It can also be deduced from our results that long-term partnerships, which happen to be the kind of relationship that all the firms used in this study engage in, is highly beneficial if both partners aim at collaborating throughout the different phases of the disaster management cycle. Moreover, collaborating at all phases of the disaster management cycle also ensures that beneficiaries get on-going aid during the rehabilitation and development phases which helps them get their lives back on track.

Furthermore, even though there exists different kinds of partnerships between the two different sectors, from our results, we can conclude that the firms used in this study engage in philanthropic partnership relationships since the partners interact in other ways other than purchasing and supplying commercial supplies.

Talking about partnership problems, none of the companies nor humanitarian organization used for this study mentioned any problems that they have encountered in the partnership. In fact, the partnerships, being long-term relationships, have been running smoothly without any obstacles. In spite of the fact that the partners are in different sectors, cultural issues and different values have not been any hindrance at all and this could be argued to the fact that trust and personal connection as in the case of Ericsson Response, are two very important elements which play a vital role in making partnerships successful. While on the other hand, through working together abroad in the field with their partner in the humani-
tarian sector as in the case of SWECO, gives the workers the opportunity to get to know and understand one another better.

The above summary ushers the reader into the last chapter of the thesis which is the conclusion of the whole work.
6 Conclusions and Discussion

This is the final chapter of the thesis which sums up the whole study. An attempt is made to show how the research questions formulated for this study are answered. Moreover, it concludes the analysis based on the empirical findings in relation to the frame of reference and discusses the limitation of the study while proposing possible areas for further research.

The authors set out at the beginning of this study to analyze the cross-sector partnership between humanitarian organizations and the private sector. Firms in the private sector and humanitarian organizations engage in partnerships to work in disaster relief operations in order to improve the lives of victims affected in one way or the other by disasters. In this thesis, the authors looked into different issues evident in partnerships between humanitarian organizations and the private sector. In order to achieve the purpose of the study, three research questions were formulated:

RQ1. What kind of partnership relationship do humanitarian organizations and the private sector engage in?

RQ2. What are the associated problems and benefits involved in such partnerships?

RQ3. What are the pre-requisites or requirements for such partnership relationships?

The above research questions led the authors to embark on a journey which led them to study a host of secondary data from articles, webpages, websites, textbooks and conference papers in order to generate theories and models which were used in the frame of reference. Interviews were conducted with two companies in the private sector (Ericsson and SWECO) whilst secondary data were used for the organization in the humanitarian sector (MSF/Läkare Utan Gränser).

The empirical findings were then analyzed in relation to the frame of reference and the results of the study showed that the partnerships between the firms of the two sectors studied were philanthropic, long-term and mutually beneficial in diverse ways. Whilst the private companies benefit through improvements in CSR, creating public awareness of their corporate image, and brand among other benefits by engaging in the partnership; humanitarian organizations on the other hand partner with companies which fit their expressed needs and gain benefits in both monetary and non-monetary terms. Moreover, knowledge transfer through the sharing of skills, experiences, resources and expertise are also very important elements which add to the benefits gained by both partners.

In addition, the findings obtained from the respondents of the study demonstrated that trust, personal connection, regular communication and working together are very important elements which can be considered as critical success factors which sustain partnerships. When two firms show a high degree of trust and personal connection between them, it becomes easier to engage in a partnership. However, pre-requisites or requirements needed to be in place before two firms engage in a partnership should not be ignored because of trust or personal connection in order to avoid any possible unforeseen risks. Ethical screening for instance, of intended partners is a requirement which should not be ignored when two firms decide to enter into a partnership. This is highly important especially when the firms are in two different sectors.

It should be noted that this study does not attempt to generalize the results of its findings as the sample used is not representative of the whole population given its small size.
6.1 Limitation of Study

By analyzing the partnership relation between humanitarian organizations and the private corporate sector, this thesis has achieved the purpose which was set out at the beginning of the study. However, there were some significant shortcomings which have to be pointed out.

First and foremost, the sample size used for the empirical findings for this study was too small, making it difficult to analyze and get a generalized view of all the parameters involved in the management of partnerships. A typical example was the issue of “partnership problems” which we could not identify from the data collected to support the theory in the frame of reference.

Furthermore, an in-depth case study of a disaster involving the collaboration of humanitarian organizations and the private sector could have been included in the study to make it more credible. The Japan earthquake and subsequent tsunami that struck on the 11th of March 2011 for instance, happened when this thesis was in progress and could have provided the perfect opportunity for a case study to be carried out but this could not be possible because of time and financial constraints.

Last but not the least, it was difficult finding a partnership model which specifically looked at how private sector companies (profit-making firms) could partner with humanitarian organizations (not-for-profit organizations) and successfully manage the relationship. Most of the models and theories found centered around profit-making organizations, prompting us to use just one source for the partnership theory and model proposed in the frame of reference.

6.2 Further Research

This thesis can be used as a base for further research since it is based on a scientific study and contributes to other research work carried out in the field of humanitarian logistics. We began this work with the aim of analyzing the empirical findings of the partnership relationship between humanitarian organizations involved in relief operations and the private corporate sector. In the course of the study, we identified some possible areas which could be further researched in the future.

This study does not consider the relationship and coordination between humanitarian organizations and other players involved in relief operations like the military and local governments of the disaster-affected area. It is well known that there are usually many players in the field playing different roles which may sometimes overlap in a relief operation. This is also a very important area and the way the relationship is conducted, directly affects the success of the relief operation. As it is not included in this study, we propose further research in this area where the relationship can be examined empirically.

Furthermore, as this thesis does not look into key performance indicators which can be used to measure how well partnership relationships are managed, the authors therefore propose future research in this field to consider these important criteria.

Moreover, since this study was carried out qualitatively with a small sample size including just two private companies and one humanitarian organization, we propose that future studies in this area be done with a large sample size involving more private sector companies and humanitarian organizations. We believe a larger sample size will give a clearer picture.
of the different kinds of partnerships between the two different sectors and how they are sustained.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Interview Questions for Humanitarian Organizations

1. What is your role or position in your organization?
2. What is the main objective of (name of humanitarian organization)?
3. Which companies in the private sector does your organization partner with?
4. At what level or phase (preparedness, response or recovery) of a humanitarian crisis do you collaborate with your partners?
5. What are the different kinds of partnerships between humanitarian organizations and the corporate private sector?
6. How would you term the kind of partnership or relationship between your organization and partners in the private sector? Is it a long-term or short-term relationship? Please elaborate on it.
7. Do you purchase transportation services or supplies from your partners?
8. What kind of assistance do you receive from your partners in the private sector? Please you can choose more than one of the following alternatives.
   A) Transportation services
   B) Medical supplies
   C) Non-food items
   D) Food items
   E) Staff
   F) Cash donations
   G) Other resources (please specify)
9. Why do you enter into partnerships?
10. What are the pre-requisites or requirements for forming the partnership?
11. What are some of the problems you face in the partnership relationship?
12. What are the benefits?
13. Are there any elements in the corporate environment which strengthen the relationship or allow it to grow? For example; shared values or mutual understanding.
14. What are some of the activities that sustain the partnership? Please you can choose more than one of the following alternatives.
   A) Planning
   B) Trust and commitment
   C) Communication
   D) Others (please specify)
Appendix B

Interview Questions for Private Companies

1. What is your role or position in your company?
2. What is the main objective of (name of company)?
3. Which organizations in the humanitarian sector does your company partner with?
4. At what level or phase (preparedness, response or recovery) of a humanitarian crisis do you collaborate with your partners?
5. What are the different kinds of partnerships between the corporate private sector and humanitarian organizations?
6. How would you term the kind of partnership or relationship between your company and partners in the humanitarian sector? Is it a long-term or short-term relationship? Please elaborate on it.
7. Do you sell transportation services or supplies to your partners?
8. What kind of assistance do you provide to your partners in the humanitarian sector? Please you can choose more than one of the following alternatives.
   A) Transportation services
   B) Medical supplies
   C) Non-food items
   D) Food items
   E) Staff
   F) Cash donations
   G) Other resources (please specify)
9. Why do you enter into partnerships?
10. What are the pre-requisites or requirements for forming the partnership?
11. What are some of the problems you face in the partnership relationship?
12. What are the benefits?
13. Are there any elements in the humanitarian environment that strengthen the relationship or allow it to grow? For example; shared values or mutual understanding.
14. What are some of the activities that sustain the partnership? Please you can choose more than one of the following alternatives.
   A) Planning
   B) Trust and commitment
   C) Communication
   D) Others (please specify)